Albemarle County Planning Commission
March 20, 2012

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 20, 2012, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

Other officials present were Lee Catlin, Assistant to the County Executive for Community and Business Partnerships**,** Rebecca Ragsdale, Senior Planner; Phil Custer, Engineer; Glenn Brooks, County Engineer; Ron White, Director of Housing; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Amelia McCulley, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator; Francis MacCall, 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.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – March 7, 2012 & March 14, 2012

Mr. Cilimberg summarized the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors at its meeting on March 7, 2012 and March 14, 2012.

Consent Agenda

Approval of Minutes: January 24, 2012, February 14, 2012, and November 17, 2011.
Resolution of Intent: Site Plan Ordinance Cleanup (Francis MacCall)
Resolution of Intent: Tourist Lodging (Amelia McCulley)
2011 Planning Commission Activity Report (Wayne Cilimberg)

Mr. Morris asked if any Commissioner wanted to pull any of the items on the consent agenda for discussion. There being no questions, he asked for a motion.

Motion: Mr. Lafferty moved and Mr. Randolph seconded for approval of the consent agenda as recommended by staff.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris said that the consent agenda had been approved unanimously.

Deferred Item:

ZTA-2012-00002 Water/Sewer Regulations
Amend Secs. 3.1, Definitions, 4.1, Area and health regulations related to utilities, 4.2, Critical slopes, 4.2.1, Building site required, 4.2.2, Building site area and dimensions, 4.2.3, Location of structures and improvements, 4.2.4, Location of septic systems, 4.7, Open space, 5.1.43, Special events, 5.1.44, Farm worker housing, and 10.5.2, Where permitted by special use permit; and repeal Secs. 4.1.1, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.6 and 4.1.7 (all untitled), of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code. This ordinance would amend the regulations pertaining to building sites, critical slopes, and water supplies and sewer systems serving developments and individual lots by adding and deleting definitions (3.1), restating and clarifying the standards for developments and lots to be served by public or private water supplies

and sewer systems (4.1), updating the terminology for provisions pertaining to critical slopes (4.2), clarifying the minimum standards for building sites (4.2.1), restating the minimum standards for building site area and dimensions for uses not served by public sewer systems, and providing for special exceptions from those standards and for alternative onsite sewer systems (4.2.2), eliminating an ambiguity as to whether special use permits for additional development rights are permitted in the watershed of a public water supply reservoir (not allowed) (10.5.2), and making corresponding technical changes and non-substantive changes updating terminology to other related sections (4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.7, 5.1.43, 5.1.44, 10.5.2). A copy of the full text of the ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and in the Department of Community Development, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. (Glenn Brooks) ***DEFERRED FROM THE FEBRUARY 28, 2012 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING***

Mr. Brooks summarized ZTA-2012-0002, Water/Sewer Regulations. This item was deferred on the February 28th Planning Commission meeting to incorporate additional changes and to prepare a corresponding Subdivision Text Amendment. It is an update of the zoning ordinance to accommodate alternative onsite sewage systems for individual lots. It also made some corrections to other parts of the ordinance and clarifications, which staff could review, that were written in the advertisement and the staff report. The subjective change made since February 28th is staff removed item 1 from the ordinance section on display for alternative onsite sewage systems, which took out the requirement for a reserve drainfield. It remains in for conventional onsite sewage systems. The zoning text amendment was deferred to accompany the subdivision text amendment, which will follow this. The subdivision text amendment is doing the same in updating the ordinance to reflect recent state laws changed as of last year to allow onsite sewer systems by right.

Mr. Morris invited questions.

Mr. Dotson asked what was the rationale and reasoning behind the change about the reserve drainfield.

Mr. Brooks replied that the state does not allow localities to require a reserve drainfield for an alternative system.

Mr. Kamptner added that staff did not think there was any other reasonable basis upon which to require the reserve drainfield in that case.

Mr. Dotson said if an alternative system failed, then the homeowner would install a new alternative system.

Mr. Kamptner agreed that the owner would install another alternative system. He noted when land is being subdivided the subdivider will essentially be making the choice for a particular lot may it be served by either type of system or served only by an alternative system. It will depend on how that lot is configured and the soils that are on that particular lot.

Mr. Morris opened the public hearing and invited public comment. There being no public comment, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Planning Commission. He asked staff what action they were recommending.

Mr. Brooks replied staff recommends the Planning Commission forward a recommendation for approval of ZTA-2012-00002 to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Kamptner added for the record that the Planning Commission did open and close the public hearing for ZTA-2012-00002 on February 28th. Therefore, this was the second public hearing on this matter.

Mr. Dotson said there were a couple of things he would like to hear staff's response on. If this ZTA is approved will it have any impact on rural density or the rate of rural development.

Mr. Brooks replied no, not that he was aware of since this is related to the area/lot requirements. The ordinance requires a 30,000 square foot area on a lot for buildable area. That has not changed. What they can subdivide is essentially the same.

Mr. Dotson asked are there any changes here that they don't have to make or have elected to do.

Mr. Brooks replied yes.

Mr. Dotson asked if the changes are editorial and housekeeping.

Mr. Brooks replied that the changes that are voluntary are editorial and housekeeping. Staff has updated terminology and minimum standards for building site area and dimensions. In addition, the changes are eliminating ambiguity as to whether special use permits for additional development rights are permitted in the watershed of the public water shed. There are some other small changes in the other parts of the ordinance.

Mr. Dotson pointed out the reason he was nervous about these systems is because they require very careful maintenance and upkeep. He knows the state has the responsibility for looking after that and the county does not. None the less he just wants them to go into this with their eyes open.

Mr. Brooks agreed. However, he did not think the county has much choice since the state has been very clear that they are not to add on any requirements for maintenance.

Mr. Kamptner noted there was an opinion from the Attorney General on March 9th that reinforced the fact that localities have no authority to impose maintenance requirements on these systems.

Mr. Morris invited further comments.

Mr. Randolph said he had questions about the special events. His understanding was the proposal was just for changes in the existing policy for the county. He noticed, however, that there was no mention of any noise restrictions on special events. He asked if that is already codified elsewhere so it need not have been cited here.

Mr. Morris pointed out the noise ordinance is codified elsewhere.

Mr. Kamptner agreed since that would be regulated under the noise regulation in Section 4.18. These events are subject to special use permits and it would also be covered under the special use permit conditions. He was not sure if they have actually had any special events come in under this particular section since it was adopted.

Mr. Brooks noted that most of those requests staff sees are with wineries, which come in under special use permit provisions.

Motion: Mr. Lafferty moved and Mr. Randolph seconded to recommend approval of ZTA-2012-00002, Water/Sewer Regulations.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris said that ZTA-2012-00002, Water Sewer Regulations, will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval at a date to be determined.

Public Hearing Item:

STA-2012-00001 Water/Sewer

Amend Secs. 14-106, Definitions, 14-309, Soil evaluations, 14-310, Health director approval of individual private wells and/or septic systems, 14-415 Central water supplies and sewerage systems, and 14-416, Individual private wells and septic systems, of Chapter 14, Subdivision of Land, of the Albemarle County Code. This ordinance would amend the regulations pertaining to onsite sewage systems serving subdivision lots by adding definitions pertaining to onsite sewage systems (14-106), and by allowing subdivision lots to be served by either conventional or alternative onsite sewage systems, requiring health director review of such systems, and revising the terminology (14-309, 14-310 and 14-416); and would amend the minimum area requirements for lots served by central water supplies or central sewerage systems (14-415). A copy of the full text of the ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of the Board of

Supervisors and in the Department of Community Development, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. (Glenn Brooks)

Mr. Brooks summarized STA-2012-00001, Water/Sewer Regulations, which is the corresponding subdivision text amendment. In the sections of Code staff added the state definitions and allowed a provision for onsite alternative systems.

Mr. Kamptner noted the purpose for this zoning text amendment was simply to align the subdivision ordinance with the changes that the Commission just recommended in the zoning ordinance, which brings these regulations up-to-date with state statutes and regulations.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff. There being no questions, Mr. Morris opened the public hearing and invited public comment.

Neil Williamson, with The Free Enterprise Forum, said he believed Mr. Dotson may have misspoken. There is nothing in any of the regulations that controls the pace of development in the rural area or the development area. The pace of development is controlled by the markets.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Morris closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Planning Commission for additional discussion and a recommendation.

Motion: Mr. Lafferty moved and Mr. Loach seconded to recommend approval of STA-2012-00001, Water/Sewer Regulations.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris said that STA-2012-00002, Water Sewer Regulations, will be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval at a date to be determined.

Work Session

CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan Revision –
Work session 6 - Industrial Land Inventory, Rural Interchanges, and Locations for Industrial Uses and Target Industries (Echols, Sorrell, Weaver)

Andy Sorrell and Elaine Echols presented a Power-Point presentation.

Mr. Sorrell presented the first portion of the presentation.

Tonight the discussion will be held on the following issues:

- Industrial Land Inventory,
- Rural Interchanges,
- Locations for Industrial Uses, and
- Target Industries

The schedule is as follows:

Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan Update
Meeting Schedule for Concurrent Planning Processes
Last updated 3-15-12
Dates are subject to change

Key:
City/Co PCs | Livability Project | Albemarle County | Neighborhood

March 20	6 pm	Albemarle Co PC -- Non-residential Land Use and Ec. Dev. Policy
March 29	4 – 7 pm	Public Workshop -- Historic Pres./Natural Heritage/Historic Res./E.C.s
April 2	6:30 – 8:30pm	Neighborhoods 6 & 7 Meeting COB - Fifth Street
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. elements
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
- Historic Pres./Natural Heritage E.C. Workshop at Water Street - March 29 4 – 7pm
- Neighborhoods 4,5, 6, 7 – April 2
- Joint PCs Meeting – April 17

Mr. Sorrell noted there will basically be three portions to the presentation. Staff will be happy to answer questions after each section. He asked how the Commission wanted to handle it.

The Planning Commission requested to take the presentation in segments so that they focus their attention on it.

Mr. Sorrell noted the first portion of the presentation will be speaking to:

Presentation Overview
- Available Industrial Land
- Industrial Land Need and Target Industries
- Locations for Industrial Uses & Targets
- Land in Development Areas
- Urban Interchanges
- Rural Interchanges
- Conclusions & Recommendations

Industrial Land Area Needs
Based on Employment Projections
- 2030 -- approx. 18,000 new jobs

- 2030 -- 3,000 industrial/quasi-industrial jobs
- Land area needs for these jobs: 200-557 acres

Formula

[Employees X square footage/employee for use X F.A.R. for use = acreage needed. Range of land area relates to low and high square footage/employee.]

Available Industrially Designated Land

Table 1: Vacant Non-constrained land in Current Land Use Plan Designated for Industrial Use (by # of designated acres)*

Development Area	Area with RA & Residential Zoning	Area with Commercial Zoning	Area with Industrial Zoning	DA Totals
Crozet	7.83	0	**52.89	**60.72**
Village of Rivanna	0	0	0	**0**
Piney Mountain	32.93	8.86	9.55	**51.34**
Hollymead	191.78	3.45	***322.98	**518.21**
1	6.08	12.5	0	**18.58**
2	0	4.9	0	**4.9**
3	0	0	0	**0**
4	11.13	1.71	36.34	**49.18**
5	0	0	0	**0**
6	0	0	0	**0**
7	0	0	0	**0**
Subtotal:	*249.75*	*31.42*	*421.76*	*702.93*
			Minus Constrained Land Area:	28.93
			****Total:**	**674.00**

- This chart shows that most designated but not zoned industrial land is in the Piney Mountain & Hollymead Development Areas. Land with residential zoning and rural area zoning that has industrial designation is generally located in those areas. Other areas have some, but the majority is in the Places29 area. There is also land area that has industrial zoning and designated industrial. So that is land that could potentially be used without having to be rezoned for an industrial use.

*Land in portions of less than 1 acre in area has been excluded, totaling 29.91 acres.
**Includes 2 acres of Acme Visible Records land which would not be available until 2016
***Includes UVA Research Park
****Report of 2-8-12 indicated 841 acres of non-constrained land; this figure inadvertently included 127 acres of constrained land in the UVA Research Park

Disclaimer/Clarification

- Page 2 of staff report 422 acres of designated land with industrial zoning
- Page 3 of staff report says 376 acres of industrial land (which came from Feb. 8 staff report)
- Correct # is **422** ac – the Feb. 8 staff report missed a few of the vacant parcels because they were part of planned districts. (Ex. Industrial area of HTC – zoned NMD)

Undeveloped Industrially-Designated Parcels

Parcel size	Designated & Zoned Industrial (# of parcels)	Designated & not zoned industrial (# of parcels)	Total
1 to 4.99 ac.	15	21	36
5 to 9.99 ac.	11	17	28
10 to 14.99 ac.	1	4	5
15 to 24.99 ac.	1	4	5
25 ac. or more	1	1	2
Total	29	47	76

- Few available parcels for larger land users
- Only 12 parcels 10 or more acres of that only 2 are 25 acres or more
- Some opportunities exist to combine parcels

Staff presented a map showing land that could potentially accommodate some additional industrial zoning that had the industrial designation by the Comp Plan, which was south of Hollymead Town Center. Access would be one of the bigger issues with that getting to that site since it was not directly accessed from a major road right now.

Industrial Land Need
Recommended target industries:
- Bioscience and Medical Devices
- Business & Financial Services
- Information Technology and Defense & Security

Complementary targets:
- Health Services
- Arts, Design and Sports & media

Target Industries
  - Bioscience & Medical Devices: 3-5 ac. parcels
  - Info. Tech. and Defense & Security: 3-25 ac. parcels. (Some targets might need area for buildings up to 350,000 sq. ft.)

Other requirements:
- High-speed internet
- Reliable electricity (some are large power users)
- Public utilities (some have large water needs)

Industrial Land Need Conclusions
- BOS needs to pick targets based upon recommendations of study and their input
- Many targets could use comm. zoned land
- Based on raw #s, need exists for 200 – 557 acres
- 674 ac. non-constrained land might be available (need buy in of the property owners)
- Few large parcels; some targets need large parcels
- Most properties in Hollymead-Piney Mountain area; some targets want to be in H-PM area
- Even with environmental constraints removed, some industrial designated sites will continue to have challenges (access issues and things of that nature)

Mr. Morris invited questions.

Mr. Randolph asked staff to go back to the section where he talked about large electricity users where it says high-speed internet, reliable electricity, and public utilities. If those are guidance as to where light industrial development could occur he asked at the current time is there a single intersection on I-64 in this county that meets those three capabilities where there is high speed internet available, reliable electricity and public utilities that would meet the need for both high power users and high water users.

Ms. Echols replied that there may be. Staff would like to go over the interchanges themselves and then maybe staff could bring that back up at that time where they can give an idea of what those interchanges are capable of.

Mr. Randolph agreed, but wanted especially to identify these three factors for that discussion when they get to it.

Mr. Franco said it was important to note that it was not necessarily just to be reliable, but a lot of the users associated with the IT and Defense needs redundant power supplies and internet. That is an important point.

Ms. Echols suggested that there may be a better word to use than reliability. Some parcels don't have continuous electrical supply because of different kinds of interruptions in the supply.

Mr. Loach said on the employment figures he noticed staff went to 2030 to get data. He wondered if staff went back 20 years and looked at the LI rezoning to see if that same percentage of employment extrapolated out the same.

Ms. Echols replied no, they did not go backwards. They just went forward.

Mr. Loach noted that over the past couple of years the Board has rezoned over 130 acres of LI land to commercial. One has to wonder if they went back 20 years if they could see that same curve. He recalled a rezoning case several weeks ago involving a request from industrial to commercial. His only objective is the methodology. He felt it should not have been used until they came out with a firm list of target industries and looked at what their needs are going to be.

Ms. Echols noted the target industry study is in a preliminary stage and could change. That being said they know there are a large number of users. There was just a variety of different kinds of potential users within the categories that they have. What they tried to do was get at what are the ones who would have the large land area. Staff does not know what the number is. They don't know how much or how many of those targets they would be looking for or how much they could accommodate. They believe they can accommodate quite a bit with their already zoned land. In past staff reports staff has given them the figures of the square footage that has been approved in the commercial developments. They know there is an awful lot of land. They were trying to find a figure that they could work with in the sense of giving an idea about additional land area that would need to be designated. It is not a science. It is an art. His points are well taken. There are many targets. If these are the targets the Board chooses, that could go into the commercial end. They don't know what is needed until they decide what the targets are

Mr. Franco said it would be helpful if table 3 were redone so that they saw how many parcels were less than 3 acres in size. He acknowledged that they were dealing just with the target industries, but that same rezoning Mr. Loach was referring to really dealt with a size question as well. It was one of the problems that applicant was having. She had an existing structure and was having a hard time keeping it filled. There were a lot of things there. However, part of that conversation was the parcel was relatively small. If this was identifying that their target industries need a minimum of 3 acres, then they ought to know how much of the acreage that is currently zoned and/or intended to be zoned LI doesn't fall into that range.

Mr. Loach asked when they are looking at 3 to 25 acres are they just looking horizontally or can they accommodate these vertically on less land as well, too.

Mr. Franco agreed that was a good point. However, he felt if this is the information they are looking at he would like to know if 3 acres is the right thing because they've considered verticality and all of the other stuff. He would like to know how much of this acreage does not fall into that category.

Mr. Loach said this goes back to the premise that Ms. Echols said that they really should have the target industries.

Mr. Dotson suggested before this moves on that staff find out if the smaller adjacent parcels with the same owner are easily assembled parcels

Mr. Franco noted he would go so far as to say it does not have to be the same ownership but just contiguous pieces would be helpful.

Ms. Echols presented the next segment of the Power-Point presentation.

Interchanges and Other Possibilities

One of the places people are most interested are the interchanges. The interchanges are most interesting because that is where they have the largest road network; where they have the greatest amount of traffic; and potentially the most opportunities for economic development. There are seven interchanges in the County with 3½ urban and 3½ rural. The one that seems to have gotten almost all of the attention in recent months has been Shadwell Interchange. However, there is a runner up because there are people from Crozet present tonight to speak.

Shadwell Interchange

Staff reviewed the issues and challenges regarding the Shadwell Interchange, as follows.

Issues:
- Access
- Utilities
- Interstate changes
- Topography
- Historic Resources (Monticello and Southern Albemarle)

Ms. Echols explained the above noted issues and the challenges.

Recommendation: Wait until interchange improvements are designed; revisit with next Comp Plan.

Rt. 29 South & I-64
(Sieg Distribution Facility)

- Designated for Regional Service

Issues:
- Access - (In our current Comp Plan it calls for preservation of the ravine. The ravine is about the only area they can get access into the rest of this particular site. Therefore, it is a challenge to get access due to the topography.)
- Property owner doesn't favor redesignation (One property owner indicated desire to have a mixed use.)

Recommendation: Expand Development Area boundary to provide better access; allow for commercial or industrial use. Consideration needs to be given to take the language out of the Comp Plan that says the ravine needs to be preserved. They can't do both.

Southpointe/5th Street

With the Avon/5th Street rezoning that took place there was concern at that time they were losing Light Industrial land. The Comprehensive Plan left in the text an opportunity for that to be rezoned to an industrial district for an industrial use should that commercial use not pan out. That is the same kind of idea they have for some of these other ones. Right now it may not be what the owner wants to do. There might be an industry that would like to have that spot and they might be able to work out something that would then be in support of a rezoning for that area.

Issues:
- Owner of largest property doesn't favor redesignation
- Only about 12 acres developable land

As with the other interchange, the property owner does not really want to lose that commercial designation that they have right now. It is zoned R-15.

Recommendation: Allow for commercial or industrial use. In the text they would make that land available for a rezoning to industrial or the commercial designation that they would be putting on the land.

5th Street / Avon Properties

If commercial development doesn't take place, Comprehensive Plan allows for industrial use already.

Staff thinks this is going to be developed commercially. There is a rezoning to modify the plan that has been submitted in recent weeks. Staff does not think right now this is in the mix of properties that are available for industry.

Rt. 20 at I-64 (Blue Ridge Area Hospital Site)

- University of Virginia Foundation wishes to retain institutional designation
- Staff working with University of Virginia Foundation in area B discussions on future uses or other designations

Staff members will be talking about this tomorrow to see if they might be able to figure out a way that this could be available for the University should they want to make it available for a Light Industrial type of use. She would defer to that conversation tomorrow in the Area B process.

Boulders Road area near NGIC

This area is designated for Urban Density Residential. Since it is such a large parcel it might be an available land area to be designated. The idea would be that this industrial designation would just be expanded. Staff thinks it is very important as they did at the Places29 planning time that they have some residential in this area to allow for people who work in this area to get quickly and easily to work without having to drive all the way up 29 or down 29. They don't regulate where people live and where they work, but they like to make that opportunity available.

- Residential areas could be reduced for greater industrial opportunities
- If Board of Supervisors endorses the targets that have been recommended, this one might be a place to look to consider redesignation of some additional land.

Properties between Avon St and Rt. 20

Most of this property is Urban Density. There is a swath that is shown for Industrial Service. They think there might be some opportunities to expand that down. It would not pick up a whole lot. There is not a large property. This particular property would have to probably be accessed from both sides and it may or may not be able to connect because there is about a 100' drop from Avon down to Route 20.

- Area adjacent & south of Snow's Garden Center
- Need property owner support

They will be working with that property owner through the Neighborhoods 4 and 5 planning process. That is another place they have been looking for land that would help accommodate the needs of future employers in the area.

Conclusions:

- Vacant land at SW quadrant at Shadwell/I-64 would be difficult to develop at this time.
- Vacant land at urban interchanges designated for commercial use appears could support industrial uses; property owners don't want to lose commercial designation.
- Better access is needed for properties at SW quadrant of Rt. 29 S/I-64 interchange.
- There may be some opportunities to designate land for industrial use in Neighborhood 4; however, parcels would not be large and residents have concerns about impacts about adding more industrial land in that particular neighborhood.

Recommendations:

- Allow for urban interchanges (not Pantops) to be used for office/R&D/flex/light industrial uses as well as commercial uses.
- Expand Development Area near Rt. 29 S/I-64 Interchange to provide area for access into the site.
- Redesignate some of the residential area near NGIC to office/R&D/flex/light industrial
- Work with University of Virginia Foundation on the Blue Ridge Area Hospital site with Area B
- Look for opportunities in Neighborhood 4 for more industrial property.

This all predisposes that those are the right targets. If they are not the targets the Board wants to work with, staff will be coming back to the Planning Commission. However, with the schedule that is what staff had to work with.

Mr. Morris invited questions.

Mr. Randolph asked if there was a good possibility out of all of these different targets that they will establish a list of priorities based on the characteristics and suitability of each of the interchanges just reviewed so there would be a ranking from a development standpoint where there would be the least environmental impact. What is left out of the equation is any discussion about industrial development in any of these undeveloped areas and the impacts in terms of rivers and streams in that habitat.

Ms. Echols replied right now at the urban interchanges there are some uses such as office uses that could occur, which with our zoning would be under the current regulations. In terms of the changes in designations and the new areas they would be looking at the targets, what their needs are, and doing a more detailed review of what the Commission had just seen. However, in terms of rankings staff was not planning on doing that. She would ask Ms. Catlin. Staff plans to work though this Target Industry Study and then see where they go from there.

Ms. Catlin pointed out where they were in the process. They have two parallel things that are moving forward. For the Target Industry Study they are in the final stages of the study itself. However, they are in the early stages of determining exactly how well those targets fit for Albemarle County and our preferences and concerns about environmental impacts, etc. What they have been trying to do in working with Ms. Echols is talking about what capacities might there possibly be at the same time that the Board is working through which of those target industries really will be the ones that work for us, are there additional ones that they have not even talked about, etc. The matching of the two of those things is going to have to be worked out over the next couple of months, which is why she thinks Ms. Echols in several instances said this is a preliminary look at capacity and inventory and when it might be possible. However, certainly the finer work of matching that up with exactly where they end up with the Target Industry Study, including environmental constraints and issues, is going to have to be worked out. That may require coming back to the Commission and revisiting some of this.

Mr. Franco said that he was not trying to promote one piece over another. There is a lot of additional study that is required. When they talk about the section that is to the Southwest of 29 and 250 at Shadwell it makes more sense that they should look at it and decide whether they want it included now and then let VDOT design their access to that piece in the future and their interchange around our needs versus waiting to see what VDOT does and potentially having to come and redo work. He was not saying that piece belongs in there. He was simply saying let's not wait for VDOT to react to what they do. Let's decide what is best for us first.

Ms. Echols continued the Power-Point presentation.

Rural Interchanges

The Board spoke to the community, staff, as well as the Commission on what they wanted to see on rural interchanges. What they said was they wanted to have uses at those interchanges that have a relationship to the rural and agricultural economy and have low impacts. What staff has been looking at is how that actually happens. First they looked at the interchanges. These things were in the February 8th report as well as that presentation. They looked at the three different rural interchanges and their characteristics. The other half is Shadwell.

Boyd Tavern/Black Cat Interchanges

- Very rural & heavily wooded
- Vacant parcels abut conservation easements
- Most parcels have critical environmental resources

Staff does not think there are many uses that could go in this area. Someone might be able to make a case in this area that would be supportive of agriculture and agri-business and need that kind of a location.

Ivy Interchange

- Very rural & heavily wooded.
- Critical environmental resources.
- Access to parcels from interstate could meet standards, but roads are narrow and winding.

The roads are not accommodating. The very narrow and winding roads don't support a lot of traffic.

Crozet Interchange

- Decision to remain Rural as part of Crozet Master Plan update
- SE quadrant has good access and adjacent to large tracts of agri-industrial land
- NE quadrant -- potential historic district
- SE and SW quadrants difficult to use and access

The Crozet Interchange is not quite as rural or winding and really takes them down 250 into Crozet. A decision was made with the Crozet Master Plan when area was under consideration for either having some kind of a special designation or being included in the development areas. The decision was made by the Board that it was not going to become part of the Crozet development area. However, the Board wanted them to look at what could happen there, again, in support of agriculture and agri-business.

The Southeast quadrant does have good access from 250. It is adjacent to industrially designated land right now. This is in the Greenwood Historic District. Many concerns have been expressed by the community of Crozet. The Commission received a copy of the resolution that will be introduced tonight that there is the desire by most of the Crozet Community that this remain rural. Staff has looked at it in terms of what its opportunities and challenges are. It potentially has some opportunities for those kinds of uses that would be support of agriculture.

Characteristics of Future Uses

At rural interchanges –

- Low traffic generation & meet VDOT access requirements
- Little need for water & sewer i.e. no future demand for public utilities
- Small scale
- Little impact on natural resources or nearby historic or scenic resources
- Could meet Entrance Corridor Guidelines
- Interstate access enhancing product distribution from the rural areas with an emphasis on local

Potential Comprehensive Plan Changes

- Recognize rural interchanges have potential benefits for supporting the rural economy
- Add provisions for characteristics of uses that would be appropriate at rural interchanges
- Add information on other uses that might be appropriate in RA
- Recommend changes to Zoning Ordinance

Potential Zoning Ordinance Changes

Existing RA Special Uses:

- Show grounds
- Custom slaughterhouses
- Sawmills
- Packing plants

- Special events

Examples of Potential Additional RA Special Uses
- Small storage and distribution facilities that relate to local agricultural or forestry production
- Landscape services
- Wholesale nurseries

Staff noted that special use permits are about is this the right location for this use at this time. There is a lot of discretion that is given to the Board of Supervisors in their decision making about what goes where when there is a special use permit involved.

Other Potential Special Uses
Not necessarily supportive of Rural Ag, but may have a place in RA
- Contractor's Storage Yards
- Mini-warehouses

Those uses also have many of those same features that they were recommending for the interchanges. Mini-warehouses go in the development areas, but they don't require any utilities. To make a use that does not require water and sewer and very little electricity there is some desire to have those in places where they can better meet the needs of the community.

Staff has made some recommendations about some other uses.

Change interstate interchange policy to allow for rural and agricultural supportive uses at the interchanges that have:
- Low traffic generation
- No need for public utilities
- Small building and parking footprint
- Little -to- no impact on natural or historic resources
- Could meet EC guidelines
- Enhanced by access to interstate for distribution of products

Add wording to the Comprehensive Plan which supports other uses, such as contractor's storage yards and mini-warehouses which may be appropriate in the Rural Areas where they have:
- Low traffic generation
- No need for public utilities
- Small building and parking footprint
- Little -to -no impact on natural or historic resources
- Ability to meet EC guidelines (if in EC)
- A location near an interstate interchange or crossroads community to serve residents

Comments and Direction
- Industrial Land Supply
- Industrial Land Need
- Interchanges
  - Urban
  - Rural

Mr. Morris invited questions and comments.

The Planning Commission held a discussion on the information presented in the presentation, including questions for staff, and noted issues and concerns, as briefly summarized below. A detailed summary of the Planning Commission's comments and suggestions from their discussion are provided after the public comment.

- Crozet Interchange should not be on the list. Master plan approved by the Board of Supervisors.
- Preserve natural resources unless have a good reason to do so.
- No compelling reason on rural interchanges to add industrial uses.

- It would change the character of districts – reducing beauty of region. No pressing demand to go in this area.
- If place those type of uses as discussed at interchanges – think about what kind of potential congestion creating.

Mr. Morris noted that the Commission would take a ten minute break and then take public comment afterwards.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:27 p.m. and the meeting reconvened 7:34 p.m.

Mr. Morris noted that they would now hear comment for clarification from Lee Catlin.

Lee Catlin reminded the Commission that the information provided by staff on the interstate interchanges and potential uses at those interchanges was at the request of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Morris opened the public hearing and invited public comment.

Public comment was taken from the following persons:

- John Savage, CCAC member, read the CCAC petition or resolution of intent in opposition to the Crozet Interchange or any commercial development thereon. The CCAC asked that the Crozet Interchange be taken off the table since the Crozet Master Plan opposed any type of commercial or industrial rezoning at that interchange. It was suggested that staff look at the Greenwood Historic District map since the Crozet Interchange is included in that area and the area should be preserved. **(Attachment A – Crozet Community Advisory Council Resolution Regarding light industrial and interstate interchange zoning dated march 15, 2012)**
- John Lowry, Chairman of Albemarle County Economic Development, suggested that the discussion is about using the interchanges to further economic growth and businesses in the county to provide jobs to the community. He urged the Commission to provide comments so the Interchange Policy can be rewritten for future business development to create jobs.
- John Chavan, a proponent for the interstate interchanges, particularly the Shadwell Interchange said he wants to provide mini warehouses that will provide jobs. He has a hotel as a neighbor and Route 250 at the Shadwell Interchange generates 30,000 to 50,000 cars per day. Mini warehouses would be a compatible use to that area.
- Mary Rice, resident of White Hall, opposed the Crozet Interchange. She suggested there should be criteria for granting a special use permit, which should answer what is “low”, “minimal”, “small scale” and “minimal impact.” There needs to be specificity.
- Jeff Werner, Piedmont Environmental Council, spoke against changing the interchange designations and said staff’s projections were hand grenade estimates.
- Alan Taylor, with Riverbend Management represented the Siegs, who own property at the Rt. 29 & I-64 Interchange. The Siegs do not wish a change in designation of their land at the interchange to allow industrial use since they want to develop it as a mixed use project. They intend to put together a Neighborhood Model plan which respects the environment, beauty of the area, and topography of the area.
- Morgan Butler, Southern Environmental Law Center, spoke against the interchanges since there is a fair amount of vacant land available for industrial. There was no pressing need to go outside of development areas to look for industrial land. Not all industrial uses need industrially zoned land to locate.
- Mary Gallo, Vice Chair of CCAC and Crozet resident, spoke against changes to the Crozet interchange due to concerns from the residents and the schools. Trust would be broken with the county if Crozet Interchange was allowed.
- Neil Williamson, Free Enterprise Forum, said each interchange should be considered individually. He said it is important to keep in mind how jobs are impacted by land use decisions.

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

Comments in general to be addressed after the Board has completed its work from the target industry study:

- Bring back actual acreage and location needs for targets
- If 3 acre parcels are still needed – how many do we have and where are they? Remove parcels of less than 3 acres from the inventory information.
- Bring back information on commercially zoned properties that can accommodate the targets
- Consider the transportation impacts of targets
- Retain the Boulders Road area near NGIC and the properties in Neighborhoods 4 & 5 near the Industrial Service designation as a possibility for future industrial designation if needed.
- Approach owners about consolidation of smaller parcels in designated areas, if there is a need to have larger parcels

Interstate Interchange Policy

- No changes are needed to the Interstate Interchange policy for Rural Areas, including the Crozet interchange which the Commission considered to have been previously decided during the Crozet Master Plan. (Mr. Smith disagreed because he felt that Crozet interchange still needs to be considered.)
- Bring back a recommendation for future land use on the south side of the Shadwell interchange including the north side of Rt. 250 to Hunter's Hall Industrial Park. (Mr. Smith disagreed.)
- Benchmark projected needs over time. 20 years may be too far in the future to project employment needs – monitor inventory of land and assess needs every 5 years
- Add language to the text of the Land Use Plan for the urban interchanges, similar to what was done for the Fifth Street Avon project that would allow for industrial rezonings also

Rural Area Uses:

- The uses suggested by staff for rural interchanges would likely be appropriate in other places in the Rural Areas
- Bring back recommendation on size, scale, and constraints needed for the potential rural uses noted in the staff report as well as for mini-warehouses & contractors storage yards

No formal action was taken.

Ms. Echols noted there would be an opportunity for this to go to the Board of Supervisors in April. Staff has given the Board the report of everything the Planning Commission has done to date. Staff will update the Board at the April meeting.

Work Session

Affordable Housing Proffers
(Ron White)

The Commission received a report on Affordable Housing Proffers from the Director of Housing, Ron White, entitled Affordable Housing Proffer Report dated March 20, 2012. Mr. White reviewed the proffer report located at the end of the minutes in Attachment B adding the following points.

- Discussion topics and questions were provided for later discussion with regards to how they craft proffers and manage existing proffers.
- For-Sale Units - There is a potential in Old Trail with the 90-day notice that the units might not be sold as affordable.
- Rental Units
    - 88 units have also been completed at Treesdale Park on Rio Road and are currently being leased. That was 100 percent tax credit deal and all 88 units were proffered as affordable.
    - A number of accessory units have been built in Belvedere and Wickham.
- Cash Proffers
    - To date they have gotten over 1,100 units of housing that have been proffered through rezonings. In addition to the units proffers there has been almost 1.6 million dollars in cash that has been proffered of which they have received $476,000.

- For a family of one or two person for sale houses the maximum income is roughly $55,000. For 3 or more person household the maximum income is about $66,000. There is a small window in the current policy to be income eligible.
- Current Maximum Sales Price - $211,250
- Current Cash-in-lieu - $21,125
- Current Maximum Gross Rents (HUD Fair Market Rents)
- As part of the Comprehensive Plan update the affordable housing policy is being reviewed to see what changes may be made. The Housing Committee is pretty close to being disbanded. An Ad Hoc Committee is being created to look specifically at the affordable housing policy.
- Discussion Topics – See Attachment B

The Commission held a discussion and raised some questions and concerns.

- Concern about County accepting cash in lieu of affordable units in the 15 percent proffers
- (Question brought up whether they want affordable housing stock or create an affordable housing opportunity for a low or moderate income person.)
- One Commissioner said that the purpose is to create an affordable housing stock. There are tools that would keep that unit which was assessed at $220,000 at $170,000. The Thomas Jefferson Community Land Trust is starting to get off the ground. There are second mortgages that could be placed that would be paid back upon sale so that it could be preserved as affordable housing stock. They need to look at some of those tools that are out there to preserve that once it is created.
- A suggestion was made that other agencies such as Piedmont Housing Alliance should be invited to the future meeting to discuss the problems and the best way to approach them.
- Due to the late hour, future follow up with the Planning Commission was requested.
- Questions from Planning Commissioners should be forwarded to Mr. Cilimberg to transmit to Mr. White. Mr. White will inform Mr. Cilimberg when a committee reviewing Affordable Housing policies is formed. At that time Mr. Cilimberg will request two volunteers from the Planning Commission to participate on the committee.

No formal action taken.

Old Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business.

- Planning Commissioner meeting evaluation results will be reviewed at the Commission's April 3rd meeting.

There being no further old business, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- No meeting on March 27, 2012
- Next regularly scheduled meeting Tuesday, April 3, 2012

There being no further business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at p.m. to Tuesday, April 3, 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)

Submitted by John Savage

Attachment A.
PC Minutes 03/20/2012

Resolution of the Crozet Community Advisory Council
Regarding light industrial and interstate interchange zoning
March 15, 2012

WHEREAS the Yancey Mills Business Park was reviewed as part of the 2009 Master Plan update; and

WHEREAS the Albemarle County Planning Commission has reviewed and rejected the Yancey Mills Business Project twice; and

WHEREAS in the 2009 survey of Crozet and Western Albemarle residents (done as part of the Master Plan update, N=700) showed that 45.2% (n=263) of respondents strongly opposed and 58% (n=336) somewhat or strongly oppose the "*commercial or industrial development in the vicinity of the Rte. 250 and I-64 interchange*" while only 14% (n=138) strongly favor and 24% (n=221) somewhat favor it (597 responses); and

WHEREAS Mr. Will Yancey presented his Yancey Mills Business Project at a public meeting in December 2009 attended by almost 150 people and when asked, the vast majority voted to oppose the project; and

WHEREAS additional acres of Light Industrial/office flex designated land was added to the Crozet growth area in the 2009 Master Plan update; and

WHEREAS over 60 acres of the property currently zoned Light Industrial in the Crozet growth area is not in use yet; and

WHEREAS the land at the Rte. 250 and I-64 interchange at exit 107 is zoned rural, is outside of the water and sewer boundaries, and is in a protected watershed; and

WHEREAS land zoned rural near any Albemarle County interstate interchange should be protected; and

WHEREAS the Rte. 250 and I-64 interchange at exit 107 is close to three public schools and Rte. 250 is an entrance corridor and part of Scenic 250; and

WHEREAS the property proposed for the Yancey Mills Business projects is adjacent to the Western Albemarle High School property;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Crozet Community Advisory Council, in recognition and support of the longstanding and consistently strong opposition to any commercial or industrial development at the Rte. 250 and I-64 interchange at exit 107, is unanimously opposed to any zoning change to said properties as well as any commercial or industrial development thereon.

I, Meg Holden, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true correct copy of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Crozet Community Advisory Council at its regular monthly meeting held March 15, 2012 by a motion made by John Savage and seconded by Nancy Virginia Bain. CCAC Members present: Meg Holden, Chair; Mary Gallo, Vice-Chair; Tim Tolson, Secretary; Mike Marshall, Nancy Virginia Bain, Brenda Plantz, John Savage, Bill Schrader, Jon Mikalson, and Meg West.

Signed: Meg Holden
Meg Holden, CCAC Chair

Submitted by Ron White

Attachment B
PC Minutes 3/20/12

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROFFER REPORT
March 20, 2012

For-Sale Units

- Fourteen have been built and sold as affordable
  - 9 in Avon Park
  - 5 in Liberty Hall
  - None that we are aware of that could not be sold as affordable

Rental Units

- Seven rental units were rented as affordable in Old Trail Town Center
- A number of accessory units have been constructed and reported as occupied (we do not monitor accessory units)

Cash Proffers

- **$476,809 received** (includes interest earned)
- **$411,385.21 used to date**
  - Down payment for 18 – 20 first-time homebuyers
  - Rehabilitation of 12 owner-occupied housing
  - Emergency electrical repairs for 150 mobile homes in Southwood
  - Replacement roof, siding, and windows for 30 rental units at Meadowlands
- **$30,000 obligated as match** for a Community Development Block Grant
  - **$700,000 grant** to do approximately 25 rehabs in Orchard Acres

Current Maximum Sales Price - $211,250

Current Cash-in-lieu - $21,125

Current Maximum Gross Rents (HUD Fair Market Rents)

Eff	$723
1 br	$870
2 br	$1029
3 br	$1334
4 br	$1476

Discussion Topics

1. Should cash proffers be used to ONLY develop new units or should funds be used when available to support any affordable housing initiative?
2. How do we move forward in crafting new proffers as well as managing existing proffers when the market has changed (ex. Mostly contract building and not speculative building; no down payment; changes in financial markets, etc.)?