Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 14, 2012

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, February 14, 2012, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Bruce Dotson, Ed Smith, Thomas Loach, Don Franco, Calvin Morris, Chair; and Russell (Mac) Lafferty, Vice Chair. Commission members absent was Richard Randolph. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Other officials present were Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish

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

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

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

Set Meeting Time, Day, and Location for 2012

Mr. Cilimberg presented the proposed schedule for the Planning Commission for 2012.

Mr. Dotson noted that he had several vacation dates for the summer that he intended to share with staff.

Mr. Morris asked that they adhere closely to the clause that anytime the staff or the Commission feels they need to have a meeting on a date that is scheduled for no meeting that they feel free to do that. The Commission is here to serve.

Motion: Mr. Lafferty moved, and Mr. Franco seconded to accept the Planning Commission schedule for 2012 meeting dates, time, day and location.

The motion carried by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Morris noted that the Commission was open to accommodate other dates. The schedule was adopted as shown in Attachment 1.

Adoption of Rules of Procedure

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the next item was the adoption of the rules and procedures. Staff received an email with the concern expressed that when the public is interested in a particular project that is requesting deferral does not know in fact that deferral is taking place until the night of that meeting because they have to take an action to defer. Staff could not recall a case where someone requested a deferral before a meeting that the Commission has not granted that. They typically advise the public as well as the applicants that they would expect the Commission would defer, but it is not official until they do it. That is probably the best they can do. Certainly staff tries to make sure that it is understood that the deferral being requested in advance would be granted by the Commission unless they were recommending something different or they have heard from the Commission that something differently should be considered. He did not know that they needed to do anything with the rules and procedures. He thought it was worth noting some sensitivity to that. Again, they do their best to make sure people understand that when a deferral is requested in advance the Commission typically would grant that and if the public does not need to want to come to the meeting they don't have to.

Mr. Morris noted in the first sentence it says the Commission may defer any matter at the request of a member of the Commission. The Planning Commission has that authority. He asked if it had ever been used.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that he could not recall.

Mr. Kamptner noted that it was there in case the Commission needs it.

Motion: Mr. Smith moved and Mr. Lafferty seconded to accept the rules of procedures.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0.

Mr. Morris noted the rules of procedures were adopted as shown in Attachment 2.

Committee Assignments & Reports

Mr. Morris noted that Mr. Randolph was absent. He asked any Commissioner had any preferences.

Mr. Dotson said he would like to stay on the ACE Committee.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the existing list has a couple of slots that are open based on prior members no longer serving on the Commission. One is the Historic Preservation Committee and the other is the MPO Technical Committee. This list included the Rivanna Advisory Council or the Place29 Advisory Council. They have Pantops and Crozet Advisory Councils on the list. Those are slots that could be filled as well. Unless someone objected they would assume that those who have served on the various committees and are still on the Commission would continue to do so.

Mr. Franco noted he would be happy to trade out the CIP Oversight Committee and the Fiscal Impact Committee if someone else had any interest.

Mr. Morris asked if anyone else was interested in those. There being no one, Mr. Morris suggested that they get Mr. Randolph's input. He suggested putting Mr. Randolph on the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council. He recommended that they designate one or two commissioners to actually serve on the Places29 Advisory Council.

Mr. Franco and Mr. Lafferty volunteered to serve on the Places29 Advisory Council.

Mr. Dotson volunteered to serve on the MPO Tech Committee.

Mr. Morris asked if anyone else would like that. There was no interested.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that it would appear that only the Historic Preservation Committee remains.

Mr. Morris suggested that they make that available to Mr. Randolph. If not, he would take it.

Mr. Cilimberg said they would have that decided through the next meeting. Otherwise this has never been a formal set of appointments. It has been the consensus that they would have this representation. For all other committees it is as already serving or as noted tonight. Then at the next meeting they will confirm the representative for the Historic Preservation Committee.

The Planning Commission held a discussion and agreed to the committee assignments as shown in Attachment 3.

Committee Reports

Mr. Morris invited committee reports.

Mr. Lafferty reported the CHART Committee met and reviewed the regional traffic model forecast results. The MPO Policy Board met. They looked into the first modeling that has come out of the Planning District. One model being worked on for 2040 basically incorporates all of the known projects on the books right now including the by-pass. The model forecasts all roads into and out of Charlottesville will have level of service "d" or less with all of the improvements. Basically what this is saying is that you can't build your way out of congestion. Information is available at the Water Street Office of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District.

There being no other committee reports the meeting moved to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – February 1, 2012 & February 8, 2012.

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors at its meeting on February 1, 2012 and February 8, 2012.

Consent Agenda

Approval of minutes: November 28, 2011 & November 29, 2011.

SDP-2011-00082 Boar's Head Sports Club (squash expansion) – Major
PROPOSAL: Request for a major site plan amendment to expand the squash club at the existing Boar's Head Inn & Sports Club on the 12.141-acre property. Associated with this request are a 20' buffer zone waiver, a critical slopes waiver, and a curb waiver.
ZONING: HC Highway Commercial – commercial and service; residential by special use permit (15 units/ acre),
AIRPORT IMPACT AREA: Yes
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No
PROFFERS: Yes
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Institutional – civic uses on public property; community centers, clubs, lodges, civic and fraternal uses and Office Service – office uses, regional scale research, limited production and marketing activities, supporting commercial, lodging and conference facilities, and residential (6.01-34 units/acre) in Neighborhood 6
SECTION: 18-32 Site Plan; 18-24 Highway Commercial
LOCATION: 200 Wellington Dr. on the south side of Route 250 West, just past the entrance to Ednam
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 059D2-01-00-01500
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller
(Joanne Tu Purtsezova)

Mr. Morris asked if any member desire to pull any of the items from the consent agenda.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the Commission is taking up the Sports Club as a matter that at one point was being requested for a full review and then that request was withdrawn. That is why staff felt this matter could be handled through the consent agenda tonight. He said that no one spoke during other matters.

Ms. Monteith said because she was an employee of the University of Virginia and have an annual income from the University that exceeds $10,000, she was disqualifying herself from participating in the Boar's Head Sports Club Major Site Plan Amendment application.

Mr. Dotson said he, too, was an employee of the University of Virginia and has an annual income from the University that exceeds $10,000; he was disqualifying herself from participating in the Boar's Head Sports Club Major Site Plan Amendment application.

Mr. Morris noted that they still have a quorum.

Motion: Mr. Loach moved and Mr. Franco seconded for approval of the consent agenda items as recommended by staff.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0:1. (Mr. Dotson disqualified himself.)

Mr. Morris said that the consent agenda had been approved. SDP-2011-00082 Boar's Head Sports Club (squash club expansion) – Major was approved with the conditions recommended by staff as shown in Attachment 4.

Work Session:

Comprehensive Plan Update (Elaine Echols)
Future Housing Supply
General Plan Format

Ms. Echols presented a Power-Point presentation to explain the Comprehensive Plan Update on the future housing supply and general plan format.

This work session is for general input and comment. No final decision making is being requested.

On October 11 the Planning Commission asked staff about the existing and future housing units and some information on how cash proffers for affordable housing are being applied. Staff originally thought Ron White was going to be able to make this meeting to discuss that. He found out last week he had a conflict and could not attend tonight. Therefore, Ron White will be coming before the Commission in March.

Future Housing Supply

Existing Housing Supply

Additional information on:
- Breakdown of DU type for pipeline units
- Housing types currently on the market
- SFD units in DA vs. RA
- Approved density vs. Comp. Plan density
- New City DUs - type & density

Mix of Housing Units Types

Mix of Housing Unit Types

	Single Family	Attached Units	Multi-Family/ Condos	Mobile Home Units	Total Dwelling Units
Development Area Units	9,379	4,329	8,326	1,028	23,062
Rural Area Units	16,840	291	515	734	18,380
Total	**26,219**	**4,620**	**8,841**	**1,762**	**41,442**

Source: Albemarle Information Services Division 2012

- 63% SFD, 11% Attached (TH), 21% MF
- DA: 41% SFD, 36% MF, 19% Attached (TH)
- RA: 92% SFD

Housing Types on Market

Price	Detached		Attached		Condominiums	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
> $1,000,000	110	18%	0	0	0	0%
$999,999 - $750,000	56	9%	3	2%	0	0%
$749,999 - $500,000	123	20%	10	7%	2	2%
$499,999 - $300,000	158	26%	15	10%	1	1%
$299,999 - $200,000	103	17%	75	51%	10	12%
< $200,000	52	9%	44	30%	72	85%

Source: CAAR website 2012

- SFD more expensive & larger supply
- Location in RA on larger parcels may relate to higher listing price
- Low # Attached/ Condos may mean higher demand & lower supply

- Developers in City work with more confined space so development is often denser
- Avg. SFD lot: 6,600 sq. ft. = 6.6 DU/ac.
- Avg. SFA lot : 3,800 sq. ft. = 11 DU/ac.
- MF = 14 DU/ac.
- Developers in City work with more confined space so development is often denser
- Avg. SFD lot: 6,600 sq. ft. = 6.6 DU/ac.
- Avg. SFA lot : 3,800 sq. ft. = 11 DU/ac.
- MF = 14 DU/ac.

Value of Single Family Detached

	# SF Units and Accessory Bldgs	SFD Assessed Value per Bldg.	Assessed Value per SQ. FT.
Development Area	15,669	$182,618	$258
Rural Area	17,220	$226,192	$312

Source: Albemarle Information Services Division 2012

- Location, amenities, age, construction quality – make assessment comparisons difficult
- SFD units assessed value is higher in RA

New Homes in the Rural Area

Certificates of Occupancy for Single Family Detached Housing 2007-2011

Year	Development Area	% DA	Rural Area	%RA	Total SFD Units
2007	136	39%	211	61%	347
2008	75	33%	153	67%	228
2009	85	37%	147	63%	232
2010	125	48%	135	52%	260
2011	120	60%	80	40%	200
	541		726		1,267

Source: Albemarle County GDS Department, 2012

- Significant drop in BP and COs since 2007
- Trend: same or greater # of SFD units being built in RA compared to DA
- SFD in RA: Lifestyle choice, wealth or family land

Will Future Trends be the Same as Past Trends?

- Age of population
- Childbearing later in life
- Cost of gasoline
- Cost in standard of living

What do People Want?

- 508 responded to Livability Project survey on housing & job preferences
- Most County residents and commuters said they would prefer to live in Albemarle's Rural Areas
- Commuters:
  - 61% of those who live out of the area cite housing cost and a better value for

their money
    - Over 50% said housing affordability was major reason for not living where they work
- Albemarle residents:
    - Live here for lifestyle, amenities neighborhoods
- Live where they want to

Approved Density vs. Comp. Plan Density

- Diversity of size, type & many unfinished projects make comparisons difficult
- Historically, Comp. Plan densities have fallen short of the highest density desired (and the low end of the range sometimes)
- Meeting Comprehensive Plan densities can depend on location: Crozet & Glenmore
- Bargamin Park & Avinity – achieving max.
- Belvedere – close to max. on MF units
- Foothill Crossing – not achieving density

Charlottesville New Dwellings

- Developers in City work with more confined space so development is often denser
- Avg. SFD lot: 6,600 sq. ft. = 6.6 DU/ac.
- Avg. SFA lot : 3,800 sq. ft. = 11 DU/ac.
- MF = 14 DU/ac.

Infrastructure

- Available CIP & VDOT funds severely limited for planned projects
- Current needs not being met

Format and Land Use Categories
Reasons for Including Format Issues in Work session

- Bring BOS vision and relevant goals to PC's attention
- Show how all of the subject areas in the Comprehensive Plan tie back to BOS vision and goals
- Proviso: Some topics may ultimately go under a different heading

Vision, Goals, and Objectives
Board of Supervisors

Vision Statement: A thriving County, anchored by a strong economy and excellent education system that honors its rural heritage, scenic beauty and natural and historic resources while fostering attractive and vibrant communities.
Objectives:

- Encompass more than the Comprehensive Plan
- Relate to actions the BOS is working on over the next several years

Board of Supervisors' Goals
Related to Comprehensive Plan

- Provide community facilities that meet existing and future needs
- Encourage a diverse and vibrant local economy
- Protect the County's natural, scenic and historic resources
- Ensure the health and safety of the community

Board of Supervisors Vision and Goals and Staff Recommended Goals and Topics for Comprehensive Plan Update – February 14, 2012

Vision: A thriving county, anchored by a strong economy and excellent education system that honors its rural heritage, scenic beauty and natural and historic resources while fostering attractive and vibrant communities.

Board of Supervisors' Goals	Staff Recommended Goals
Provide community facilities that meet existing and future needs	**Provide community facilities that meet existing and future needs** Transportation Utilities Community Facilities
Encourage a diverse and vibrant local economy	**Encourage a diverse and vibrant local economy** Economic Development
Protect the County's natural, historic, and scenic resources	**Protect natural, cultural, scenic, and historic resources** Natural Resources Cultural Resources Scenic Resources Historic Resources Sustainability Goals Overall Growth Management Rural Areas Neighborhood Model Housing Goals
Ensure the health and safety of the community	**Ensure the health and safety of the community** Community Services

New Standard Land Use Format

- Not set in stone
- Not for Places 29
- Would like to use for Neighborhoods 4 – 7 mini-Master Plans
- Will preserve special aspects of Pantops and Crozet Master Plans

Residential Designations -- essentially the same as now

Commercial Designations become Mixed Use Designations, categories similar to 1996 Land Use Plan

Multiple Industrial Districts become two districts: Office/R&D/Flex /Light Industrial & Industrial (no Light or Heavy)

Schedule
2012

January 26	4 pm	Public Workshop – Transportation – Water Street
Feb. 14	6 pm	Albemarle Co PC – Housing and Population follow-up, Goals/Vision for and Standard Land Use Designations
Feb. 23	4 – 7 pm	Public Workshop – Facilities/Services
Early March	6:30 – 8:30pm	Neighborhoods 4 & 5 Meeting – COB Fifth Street
March 13	6 pm	Albemarle Co PC – Non-residential Land Use and Ec. Dev. Policy
March 22	4 – 7 pm	Public Workshop – Historic Pres./Natural Heritage/Historic Res./E.C.s
Late March	6:30 – 8:30pm	Neighborhoods 6 & 7 Meeting (date and location TBA)
April 17 2012		Joint PC Work session on Joint Goals
April 24 (Tent)	6 pm	Albemarle Co PC- N 4 – 7 Land Use/Master Plan format - impt. element
May	6 pm	Community Facilities/Service Standards Entrance Corridors and Design Guidelines
Spring 2012		Focused Citizen Input Meetings
July 2012		Albemarle Co PC – Review of Draft Comp. Plan
Early Summer 2012		Joint PC Worksession on Chapter Updates
Fall 2012		Albemarle Co PC – Public Hearings and Recommendation to BOS
Fall 2012		Citizen Check-ins on Recommendations
Winter 2012		Recommendations to PACC-Tech
Early 2013		BOS Adoption of Alb. Co. Comp. Plan

Upcoming Meetings

- Community Facilities Workshop at City Space February 23 4 – 7pm
- Neighborhoods 4 & 5 – Early March
- Neighborhoods 6 & 7 – Late March
- Joint PCs Meeting - April

Questions or Comments

- Housing Information
- General Format
- Land Use Categories

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Public comment was taken from the following persons:

- Morgan Butler, Southern Environmental Law Center, questioned whether there was any need to expand residential area to this expansion of the comp plan. From the meeting in October it was clear there was plenty of growth and they decided not to propose an increase in the development area since there was plenty of residential capacity. There is a fair amount of vacant land available.
- Tom Olivier, chairman of the Piedmont Group of the Sierra Club, recognized the comp plan is

extremely important to public. From the state law point of view it is fundamental. He recognized it was a key vision for developed area. The comp plan needs to offer biodiversity protection for natural resource protection, which is important for community vision. They need to put in place environmental protections. The Population growth – with open space – needs to be sustainable in the comp plan. The update needs to seriously examine conflicts between environmental protection and economic vitality.

- Jeff Werner, Piedmont Environmental Council, submitted a Draft of Combined Information from 12/20/2011 Staff Summary and 01/08/2012 Staff Report for CPA. (Attachment B) This information was referenced at last week's Board meeting**.** The current inventory needs to be taken into consideration before future growth is allowed. There is a large amount of unbuilt retail. He would assume the multi-family attached would be shifted.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Morris invited discussion and comments from the Planning Commission.

The Commission commented on the information provided as follows and asked staff to take their comments into consideration in the continuing work on the Comprehensive Plan.

Comments in general on Future Housing Study:

- There was some question about the form of development taking place in the development areas. A suggestion made to review the forms, such as large lot subdivisions and compact developments that have been successful.
- There was some fear expressed that the Commission was not looking at expected demand for housing by type for 20 years but just the number of units that could be built.
- One Commissioner said he hoped that houses built in the DA were comparable to those built in the RA. He said we don't want to force people to the RA because they can't find a comparable house in the Development Areas and don't have the opportunity. He asked if we need to change something to make it possible to build the type of unit in DA being built in RA.
- Another Commissioner commented that there are some distinctive differences between housing in the DA and RA that relate to "setting". He said that sometimes there is not a comparable option in the DA if someone just wants to live in the RA.
- It was suggested that a discussion needs to take place about the building trend in the Rural Area and on whether that trend should continue or it should be encouraged.
- A Commissioner noted that we need to look at available housing stock when analyzing supply and demand. She asked if we are really representing the amount of housing stock on the market. Later provided the total number of units by type that are on the market right now as 602 single family units, 147 townhouses, and 85 condominiums.
- A question was asked if cluster development would be useful. Staff responded that it is now by right, but not used very often.
- A question was asked concerning the percentage of 5 acre lots that were available in the RA.
- A question was asked whether purchasers of recently built single family homes in the DA would tell us about why they chose to live in DA versus the RA.

Comments in general on General Plan Format:

- A suggestion was made that staff look at what the city is going to use as their format for possible consistency.
  - A suggestion was made that the staff see if we could simplify the categories into possibly just three categories, neighborhoods, centers and areas.
  - A Commissioner asked that staff explore ways to make sure that recommendations in the comp plan refer back to the goals established by the Board. In addition, it should be made clear how ordinance amendments are done to tie into the county's goals so they can have topic areas that the board is already using.

No formal action was taken.

Staff invited other comments from the Planning Commission. Staff is going out and working with Neighborhoods 4, 5, 6 and 7 to develop a "mini" master plan to bring back to the Planning Commission.

Old Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- No meeting on February 21, 2012
- Next regularly scheduled meeting Tuesday, February 28, 2012

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:24 p.m. to Tuesday, February 28, 2012 at 6:00 p.m. 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)

ATTACHMENT 1

2012 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SCHEDULE

PUBLIC HEARINGS, WAIVERS AND MINISTERIAL APPEALS	**WORK SESSIONS**	**NO SCHEDULED MEETING**
JANUARY 10, 2012	JANUARY 31, 2012	JANUARY 3, 2012
JANUARY 24, 2012		JANUARY 17, 2012
FEBRUARY 7, 2012	FEBRUARY 14, 2012	FEBRUARY 21, 2012
FEBRUARY 28, 2012		
MARCH 6, 2010	MARCH 13, 2012	MARCH 27, 2012
MARCH 20,2012		
APRIL 3, 2012	APRIL 24, 2012	APRIL 10, 2012
APRIL 17, 2012		
MAY 8, 2012	MAY 15, 2012	MAY 29, 2012
MAY 22, 2012		MAY 1, 2012
JUNE 5, 2012	JUNE 12, 2012	JUNE 26, 2012
JUNE 19, 2012		
JULY 10, 2012	JULY 17, 2012	JULY 3, 2012
JULY 24, 2012		JULY 31, 2012
AUGUST 7, 2012	AUGUST 14, 2012	AUGUST 28, 2012
AUGUST 21, 2012		
SEPTEMBER 11, 2012	SEPTEMBER 18, 2012	SEPTEMBER 4, 2012
SEPTEMBER 25, 2012		
OCTOBER 9, 2012	OCTOBER 16, 2012	OCTOBER 2, 2012
OCTOBER 23, 2012		OCTOBER 30, 2012
NOVEMBER 13, 2012	NOVEMBER 27, 2012	NOVEMBER 6, 2012
NOVEMBER 15, 2012		NOVEMBER 20, 2012
DECEMBER 4, 2012*		DECEMBER 18, 2012
DECEMBER 11, 2012*		DECEMBER 25, 2012
JANUARY 8, 2013	JANUARY 31, 2013	JANUARY 1, 2013
JANUARY 22, 2013		JANUARY 31, 2013
FEBRUARY 5, 2013	FEBRUARY 12, 2013	FEBRUARY 19, 2013
FEBRUARY 26, 2013		
MARCH 5, 2013	MARCH 12, 2013	MARCH 26, 2013
MARCH 19, 2013		

*December meeting dates will be available for public hearings, waivers, ministerial appeals ***and*** work sessions.

Highlighted Planning Commission meeting dates in 2013 are based on application submittal dates in 2013.

Attachment 2 –

ALBEMARLE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
2012 RULES OF PROCEDURE

1. Officers

A. *Chairman.* At its annual meeting, the Commission shall elect a Chairman who, if present, shall preside at the meeting and at all other meetings during the year for which elected.

B. *Vice-Chairman.* At its annual meeting, the Commission shall elect a Vice-Chairman, who, if present, shall preside at meetings in the absence of the Chairman and shall discharge the duties of the Chairman during his absence or disability.

C. *Secretary*. The Director of Planning shall serve the Commission as its Secretary. The duties of the Secretary shall include keeping and maintaining custody of the records of the Commission and such other duties as these rules may provide and the Commission may, from time to time, assign.

D. *Recording Secretary*. The Director of Planning, or his designee, shall serve the Commission as its Recording Secretary. The duties of the Recording Secretary shall include keeping the minutes of the Commission's meetings, acting as the timekeeper, and such other duties as these rules may provide and the Commission may, from time to time, assign.

E. *Other Offices*. At any of its meetings, the Commission may create and fill any other offices as it deems necessary.

F. *Term of Office.* The Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall be elected for one-year terms; but either or both may be re-elected for one or more additional terms.

G. *Absence of Chairman and Vice-Chairman.* If the Chairman and Vice-Chairman are absent from any meeting, a present member shall be chosen to act as Chairman.

2. Meetings

A. *Annual Meeting.* The first meeting in January of each year shall be known as the annual meeting. At the annual meeting, the Commission shall establish the day, time, and place for regular meetings of the Commission for that year, and shall elect the chairman and vice-chairman.

B. *Regular Meetings.* The Commission shall meet in regular session at the time and place and on the day or days established for regular meetings. The Commission

may subsequently establish a different day, time, or place to conduct its regular meetings by passing a resolution to that effect.

If the Chairman, or the Vice-Chairman if the Chairman is unable to act, finds and declares that weather or other conditions are such that it is hazardous for Commission members to attend a regular meeting, the meeting shall be continued to the next regular meeting date. This finding shall be communicated to the members of the Commission and to the press as promptly as possible.

Without further public notice, a regular meeting may be adjourned from day to day or from time to time or from place to place, not beyond the time fixed for the next regular meeting, until the business of the Commission is complete.

A. *Special Meetings*. The Commission may hold special meetings as it deems necessary at such times and places as it deems convenient. A special meeting may be adjourned from time to time as the Commission finds necessary and convenient.

A special meeting shall be held when called by the Chairman or requested by two or more members of the Commission upon written request made to the Secretary and shall specify the matters to be considered at the meeting. Upon receipt of the call or request, the Secretary, after consultation with the Chairman, shall immediately notify each member of the Commission and the County Attorney. The notice shall be in writing and shall be mailed or delivered to the person or to his place of residence or business at least five days prior to the special meeting. The notice shall state the time and place of the special meeting and shall specify the matters to be considered. The Commission shall not consider any matter not specified in the notice at the meeting unless all members are present. The notice may be waived if the time of the special meeting was fixed at a regular meeting, if all members are present at the special meeting, or if all members sign a waiver for the notice.

The Secretary shall notify the general news media of the time and place of such special meeting and the matters to be considered.

3. Order of Business

A. *Agenda Established by Secretary*. The agenda for each regular meeting shall be established by the Secretary in consultation with the Chairman.

B. *Organization of the Agenda*. The agenda of each regular meeting shall be organized in substantially the following order, subject to change at the request of the Chairman and with the consensus of the other members of the Commission:

(1) Call to order and establish quorum.
(2) Committee Reports. (Only on first meeting of each month.)
(3) Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public.
(4) Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting (when applicable).
(5) Consent Agenda. (Includes approval of minutes from previous meetings when applicable.)
(6) Items Requesting Deferral (when applicable).
(7) Deferred Items (from previous meetings when applicable).
(8) Regular Items.
(9) Public Hearing Items.
(10) Work Sessions (when applicable).
(11) Old Business.
(12) New Business.
(13) Adjournment.

C. *Matters not on the Agenda*. Each regular meeting agenda shall include a period for matters not on the agenda, during which time up to three persons may speak on matters that are not on the agenda at the same regular meeting of the Commission. Each person speaking shall be allowed to speak for not more than three minutes. The Commission shall neither engage such a speaker in a dialogue nor engage in a discussion on the matter raised by a speaker at that time.

B. *Time Limits for Applicants and Other Speakers*. Each applicant shall be allowed to make a presentation not to exceed ten minutes, and a closing remark at the close of the hearing on the matter not to exceed five minutes. Each other person speaking on a matter shall be allowed one appearance not to exceed three minutes. A speaker may not reserve any time for rebuttal or transfer any time to another speaker. The time limits set forth herein shall not include any time during which the applicant or other speaker is responding to questions asked by the Commission.

E. *Deferrals*. The Commission may defer any matter at the request of a member of the Commission, the County staff, or the applicant. The request may be either oral or in writing, and may be made at any time prior to the vote on the matter. The person making the request shall state the reasons therefor. A motion to defer shall either specify the date to which the matter is deferred or defer the matter indefinitely. If the motion to defer pertains to a matter for which a noticed public hearing is required and the motion is to defer the matter to a specific date, the Chairman shall either close the public hearing or, if the public hearing was not opened, open and then close the public hearing, before the Commission votes on the motion.

4. Quorum

A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum for any meeting of the Commission. If, during a meeting, less than a majority of the members of the Commission remains present, no action can be taken except to adjourn the meeting or to adjourn the meeting to a fixed time and place. If, prior to adjournment, a quorum is again established, the meeting shall continue. A meeting shall not be adjourned to a date and time beyond that fixed for the next regular meeting.

5. Voting Procedures

A. *Motions*. Each action by the Commission shall be initiated by a motion that is seconded. Any motion that is neither seconded nor immediately followed by debate shall not be further considered.

B. *Approval of Motion by Majority*. Except for a decision on a motion of the previous question, each decision of the Commission shall be made by approval of a majority of the members present and voting on a motion.

C. *Time for Vote*. Any matter before the Commission requiring a public hearing shall not be decided by the Commission until the public hearing has been held. The Commission may, however, in its discretion, defer the holding of a public hearing or consideration of such matter.

D. *Manner of Vote*. The vote on a motion pertaining to a matter for which the Commission is making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors shall be by roll call vote. The vote on a motion pertaining to any other matter may be either by roll call vote or voice vote, in the discretion of the Chairman; provided that a roll call vote on such a motion shall be required if requested by a member of the Commission. For each roll call vote, the Recording Secretary shall record the name of each member voting and how the member voted on the motion. For each voice vote, the Recording Secretary shall record the result of the vote.

E. *Tie Vote*. A tie vote shall only defeat the motion voted upon. Any matter receiving a tie vote shall not be deemed to have been acted upon and a tie vote shall not be deemed to be either a denial or a recommendation of denial.

F. *Effect of Defeat of Motion to Deny or Recommend Denial*. The defeat of a motion to deny or to recommend denial of a matter shall not be deemed to be approval of the matter. In such a case, the Chairman shall call for another motion.

G. *Abstention*. If any member abstains from voting on any motion, he shall state his abstention. The abstention shall be announced by the Chairman and recorded by the Recording Secretary.

H. *Motion to Amend*. A motion to amend a motion before the Commission shall be discussed and voted by the Commission before any vote is taken on the original motion unless the motion to amend is accepted by both the members making and seconding the original motion. If the motion to amend is approved, the amended motion is then before the Commission for its consideration. If the motion to amend is not approved, the original motion is again before the Commission for its consideration.

I. *Previous Question*. The discussion of any motion may be terminated by any member moving the "previous question." Upon a proper second, the Chairman shall call for a vote on the motion of the previous question. If approved by a two-thirds majority of those voting, the Chairman shall immediately call for a vote on the original motion under consideration. A motion of the previous question shall not be subject to debate and shall take precedence over any other matter.

J. *Motion to Reconsider*. Any decision made by the Commission may be reconsidered if a motion to reconsider is made at the same meeting or an adjourned meeting held on the same day at which the matter was decided. The motion to reconsider may be made by any member of the Commission. Upon a proper second, the motion may be discussed and voted. The effect of the motion to reconsider, if approved, shall be to place the matter for discussion in the exact position it occupied before it was voted upon.

6. Amendment of Rules of Procedure

These Rules of Procedure may be amended by a majority vote of the Commission at the next regular meeting following a regular meeting at which notice of the motion to amend is given.

7. Suspension of Rules of Procedure

These Rules of Procedure may be suspended by the majority vote of the members of the Commission present and voting. The motion to suspend a rule may be made by any member of the Commission. Upon a proper second, the motion may be discussed and voted. The effect of the motion to suspend a rule, if approved, is to make that rule inapplicable to the matter before the Commission; provided, however, approval of a motion to suspend the rule shall not permit the Commission to act in violation of a requirement mandated by the Code of Virginia, the Constitution of Virginia, or any other applicable law.

8. Rules of Procedure not Covered by These Rules of Procedure

Any rules of procedure not covered by these Rules of Procedure shall be governed by the current Robert's Rules of Order.

9. Nature and Effect of These Rules

The purpose of these Rules of Procedure is to facilitate the orderly conduct of public meetings and decision-making. The parliamentary Rules of Procedure (those rules other than Rules 2(B), 2(C), 4 and 5(B)) are procedural, not jurisdictional, in nature, and Rules 2(B), 2(C), 4 and 5(B) are jurisdictional only to the extent that Virginia law makes them jurisdictional. The failure to comply with the parliamentary Rules of Procedure shall not invalidate any decision of the Commission.

* * * * *

(Adopted 01/12/99; Amended and/or Readopted 01/11/00 (§3(C)), 01/09/01(§2(B)), 01/15/02, 01/14/03, 01/13/04 (§§1(C), 1(D)), 01/05/05, 01/11/06, 01/09/07, 01/15/08, 01/06/09, 01/12/10, 01/11/11 (§§ 1(D), 2(C), 3(C), 3(D), 4, 5(A)(added), 5(B

Attachment 3 –

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AS OF 2/14/12:

ACE Committee Liason:
Bruce Dotson

CIP Technical Committee:
Don Franco

Charlottesville Albemarle Regional Transportation Advisory Committee (CHART):
Mac Lafferty

City/County/University Planning & Coordination Council Tech Committee (PACC Tech):
Mac Lafferty

Crozet Community Advisory Council:
Tom Loach

Fiscal Impact Committee:
Don Franco

Historic Preservation Committee:
Rick Randolph

Metropolitan Planning Organization Tech Committee (MPO Tech):
Bruce Dotson

Pantops Community Advisory Council:
Cal Morris

University of Virginia Master Planning Council:
Ed Smith

Places 29 Community Advisory Council:
Don Franco, Mac Lafferty

Village of Rivanna Community Advisory Council:
Rick Randolph

Attachment 4 – Consent Agenda –
Conditions of Approval

SDP-2011-00082 Boar's Head Sports Club (squash expansion) - Major – Approved site plan amendment to expand squash club associated with this request are a 20' buffer zone waiver, a critical slopes waiver and a curb waiver with staff's recommended conditions as follows:

The amended site plan shall not be signed until the following conditions have been met.

1. Planning/Zoning approval.
2. Engineering approval.
3. Albemarle County Service Authority approval.
4. Virginia Department of Transportation approval.