Albemarle County Planning Commission
January 22, 2013

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, January 22, 2013, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

Other officials present were Andrew Sorrell, Senior Planner, David Benish, Chief of Planning; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney; and Steve Williams, Executive Director of Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC).

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

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.

Other Matters Not on the Agenda

The following individuals spoke about the proposed police firing range at the Keene landfill:

- Barbara West noted that people move into the rural areas to have peace and quiet. The rural folks value this way of life so highly that they are willing to drive 30 to 40 miles on a regular basis for most of our needs. They are passionate about maintaining the right to peace and tranquility, quality of life, physical safety, health and property values. She asked that they remember what rural means. In future planning she asked to retain a clear demarcation between rural and growth area. They respectfully request that they do not expand the growth and development areas south of Charlottesville. In all revisions of the comprehensive plan they request that the rural areas continue to be preserved and protected. That means no provision for a firing range or any of the proposed additional phases.
- Hal West, resident of Keene, read a letter from Justin Young, a concerned Albemarle County Resident and firearms instructor about safety concerns with locating the shooting range on the old Keene landfill. (Attachment 1 - Letter from Justin Young to Ann Mallek in reference to Keene Police Firing Range – Copy of letter on file with minutes in the Clerk's Office)
- D.G. Van Clief noted that only four individuals spoke during the initial meeting when the Commission dealt with the issue of whether or not the landfill facility was in keeping with the comprehensive plan. Things have changed since then. At present they have signed petitions from residents of the area and property holders in southern Albemarle. Over 1,300 individuals have put their names on paper in opposition to this facility. They

have sought the advice of experts in the area. They have looked at the sound studies that have been done by the county. Limited as they are it shows that the sound of gunfire on the periphery of this facility will be between four and eight times the level currently allowed by the County's sound ordinance both during the day and at night. The current 20' berms are fine but they do not provide protection especially in the down range, which will be at least three sides of this facility. There is nothing further in the site plan to provide a stopper for any of their errant rounds and they know it is a risk. The EPA's best management practices will tell you that earth and berms do not stop lead leaching into the soil. They sought out the leading real estate agents and have figured out it would be on average a 35 percent reduction in land and home values in this area. Alternatives do exist. They have at least one major viable alternative on the table. They would ask the Commission for any help they can give with the Board of Supervisors to put the brakes on this and avoid what would be a major mistake. They thank them for questioning the additional four phases that are planned for this and please help them in opposing this and in finding an alternative.

- Jerome Beazley spoke in opposition to the police firing range. There is too much at stake and too much to lose. The county plans to dump at least two million dollars into a non-returning asset that will not add one dollar of economic value to the community or to the county. The county has alternatives each with its own set of pros and cons and costs, but that can accomplish the goal better than the Keene site. They expect the county to look at all of those consequences and to move it to a location where it can be a win/win for everyone where the public and the police can work side by side for a positive resolution that will spur economic activity and increase tax revenue. Common sense would say who their right mind would buy near a firing range when they want to live in the tranquility of the country side. As you consider revisions to the comprehensive plan please respect the value of our rural areas. Do not expand the southern and western neighborhoods into what is currently zoned rural. The rural areas are designated rural for a reason and they need to maintain it. Please do not approve any language that would locate the police firing range or any of it proposed subsequent phases to the Keene landfill site. This facility does not belong in the rural areas.
- Paula Beazley was present on behalf of the Save Rural Albemarle and the Edith and Theodore Roosevelt Pine Knot Foundation, each of which exists in southern Albemarle to discuss preservation of the rural areas. She requested as they proceed in the review of the comprehensive plan that they consider the proper place of rural areas. Specifically, they implore them not to designate the Keene landfill as the site of a police firing range or to designate it for any further contemplated phases of that range. The Keene site rests in the heart of the rural area and this type of activity does not belong in the rural area. There are specific characteristics of this site with regard to the acidic soil and acidic rain, the high water table, and the wetlands. The eastern and western berms still continue to be sitting on the wetlands. Those two berms will be fired into. That is specifically prohibited under the EPA best management practice guidelines. Secondly, she requested that the existing rural areas remain as such and not be sucked into the development areas, specifically in regards to southern Albemarle. Please preserve the rural areas. They oppose the Summerset Farm proposal and ask that they keep the demarcation between growth and rural areas and maintain this hard line. Please be mindful of the uses conducive to the rural areas.

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

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – January 16, 2013

Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on January 16, 2013.

Consent Agenda

Approval of Minutes: September 18, 2012

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

Motion: Mr. Lafferty moved and Mr. Loach seconded for approval of the consent agenda.

The motion carried by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris noted the consent agenda was approved as submitted.

Work Session

CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan
Review of Transportation Section (Andy Sorrell, David Benish)

Review of Transportation Section
Andy Sorrell and David Benish presented information and recommendations for the proposed Comp Plan Transportation Section in a PowerPoint presentation.

- The Land Use Section and the guidelines that were distributed in the packet for tonight will be discussed at the January 29th meeting.
- Staff asked the Commission to provide direction on the recommendations and material in the Transportation Section tonight.

General Format
Five Main Parts:

- Discussion of Travel Modes
- Discussion of Transportation Planning
- Goals, Objectives Strategies
- Performance Measures (to be added)
- Appendix (to be added)

Staff passed out the "Cheat Sheet" shows "what went where" (See Copy of Attachment #2 with Printed Minutes in Clerk's Office)

General Changes

- Removed repetition & reorganized to flow better
- Removed recommended actions if completed
- Removed items that are:
- Better located in an appendix, such as "standards"

- Referenced in other Plans – master plans, LRTP
- updates ones with status changes

Mr. Williams was present from Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission for questions on the MPO Long Range Transportation Plan that is currently going through an update.

Staff is looking for the following information tonight:
- Did we go too far in our cuts?
- Are we missing something substantive?

Inadvertent Omissions and Errors?
- Trans Dominion Express line information was left out by accident in the explanation in the rail section.

Highlights of Travel Modes
- Generally updates and shortens existing text
- Maps of various travel mode facilities will be added
- Relocated and renamed recommendations to the end for easier access
- Particular modal plans are referenced in the local planning section

Highlights of Transportation Planning
- Greater stress on multimodal planning
- New section on VTRANS and CoSS'
- Updates LRTP references (urban & rural)
- References regional modal plans such a Jefferson Area Bike & Pedestrian Plan from 2004.
- Local plans are addressed such as the SYIP, DA Master Plans, & Airport MP

Goals, Objectives and Strategies

GOAL: Provide a safe, affordable, convenient, efficient, and environmentally sound multi-modal transportation system with mobility choices ***(New)***

Obj. 1: Fully participate in State, Regional and Local planning efforts *(new as objective)*
- **1A: Comply with VTRANS2035; COSS'**
- 1B: Reg. MPO as trans. planning body for region
- 1C: Support MPO;
- **1D: Implement UNJAM 2035.**
- **1F: Complete build-out of Road network**
- **Info on Western Bypass is updated; references UNJAM**

*The new items are bolded. Updates are not bold.

Obj. 2: Continue to provide safe, effective and improved urban streets in the Development Areas. *(new as objective)*
- 2A: Neighborhood Model Principles
- 2B: Master Plan Recommendations
- **2C: Recommended improvements for 4, 5, 6 & 7:**
  - **US 29/250 Bypass**

- Rt. 250 West Improvements
- Avon – 5th St. Connector
- **Southern Parkway Connector**
- **Sunset-Fontaine Connector**
- Stadium Rd. Multimodal Connections
- **Western Bypass**
- Old Lynchburg curves
- **Galaxy Farm Lane, Whittington, Wintergreen Land Trust**

Obj. 3: Continue to provide safe, effective transportation options while preserving the character of the Rural Areas. Respect and encourage shared use of rural roads by pedestrians, equestrians, farm vehicles, bicyclists and automobiles by making only those improvements necessary for the safety and utility of all users.

- 3A: Utilize Rural Road Standards (to be in Appendix)
- 3B: Rural Rd Improvements (Safety)
- 3C: Rural Rustic Roads
- 3D: Rural Transportation alternatives like JAUNT
- 3E: Rural Transportation alternatives like Park & Ride
- 3F: Except for Ag & forestal, limit new roads in RA
- 3G: Measures to avoid habitat degradation & improves it

Obj. 4: Complete a multi-modal system to include pedestrian and bicycle facilities, transit, and access to rail and air. *(new as objective)*

- 4A: Eval. Need to supplement VDOT sidewalk funding
- 4B: Maintain bike & pedestrian facilities CIP fund
- 4C: Utilize Development standards for RA & DA roads (appendix)
- 4D: Plan for bike & pedestrian in new development
- 4E: excess ROW for multiuse trails
- 4F: Bike & Pedestrian recc. from UNJAM
- **4G: Rec. for bike & pedestrian in Master Plans**
- **4H: Southern & Western Neighborhoods Rec.**
  - Rt. 250 W, 5th St. Ext., 5th St at I-64, Avon St. , Rt. 20 improvements, & Avon – 5th St Connector Rd., **street lights**

The only new one that came out of the discussion and public meetings was the possibility of having street lights in that area.

Obj. 5: Improve mass transit service. *(new as objective)*

- **5A: Support RTA**
- 5B: transit rec. Of UNJAM
- 5C: Support MPO & JAUNT ride sharing services
- 5D: Regional Park & ride system
- 5E: work with employers to encourage rideshare & vanpool
- 5F: JAUNT as primary public trans. provider in RA
- **5G: similar to 5D merge – Park & ride from RA to DA**
- 5H: expand transit to Hollymead, Cedar Hill MHP, & Avon St.
- 5I: Keep night & weekend transit service
- **5K: (should be 5j) – new as a strategy**

- Multimodal connection to stadium rd., transit to Morey Creek Office park, service to PVCC, **regional jail,** 5th St project

The new one that came out of the discussion and public meetings was to provide connection to the jail. It is difficult to get from the jail to the city because there are no pedestrian accommodations on the bridge over I-64.

Obj. 6: Continue to support air transportation planning and participation in the Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Authority.

- **6A: Support Airport Master Plan Process**
- **6B: Participate in Airport Authority**

Obj. 7: Continue to support rail transportation planning and participation in the Charlottesville-Albemarle Airport Authority.

- **7A: Maintain existing passenger rail service**
- **7B: Support TransDominion Express**
- **7C: Continue improving railroad crossings**
- **7D: Similar to 7C – merge.**

Performance Measure Ideas

Performance Measure:

- Annual Crash Data Rates
- Level of Service
- Average commute time
- On-time performance of transit /rail
- Proportion of residents living in Mixed Land Uses
- Average Vehicle Occupancy
- VMT per capita
- Combined transportation and housing costs as a % of median income

Target:

By 20__, reduce the number of pedestrian, bicyclist, and motor vehicle occupant fatalities plus serious injuries each by __% compared to 2012.
By 20__, reduce vehicle hours of delay (VHD) per person by __% compared to 20__.
By 20___, increase by __% the number of essential destinations accessible within __ minutes by trails, bicycling and public transit or within __ minutes by sidewalks for all residents compared to 20__.
By 20__, reduce vehicle miles traveled per person by __% compared to 20__.
By 20__, reduce the average household combined cost of housing and transportation by __% compared to 20__.

There are various ways to measure transportation in terms of its performance. These are just a couple ideas.

Upcoming Schedule

- Transportation section tonight
- Land Use Section and Guidelines 1/29/13
- More in-depth schedule will be provided next week (included in memo)

- February 12th – Neighborhood Model Guidelines
- February 22nd – Provide full draft of plan
- Hopefully a public hearing sometime in early March with the Commission

He pointed out in the handout at the end of the page was additional notes that went over information that may have been left out or just needed some additional explanation. He would be happy to answer questions.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff.

Initial comments and questions from the Planning Commission were as follows:

- Where is the bus service and taxi service? There has been bus service into the city for years.

Staff indicated that was in the Long Term Transportation Plan. However, in this plan staff will acknowledge that it exists and where it is.

- Question asked if it includes the cost of the road projects and the percentage.

Staff indicated that they don't fund a lot of road projects. Transportation would include sidewalks and such. So if they were lumping those costs together, then it includes it.

Public Comment

The following individuals spoke:

Jeff Werner, with Piedmont Environmental Council, distributed a handout "The Route 22/231 Corridor – Concepts for a Rural Traffic Calming Plan – A Rural Road Safety Demonstration Project for Keswick, Virginia".

- The ideas are on the policy level and not on specific locations. (Attachment filed in the Clerk's office with minutes) The rural traffic calming plan is something the Commission might want to consider adding to the transportation discussion. There are things in the plan that are applicable anywhere in the rural area, particularly historic districts and scenic byways. The bottom line is that straighter, wider, smoother and flatter roads do not make rural roads safer.

- On the transportation plan itself they have a quarter billion dollar bypass and absolutely nothing talking about access management to the north or south of it. It is ridiculous to build a road and not talk at least about limiting access to those points north. Otherwise, they will be bypassing those at some point in time.

Travis Pietila, on behalf of the Southern Environmental Law Center, delivered the following comments:

- One of the main goals of this comprehensive plan update is to eliminate extraneous information from the existing plan and focus on essential planning goals and objectives. To a large extent, most of the draft chapters presented thus far have done this, but we believe this draft transportation section falls short.
- Our main concern is that the transportation section includes overly detailed information about certain aspects of the transportation system, yet lacks a basic

overarching vision that explains why a multimodal and interconnected transportation system is needed, and clearly outlines what benefits beyond transportation this system will provide, such as environmental benefits through reduced air and water pollution, fiscal benefits through increased efficiency, and its important contribution in meeting other interrelated comprehensive plan goals. This type of vision and explanation is needed not only in the introduction, but should be interwoven throughout this entire section. He would address our remaining comments in order as you walk through the plan.

- In the first paragraph under Part B on page 1, the draft states that the County will "ensure coordination and continued successful growth." The phrase "successful growth" can mean many things to many people. We suggest dropping the word "successful" to instead say "well-planned growth that is consistent with the County's growth management strategies."
- The Multimodal Transportation System section starting on page 2 again seems to lack connection to the overall vision and important information on the public benefits of each mode. More specifically, the Travel Demand Management section lacks a basic explanation of the purpose of this concept to reduce vehicle miles traveled. The Rail Section likewise dives directly into discussion of the safety concerns of rail, rather than providing information on the benefits and increasing use of rail travel in the Commonwealth.
- On page 14, the language in Strategy 1f, which broadly recommends to "complete the build-out of the major road network," is unclear. We assume it means build-out of the road network laid out in the master plans, because those road projects have already been vetted. But we ask that you please clarify what is intended by this strategy, and add qualifying language concerning the need to carefully consider each new roadway project in light of other comprehensive plan goals and the public interest.
- We also note that access management is not discussed at all in this draft section, including the access management plan developed for 29 North and adopted in Places29.
- Finally, the proposed Western Bypass has not yet completed necessary environmental reviews, and SELC is determined to ensure that less damaging and less expensive alternatives receive serious consideration as part of the review process. In addition, the proposed design has numerous problems, particularly at the southern interchange, and the County should play an active role in the final design process to make sure impacts on important community resources in this area are minimized if the road is built. We recommend that qualifying language addressing these concerns be inserted in the draft's discussion of this project.
- In conclusion, we feel there is quite a bit of work left to do on this draft transportation section, and respectfully ask that a new draft version be completed for additional public comment at a future work session. (See written comments Attachment #4 – On file with minutes in the Clerk's Office)

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

Mr. Sorrell asked if there were particular sections that the Commission felt needed additional explanation or that too much was removed that some of the speakers addressed tonight.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed draft language for the transportation section and provided the following comments and suggestions:

- The objectives and strategies are unbalanced/ uneven. Think of this as a story; could groups items geographically and in chart form for ease of use
- Deal with how they prioritize the objectives and strategies and how they deal with the levels of specificity.
- Add information on private buses and taxis
- Would be nice to know which projects are funded and which are not
- Liked having specific measurements for performance measures, such as for bike, pedestrians, and things of that nature.
- Generally liked the comments provided by Southern Environmental Law Center (SCLC) and Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) - consider when revised section. For example, look at the rural traffic calming plan distributed by PEC.
- Take a look at the Stadium Road connection to make sure the wording is correct. This is a managed use and it is not envisioned for regular vehicular traffic – but only for transit when needed to relieve traffic during special events most of the time for just bike and pedestrian traffic.
- Add information on John Warner Parkway
- Include the number of miles (or feet) of bike and pedestrian surfaces as a performance measure.
- Add information on Zip Cars – Ms. Monteith will provide staff information on the University's Zip Car program which is part of their TDM strategy.
- Section seemed to be too descriptive in places and not descriptive enough in others.
- In the introduction or beginning, set the context for transportation by describing the main challenges and opportunities for the next 20 years.
- On page 2 - provide better explanation of why the classification system of roadways is important – i.e. it connects a system
- Page 2 – regarding streets and roads need something that says when they classify roads and streets this way what they are looking for is a grid of parallel roads - which they are talking about a system and just not individual links. That needs to be put in.
- On page 4 – bike surfaces – make language stronger about bikes not traveling on sidewalks which is a safety issue
- Page 6 – identify the deficient railroad bridges
- Page 7 – provide more information on passenger train services.
- Pages 8 - for Corridors of Statewide Significance (COSS) explain that one of the issues is connecting these multimodal corridors.
- Page 9 – paragraph on the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) – be clearer who are voting and non-voting members – just city and county and VDOT are voting.
- Page 9 – in Rural Areas if you do not widen roads you cannot have other modes like bicycles use them
- Page 13 wording in strategies is too passive and timid – use phrases like "continue to monitor and participate as possible", "participate actively" and "participate in developing" Specifically, Page 13 goals, objectives and strategies – Consider change in the wording since they are a little too timid or passive. They say continue to maintain compliance. Suggested it say "continue to monitor and to participate as possible" and not

to passively comply. If ways they can be on top of and be active in the state's planning they should do that. Likewise in strategy 1b.1 b suggested some revised language from "to continue to recognize" to change to "participate actively". In strategy 1C - in take formal action on the MPO recommendation – revise language to say "participate in developing those recommendations".

- Page 14 1 F – note that the road network should be interlinked to the multimodal network.
- Page 14 1 F – out of balance – too much detail on neighborhoods 4-7 and the framework plan and not enough on other neighborhoods – be consistent in how this is done either reference other plans or put the detail in – don't do both.
- Page 15 Southern Parkway Connector – note that if to be used for bicycle traffic, it should be hard surfaced or compacted.
- In objective 4 on page 16 – since the multimodal system is unlikely to be completed within the planning timeframe, change to "Continue to work towards" or "maintain compliance"
- Should the need for private roads and alleys be discussed? Needed for a complete street system. There have been issues with them recently in terms of shared streets and fire safety requirements. Neighborhood Model is dependent on alleys.
- Review multimodal uses and how much right-of-way (ROW) many be needed for multiple modes in a corridor.
- Make sure to be specific that the proposed connector roads like Sunset-Fontaine and Southern Connector are mentioned as two-lane roads.
- Don't just single out the Southwood community on 5th Street Extended as needing transit service – be more general – any opportunity should be taken along this road alignment to improve services.
- Make sure current and planned CIP projects are included. Examples include sidewalks on Barracks Road and sidewalks adjacent to schools. Needs to be better understanding of CIP process – need to describe how funding is done once priorities are set.
- Consider a walkability/ bikeability matrix for performance measurement
- Would be nice to have cost analysis for major development projects to know if such projects add or subtract to taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Morris said he felt the plan covered everything and was very well put together. In the area of the objectives and strategies he was concerned if it is in order of priority and if there is duplication. He invited Jeff Werner and Travis Pietila if they have notes to share so they get everything that was said.

Mr. Sorrell reviewed the high points of the Planning Commission's comments.

Mr. Benish noted that Mr. Franco's comment raised an issue that maybe more discussion or analysis on our part is needed related to private roads and alleys. He asked if that was an issue he felt needed to either be reaffirmed or to state our position on those.

Mr. Franco replied that for private roads it would be a quick explanation of what the policy is, where they are applicable or not. He did not understand the alley thing quite yet because he was just hearing talk on the street so to speak. If our policy is changing in that it is not something they support, then he has big questions personally about how they execute some of the aspects of

the Neighborhood Model if they are not going to support alleys. When they talk about transportation it is like a sidewalk that is a tool which is out there; and, therefore should be included with some brief discussion.

Mr. Benish pointed out some of the issues that have arisen lately are emergency access in alleys where there are some buildings that have carriage houses. An example would be in Belvedere where they have carriage houses that may have a unit that has its main access for the carriage unit from the alley. The amount of parking that occurs on the alley in the clear zone would be required for fire equipment. Some of this is a coordination of our road and Fire Code requirements with a closer eye to the density and the parking requirements. It is an issue that they are going through. He wanted to get into context what the Commission was expecting with this revision. He thinks he has a clearer idea.

Mr. Franco said when they talked about public services he had mentioned there ought to be some language recognizing that access, the fire equipment that is being used, and so on. He felt it was a bigger issue and it keeps growing. He is dealing with it in the city and knows the county is also dealing with it. Therefore, they should start talking about how they are going to fix that. He did not hear it in the summary, but felt it is important when they talk about some of the roads and right-of-ways that it is defined. If indeed the Southern Connector and Sunset Fontaine both have two lanes as their ultimate section, then that is what they should say.

Mr. Morris asked if staff had any questions. There being none, he noted that next week the Commission would take up the Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan.

Old Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business.

Mr. Lafferty expressed his concerns about VDOT recommendations and decisions in light of access issues to Stonefield that have resulted from VDOT's prior approvals, significantly increased cost estimates for the Best Buy ramp based on inclusion of sound/retaining walls and cost estimates for the Western Bypass that did not include sound walls and landscaping. He noted these concerns have led him to change his mind on his support of the recent church special use permit on 250 East that he based on VDOT comments and that he will certainly question the information that they get from VDOT from now on.

There being no further old business, the meeting moved to the next item.

New Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

Mr. Loach asked to follow up on the report the Commission received from PEC concerning rural traffic calming. He would like to see a process where they can move this document by motion back to the staff for a formal evaluation and recommendation. He did not want this document to get lost. After staff looks at the information to determine if the data is valid and what they think, then the Commission could receive feedback. He asked if the Commission should take action on it.

Mr. Morris said it was appropriate.

Mr. Loach moved and Mr. Randolph seconded to forward the Route 22-231 Corridor to staff for further evaluation and recommendations.

Mr. Franco suggested that they be careful about that. Generally he agreed with the statements Mr. Loach just made. However, as far as the timing of that he would not want that to slow down the comp plan effort. As they process that motion he thinks it is something that eventually he would like to get back to. By eventually he did not mean two years from now, but in a more reasonable timeframe. He did not think it needs to be reviewed as part of the comp plan process and to go into it.

Mr. Loach agreed. He was saying by making it a motion to do it at least the whole Planning staff can evaluate what is before them and decide whether it is important enough to go to staff. He did not see it as part of the discussion tonight, but a separate entity that came up during the transportation discussion.

Mr. Morris noted that there was no time frame within the motion.

Mr. Franco noted the only other comment that he would make on the process aspect of it is that he has not read it. It was just given to the Commission. He would prefer if the Commission is going to vote on asking staff to go into it further that they do it next time so that they have an opportunity to read that. There are all kinds of documents that are presented to the Commission and he would not want to start to burden staff with every single document that they get.

Mr. Loach agreed. However, he felt it was extensive enough with the five or six pages that he had seen enough tonight to evaluate and move it forward. He suggested that a motion could be made to table it to next time.

Mr. Franco noted there was already a motion on the table. He preferred that they put it on the agenda for next time to talk about.

Mr. Loach amended the motion to have a vote on the rural calming study document at the next meeting as part of the meeting.

Mr. Benish pointed out that things of this nature are things that can be added to the comprehensive plan as an amendment. There is an amendment process. The Commission can chose at any time to direct staff to consider a comprehensive plan amendment. That is another approach. He suggested what they were looking for is sort of a mechanism to provide us direction. Any motion can do that. However, the Commission can also just direct staff to study a comprehensive plan amendment.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out in this particular example there are two levels of consideration. One is the general concepts that were identified that Jeff Werner spoke to that. He thought it was very pertinent to what they discussed tonight in terms of the transportation planning and particularly how they might want to try to plan for roads in the rural areas, particularly roads that might have some significant traffic on them. There is a context sensitive aspect to this, which he

thinks is more in the policy area. In the results of the work that was done it was more specific to a corridor, that were probably not be in a place where they could include that in the comprehensive plan. It may be an implementation item identified in the plan to further analyze. Ultimately for the interest that went into that study they would like to have some consideration for improvements such as those identified to be actually incorporated in a future six-year plan. That is a little different animal, but is something they certainly could identify as well. Since they are trying to get to the conclusion of the comp plan to set the broader picture they can pull from this the concepts that he thinks help in laying out what they want to try to do on rural area roads, but also could identify even the need for further evaluation of the particular recommendations as an implementation item in the plan. That in and of itself leads to additional work that staff would do after the plan is completed as part of our transportation plan work. Therefore, he did not think it necessitates the Commission taking any particular action.

Mr. Franco agreed they should look at the concepts to see if they can adopt some of those as opposed to putting a traffic circle at this intersection.

Mr. Morris asked Mr. Kamptner what the procedure was.

Mr. Kamptner said Mr. Loach did a friendly amendment. If the seconder can agree to the friendly amendment to table it for now that would be fine.

Mr. Randolph seconded the amended motion.

The Planning Commission passed the amended motion.

Mr. Morris noted that the motion was tabled and the Planning Commission agreed to further consider how to proceed with the Route 22-231 Corridor (rural traffic calming) report provided by PEC at its next meeting.

- The next Planning Commission meeting will be on Tuesday, January 29, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:42 p.m. to the Tuesday, January 29, 2013 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Room #241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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