Albemarle County Planning Commission
April 2, 2013

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, April 2, 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, Thomas Loach, Richard Randolph, 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 Andy Sorrell, Senior Planner; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Summer Frederick, Intern; Sharon Taylor, Clerk; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

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.

Joe Draego, Carrsbrook resident, spoke about his concerns regarding the red light cameras at the 29/Rio intersection. He disagreed that the cameras provide additional safety and asked that the cameras be removed.

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

Committee Reports

Mr. Morris invited committee reports.

The following committee reports were given:

Mr. Franco reported on two committee meetings:
- Places 29 and the understanding of the relationship of the Comp Plan to zoning. There appears to be some disconnect between the existing zoning and the Comp Plan and what it all means. He thinks it is going to come up in the future. Therefore, they need to understand how they relate to each other.
- The Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee discussed the status of cash proffers and a possible recommendation to the Board. There is not going to be a recommendation at this point to the Board on what values should be accepted. The assumption is that the status quo will continue so it will continue to increase. The Impact Committee's staff has been tasked with meeting with some of the development community to talk about the properties that are developing by right and why the development is being done by right. The question would be are the amount of the proffers encouraging developers to develop by right as opposed to in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan. If that is something that is happening, then they would consider that a weakness and something that needs to be reported to the Board. So they are going to be looking at that. The one case of point that was brought up was Dunlora IV, which was developed by right and did not go through the rezoning. As an income source for CIP money the County missed out on a whole lot of money there.

Mr. Loach reported on the Crozet Advisory Committee and the status of the library construction and the Crozet Avenue improvements project. The library construction is coming along fine. They have started work on the main street improvement plan to relocate the utilities. They are looking forward to that getting done.

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

Consent Agenda:

a. **Resolution of Intent**: Family Day Homes (Mandy Burbage)
b. **2013 Planning Commission Annual Report**: (Wayne Cilimberg)
c. **Approval of Minutes**: April 24, 2012, February 5, 2013, February 12, 2013

Mr. Morris asked if any Commissioner wanted to pull an item from the consent agenda for discussion.

Motion: Mr. Franco moved and Mr. Randolph seconded for acceptance of the consent agenda.

The motion carried by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Morris noted the consent agenda items were approved.

Public Hearing Item:

CPA 2013-00001 – Comprehensive Plan – Amend the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan in its entirety by restating the County's values and vision which guide the Plan, and its policies, goals, objectives and strategies for natural resources, historic, cultural, and scenic resources, economic development, the Rural Areas, the Development Areas, housing, transportation, parks and recreation and greenways and green systems, and community facilities and services; adopt a corrected Village of Rivanna land use map; amend the Development Areas' and Rural Areas' boundaries by adding the Mosby Mountain and Whittington areas to the Development Areas within one of the Plan's Southern neighborhoods (Neighborhood 5), to be designated as Neighborhood Density Residential and Parks and Green Systems, and by adding area to the Development Areas immediately north of the Rivanna Station area along the east side of Route 29 North within the Places 29 Master Plan and to change the variety of plan designations in that area; change the comprehensive plan designation of the Forest Spring Park area west of Hollymead Town Center from Light Industrial to Residential – Urban Density; and amend the Pantops Master Plan by removing two planned streets shown on the master plan. Copies of the full text and maps of the Comprehensive Plan are 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 and may be viewed at the County's website at www.albemarle.org. (Elaine Echols/Andy Sorrell)

Review of Draft Comprehensive Plan
Elaine Echols reviewed the proposed Comprehensive Plan in a PowerPoint presentation. After the presentation staff will ask the Commission for clarification. If there are no other questions for clarification recommended, then staff will recommend the Commission open up the public hearing and then bring it back for discussion.

Getting to the Public Hearing
- 21 Work sessions on Comprehensive Plan
- 12 Joint PC Meetings – Livability Project
- Public input at Livability Project workshops
- Public input at Commission meetings

It is finally time for the public hearing. They have taken public input received on the Livability Project plus the input the Planning Commission has given in addition to public comment received at the Commission meetings to bring back the first draft of the full document.

Tonight
- Substantive areas of change to the Plan
- Edits in writing, please
- Questions for clarification after presentation
- Public Hearing for Input

* * * * *

- Commission identifies areas where no additional discussion is needed

- Commission identifies areas for additional discussion

After Tonight
- Potential Work sessions on April 16, 23, 30
- Staff to bring back final draft in early May for Commission review and provide recommendation to BOS

Overview of Structure of Draft Document
- Executive Summary
- Chapters
- Sections
  - Background info
  - Goal, Objectives, Strategies
  - List of Actions
  - Indicators of Progress (One section, the Scenic Resources section, is missing the indicators of progress.)
- Appendices
- References

Information to be Added
- Maps in Natural Resources Section
- Land Use Chart in Development Area Section
- List of Implementation Activities and Costs in Southern and Western Neighborhood
- Proposed Priorities
- Capacity Update
- Other enhancements based on comments from the public that are consistent with PC direction

A lot of comments from the public were received at the Open House. Many of them were ways to improve or enhance the plan, not necessarily disagreements with it. Staff thinks they can make those changes if they are consistent with direction from the Commission. The Commission should look for that the next time around.

One of the things really important to the Commission at the beginning of this process was an understanding of what the Board of Supervisor's vision was for the County and making sure it translated into each section of the plan so they could see a clear line. Staff has tried to do that visually. They have received some comments that would suggest that perhaps it needs to be done more. The Board of Supervisors vision for the community from the Strategic Plan has been placed on the page of each one of these sections. The areas are highlighted as to how that particular section ties back into the vision. The joint recommendations from the City and County are highlighted. In the introduction and background chapter is the whole list of recommendations made together. Then they broke those out by the topic area and put them in their respective sections.

Policies that Remain the Same
- Growth Management Policy
- Historic and Scenic Resource Preservation
- Natural Resource Protection
- Density and Infill in Development Area (DA) in accordance with Neighborhood Model
- Distinctions between Rural Area (RA) and Development Area (DA)

Changes to Current Plan - Cash Proffer Policy
- Recommend addition of language to clarify that relief from cash proffers applies only to affordable units and not cash-in-lieu of units

Natural Resources
- Habitats
- RRBC and StreamWatch
- State requirements (TMDLs); possible storm water utility fee

- No Mountain Overlay District recommendation
- Expand Natural Resources Extraction Overlay
- Discourage fill in the floodplain to make land available for development

Historic, Cultural, and Scenic Resources
- Re-establish full-time Historic Preservation Planner
- Provide on-line mapping of Monticello Viewshed (still being worked on)
- Placement of Viewshed Guidelines in Reference Documents
- Recommendations to coordinate Entrance Corridor (EC) guidelines with City Entrance Corridor (EC) Guidelines
- Tie Entrance Corridor (EC) Guidelines to the Neighborhood Model

Economic Development
- Add Target Industry strategies, including Ag-related
- Possible creation of Technology Zones
- Continue to monitor land availability for employment/industrial growth

Land Use in the Rural Area
This is the biggest area of change in the plan.
- Importance of attractive and livable Development Area
- Agriculture related and food processing uses without need for public utilities at interstate interchanges with emphasis on the Shadwell Interchange as sort of the first priority area
- Consider zoning ordinance amendments for:
    - small scale beer production
    - small scale agricultural distribution centers
    - community centers
    - restaurants in crossroads communities
    - use of historic structures for restaurants or lodging
    - lodging
    - commercial events on a regular basis,
    - farms having the same allowances for events as farm wineries,
    - home occupations

Land Use in the Development Area
- Expansion of information on Neighborhood Model Principles and Guidance
- Importance of concurrency of infrastructure with new development
- Recommendations for urban agriculture
- Master Plans

Housing
- Standalone section
- State Code information
- Credits for very low income housing
- Partial credits for work-force housing in affordable housing policy
- Recommendations to work with the City

Transportation
- Emphasis on multi-modalism
- Connecting transportation improvements to greenway trails
- Greater support for transit and passenger rail
- Western Bypass information

Parks, Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems
- More emphasis on working with the City, Rivanna River Corridor
- More emphasis on connections
- Location-specific improvements in Appendix

Community Facilities

- Enhanced energy conservation recommendations
- Reinforced importance of Neighborhood Model Principles in new public facilities
- Recommendations for geographic policing
- Recommendation for a public training facility – no location specified

Southern and Western Neighborhoods

- New Master Plan
- Area B information
- Transportation recommendations
- New Land Use Chart

Staff has recommended several changes to the existing Master Plans mostly maps.

Other Master Plan Changes-

Pantops

There are two roads shown in the Pantops Master Plan that the Advisory Committee requested to be removed from the plan. Staff is going along with their recommendation on that.

Village of Rivanna

When the land use map was adopted it gave information on environmental features. However, when they tried to put it on the GIS Web floodplains came up as a land use and that is not intended to be a land use. It is an environmental feature. So in keeping with the other master plans staff took the existing map and translated all of those environmental features into the Parks and Green System color. One map will stay in the plan. The other map gives a higher level picture of what the recommended land use in the Village of Rivanna would be. It also went to the Community Advisory Council and they endorsed that plan.

Places 29 – Hollymead Town Center Area

In Places 29 there are two areas that they recommended for changes. One has to do with the existing mobile home park south of Hollymead Town Center. It has been shown as Light Industrial on the Places29 plan. That is a holdover from many years ago when there was an expectation that if this mobile home park went away then the land should be reverted to an industrial status. It does not appear that is going to be happening. Therefore, staff is recommending that this Light Industrial land be designated for urban density residential.

In the course of the public input section they got information on the existing zoning that they were not looking at on these plans. The area both north and south of that mobile home park has R-15 zoning. Staff believes that needs to be changed on the next version of the plan. Where the R-15 zoning is will replace the Light Industrial land just to reflect what was approved a number of years ago for a high density housing area.

Places 29 – NGIC Area

The NGIC Area is something the Commission has received some correspondence on. They talked about this a while back in terms of trying to increase the amount of area that would be available for Office R&D Flex Light Industrial, especially in relation to the Rivanna Station. What they did was to show an expansion of that area and then take the residential land here and move it outside the Development Areas by moving the Development Area boundary line and adding the green area shown in the presentation as protection for the Rivanna Station. Staff has found out there is different information about the appropriateness of that. What staff wants to do is sit down with the people at Rivanna Station and the property owner to talk through this and make sure they are all on the same page. They got information they thought was accurate and it turns out it might not be accurate. Therefore, they need to work that one out before they make a firm recommendation on this area. So they may hear something about that tonight, but staff thinks it needs to come off the table for now to look at father.

Comments from the Public

- Open House

- Emails
- Letters
- Phone calls

Staff thinks the Commission has the information they need along with this public hearing to know how they need to go to the next step. After the public hearing staff would like to take a short break. Then staff would ask the Commission is the format good to go; are there areas that can stand as written; and what needs more discussion. She asked if the Commission had any questions for clarification at this time.

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

Morgan Butler, of the Southern Environmental Law Center, thanked the Commission for the opportunity to provide input and asked the Commission for more time to read and process the draft before providing a detailed response.

Meredith Richards, from the Fifeville Rail and The Piedmont Rail Coalition (Charlottesville Rail Coalition), spoke about the Lynchburg-Boston rail line. She requested that the Commission approve language related to inter-city rail travel found in Draft Comp Plan. They have an intercity passenger train that is making modern history in Charlottesville and Albemarle. If any mobility has ever demonstrated that people will change the way they travel and will do so quickly when given a convenient reliable safe and affordable alternative it is here where our Lynchburg, Washington, Northeast regional train is running. It began in October, 2009 and has set national records for ridership growth, cost recovery, and profitability. It grew 29 percent in the second year and 14 percent in the third year. Both of these were the second highest rate of growth in the entire Amtrak system. It also grew similarly in terms of fair revenues and also among the highest rates of growth in the second and third year. After its first year Amtrak also announced that it was the best performing state supported train in its entire national system in terms of cost recovery. In fact, in its second year it made 5 cents per passenger mile and last year it made 8.4 cents per passenger mile for a total of 3.3 million dollars profit last year for Amtrak. She believes it is appropriate and necessary that intercity passenger rail be an integral part of planning for the future of transportation for our region. This mobility should be recognized in the Comp Plan for its importance. Please approve the intercity passenger rail section of the Comprehensive Plan.

Marcia Joseph, representing Habitat for Humanity, said that Habitat is working with staff on the process for redeveloping the Southwood Mobile Home Park. She said that Habitat for Humanity supports the revised language provided to the Commission electronically by staff several days before the meeting.

Nancy Carpenter, a resident of Neighborhood IV in the southwest area, talked about the lack of affordable and workforce housing in the County. She said the County needs more affordable/work force housing, as well as the need to improve the current inventory of affordable housing. She supports the language in the Draft Comprehensive Plan that makes housing a priority and specifies working with other local agencies and organizations to implement housing initiatives. She mentioned a report entitled, "Out of Reach" which had been written in the prior year.

Kirk Bowers, PC, resident of Albemarle County representing the Sierra Club, said the Sierra Club supports the County policy of natural resource protection with growth to occur in the Development Areas. He said the Club would like the County to require proof of adequate infrastructure before approving future development. He said that jobs and economic development should not be at the expense of natural resources. He said he liked the regional transit authority language. A copy of his comments was provided to staff for inclusion in the minutes. A detailed review of the Comprehensive Plan with comments is forthcoming. (Attachment A - Letter regarding Comp Plan Review with four pages of Comp Plan comments dated 4/2/2013 from Sierra Club, Piedmont Group from Kirk A. Bowers, PE – Attachments on file with the printed minutes in the office of the clerk)

Anne Taylor, representing the Thomas Jefferson Foundation (TJF), spoke about the unique assets of Monticello. She noted the cultural and economic benefits to the community, specifically the impact on local tourism. Regarding viewshed protection she said Thomas Jefferson Foundation (TJF) wants to provide information to landowner/developers on how projects would affect viewshed, and letting them

make their own decisions while being fully informed. She said she looks forward to continuing a dialog with the County.

Natasha Sienitsky, representing Thomas Jefferson Foundation (TJF), added her thanks and support to Anne Taylor's comments.

Tom Olivier, representing Advocates for Sustainable Albemarle Population (ASAP) as its president, provided a written letter to Commissioners and staff. He said he appreciates the work done by staff, but more work is needed. He said the vision should have specific features, is too short, and needs more meat. He said ASAP would like a statement in the Comprehensive Plan that says the population of Albemarle won't get any larger than it is today. He believes the Indicators of Progress need further review and all of the recommendations should be prioritized. Tom Olivier, ASAP President (Attachment B – ASAP comments on the March 2013 draft of the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan submitted by Tom Olivier, ASAP President – ten pages – Attachments on file with the printed minutes in the office of the clerk)

David Flynn, owner of the Aunt Sarah's Pancake House property on Pantops, said that any change in designation of land should require legal notification via registered mail. He complained that staff had not done their job in dealing with the public interested in purchasing his land. He said he had not been able to sell this property due to the designation of a future road across his property. He said he was happy to see the recommendation to take the road off of the Comprehensive Plan maps.

Dr. Charles Battig, a resident, said that the Draft Comp Plan should not be considered at all and should be rejected out of hand for many reasons. He said it violates Federal Code and violates State Code. He said it micro manages residents lives (specified in Chapter 5) and replaces "We the People" with "We the Planners". He said the Plan mirrors the UN Biodiversity Report. He provided a written copy of his comments to the Clerk for inclusion in the minutes. (Attachment C – Public comments Comprehensive Plan Draft March 2013 for Planning Commission Meeting April 2, 2013 by Charles Battig, MD - Attachments on file with the printed minutes in the office of the clerk)

John Chavan, owner of property on Route 250W near the I-64 Interchange at Shadwell, says that his land is designated RA but really isn't rural. He said that a former Planning Commissioner and Board of Supervisors member agree with him. He wants approval of a special use permit to allow for personal storage (mini-warehouses). He asked about the difference between food product storage and personal storage.

Joe Draego, a resident of Carrsbrook, challenged the Planning Commission Chair on his instruction that Mr. Draego not clap after other speakers made comments. Mr. Draego said he had a right to clap. After Mr. Morris said he would explain the reasons why at the break, Mr. Draego continued. He said that the proposed Comprehensive Plan is un-American. He asked why the tax rate for Rural Area (RA) residents is the same as the rate for Development Area (DA) residents since the RA residents don't receive the same services. He made comments about the "social justice" portion of the Plan (although he did not point out where in the Plan there is mention of "social justice").

Roger Schickedantz, a resident of Neighborhood 5, said that he didn't want land called the Parham site designated for light industrial use. He asked where the protections for adjacent residential areas are mentioned. He asked about how the County would protect the residents from light and noise. He asked about size and density guidelines for light industrial use in such areas. He asked that the Parham property be kept as Urban Density residential. He said that the qualities of neighborhoods and the community are compromised when economic development is given too much weight/priority. (Attachment D – Letter to Members of Planning Commission from Roger O. Schickedantz, AIA dated April 2, 2012 regarding the proposed Parham site - Attachment on file with the printed minutes in the office of the clerk)

Audrey Wellborn, a resident, spoke to the Commission about the process for developing the Update. She said she had attended all of the One Community workshops and meetings and taken all the work of the update process very seriously. She said her comments on the need for protection of personal property rights have not been included in the draft of the Comp Plan. She said further that it isn't clear what is

new/same in relation to old/current Plan. This information should be provided. She said she had concerns about the transfer of development rights language and asked, "What does this mean? How is the average property owner going to understand/know what this new Draft Comp Plan is all about?"

Neil Williamson, with the Free Enterprise Forum, said he likes the Economic Development chapter and the shorter length of the document. He said he still has concerns with the general direction of the Plan. He believes that everything in the Plan should be vetted by the PC, not just the areas where change has been proposed. The Entrance Corridor, and Monticello Viewshed, Environmental section of the Plan are all sections that need consideration. He said the Plan lacks a unified voice. He said it should start all over from the bottom up -- "zero based planning."

Wendell Wood, a property owner and resident of Albemarle, said that the areas recommended for light Industrial zoning, as written, can't happen. Land is too expensive. He said that the County needed to start looking forward and thinking about the future. He said that undeveloped light industrial land should be designated now in areas away from the population. He said this needed to take place before areas become populated with residential development so the Commission won't have to deal with the backlash.

Jeff Werner, representing the Piedmont Environmental Council, said he agreed with Mrs. Wellborn on the need for a "compare" version of the plan. He said it is hard to compare the new language with the old language, even though he felt the Plan needed to be shorter. He said that there are several different models "out there" for light industrial development that the County should consider. The County should consider traffic calming in the Plan. The map and list of deficient bridges and culverts should also be included. He said more adherence to access management is needed so another Western Bypass situation can be avoided.

Bill Schrader, from the Crozet Community Advisory Council, said he liked the work that staff has done. He said he likes the fact that the Master Plans have stayed the same in the Plan. He said he is concerned about interchange language – what does "near the Interstate" mean? Does a property need to be touching the four quadrants of the interchange in order for the policy to apply?

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

Recess: At 7:25 p.m., the Planning Commission recessed and then reconvened at 7:35 p.m.

Mr. Morris called the Planning Commission back to order. He asked Ms. Echols to provide a recap.

Mrs. Echols asked the Commissioners to provide feedback on the format of the plan and the proposed process for review.

In response, Planning Commissioners provided the following comments and recommendations:

Mr. Dotson said he would like to see an explanation of the "what" and "why" of the Plan early on. He said he sees the strategies as an inventory of all that the County may do. He said the plan needs clarification that it all may not get done in 5 years. He said there needs to be a relationship between the plan and the process for developing the annual work program.

Mr. Franco asked for a preface or preamble to the plan. He suggested the staff take what is now in Chapter 2 and move it forward.

Mr. Randolph commented he thinks the document is too "encyclopedic" in some ways and used the section on the Neighborhood Model as an example.

Mr. Morris said he liked how the Joint Goals were presented in the Plan. He said he liked having it all in front of him, up front where it needs to be. He agreed with Mr. Franco about the need to have an explanation of the plan up front.

Ms. Monteith said she would like to see more graphics incorporated into those chapters that don't have any. She said this will make the plan easier to understand. She said the plan needs to be more balanced in terms of content of sections and to even out "passive-active" language. She said the order of sections in Chapter 5 may need to be different. Reorganizing the sections might help reduce redundancy.

Mr. Lafferty said he likes the detail provided in the Neighborhood Model portion of the Plan.

Mr. Loach said he also likes the detail in the Plan.

Mr. Lafferty asked if there is a legal reason why information on the State Code should be included in the Plan. He said that he believes what is in the Draft Plan is adequate, but perhaps a memo from the County Attorney with more detail on what is needed could be provided. It is possible that the State Code information could be put in the Reference or Appendices.

Mr. Franco said he believed the information on the State Code is okay as is.

Mr. Randolph suggested that more of the details of the Neighborhood Model in the Plan should be put in the Appendix.

Mr. Franco said to even out the chapters, size-wise he suggested that staff move more to the Appendices. He noted that the section on Natural Resources is longer than it needs to be in the Plan.

Ms. Monteith agreed with Mr. Franco.

Mr. Morris asked if the Neighborhood Model information could all be put in the Appendices.

Mrs. Echols said that this was an example of an effort to provide information on "why" the Neighborhood Model principles exist.

Mr. Dotson said that each chapter needs a capsule at the beginning to relate back to the vision and values at the beginning of the document.

Mr. Franco said that the Historic Resources section provides an example of too much detail. It needs to be refined.

Mr. Lafferty said that they need to prioritize the next 5 years desires for each Section.

Mrs. Echols answered that this will be provided with the next version of the plan or during the review of each section.

Mr. Loach said there should be some information on how the Plan can change over the next five years and under what circumstances change might occur.

Mr. Morris said he liked the summary handouts.

Mr. Franco said he was more concerned about the objectives and strategies.

Mr. Loach said he would like the performance measurements included in the objective and strategies list.

Mr. Smith said he thinks the language should be changed to what the COUNTY wants, not what WE (the Commission) want.

Mrs. Echols said that she could take any written edits from the Commission and would quickly return the binders to Commissioners after copying their notes. Several members of the Commission said they were not ready to submit edits or changes until more or all public input had been received.

After briefly talking to Mr. Butler from SELC who had made the request at the beginning of the meeting and talking to the Commission, the Chair agreed to give the public an additional two weeks to provide comments. The Commission would be given another week to process the information, then turn in edits to Mrs. Echols. After that that time, the Commission would begin its deliberation on substance in the Plan.

Ms. Monteith noted she had several additional questions. She questioned if the City's comp plan format is the same as the County's. In the Community Services and Facilities section most of the discussion about storm water is up front in the document. With TMDL regulations coming down the line will there be something else in that realm in Community Service about water quality and the impacts of storm water. In the transportation section she questioned if there might be more about Places29 or would it just be separate.

Mr. Franco asked if the April 16 Commission work session could be used to discussion information, such as an awaited Monticello Viewshed map and the parcels changing designation. He thought that was independent of form. He said he hated to not be working on the Draft at all while awaiting additional comment.

Mr. Randolph said he wanted to provide some feedback on the Plan that night. He said more is needed in the Plan about bicycle transportation that creates connections between schools, parks, communities. He said these networks need to be in excess of greenway trails and should link important places together. He said more information is needed in the Plan on how infrastructure to support development will be built. He suggested there was some merit, given Mr. Wood's concern, about looking at our planning process for light industrial. He did not think they could get that resolved in the Plan, but felt they need to start working on it now.

Mr. Loach asked that public input reference specific sections and suggestions on ways to have more metrics in our system so they can measure which direction they are going.

Ms. Echols said they would look into this and agreed to contact the Chair with information on topics which could be discussed on April 16.

Staff was asked to take the comments into consideration in the Comp Plan Update. No formal action taken.

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

Old Business

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

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- THE NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BE ON TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2013 AT 6:00 p.m.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m. to the Tuesday, April 9, 2013 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Auditorium, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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