Albemarle County Planning Commission
November 27, 2012

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, November 27, 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 Ron White, Housing Director; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Andy Sorrell, Senior Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning, Matt Weaver, Intern; Dan Mahone, Parks and Recreation Trails Planner; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; 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.

John Lowry, Chair of the Economic Development Authority, Chair of the Equalization Board, and Assistant Chief at the Redhill Precinct, spoke regarding the Comp Plan work.

- He commended staff on the Comp Plan work and noted his comments were postponed from last week's meeting.
- He was worried last week about Advocates for a Sustainable Albemarle Population (ASAP). He did not want to see any last minute advocacy group show up and short circuit the public process. He felt a little bit better about that after last week.
- There are a lot of competing interests in the County. He does not want to have special interest groups highjack the process. ACE is very worthy, but there are 744,000 acres in the county with 87,000 acres under conservation easements. Over two-thirds of the land in the county is under land use, which means little or no tax revenue. Where is the balance? The growth area is 5 percent of the county, which is 24,000 acres and where business and housing starts and is hoped to be. Where is the balance? That is partly for the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to decide, which he was worried about it.
- He was very worried when he saw written into the Comp Plan update one million dollar minimum funding for ACE to be codified. He would like to have $400,000 or $500,000 for the Economic Development Authority, which is not written into the Comp Plan. There are competing interests for the dollars, which he did not think that was really fair. He hoped the Commission would have a balanced interest as they rewrite the Comp Plan.

Charles Battig, M.D. spoke regarding concerns including sustainable population growth in the Comp Plan review as noted in his letter addressed to the Albemarle County Planning Commission dated November 27, 2012 as shown in Attachment 1. In his letter he asked, "Please set your planning objectives broadly, and let our established system of legal redress sort things out on an individualized basis." (Attachment on file with the printed minutes in the office of the clerk.)

There being no further public comments, the meeting moved to the next item.

Consent Agenda

Proposed 2013 Planning Commission meeting schedule

Mr. Cilimberg noted the anticipated Commission meeting dates were listed in the memo for next year. The Commission makes the final decision regarding those meeting dates in January at the organizational meeting. However, staff had to do some advance scheduling and wanted to get an initial affirmation of the schedule. The most critical dates staff needs affirmation on are on the public hearing dates because staff was scheduling applications to run to those dates. The work session dates are there to work with. However, the Commission should be aware that they have in the past and he would expect for next year as well held the no schedule meeting dates as back-ups in case there is a need for any additional meetings. They can expect that need particularly early in the year when they are still working on the Comp Plan. Staff may ask the Commission to meet on one of those dates.

Mr. Franco noted that he would be unable to attend the January 8 meeting.

Mr. Morris pointed out his only concern is on the no scheduled meeting he was looking at January 22, February 19 and March 12. He was also looking at the schedule provided by Ms. Echols. For one Commissioner he would hope staff would feel comfortable on utilizing any one of those or all three of those dates for work sessions for the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is supposed to be going to the Board of Supervisors in March.

Motion: Mr. Randolph moved and Mr. Smith seconded for approval of the proposed 2013 Planning Commission meeting schedule.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris noted that the proposed 2013 Planning Commission meeting schedule was approved.

Work Sessions

CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan
Parks and Recreation, Housing & Community Facilities (Elaine Echols, Andy Sorrell)

Mr. Morris noted the Commission would take each one of the three items, Housing; Parks & Public Greenways, Recreation, and Green Systems; and Other Community

Facilities as a separate item. Staff will give a briefing, the Commission will talk about it, open it up to the public, bring it back to discuss, answer all of the questions for that specific area, close, and move to the next item.

Ms. Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation. The supporting information provided by staff on each individual topic was distributed to the Planning Commission as notes for review on the following topics:

I. Housing
II. Parks & Greenways
III. Other Community Facilities

Purpose of November 27th Meeting

- Allow for opportunity for public input
- PC - Review & Discuss draft sections
- PC - Provide direction on recommendations

Meeting Format

- Staff presentation on each section
  - Housing,
  - Park & Rec.
  - Other Community Facilities
- Public comment
- PC direction on topic areas

General Format

Three Main Parts:

- Existing Conditions
- Recommended Plan
- Performance Measures

"Cheat Sheet" shows "what went where"

After staff's presentation they would like to know:

- Did we go too far in our cuts?
- Are we missing something substantive?
- Inadvertent Omissions and Errors?

Ms. Echols noted the first presentation was on Housing. Ron White, Housing Director, is present to answer questions.

Housing Discussion

Elaine Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the existing conditions and recommended goals, objectives, strategies and performance measures. *(An overview of the Housing section suggested changes as summarized in the notes were provided as supporting information by staff.)* Discussion took place on the topic of "Medi-Pods" and reporting on progress with affordable units. Ms. Echols said that the

strategy related to accessory units should be moved out of the "affordable housing" section because it relates to a number of other goals for housing.

The Planning Commission held a discussion with staff. The Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- On page 9, provide greater clarification concerning the County's existing inventory of housing and land and projected needs.

- Change the word, "builders" to "developers" in Strategy 4c, in terms of who to encourage to provide affordable housing using density bonuses.

- Change Strategy 4e to say, "Amend the zoning ordinance to provide for greater opportunities to construct accessory units to diversify housing supply," and move this section out of the affordable housing section. Talk about the benefits of accessory units, what it can accomplish as well as mentioning granny pods as a form of housing for care givers.

- Incorporate transportation into the discussion, specifically transportation in the definition of affordability and public transportation related to affordable housing. Transportation for affordable housing should be public transportation and needs greater prominence in the Master Planning efforts.

- Look at the City's housing program and opportunities for the two localities to work together, as is done in the Parks section. Defer this discussion to get more information from subcommittee report at next week's joint meeting. Put the County in a more regional context – What is the City and UVA's commitment to affordable housing? Consider putting a broad goal earlier in the plan about regional relationships that would set the stage for this part.

- Provide an explanation on where the range of density came from on page 9.

- Be more specific about the relationship of the growth management policy and housing location/types.

- Reference the "State of Housing Report" completed in 2007 for the region.

- Consider recommending changes to the zoning regulations for affordable housing to encourage and allow such things as density bonuses or having no parking requirement on-site for developments that are on a bus-line or allowing multi-family structures in single-family districts if the structure looks like other houses in the neighborhood. These changes would not just be in architectural design, but really in code changes that would help achieve density and affordability.

- Mr. Loach disagreed with doing away with the parking requirements since it was problematic.

- Identify thresholds for when additional public transit is needed based on stress on existing roads.

- Be consistent with the timing of performance measurements – 2015 or 2018?

- New possible performance measures would be to monitor land supply, track the number of housing units approved by legislative action, track the number of units that have been proffered and how many have been built. A strategy could be to review the results of the above tracking on a regular basis considering adjustments based on such review.

- Work on ways to ensure that affordable units continue to stay affordable.

- Look into whether or how providing affordable housing has suffered from reductions in staff.

- Clarify the affordable housing policy as it relates to cash proffers and conditions under which cash in lieu of units should be accepted.

- Provide data on participants who have been part of the Homebuyer's Club who have successfully been able to purchase a home.

- Emphasize the need for the Homebuyer's Club to be reinstated and the importance of having adequate staffing.

- Make distinctions between strategies and performance measures. Having at least 15% affordable units in all new housing developments is a performance measure. Amending the zoning ordinance for more opportunities for accessory units is a strategy.

The following comments came from the public:

Charles Battig, M.D. commented that so much hangs on these meetings. Tonight he represents the public. He was a biased person in that view and was trying to represent some thoughts of the public. He thinks this is a problem in moving forward with these types of meetings. He had not heard a definition of what affordability is. What makes housing affordable and what is driving this. He asked what the Neighborhood Model has achieved, specifically clustering and what not. All regulations make housing more expensive. The more layers of regulations make property more expensive. He was glad the county was considering senior citizens. The public can make their own value choice. However, he questioned where the public was making their choice. They were designing a system for them, which may appeal to some but not others.

The Planning Commission moved to the next topic.

Parks and Recreation, Greenways and Green Systems Discussion

Elaine Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation and reviewed the existing conditions and recommended goals, objectives, strategies and performance measures. *(An overview of the Parks and Recreation, Greenways and Green Systems section*

suggested changes as summarized in the notes were provided as supporting information by staff.) Dan Mahon, Parks and Recreation Trails Planner, was available to answer questions.

The Planning Commission held a discussion with staff. The Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Identify the joint work of the City and County for the Rivanna River corridor as a high priority.
- Look at parks in the southern and western part of the county – more are needed there. Those will be discussed with upcoming meeting on Neighborhoods 4, 5, 6, and 7.
- UVA grounds should be identified on the parks and greenways plan.
- Rivanna River crossings are needed for cyclists and walkers, especially if they want to commute.
- There needs to be connectivity between the southern and western parts of the County.
- A better definition is needed for greenways, greenway trails, and paths in the beginning of the chapter.
- Develop criteria for land offers in conjunction with the City. The City may have funds where the County does not and joint land acquisition may be possible.
- Can we use the provisions of the TMDL process as leverage for acquiring easements? Check with Greg Harper.
- Should parks and amenities be classified by the age group or the users? Or by special interest, like dog parks?
- Providing bike racks and benches at parks should be in the recommendations; donated benches, bike racks, or trash receptacles can mitigate the cost for the County. Also, there should be trails within those parks.
- Note that there is a need for walkable parks in the Development Areas.
- Should the amenities provided by private entities (such as homeowners associations) be discussed?
- Provide additional references to the different needs of specialized population, such as the elderly and young. Also, needs for dog parks and equestrian facilities.

- Recommend that more work is needed with the public, including homeowners who might be living near a future greenway trails, about the value of greenways.

- Continue to create plans for County parks even if the County does not have the funding to develop the parks in the near future.

- Consider grade separated interchanges at the intersections of Route 29 & Hydraulic Road and Route 29 & Rio Road to help provide a pedestrian network to connect greenway trails.

- Coordinate better with City to provide better bike/pedestrian access to the Ragged Mountain Natural Area.

- Broaden the language for the Trail Advisory Committees to include City representatives and associated club representatives.

The following comments came from the public:

Ken Crawford was present on behalf of one of the mountain bike clubs mentioned by Mr. Lafferty, CAMBC (Charlottesville Area Mountain Bike Club). They are a non-profit organization whose mission is to advocate for mountain biking in the area. They provide support through their 300 plus members by volunteering with the Albemarle County Parks and Recreation on the trails. He was happy with the plan, but was present to discuss resolution and clarification for the recreation, the planning, and the access of this plan. They support all seven of the objectives and glad to hear about the bridge crossing for the Rivanna River. They support that access as well as a crossing on Route 29 for the retail corridor on Hydraulic Road and Route 29. They support bike access as well as access for the trail walkers, joggers, and runners. They also would like to have an access way to new trails or an easement granted for bikers for the Ragged Mountain area. They objected to the words "natural area" in the documentation and would like to see large parks, rural parks or wooded parks. Natural area has a negative connotation where it sounds like it is only going to be open to pedestrians and not bikers.

Will Sanford, with the Charlottesville Area Mountain Bike Club, asked to add to Mr. Crawford's comments. On strategy 1d there is an opportunity to mention working with the City on Sugar Hollow. It would be a nice connection through the national park to Byron Park. He suggested adding CAMBC to the Greenway Trail Advisory Committee. He would like a clarification on page 33 on the class b - are these standards and greenway services specific to the greenways or all the trails in county parks considered greenways. He would like a discussion on the 4' to 5' wide width specification for a class b trail. That does not seem to provide enough variety for the different uses if every trail is specified to be 4' to 5' wide. There are reasons why they might want to have a 2' wide trail or a 6' wide trail corridor. He did not think the class b definition is wide enough and he encouraged that to be developed more.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:57 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 8:02 p.m.

The Planning Commission moved to the next topic.

Other Community Facilities Discussion

In a PowerPoint presentation Andy Sorrell reviewed the Introduction to the Community Facility Standards section of the Plan as well as recommended standards for Police, Schools, Fire/Rescue, County Government, Solid Waste Management and Libraries. *(An overview of the Community Facilities Section suggested changes, as summarized in the notes. was provided as supporting information by staff.)*

The Planning Commission held a discussion with staff. The Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- The introduction is very helpful. Bold and underline the paragraph on page 3 which speaks to the importance of efficiently using the Development Areas and the need for an increased commitment by the County for public infrastructure improvements and community facilities and services.

- Add to the general community facilities section that regular dialogue should occur among the City, County and UVA to seek ways to optimize provision of facilities and services.

- Define standards – are they really guidance?

- Provide some text describing the current fiscal realities and what that means for community facilities. Some needs are currently not being met.

- The term "bikers" should be replaced with the term, "cyclists".

- In terms of format, consider placing the existing conditions for each community facility along with the objectives and strategies instead of in a standalone "Existing Conditions" section.

- In general, the text of this entire section is very disjointed compared to the Housing and Parks sections. It is unbalanced. In some cases there is too much detail and in other places there does not seem to be enough.

- Much of the detail is "programmatic" in nature. It is unvetted and should not be included.

- Work on the consistency regarding the level of detail provided for each County Service. Consider an Appendix for the detail.

- The entire process for review of the CIP should be redone. By the time the PC receives recommendations from staff, all the prioritization has been done and the public has not been part of the input. Consider a change in the way the CIP is developed. More involvement by the Planning Commission and public is needed.

- Why are there detailed recommendations related to the Keene Landfill which are contrary to the comments provided by the Commission at their last meeting on the topic? There has been no public notification and this implies that the County has done a bait and switch. This section needs to be totally redone and text recommending the location and components of the public safety training facility need to be removed. Instead, the language should say,

  Objective 4: Evaluate the need for a County owned Public Safety Training Facility to provide for firearms and vehicle training to meet Department of Criminal Justice Service certifications as well as firefighting training, including burn buildings and hazardous materials training. Identify options for meeting training requirements, evaluate the benefits and liabilities of constructing a local facility and, if appropriate, consider future locations for these facilities in the County.

  The next time this topic comes up, neighbors to the Keene Landfill should be notified.

- Regarding schools, in Objective 1, add a reference to the fact that schools serve as important community centers and help implement the Neighborhood Model.

- Schools - Objective 5 is bureaucratic gobbledy-gook. This objective needs to be clear and usable, not just words on a page to make people feel good. Clarify what "parity" refers to. Programmatic aspects of schools should not be included in this section since it deals mostly with facilities standards.

- Schools – Objective 12 – provide individual sites for schools rather than multi-school sites – needs more review. Not all PC members support this objective.

- Schools – Objective 14 – further discussion is needed on the recommendations related to site grading. Consideration should be given to having a single school design that can be applied to any site rather than having architects draw up individual plans for specific sites.

- Something should be provided on creating safe routes to school. This includes funding and how to identify who would be responsible for getting that funding.

- Regarding Libraries, reword the text saying new technologies should be considered after the library in Crozet is built. Something about the wording is confusing.

  Regarding Libraries, use of "travel time" as a level of service objective may not be appropriate. Number of miles traveled might be more appropriate. Travel times may need to be amended if you are considering other transportation modes such as cycling.

- Regarding County Government Buildings, consider referring to the McIntire Road County Office Building as COB-North and the Fifth Street County Office Building as COB-South.

- Regarding Emergency Communications, add text pertaining to how the County, City, and UVA would respond to and support the community in a large scale emergency – hurricane, earthquake, etc.

- Regarding Solid Waste Management, make sure that the correct terminology for household hazardous materials is used.

- The section on Solid Waste Management needs more metrics or performance standards.

- Consideration should be given to adding a library to serve the Village of Rivanna.

Other comments related to Community Facilities

- Reference somewhere needs to be made to the 2011 Citizen Survey and the value placed on the County's rural areas, growth management policy, and regulations that help to keep the rural areas rural.

- Recommend making a coordinated effort between all county departments when searching for grant opportunities and writing grant applications, such as the Safe Routes to Schools grant.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Morris thanked staff for their work on this.

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.

- NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BE ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2012 JOINT CITY/COUNTY WORKSESSION AT CITY HALL at 5:30 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment

Mr. Lafferty moved and Mr. Franco seconded to adjourn to December 4, 2012, 5:30 p.m., at City Space, 100 Fifth Street NE, Charlottesville, Virginia.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m. to Tuesday, December 4, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at the City Space, 100 Fifth Street NE, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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

ATTACHMENT – NOTES ON HOUSING SECTIONS REFERENCED IN MINUTES

Notes on Housing Sections
November 21, 2012

NOTE: Use the below in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan "Existing Conditions – Housing" section (pages 2 - 7 of the draft), "Housing – Proposed Plan", (pages 8 – 11 of the draft), and "Affordable Housing Policy", pages 12 – 17 of the draft". Page numbers in italics correspond to the draft plan location. Pages numbers underlined correspond to existing plan location; New text is indicated in ***Bold****. NM – Neighborhood Model, AHP – Affordable Housing Policy, LUP – Land Use Plan*

Existing Conditions

Introduction *(page 2)*
- ***New introductory text***

Safe, Sanitary Housing *(pages 2 – 3)*
- ***Graph and analysis of housing stock – new***

Equal Housing Opportunities *(page 3)*
- ***New text***

Location for Housing and Mix *(pages 3 – 5)*
- ***New analysis of existing housing types***

Affordability (pages 5 – 6)
- *Updated and revised text from page 2 AHP*
- ***New information on status of programs and staffing***

Future Housing Trends *(pages 6 – 7)*
- ***New information on how demographic changes affect housing with emphasis on a growing senior population***

Goal for Housing *(page 8)*
- *Updated and revised text comes from "objectives" page 4 AHP*

Objective 1: Support for non-profits to ensure safe, sanitary housing *(page 8)*
- *Updated and revised text on working with non-profit partners page 5 AHP*
- ***New strategy to apply for grant money to help fund housing rehab***

Objective 1: Promote equal opportunities in housing *(page 8)*
- ***New strategies to capture current activities and commitments for equal opportunities in housing***

Objective 2: Sufficient land area for future populations *(pages 8 – 9)*

- *Updated information revised from various sections of the LUP related to residential capacity*
- ***New strategy to capture current activities***

Objective 3: Variety of housing types for all income levels, and density (pages 9 – 10)

- *Updated and revised text for Objective from pages 22 and 100 NM*
- *Updated and revised text for Strategies 3a and 3b from pages 22 and 100 NM; emphasis on aging population and universal design added*
- ***New Strategy 3 c to reflect current activities of County for seniors and citizens with disabilities***

Objective 4: Affordable housing (pages 10 – 11)

- *Strategies 4a and 4b - Updated and revised text from pages 4 – 6 AHP*
- *Updated and revised text for Strategy 4c o encourage developers to use density bonuses for affordable housing page 5 AHP*
- *Updated and revised text for Strategy 4d for similar appearance of affordable units and mixing affordable housing into developments taken from pages 22, 100 NM*
- *Updated and revised text for Strategy 4e for accessory units taken from page 101 NM*
- ***New recommendations related to guidance for zoning text amendments for accessory units***

Performance Measures *(page 11)*

- ***New suggested performance measures for built units and zoning text amendments***

Affordable Housing Policy (AHP) *(pages 11 – 17)*

- *Updated and revised text on policy from page 4 AHP*
- ***Expanded definitions to help explain policy*** *(pages 12 – 13)*
- *Updated and revised text on goal of 15% affordable units in SPs and ZMAs from page 5 AHP*
- ***New sliding scale credit tables for rent and sales related to varying levels of*** *Adjusted Mean Income* ***(AMI)***

Strategy 1 and Recommendations (page 15)

- *First Strategy on implementing regulatory and administrative functions to implement the policy - updated and revised text from pages 4-5 AHP*
- *All but bullets 9 & 10, updated and revised text from pages 4 – 6 AHP*
- ***Bullet 9 – Added recommendation to explore opportunities to provide incentives/allowances for developments that commit to produce 25% or more units as affordable***
- *Bullet 10 on accessory units from page 101 NM*

Strategy 2 and Recommendations (pages 15-16)

- *Second strategy on working with developers to phase in affordable units updated and revised text from pages 5 AHP*

- *Bullet 1 – updated and revised text from page 5 AHP*
- ***Bullet 2 – new to provide flexibility in proffers as off-set to impacts***

Strategy 3 and Recommendations (page 15)

- *Third strategy on developing mechanisms for long-term affordability of units after sale from page 5 AHP*
- *First three bullets from page 5 AHP*
- ***Bullet 4 new to explore ways to reduce tax burden on deed-restricted dwellings***

Strategy 4 and Recommendations (page 16 – 17)

- *Fourth strategy on partnerships with other housing providers and lenders – no change (page 5)*
- *All bullets – no change, except to promote increased coordination with the City of Charlottesville from pages 5 – 7 AHP*

Strategy 5 and Recommendations (page 17)

- *Fifth strategy – no change (page 6 AHP)*
- *Both bullets – no change (page 6 AHP)*

Items removed

- *Preface from existing AHP – page 2*
- *Overview and Background from existing AHP page 3 – replaces with some text in existing conditions*

ATTACHMENT – NOTES ON PARKS & PUBLIC GREENWAYS, RECREATION, AND GREEN SYSTEMS REFERENCED IN MINUTES

Notes Section Parks & Public Greenways, Recreation, and Green Systems
November 26, 2012

NOTE: Use the below in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan "Existing Conditions – Parks Greenways, and Recreation" section (pages 2 - 4 of the draft), "Parks and Greenways, Recreation, and Green Systems (Proposed Plan)", (pages 5 13 of the draft), "Parks and Greenways (Appendix to Greenways Map)" section (pages 18 – 23) and "Parks and Public Greenways (Locations and Standards)" pages 24 - 36 of the draft". Page numbers in italics correspond to the draft plan location. Pages numbers underlined correspond to existing plan location; New text is indicated in ***Bold****. CP = Comprehensive Plan, LUP =Land Use Plan.*

Existing Conditions – Parks, Greenways, and Recreation
Parks and Recreation – page 2

- *Updated and revised text from CP Community Facilities section for Parks and Recreation, page 165.3*

Existing Facilities
Parks and Natural Areas – page 2

- *Updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources Greenways section p. 183.*
- ***New text in relation to Biscuit Run State Park.***

Greenways, Greenway Trails, and Blueways – page 3
Greenways and Greenway Trails

- *Updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources Greenways section p. 184 and 187.*

Blueways – pages 3 - 4

- ***New text in relation to defining blueways***
- *Matrix graphic: Updates existing chart on parks and rec. website*

Parks and Public Greenways, Recreation, and Green Systems (Proposed Plan) *– page 5*

- ***Goal and performance measures are new.***

Objective 1: *pages 5-6*

- ***This is new and its strategies – part of the city-county objectives will add One Community Text here. Strategies will be addressed once joint PC's discuss.***
- *Strategy 1c related to working with the city in relation to grants from CP Natural Resources Greenways section, page 188.*
- *Strategy 1 d updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources Scenic Resources section, p. 148.*

Objective 2: *pages 6 - 7*

-
- ***The text for this objective is new but represents existing practice.***
- ***The articulation of these strategies is new, although some of the strategies represent existing practice.***

Objective 3: *pages 7-9*

- *Updated and revised text to provide a heading under which to place existing recommendations, CP Natural Resources, Greenways section pages 188 - 191*
- *Strategy 3A is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 188.*
- *Strategy 3B is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 190.*
- *Strategy 3C is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 189.*
- *Strategy 3D is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 190.*
- *Strategy 3E is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 191.*

Objective 4: *pages 9-10*

- *Updated and revised text from Neighborhood Model and Community Facilities Plan.*
- ***Strategy 4a and 4b represent existing practice.***
- *Strategies 4c, 4d, and 4e are from CP Community Facilities Plan Parks and Recreation section, page 165.3*

Objective 6 (misnumbered should be 5): *page 11*

- ***This objective and its 3 strategies are new****, but builds upon existing recommendations in the greenway advisory committee responsibilities found on from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 186.*

Objective 7: *pages 11 - 12*

- ***This is a new objective and*** *an updated and revised strategy from page 186 of the CP greenway section.*
- *Strategy 7A is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 186.*
- *Strategy 7B is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenway Plan p. 214.*
- *Strategy 7C is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 190.*
- *Strategy 7D is updated and revised text from CP Natural Resources, Greenways section p. 190-91.*

Parks & Public Greenways (Appendix to Greenways Map) *pages 18 - 23*
Places 29 Neighborhoods, Southern and Western Neighborhoods, and Village of Rivanna

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways section, p. 187.*

Hollymead/Piney Mountain

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways section, p. 187.*

Crozet

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways section, p. 187.*

Rural Area

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways section, p. 187.*

River/Stream Crossings *page 19*

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways plan, p. 208.*

Bridge Location Guidelines: *page 19*

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways plan, p. 208.*

Trail Access Point Classifications *page 19*

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways plan, p. 209-210.*

Trail Access Point Locations *pages 19 - 22*

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways section, p. 187.*

Recommended locations for access to the greenway system include (See Maps):

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways plan, p. 210-211.*

BOAT ACCESS: *pages 22 - 23*

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways plan, p. 212.*

Greenway Trail Access Point Guidelines *p. 23*

- *Updates and revises text from CP Greenways plan, p. 212*

Parks & Public Greenways (Locations and Standards) *page 24*

Area and Site Size Guidelines: page 24

- ***Table is adapted from Virginia Outdoors Plan as well as from*** *CP Community Facilities Plan, Schools Section pages 161- 165*

Space and Capacity Guidelines: page 24

- *Updated and revised text from CP Community Facilities Plan, Schools Section pages 161- 165* ***and Virginia Outdoors Plan***

Table 1. Park Area Standards *page 24*

- ***New text that from the Virginia Outdoor Plan and Parks and Recreation staff and Schools staff***

Small Neighborhood Parks *page 25*

- *Updated and revised text from Neighborhood Model and* ***Virginia Outdoor Plan. Parks and Rec staff as well as school staff have provided input in developing and updating the facilities and services chart.***

Facilities and Services Table *page 26*

- *Updated and revised information from CP Community Facilities Plan, Schools, page 164*

Neighborhood Parks *page 26*

- *Updated and revised text from Neighborhood Model and* ***Virginia Outdoor Plan. Parks and Rec staff as well as school staff have provided input in developing and updating the facilities and services chart.***
- *Updated and revised information from CP Community Facilities Plan, Schools, page 164*

Community Parks *pages 27-29*

- *Updated and revised text from Neighborhood Model and* ***Virginia Outdoor Plan. Parks and Rec staff as well as school staff have provided input in developing and updating the facilities and services chart.***
- *Updated and revised information from CP Community Facilities Plan, Schools, page 164*

Regional Parks *pages 30-31 – This heading refers to different regions of the County, not different regions of the State*

- *Updated and revised text from Neighborhood Model and* ***Virginia Outdoor Plan. Parks and Rec staff as well as school staff have provided input in developing and updating the facilities and services chart.***

County Parks and Nature Preserves *page 33*

- ***Generally this is new text that comes from the Virginia Outdoor Plan. Parks and Rec staff as well as school staff have provided input in developing and updating the facilities and services chart.***

Public Greenway Services and Standards *page 33*
Trail Guidelines: *page 33*

- ***Existing text from the*** *CP Greenways plan, p. 203*

Class A & Class B Trail Cross-section Diagrams *page 34*

- *Same charts from CP Greenways plan, p. 204-205.*

Greenway System Network *– pages 34-35*

- *Updates and revises text found in CP Greenways plan, p. 213-214*

Greenway Trail Facility Guidelines *page 36*

- *Updates and revises text found in CP Greenways plan, p. 214.*

Methods of Obtaining Land *page 36*

- *Updates and revises text found in CP Greenways plan, p. 217-218.*

ATTACHMENT – NOTES ON OTHER COMMUNITY FACILITIES REFERENCED IN MINUTES

Notes on Other Community Facilities
November 21, 2012

NOTE: Use the below in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan draft section "Other Community Facilities". Page numbers in italics correspond to the draft plan location. Pages numbers underlined correspond to existing plan location; new text is indicated in ***Bold****. NM – Neighborhood Model, CP = Comprehensive, LUP – Land Use Plan*
Community Facilities Standards and Plan *pages 3 - 10*

Introduction and Expectations for all Community Facilities

- *Updates and revises existing text CP, LUP p. 140-141 Community Facilities section*
- *The discussion of the Capital Improvements Program and Population Growth and Service Demand are addressed in other locations*

OVERALL FACILITY OBJECTIVES: *pages 4 - 7*

- *These Objectives (1-13) are updated text from the objectives listed on pages 143-144 CP LUP Community Facilities - Introductory section.*

The Neighborhood Model Principles and Application with Community Facilities pages 7 - 9

- *Updates and revises existing text CP, LUP p. 144-145 Community Facilities Introductory section*
- *The goals of the Neighborhood Model were repetitive and were removed as they are mentioned elsewhere in the plan.*

Energy Efficiency – pages 9 - 10

Objective 13 and strategies 13a-d:

- *Updates and revises existing text CP, NR section Sustainability Design in Buildings and Planning p. 4.1*
  ***

Community Facility Standards for Police *pages 11 – 15*

- *Updated and revised text is from pages 147 – 149 CP LUP Community Facility Standards for Police* ***and Police Dept.***
- ***Changes for Geographic policing and map are from Police Dept.***

SERVICE AREA OBJECTIVES: *page 11*

- ***Objectives 1 and 2 are updated and revised and reflect the new geographic service model that has two districts.***

LOCATION OBJECTIVES: *page 11*

District Stations – page 11

- ***Objectives 3 is new and revised text based upon the new geographic policing model.***

Public Safety Training Facility – page 12

- ***Objective 4 is new.***

Public Safety Training Academy – pages 12

- ***Objective 5 is new.***

BUILDING AND SERVICE EXPECTATIONS: *pages 11 - 12*

- ***New*** *and updated text from CP, LUP p. 147 Community Facilities – Police section.*

FACILITY STANDARDS: DISTRICT STATIONS *pages 12 - 14*

- ***For the most part facility standards are new. They update a few such standards already provided,*** *CP, LUP p. 147-148 Community Facilities - Police section.*

Page 15 - ***Figure 1: Albemarle County Geographic Policing Districts – this map is new based on the proposed geographic policing model.***

***

Community Facility Standards for School Facilities

Mission Bullets page 17

- *Generally updated and revised text from CP, LUP, p. 161 Community Facilities – Schools section.*

SERVICE AREA OBJECTIVES: *page 17*

- ***Objectives 1 and 2 update and revised objectives found in*** *CP, LUP p. 164 Community Facilities - Schools section.*

LOCATION AND OTHER OBJECTIVES: *pages 17 -19*

- ***Objectives 5, 11, 12 are new. Other Objectives update and revise text found in*** *CP, LUP p. 164-165 Community Facilities – Schools section.*

SCHOOL SERVICE AND FACILITY STANDARDS (FOR ALL SCHOOLS): *pages 19 - 21*

- *Generally updates and revised text found in CP, LUP p. 165-166 Community Facilities – Schools section.* ***Portions on "Usable Area" and Rec. Fields, Facilities and Equipment" are new.*** *Portions on "sustainability" and "infrastructure" were not included because they were duplicative from introduction.*

FACILITY STANDARDS - ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: *pages 22 - 23*

- *Generally updates and revised text found in CP, LUP p. 166-167 Community Facilities – Schools section. "****Public Park at School" is new*** *and the minimum facility standards have been revised based on consultation with the Schools Division and Parks and Recreation staff.*

FACILITY STANDARDS - MIDDLE SCHOOLS: *pages 23 - 24*

- *Generally updates and revised text found in CP, LUP p. 167 Community Facilities - Schools section. **"Public Park at School" is new** and the minimum facility standards have been revised based on consultation with the Schools Division and Parks and Recreation staff.*

FACILITY STANDARDS - HIGH SCHOOLS: *pages 24 - 25*

- *Generally updates and revised text found in CP, LUP p. 168 Community Facilities section. **"Public Park at School" is new** and the minimum facility standards have been revised based on consultation with the Schools Division and Parks and Recreation staff.*

***

Community Facility Standards for Fire – Rescue *pages 25 - 27*

SERVICE AREA OBJECTIVES: *page 25*

- *Objective 1 is updated and revised text found in CP, LUP p. 154-155 Community Facilities section – Fire and Rescue Services.*

LOCATION OBJECTIVES: *page 25*

- *Objectives 2-4 are updated and revised text mainly found in facility and service objectives found in CP, LUP p. 155 Community Facilities – Fire and Rescue Services section.*

BUILDING AND SERVICE EXPECTATIONS: *pages 25 - 26*

- *These 7 bullets are updated and revised text mainly found in facility and service objectives found in CP, LUP p. 154-156 Community Facilities – Fire and Rescue Services section. The response times for fire and rescue emergencies and the number of calls for service have been adjusted in consultation with the Fire-Rescue staff.*

FACILITY STANDARDS: *pages 26 - 27*

- *Generally updates facility standards found in CP, LUP p. 155 Community Facilities – Fire and Rescue Services section. Some of the facilities standards listed on pages 155 and 156 have been removed because of repetition or from being addressed elsewhere.*

***

Community Facilities Standards for County Government Buildings *pages 28 - 30*

SERVICE AREA OBJECTIVES: *page 28*

- *Map: [to be updated] from p. 165.1*
- ***Objectives 1 – 3 are new text which reflects existing activities.***

BUILDING AND SERVICE EXPECTATIONS: *page 28*

- ***Bullets relating to court services and emergency communications are new.*** *Administrative facilities update and revise existing text from CP, LUP p. 165.4 Community Facilities – County Government Administration.*

FACILITY STANDARDS: *- pages 28 - 29*

- *For general government administration, generally updates and revises existing text from CP, LUP p. 165.4 Community Facilities.*
- ***Sections on Courts and Emergency Communications are new standards from County staff.***

***

Community Facility Standards for Solid Waste Management *– page 32- 33*

SERVICE AREA OBJECTIVES: *page 32*

- ***Objective 1 is new.***

SERVICE OBJECTIVES: *page 32-33*

- ***Objectives 2 and 3 are new.*** *Objective 4 and its two strategies update and revise existing text found in CP, LUP p. 165.5 Community Facilities.*
- *Objectives 5 – 9 updates and revises existing text found in CP, LUP p. 165.5 Community Facilities.*

***

Community Facility Standards for Library Services *pages 34 - 36*

SERVICE AREA OBJECTIVES: *page 34*

- *Objectives 1 – 3 updates and revises existing text found in CP, LUP p. 160 Community Facilities – Library Services section.*

LOCATION AND OTHER OBJECTIVES: *pages 34 - 35*

Locations pages 34 - 35

- *Objectives 4 – 7 reflect language in Places 29 Master Plan, Crozet Master Plan, and the CP LUP page 58 – Neighborhood 4 and are updated text.*

Visibility page 35

- *Objective 8 updates and revises existing text found in CP, LUP p. 161 Community Facilities – Library Services section.*

Alternative Service Provisions page 35

- *Objective 9 updates and revises existing text found in CP, LUP p. 160 Community Facilities.*
- ***Objective 10 relating to new forms of technology is new.***

BUILDING AND SERVICE EXPECTATIONS: *page 35*

- *Bullets update and revise existing text found in CP, LUP p. 160 Community Facilities.*

LIBRARY FACILITY STANDARDS: *pages 35 - 36*

- *Numbered items under all 5 headings update and revise existing text found in CP, LUP p. 161 Community Facilities.*