Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 11, 2011

A regular meeting of the Albemarle County Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, October 11, 2011, at 6:00 p.m., Room #241, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Russell (Mac) Lafferty, Ed Smith, Linda Porterfield, Don Franco, Thomas Loach, and Calvin Morris, Vice Chair. Commissioners absent was Duane Zobrist, Chair. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia (Ex-officio), was absent.

In a transactional disclosure statement Mr. Zobrist recused and disqualified himself from CPA-2010-0001 Comprehensive Plan Update Expansion Area Request – Development Area 5 – Redfields.

Other officials present were Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Community Development; Andy Sorrell, Senior Planner; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; and Andy Herrick, Assistant County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris, Vice Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Committee Reports

Mr. Morris invited committee reports. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Matters from the Public not Listed on the Agenda:

Mr. Morris invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting proceeded to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – October 5, 2011

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on October 5, 2011.

Consent Agenda:

Approval of minutes: July 26, 2010

Mr. Morris asked if any Commissioner would like to pull an item from the consent agenda for further review.

Motion: Ms. Porterfield moved and Mr. Lafferty seconded for acceptance of the consent agenda as presented.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Morris said the consent agenda was approved.

Work Session:

CPA-2013-01 Comprehensive Plan Update

Work session on Demographics, Capacity Analysis, and Expansion Area Requests (Elaine Echols)

Purpose: The Planning Commission held a work session to review and discuss three areas of importance to the upcoming Comprehensive Plan update, as follows:

1. Current demographic and land use information
2. Trends and projections for future populations; land capacity for growth
3. Requests for expansions of the Development Areas

Mr. Morris noted that this evening he would ask the staff to discuss sections 1 and 2, the overall picture of what they are looking at with the comprehensive plan. They would then discuss it as a Commission, open it up to the public so the public can focus on that area, and then bring it back, discuss it, and give staff any feedback that they might want. Then on section 3 there are about 12 specific items that they want to look at individually. All of those items will be covered by staff. The Commission will open it up for public discussion and then bring it back to the Commission for discussion. The public as well as the Commission will have a chance to digest this thing in smaller bites.

Ms. Echols said they have been working on the comp plan quite a bit lately more in a regional sense with the city. Now they are getting into the County's comp plan update. This is the first meeting where staff is going to be bringing the Commission background information that relates to future decisions. They want to go over the demographic information provided in the staff report, talk a little bit about trends, projections for population, the capacity they have for growth, and then go over the requests that have been made for expansion for the development areas boundaries.

Parts 1 and 2: Current Demographics and Future Projections, Trends and Capacity
Ms. Echols presented PowerPoint presentation on Section 1 on demographic changes which will inform the work with the comprehensive plan. The Commission held a discussion with staff, received no public comment, and provided comments and feedback to staff.

Ms. Echols noted that Mr. Sorrell had put together a notebook concerning the capacity analysis with provisional numbers.

Mr. Sorrell continued the PowerPoint presentation on Part 2 Trends and Projections highlighting the major elements of current county demographics and what future projections were expected to be. Staff next compared the projected population and need to land supply and residential capacity to show how the County's future residential need could be accommodated by our current land supply. Staff presented the methodology for calculating the housing needs of future populations and a capacity analysis on the ability of the undeveloped land to provide for future residential growth. The capacity analysis indicated that there is sufficient developable land area on zoned parcels as well as designated parcels on the land use plan to accommodate anticipated residential demand through 2030. The Commission held a discussion with staff, received public comment, and provided comments and feedback to staff.

The Commission then had several questions and comments for staff.

- Don Franco –
    - Would like to see a breakdown by dwelling unit types in the approved rezonings since 2001 that have not been built (expand upon information in Table 6). This would help in unit type projections which we do not have now. The biggest competition between the growth area and rural area is going to be the single-family detached numbers.
    - In charts 6 and 7 he was looking for the historic information to get an idea of how they are doing. There was some value in breaking down the price points.
    - Asked how non-residential land area was backed out of the "land available for residential development" column in Table 2.
    - Asked what type of development are we producing now and stated that he did not believe we are currently producing the higher densities the Comprehensive Plan desires.
    - Asked what the metrics were for measuring success or failure in the future – is it less dwellings in the Rural Areas? What do we use to measure success or failure?
- Tom Loach-
    - Questioned the development in the rural section. The 35 percent average of development in the rural growth area is a significant number since they are talking about one-third.

The Commission next opened the floor for public comment on Parts 1 and 2.

Public Comment on Parts 1 and 2:

- Morgan Butler, with Southern Environmental Law Center, stated that the capacity analysis was conservative in its estimation of buildable lands. The analysis did not include a look at potentially redevelopable land or the demand for dwelling units in the Rural Area. The analysis backed out all critical slope and stream buffer land on potentially buildable land, but the county could grant waivers to use these areas.
- Jo Higgins stated that the density planned when developments have been rezoned over the last 10 years is not being achieved. Rezonings approved an upper limit but did not set a lower-limit floor.
- Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, said the concurrency of infrastructure is important. Expansions make sense where utilities already exist or are nearby. He also requested the Commission to consider how they measure success of growth in the Development Areas (and non-growth in the Rural Areas).
- Jeff Werner pointed out the average persons per unit multiplier used (2.19) is very conservative and should be higher. He stated that people moving to the Rural Areas are moving to the RA to be there not to be in some type of country suburbia.
- Steve Blaine cautioned the Commission to rely upon on staff's supply and need analysis because historically central governments have done a poor job of predicting future need.
- Scott Collins stated that if the Commission waits 10-20 years to include property within Development Areas that is close to it now, it is likely such property will develop by-right and lose the chance to accommodate greater density. The result would be "leap-frogging" to other parcels further away from DA boundaries that would result in a less-compact development and utilities pushed further out.

Requests for expansions of the Development Areas

Part 3: Expansion Area Requests

Ms. Echols continued with a PowerPoint presentation entitled, "To Expand or Not to Expand … that is the question", that highlighted expansion area request in Development 7, Hollymead, Pantops, Development Areas 4 & 5 and the Shadwell interchange area. Section 3 of the report contained analysis of individual requests for inclusion in the Development Areas.

- Staff noted that more up-to-date information was going to be presented for the Redfields request, since the staff report that went out to the Commission was not correct due to the Zoning Map Amendment request preceding the Expansion Area request.
- They hear a lot about the figure of 5 percent and wonder where did it come from and what does it actually mean. In the staff report it was a matter of things just worked out that way. It has become a convenient way to convey our goals for the county – 95% undeveloped and 5% developed. Sometimes they look at that in terms do they want to retain that 5%. The question should be rephrased more about what they want to have for future residential capacity rather than land area and see how that all works out.
- Staff proposed in the staff report some modifications of the boundaries, as follows.

One area to be removed relates to Biscuit Run and the Forest Lodge property for which a conservation easement has been requested.

Biscuit Run's Effect on the 5%

- Proposed staff revisions = 298 ac. net reduction in DA

- Leaving 22,113 acres in DA
- Removal of majority of BR still permits 5.0% DA

Currently: 23, 411 / 464,623 = 5.0% (5.04%)
Reductions: Polo grounds (southern end of 4) 85 acres, BR 561 acres out of 5 = **646 acres**
23, 411 – 646 = 22,765 / 464,623 **= 4.9% (4.90%)**
Additions: Whittington 199 acres, 110 acres Mosby Mountain (what is not in already), 16 acres between Mosby Mnt. & Redfields and 23 acres of Redfields already in lots = **348 acres**
22,765 + 348 = 22, 113 / 464,623 **= 5.0%** (4.97%)
22,113 is a net reduction
Note: proposed to keep the 231 acres of BR in 4 in due to Breeden property & possibility of public utilities need for BR property for cabins and etc.

Expansion Area Requests

- **Neighborhood 7** on Barracks Road – There are three development area requests outside of that area.
- **Hollymead** –Polo Grounds Road
- **Pantops** – Route 20 North
- **Neighborhoods 4 & 5** – Redfields, Somerset Farm -
- **Shadwell** – Rt. 250 East and Interchange with I-64

The Expansion Area Requests, in this order, are as follows:
- **Neighborhood 7** – These Barracks Road requests are not recommended because they are in the drinking water supply watershed.
- **Hollymead** – This request on Polo Grounds Road is not recommended due to environmental impacts.
- **Pantops** – These two requests might have value if improvements to Rt. 20 and 250 can be made and sewer extension issues are dealt with.
- **Neighborhoods 4 & 5** – Redfields is not recommended for approval. Somerset Farm may have value if the historic, cultural, and environmental features are respected in conjunction with a development proposal.
- **Shadwell** – The request is non-residential in nature. (We are recommending further study of this area after the Target Industry Study and the area will be larger than shown on the map, at least for study.)

Other Changes Recommended by Staff

- **Biscuit Run** – Boundary reduction – Rt. 20 South
- **Whittington and Mosby Mountain** – Old Lynchburg Road

Neighborhood 7 Expansion Area Requests

Morris, Montvue and Ingleridge Farm

1. Morris parcel – interesting question, between existing townhouse development, undeveloped land, and then an apartment complex. Across the street from the Colonnades. To bring it into the DA would mean a change in the water supply watershed boundary to the west. Understand the applicant's desire is for more than a residential use. Staff cannot recommend.

2. Montvue is further out on Barracks Road. It has some greater environmental constraints than Morris does. It also has an historic structure on it. The request is for low density residential.

3. The third request on Barracks Road has to do with the Ingleridge Farm. It has a few of the same issues environmental constraints. It is located in the rural areas and adjacent to a conservation easement.

Neighborhood 7 Issues are fairly significant in terms of a policy shift.

- Water Supply Watershed – (Note: Ms. Higgins supplied information today on the water supply watershed.)
- Barracks Rd Improvements
- Environmental and historic features
- How far do you go into the Rural Areas?

Mr. Morris asked as they go further out would they be taking everything from the current boundary of the development area out to the new area. He asked would that all be included in the new development area.

Ms. Echols replied that it had to be a contiguous area. .

Polo Grounds Road – Hollymead Expansion Area - Neighborhood 2

The request is for a piece of land between the two development areas of Neighborhood 2 and Hollymead.

Environmental Features and Tree Cover for the Polo Grounds Request was described as an area of steep slopes with a fair amount of tree cover. There are advantages in keeping the forest cover on that land for water resources. Staff does not believe this one is a good candidate for expansion due to the following reasons:

Polo Grounds Road – Hollymead Issues

- Confluence of Rivanna River and Powell Creek
- Polo Grounds Rd. Improvements
- Water resources and forest cover
- Difficulty creating NMD-type development

Pantops

There are two properties:

1. Clara Belle Wheeler property, which formerly was in the development areas. It came out at what they thought was the request of the owner of the property. The owner of the property said she wanted to be back in the development areas before the Pantops Master Plan was adopted. However, at that point the Board decided to go ahead and leave the property out.
2. Franklin Farm – Vermillion – They made a request at the end of the Pantops Master Plan process to be brought in.

Pantops: Environmental Features for Wheeler and Franklin Farm - Vermillion

- There is a stream buffer in this particular area. This parcel has a fair amount of buildable area if the issue of access can be taken care of.
- The staff report talked about sewer problems. Staff got some conflicting reports as to how easy it would be to provide sewer to both the Wheeler and the Franklin Farm property. That needs to be researched more. Pete Gorham, with the Service Authority, indicated that providing sewer under the Rivanna River is not as imposing as it sounds. However, there would have to be some kind of sewer extension that would take place on each of these parcels in order for them to be developed. If this is an area the Commission expresses an interest in getting more information on, staff can bring that back.

Pantops Issues

- Historic Structures
- Need for Rt. 250 at Rt. 20 Improvements
- Potential Rt. 20 N Improvements
- Access for Franklin Farm

Neighborhoods 4 & 5

Redfields Expansion

- In a transactional disclosure statement Mr. Zobrist recused and disqualified himself from CPA-2010-0001 Comprehensive Plan Update Expansion Area Request – Development Area 5 – Redfields.

Staff thanked Steve Blaine for pointing out some problems and issues with the staff report. Staff did err in the report provided to the Commission. When staff did the analysis, they were writing the report at the same time the ZMA report was being done. The CPA analysis got behind the ZMA report. Staff missed some things that should have been caught. Staff wants to provide a more up-to-date report on the Redfields expansion.

Last week the Planning Commission made a decision not to recommend approval of the rezoning. That does not presuppose that the Comprehensive Plan decision has been made. The CPA stands alone. The Commission's decision needs to be on the CPA and not on the rezoning. The rezoning proposal has some influence over it because they can see what is proposed.

Redfields Issues to Consider:
- The CPA stands alone
- Open space for use by residents
- Streams and slopes
- Value as an RA parcel
- Access
- Neighborhood Model Principles
- Adjacencies

Redfields - Value for Rural Areas
- Provides a conservation area for animal and plant habitat.
- A rural area stream will be affected by the crossing; critical slopes may also be affected with the development.
- Provides for low-impact recreational use to nearby residents.

Value for Development Areas
- Adds units in an area between existing residential developments with old zoning
- Has utilities
- Can meet some of the principles of the Neighborhood Model

Factors Favorable and Unfavorable

Favorable
- Is adjacent to the Development Area and to PRD zoning.
- Near major highway access and utilities.
- Available land for development is used as intensively as possible.
- Utilities are available.
- The applicant is proposing the highest density on the buildable part of the land.

Unfavorable
- One way in and one way out of this property
- In looking at the potential to connect to the adjoining properties where there is a stub out that piece of property is in the rural areas right now. That would be something that needs to be looked into.
- Sunset Avenue is substandard in design and alignment and not upgrades are planned for or funded. The additional traffic on Sunset Avenue would need to be considered. This is an issue to be considered because they have substantial infrastructure in a number of places in the

development areas now.
- Open space/trails that the community has been using will no longer be available.
- New trails are proposed in the area which could otherwise not be developed.
- The community of Redfields would be losing something that is fairly valuable and also provides a rural area function of conservation.

Staff Recommendation
- Still cannot recommend approval because of the current function of the property for conservation, slope preservation, and stream quality.
- If the Planning Commission wishes to expand in this area, staff recommends less impact to critical slopes.

In the rezoning proposal the Commission saw a development plan that was not on the critical slopes. However, staff believes that critical slopes would still be affected by the development proposal. Staff would like some considerations given to the amenities that would be provided. Right now the trails provide a significant amenity to the Redfields development and the trails that would be proposed really are some difficult trails that would not be the same kind of amenity that they have right now because of the steepness of the slopes.

Somerset Farm

Proposed Use:
- Up to 1902 units
- 2 centers
- 350K sq. ft. office and commercial
- No dev. Above 700' elevation

Somerset Farm Issues to Consider:
- Approximately 273 Acres are buildable
- Within historic district; adjacent to Ag-For District and conservation easement
- Transportation improvements needed that would be similar to improvements for which money was proffered in Biscuit Run
- Water service may be problematic because of the ability to serve at higher elevations.
- Historic structures on-site
- Can meet Neighbor Model Principles
- Would need to provide for extensive preservation on rest of 710 acres
- Current boundary of Rt. 20 forms a very visible edge between Rural Areas and Development Areas

Staff Recommendation
- Still can't recommend approval because of the current function of the property for conservation, slope preservation, and stream quality.
- If the Planning Commission wishes to expand in this area, staff recommends less impact to slopes. The development rights could potentially be eliminated at the top of the slopes. There may be a good value for getting that for the development areas, again, if they need more capacity.

Other Changes Recommended

Shadwell Interchange

- Chavan request is for designation to allow for mini-warehouses. There are issues to consider since it is an economic development opportunity.

Shadwell Interchange Area Zoning
- The old zoning creates some large issues.

- Staff is recommending this whole area be considered for possible expansion area potential since it might provide areas to meet economic goals and worthly of discussion.

Decisions

- Does the Commission believe expansion is appropriate?
- If so, which areas, if any, deserve more study?

The Commission then had several questions for staff.

- Don Franco -
  - Reiterated that he would like to see the dwelling unit types that were planned in the rezoning projects that have unbuilt dwelling units within them.
  - Also stated he would like to see how the unit type capacity in our Rural Areas compared to the unit type capacity that has already been approved in rezoning projects – specifically, how does the number of single-family detached dwellings we have approved capacity for compare to what the trend is for such units in the Rural Areas.
  - Stated the "Leap Frog" effect mentioned in public comment was an interesting point for consideration.
  - Indicated he liked a larger person per unit multiplier – such as the number Charlottesville uses.
  - Reiterated the need to understand how we measure success.
- Tom Loach –
  - Responding to the public comment about "Leap-frogging", stated that the County has failed to provide the needed infrastructure to support the Development Areas
  - Stated that with the large amount of additional residential capacity that we currently have, we should use this time to better plan for infrastructure improvements.
- Linda Porterfield -
  - Would also like to know what the number of dwelling unit types are that have been approved in rezonings.
  - Also stated that she would like to know the current number of vacant existing dwelling units.
  - Asked what services the County could really afford to provide in the Development Areas to accommodate the existing inventory of approved yet unbuilt dwelling units.
- Tom Loach -
  - Does not support the expansion requests to that are in the watershed areas
  - Stated that we need to look at a more micro, community level rather than the macro Places 29 level.
  - Did not feel that any expansions were warranted at this time.
- Don Franco –
  - Indicated that he needs more information (info he has requested at this meeting) before he would be comfortable in making a decision on the expansion area request.
  - Stated that rather than maximum facility, we should be looking at the "practical capacity."
- Tom Loach –
  - Stated that with the impact that expansions would have on county services, it was important to have the Board of Supervisors weigh-in on the expansion request and if there was going to be enough funding in the CIP to cover needed infrastructure improvements.
- Cal Morris –
  - If the Redfields expansion request was appropriate, could the DA boundary connect differently from Mosby Mountain to Redfields?
  - Also stated that the Polo Grounds Road expansion request was problematic with the road issues.
  - The Pantops requests appeared to merit further study, but providing utilities may be difficult due to past issues in the area.
- Linda Porterfield –

- Indicated she was hesitant to expand the development boundaries without knowing who and how the needed road improvements would be handled. Stated that we need to fix the road and traffic issues we have now before considering adding more land area to our Development Areas.

The Commission took at short break at 7:42 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:50 p.m. and returned to accept public comment on Part 3.

Public Comment on Part 3:

- Jack Vermillion said he was the applicant for the Franklin Farm request and that while he had no plans to develop the property at this time, he was surrounded by development and when his well was damaged he had to get a special exception to have his home connected to public water. He said he wished he had never suggested the County remove the property from the Development Area as had occurred at his request years ago.
- Steve Blaine, representative for the Redfields expansion request, stated that it was inappropriate to consider expanding the Development Area to include Whittington and Mosby Mountain and not include the Redfields property which has public water and sewer.
- Nick Leveritt, representative for Wintergreen Land Trust, stated that they would like to include all of the remaining land of the Wintergreen Land Trust into the development area (a portion of it is in right now).
- Scott Collins, representative for the Somerset Farm expansion request, stated that the property is close to transportation corridors and the City and there are utilities nearby.
- Christina Parker, Redfields resident, indicated opposition to the Redfields expansion request.
- Wendell Wood, developer of Somerset Farms, stated that the property was within walking distance to a several schools and the fire station. He also stated that the property did have the ability to connection to public utilities.
- Susan Murphy, Redfields resident, indicated opposition to the Redfields expansion request.
- Cathy Cassidy, Redfields resident, indicated opposition to the Redfields expansion request.
- Marcia Joseph, another representative for Redfields, indicated that the property was private and the developer could put up a fence if they desired. She stated that the property's relationship to the rural areas was important and that it also makes sense to put the adjacent Wintergreen Land Trust Property in the Development Area.
- Jo Higgins, representative for the Polo Grounds Road expansion request, stated that the property was surrounded by development and there were a lot of amenities that the county could get if the property was developed.
- Jeff Warner stated that the County shouldn't be considering expansions if it cannot fund existing transportation improvements.
- Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, reminded the Commission that they are the body that reviews and considers expansions of the development area boundaries not other advisory boards.
- Jo Higgins, representative for Ingleridge and Montvue expansions, stated that development was adjacent to it on the north and east and that it was suited to rural farmette type lots of 2 acres. Not including it in the Development Areas would be an opportunity lost.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Morris closed the public hearing to bring the request back to the Planning Commission for discussion and possible action. He asked exactly what staff expects the Planning Commission to do tonight and if and when would these things be brought up again.

Ms. Echols replied that staff hoped the Commission might be able to advise them on whether or not they wanted to do expansions of the development areas. The Commission has not answered that question, but has listened to the requests. She also heard from at least one commissioner that more information is needed before they can answer the question on whether or not they want to recommend expanding the development areas. She thought at this junction what she would like to get is the list of questions the Commission wants answers for and then they will bring back the answers to them and they can advise

staff on how they want to deal with the expansion area requests.

Ms. Porterfield asked if staff has a feel for when that would happen. She thought that for the people who came to speak from some of the areas that it would help if they had a clue. It did not have to be a specific date, but whether staff was talking about a few months or three weeks.

Ms. Echols noted as she made a list of the questions the Commission wants answers for she thinks they need to look at how much time that will take to get those answers. The information she heard that the Commission asked for is as follows:

1. Information on the housing mix that is on the market in relation to the hole.
2. How well the zoning is maxing out its density.
3. A matrix on the mix of units that have been approved by a rezoning (Table 6).
4. Something that is more up to date on the rural area capacity,
5. The type of density that is being achieved in Charlotesville.
6. The single-family detached housing in the rural areas versus the development areas broken down by value, if possible.
7. Several minor changes in the tables suggested by Mr. Lafferty.
8. What the metrics are for measuring success of our policies or plans.
9. How well the County is providing the amenities to the current development areas where the problems are currently that are not being addressed. Specific areas would be as far as transportation, the numbers of police, etc. The Commission wanted to know what infrastructure improvements are needed just to serve the developments that already exist. The big question is the infrastructure on any of the 12, or possibly 13, expansion requests.

Ms. Echols asked if she missed anything.

Mr. Franco said the only thing he was still looking for would be in staff's opinion how they would measure or what are the metrics for measuring success of our policies or plans. He asked if it was the number of units in the rural area, the amount of acreage lost to development in the rural areas or density that they achieve in the growth areas. What are the future metrics?

Ms. Echols replied that those are the things that the Livability Project is working on.

Mr. Franco said that is something they need to be considering during their project as well.

Ms. Echols agreed.

Ms. Porterfield added also how well the County is providing amenities to the current development areas where there are problems that are not being addressed. Specific areas could be as far as transportation goes, the numbers of police, and do they need more fire stations. Are there certain things that they are behind on and what is the chance of catching up on that?

Ms. Echols replied the way she worded that was the Commission wanted to know what infrastructure improvements are needed just to serve the developments that already exist.

Ms. Porterfield agreed that would be great.

Mr. Loach noted they would have to project out the 8,000 units, too. They have to be included because they have already been approved. Therefore, they ought to be factored in. As a matter of fact, they should probably factor in the 35 percent expected in the rural area on top of that if that is the current average. Irrespective whether are not it is supposed to be there they will be there and will have an impact on the roads and infrastructure.

Mr. Morris said that infrastructure is the big question for any of the 12 or 13 expansion requests.

Mr. Franco asked staff to speak briefly on the overall big process. He heard people asking where they were going from here. He knows it is a slow process and not a decision that is going to be made this month or year. He asked staff to explain in general that timeline.

Ms. Echols replied that their goal in CPA-2013-1 is to have something to the Board of Supervisors by January, 2013 that they could potentially adopt. This is a very small piece of the whole.

Mr. Morris asked for staff's benefit that the Commission go down the list by areas and get a sense of where the Commission is right now on how strong they feel they should be looking further at areas in NH 7.

- The Planning Commission discussed and did not support expansions areas in Neighborhood 7. One question was how the Western Bypas would affect this area.

- The Planning Commission did not support the Polo Grounds Road expansion.

Mr. Morris asked for thoughts on Pantops that included Franklin and the Wheeler area.

Mr. Franco said that he did not have strong feelings on either one.

Ms. Porterfield said she was scared to death to have anything else that is going through Pantops right now. The Village of Rivanna Master Plan is written saying that they have to do something with Route 250. This is part of Route 250 essentially.

Mr. Smith said he did not know how much development could be done on the Franklin property by right.

Mr. Morris replied that he thought it was five.

Ms. Echols replied she did not know since it depends on how many development rights are in that area.

Mr. Smith noted that the owner is not interested in doing the development himself, but just wanted it included. He was in favor of including Franklin.

Mr. Morris said as far as the Wheeler property was concerned, it was in there in the beginning and could be put back in. It is not needed. As far as the Franklin property, they heard Mr. Vermillion say why he wants to include it.

Mr. Loach said that he was against including Franklin and Wheeler properties.

Mr. Lafferty supported the Franklin property.

Mr. Morris advanced to Neighborhoods 4 and 5, which was Redfields and the Sommerset Farm.

Mr. Franco questioned what the benefit is. He thought that the staff report to date has said Sommerset has a lot of advantages and disadvantages. He thought it warrants additional study. He thought Redfields warrants additional study, but he could not support the density that was proposed last time in the location within the neighborhood and everything else. There was too much density proposed at the back of the subdivision. He thought something back there with less of an impact that provides final resolution to that privately owned land would be a benefit to the community.

Ms. Porterfield suggested Sommerset Farm because it offers both residential and commercial with two centers that it be moved into the study of the interchanges because it does have interchange access. Along with that she recommended that the Chavan property in the Scottsville District move into the interchange section. She thought they both were partially commercial or all commercial in the Chavan case, and it would be more logical to discuss them knowing that the applications were not totally residential. She could not support the Redfield proposal.

Mr. Smith said that Sommerset has a lot potential. He did not like the gross numbers that were there since he felt it was too much. It depends on what the plan does. The utilities are in proximity. If not, they make pumps and water tanks. He cannot support the Redfields proposal.

Mr. Morris and Mr. Loach both said they have no support.

Mr. Lafferty said they were basically talking about further study on Sommerset Farm. His position has not changed on Redfields in non-support.

Mr. Morris noted that he assumed with Shadwell they were taking a look at that with the interchange.

Ms. Porterfield said if everyone agreed she felt Shadwell was logical and made sense to be studied with the interchanges.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out he would not put Sommerset in the interchange study.

Ms. Porterfield replied that she was just saying that since it has commercial in it.

Mr. Lafferty said that it should be independent.

Ms. Porterfield noted it should go with the majority.

Mr. Loach understood with the interchange the commercial was supposed to be low impact and not using water and sewer. It was for low employment centers and mostly for parking, etc.

Mr. Cilimberg said the way the interchange was described in the economic development plan and priorities in the economic vitality action plan was to view them where public utilities were not available as potential areas to support rural agricultural or supplement with potential rural industrial type of use. In this case he thought they have little different circumstance. In this interchange because there is public water it is directly adjacent to the development area. So there are areas including the Chavan property that may actually merit some look as they relate to the development area as well as the interchange. It is a little different circumstance than the other interchanges that they are going to be looking at as part of the Interstate Interchange Policy.

Ms. Porterfield said that it also does not say that they can't look at the interchanges a little bit differently, too. Obviously, they are a bit down the pike from having started that process. They are also looking at another financial problem for the County and are already saying that they are not going to meet the budgetary amount they need again and are going to have to do some cutbacks. It makes sense to start looking at interchanges as potential areas to bring businesses that could generate income for the County other than just property tax. The reason she suggests Sommerset Farm is because it has an interchange that serves it. That is why it might be something they might want to look at both ways at that point.

Mr. Morris asked staff does that help at all.

Ms. Echols replied that it all depends. There was at least one Commissioner supporting everything except Ingleridge and Montvue. She did not know what to do with that. She did not know if that means that everything but Montvue and Ingleridge there should be further study on that or if there was some kind of majority that was being taken here that would suggest that they only go with what the majority wants.

Mr. Loach pointed out this was a question first for the Board of Supervisors to give us some direction where they should consider expansion in view of the financial status of the County. This is going to add on to that financial obligation. As far as infrastructure do they have money for roads, what is the future of the road, and what does the six-year plan look like. He thought they need some information before he was willing to consider the expansions.

Ms. Porterfield said her personal opinion is they don't need any more residential right now. She was basically saying she could live without all of the residential applications. The only two she suggested moving forward were because they have opportunity for commercial. That is a whole different ballgame than simply talking about property tax. She thought that they have plenty of residential right now. Somebody mentioned the fact that they need to make a decision as to what they really need. As Mr. Franco said before, what they may really need are bigger parcels in the development area so that they can figure out how to get people who might move into the rural area to stay in the development area. That is a whole different ballgame than anything that is being offered to the Commission tonight.

Mr. Morris asked if there was anything else. He thought Ms. Porterfield hit it right on the head. It seems that those people who had requested inclusion into the development area need a fair hearing from his point of view. However, he would agree that based upon the figures they don't need any more residential at this particular time or probably for the next five to ten years.

Ms. Echols asked if the Commission was saying that all but those two they should bring back additional information on, or did the Commission want to vote on whether or not they would bring additional information back for any on the list.

Ms. Porterfield said she was willing to put a motion on the table.

Motion: Ms. Porterfield moved that based on the information provided by staff the County does not need any more residential development at this point and for at least five additional years, they do not need to study these applications anymore.

Mr. Loach seconded the motion.

Mr. Morris invited further discussion.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested that they go back to the list so they were clear. When they say these applications are they referring to the five bullets in the presentation. He asked if it was the first four bullets basically.

Ms. Porterfield replied that was correct that it was the first four bullets.

Mr. Morris noted that a motion and second was on the floor. He asked for discussion.

Mr. Franco said he was still nervous about making a decision without having the final data. He was concerned that single-family detached may be a hole in the analysis at this point. He would like to see that before everything is thrown out.

Mr. Lafferty asked to give Mr. Franco what he wants on how much delay are they talking about to have a refinement in the figures.

Ms. Echols asked Mr. Franco if he was saying that he wants to see the metrics on the mix of units that have been approved by a rezoning and something in relation to the rural areas, the demand in the rural areas for single-family detached versus in the development areas how much supply they are providing right now for detached

Mr. Franco replied yes that it was along those lines that they keep talking about the projects in the pipeline. It would be looking at those and figuring out what that product mix is so they can better understand what is coming down the pipeline as far as single-family detached goes. Then they can sit down and look at what the past needs have been, which starts to tell him whether there is an adequate supply of that or not.

Mr. Cilimberg reiterated that Mr. Franco's interest there is to really have a feel for whether they have enough opportunity for single-family detached in the planning period. He asked if that was really what he

was trying to get at since the market, as they know, is also changing. It is not what it was five or ten years ago.

Mr. Franco replied yes, which was part of what Mr. Loach was asking for as far as the price points.

Mr. Loach said what he was trying to discern is why people are buying in the rural area versus in the development area and be able to say in those two acre lots within certain price points. Then they could see if there is anything they can do as far as changing them. He understands what he is saying as far as in the growth area, but wondered in the 8,000 units how many would be single-family homes. With that said he was not sure how they would extract out of that equation the change in market towards the different types.

Mr. Franco thought they would get the stand alone in what he is asking for. They need the information Mr. Loach was asking for as well or they have to make some assumptions about that. Right now he does not have a good idea how many of those 8,000 units they have been talking about tonight are single-family detached versus multi-family or townhouse. He thought the biggest competition for the rural area house is a single-family detached house in the growth area. The percentage is changing, but that is still the bigger component. Therefore, he would like to know how many of those are in the pipeline.

Mr. Morris asked Ms. Porterfield if she would entertain a motion to table her motion until this information is gained.

Ms. Porterfield asked when they can get it. She asked if another work session is scheduled for this.

Ms. Echols replied that she did not have that information right now. The initial information on what is the breakdown by unit on what has been rezoned won't take long. That could be done in a couple of days. Staff could probably get something out to the Commission in two weeks. As far as the price points that is questionable.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out staff does not actually track that information.

Mr. Loach said he thought it was interesting what Mr. Franco was asking for. He did not think it changes the equation overall what is available. It may give them some information on ways they may be able to look at rural area development and make some impact on it within the growth area. But, he did not think it was going to drastically change the capacity now as Ms. Porterfield said for five and possibly ten years. He would recommend Ms. Porterfield go ahead with the resolution.

Mr. Smith said he would not support Ms. Porterfield's motion because for five to ten years down the road they certainly can't ask these people to sit on their hands for that time period. He did not think any of them knew the answer.

Ms. Porterfield suggested they vote on the motion. In reading the staff report it made her realize they have more approved than they need. They may have gotten the wrong things approved. However, that is the developer's responsibility to then come back in and say they need to change what they asked for because it was not selling and he wanted to do this or that. But to sit here and spend time and make the residents of this County keep coming back to either support or fight a particular application that at this point they really don't need, she has problems with that. Not only do they not need it, but she is really afraid that they can't afford what they have already got. All they are going to do is lower the quality of life of the people who live in Albemarle County, as Mr. Loach said. Based on that, she would ask to call the question.

Mr. Morris asked that the motion be repeated.

Ms. Porterfield said the motion was that they do no further study on any of the expansion area requests except for the Shadwell one that will move into the Interchange Study.

The roll was called.

Mr. Lafferty voted aye. Given the report, which is an excellent report, he believed that they don't need to have any further expansion.

Mr. Loach vote aye.

Mr. Morris voted aye.

Mr. Smith vote no.

Ms. Porterfield voted aye.

Mr. Franco voted no. Without an understanding of the product types that are in the pipeline, he can't support the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 4:2. (Franco and Smith voted nay.)

In summary the following action was taken:

Vice-Chairman Morris polled each member on the expansion requests to the 5 areas discussed tonight (DA 7, Hollymead, Pantops, DAs 4 & 5, and the Shadwell interchange) and each member was given an opportunity to explain their position on the expansion requests. Following this discussion, a motion was made:

> Ms. Porterfield moved to not consider the proposed residential expansions to DA 7, Hollymead, Pantops, Development Areas 4 & 5 at this time due in part to the large existing supply of residential capacity that is currently available in the Development Areas. The motion was seconded by Mr. Loach.
>
> Vote:
> Aye: Morris, Lafferty, Loach, and Porterfield. Nay: Franco and Smith.

Mr. Cilimberg asked to add information on this year's CIP submittal for the benefit of Mr. Loach's question. This year's CIP submittals were not just a maintenance and replacement CIP. They actually given the opportunity to request the needs they thought existed based on our development and our future potential development. Not only was it a five-year CIP request, but it was a second five years of capital needs requests. So this particular CIP is going to be going through an analysis that is a little different than it has been for several years based on what are anticipated to be the real needs in the five to ten year period. How that shakes out in terms of the review and ultimately how the Board decides is yet to be seen. But, he thinks in this case they will have more of an indication of what kinds of project needs are out there based on our plans, based on our deficiencies and based on what they expect needs to be. That is not only for requests they made as community development, but also from other departments.

Mr. Loach noted that was his premise before that maybe this should go to the Board and let them tell us within the context of this new and upcoming CIP.

Mr. Cilimberg noted they won't actually have that until next year. The answers to the question that might come from the Board really won't come until the budget process is done.

Mr. Loach noted that they have to deal with what they have currently.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out he just wanted to let the Commission know what was coming. He thought there would be a work session with the Commission in January just to inform them on how those requests were moving forward.

Mr. Franco said there has also been a potential change in the funding strategies as well. He thought that there was a two million dollar reserve previously that was lowered and they were encouraged to look at some other funding sources.

Mr. Cilimberg said there have been a variety of revenue considerations. He did not think any definitive decisions have been made. That will also happen as part of the budget process.

Mr. Morris pointed out that what would be sent to the Board at this time is the Commission does not recommend any further increase in the development areas for residential as represented by the four requests as shown in bullets.

Mr. Franco asked if the Commission was still going to get the information.

Mr. Cilimberg said it could be pertinent to their consideration in what land uses changes may be necessary in 4, 5, 6 and 7, which are actually non-master planned areas that they will be taking up during the comp plan work.

Ms. Echols noted that it would also be important as they talk about the housing section of the comp plan.

Mr. Collins asked with that ruling as far as the Shadwell Interchange was the commercial part of Sommerset included in that motion.

Mr. Morris replied that it was not. However, he understood based upon what they said if Sommerset Farm is considered in the interchange location that when that is considered it may come up again.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out the Interstate Interchange analysis is based on some distances from the interchange, which this would not qualify under. He wanted to be clear so not to mislead anybody.

Mr. Morris noted that Sommerset Farm would not be considered since the interchange would be based upon the distance factor.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that staff will send the Commission's action taken on to the Board for their information. They want to keep the Board abreast of decisions that get made during the process of the comp plan review.

Old Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

New Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m. to October 18, 2011 meeting at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)