Albemarle County Planning Commission
May 28, 2013

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a work session and regular meeting on Tuesday, May 28, 2013, at 4:00 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. Mr. Randolph arrived at 4:03 p.m. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was absent.

Other officials present were Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Summer Frederick, Intern; Andy Sorrell, Senior Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning, and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish

Mr. Morris, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Work Session

CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan Update

The Commission reviewed the following topics at the Work session:

- Comprehensive Plan Document Format, including Indicators
- Groundwater
- Master Plans for
  - Southern and Western Neighborhoods
  - Places 29
  - Pantops
  - Village of Rivanna

Comprehensive Plan Document Format Changes including Indicators

Ms. Echols presented a short PowerPoint presentation on changes in format to the chapters. Staff also distributed a handout on a possible way to show indicators and measures of progress for feedback from the Commission.

Public Comments:
There was no public comment.

Related to the above topics, the Commission discussed and requested the following:

Comprehensive Plan Document Format

- In general, Commissioners liked the new format. Several Commissioners had detailed suggestions for improvement such as placement of shaded boxes and the like.
- Commissioners directed staff to:
  - Format the Implementation Activities page so that current programs are identified and less prominent than new initiatives. They also asked staff to find a way to show the highest priorities first on the list.
  - See if it is possible to present Implementation Activities in such a way as to indicate their impact on the Capital Improvement Plan.
  - Provide a way for Indicators of Progress to be linked with current data to establish a baseline to be used to gauge future success of policies.

Groundwater

Public Comments:

Discussion on Groundwater from League of Women Voters:

Karen Yates, President of the League of Women Voters of the Charlottesville area, presented a document dated May 28, 2013 on the Water Resources section of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update requesting the following: retaining many of the water resource items from the current comp plan; the comp plan acknowledge that water is our most precious resource; and make sure that programs that were terminated because of finances are not dropped, but reinstated as the budget allows. (Letter submitted on file in office of clerk with written minutes)

Martha Leverly, with the League of Women Voters' Natural Resources Committee, said it difficult to find references to all the water resources without an index and suggested five concepts that should be in the plan as outlined in the submitted document. She submitted a document of Talking Points by Martha Levering. (Letter submitted on file in office of clerk with written minutes)

Linda Goodling, with the League of Women Voters, noted groundwater is still our unprotected resource and they not only need a Water Resource Manager, but they need to reinstate the Groundwater Subcommittee made up of environmentalists and have a Groundwater Protection Program.

Individual Public Comments on Groundwater

Jeff Werner, with Piedmont Environmental Council, said the key point is if something is really important don't let it get lost in a narrative but state it in the objectives. The County needs to have a body, individual, committee, or a group that is able to stay on top of the water related issues and advise the County.

Linda Goodling, as a citizen not representing, the League spoke to the need to monitor our septic systems and wells.

Muriel Grimlin said groundwater was missing from the comprehensive plan and should be focused on. She submitted a letter dated May 28, 2013, which would show them which things relate to those concepts. (Letter submitted on file in office of clerk with written minutes)

Richard Wagaman, resident of the Village of Rivanna, talked about two strategic issues that impact the comprehensive plan as being transportation and land use.

Related to the above topics, the Commission discussed and requested the following:

Groundwater

- Commissioners agreed groundwater is an important issue, deserving of being included in the Comprehensive Plan. They also agreed that the plan should emphasize the importance of data collection and work on surface water issues.
- Discussion occurred on the extent to which the County should be involved in requiring homeowners on well and septic to have their water tested and septic systems pumped.
- Commissioners requested that specific groundwater information be included in the Natural Resource Section of the Comprehensive Plan to address:
  - On-going data collection to establish a record of well information
  - County testing of wells each year to add to the data being collected
  - Education of property owners regarding appropriate testing of wells and well head protection measures
  - Education of property owners on the importance of having their septic systems pumped regularly
  - Coordination with other agencies such as the Health Department for information such as notification to the County of well failures
- Commissioners agreed a County staff member dedicated to groundwater related work is important, and should be a priority. Additionally, Commissioners agreed other issues that specific staff is needed for is transportation, housing, and historic preservation.
- Commissioners requested staff look into possible ways to collect data related to alternative septic systems.

The Planning Commission recessed at 5:08 p.m. The Planning Commission reconvened to the

regular meeting at 6:00 p.m.

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 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 Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Summer Frederick, Intern; Andy Sorrell, Senior Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning, and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order

Mr. Morris called the regular meeting of the Albemarle County Planning Commission back to order at 6:00 p.m.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

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

Southern and Western Neighborhoods

Andy Sorrell presented a short PowerPoint presentation on issues which have come up on the Southern and Western Neighborhoods and asked the Commission for final guidance on the proposed plan. Ms. Echols discussed TM 90-28 the "Parham parcel."

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Public Comment:

Robert Garland, resident of 105 Woodhurst Court, spoke on behalf of Canterbury Hill neighborhood residents whose properties back to the property at the intersection of Barracks and Georgetown Road. All of the responses he received from those residents have been in opposition to the "Center" designation because of the risk that it poses to their quality of life and home values, especially if the use is non-residential or is not a park. He suggested it would be better for the County to improve pedestrian access to the existing retail centers in the area rather than encouraging new ones to develop. He submitted a letter. (Letter submitted on file in office of clerk with written minutes)

Jim Simmons, resident of 2520 Smithfield Road, agreed to all of the comments the previous speaker made in opposition to the "Center" designation. His property directly abuts the "Out of Bounds" property that is in question. He personally could see no need for a center of any type other than possibly a park being developed in that particular area. He was not in favor of high density development in the area.

Vito Cetta said he has the Parham property under contract on Route 20 and Avon. He presented a slide of the proposed development and explained some of the details. The proposed plan is based on the present designation of residential. His proposal will be before the Commission in a few months and he wanted feedback from the Commission on whether they were committed to a residential mixed-use concept.

Roger Schickedantz of 1858 Scottsville Road said he was pleased to hear that staff has taken the comments about the Parham lot from the May 9th memo very seriously. He was not comfortable seeing some of the parking lots and loading docks in some of the photos presented by staff as examples of Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial. He said that, eventually it all comes into working out the details. Having seen Mr. Cetta's plan for residential development Mr. Schickedantz said he thinks it would be compatible with the surrounding residential area and hopefully acceptable to his neighbors. Mr. Schickedantz said he and the neighbors were open to discuss what the possibilities could be.

Linda O'Connor, Vice President of Avon Park, supported the previous speaker, Roger Schickedantz, on his recommended uses for the Parham lot. She was appreciative and in favor of Mr. Cetta's residential plan that was just presented. She said she had several questions regarding Biscuit Run. She provided handouts of the Avon II Site Plan approved in 2008, an insert on the boundary line adjustment in 2008, the proposed rezoning, and various pictures and excerpts from the proposed comprehensive plan. Ms. O'Conner said that Avon Park residents believe that the Planning Commission did not have sufficient data to base their positive recommendation on the rezoning of Avon II and hope that they will make some annotations on the Avon Park II rezoning with the Comprehensive Plan particularly related to the setbacks. She said the connectivity called for is not satisfied and that they oppose the rezoning. (Submitted documents on file in office of clerk with written minutes)

Dennis O'Connor, resident of Avon Park I, asked to address two issues that being setbacks and erosion because the data was not available when Avon Park was discussed in March. The setback reduction of 25 percent is significant and he requests that it be included in the Comprehensive Plan. They are not adverse to development, but strongly prefer the 2008 plan. However, even that plan has some issues like erosion.

Wendell Wood said he was told he could bring up and address Somerset Farm. He asked the Planning Commission to look at this area and consider expansion of the development area to include it. This area can be developed by right. This property has public water and public sewer to the site. Somerset Farm meets every criterion for development and he doesn't want to lose the ability to develop the property. There are no critical slopes on this property. There are schools and a rescue squad nearby. He asked that the property be placed in the Development Area because it meets every criteria or goal except for the widening of Route 20. He said he has made a proposal to widen Route 20 from existing Route 53 to Mill Creek. He would like for this expansion area discussion to take place now.

Jeff Benaugh, resident of Canterbury Hills, spoke in opposition to the "Center" designation for the Out of Bounds property. Having lived in the neighborhood for years the last thing they need is more retail space. There is an abundance of commercial in Barracks Road Shopping Center. However, they need adequate walkways and a way to be able to walk to retail businesses they now have available.

Related to the above topics, the Commission discussed and requested the following:

- Commissioners participated in lengthy discussion regarding the appropriateness of the Center at the intersection of Georgetown and Barracks Roads, ultimately coming to consensus that the Center designation is not appropriate for that site.
- Commissioners requested staff remove the proposed Center designation from property shown on the map at the intersection of Georgetown and Barracks Roads and that sidewalk projects in the area be given priority.
- Commissioners said that the Parham property could be designated for a mixture of uses, but not include retail, or it could be all Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial for target industries. The most important features for any development are: a pedestrian orientation, building and spaces of human scale, relegated parking, and site planning that respect terrain. If the property is to be developed for Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial, it should be very sensitive to nearby properties in terms of architecture, lighting, scale of buildings, location of loading bays, and other aspects which might have negative impacts on adjoining properties and properties in the area.
- Commissioners discussed whether the Somerset Farm property should be added to the Development Area. Although it was not unanimous, the Commission said that the appropriate time to study the property for inclusion in the Development Area is when the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Plan is updated since it appears that sufficient residential land is zoned and designated for the next decade or more. If a discussion were to take place now, all requests for Development Area expansions would need to be reexamined, which a majority of the Commission was not willing to do.

Mr. Franco noted he had received a lot of emails about the Southwood language, and Ms. Echols pointed out staff was going to work on that language and bring it back to the Commission.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:19 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 7:27 p.m.

Mr. Dotson left the meeting at 7:19 p.m.

Pantops

Andy Sorrell provided a brief presentation on changes to the Pantops Master Plan related to roads and the Village of Rivanna Master Plan. Basically, it is a recap of what the Commission already heard earlier this year. The only revisions that they are doing to the Pantops Master Plan at this time is the removal of two of the proposed roads that were shown on the Master Plan. That has been vetted by the Pantops Advisory Council earlier this year. That is the one shown on Aunt Sarah's property, which was requested by the property owner. The other one was the connection between Route 250 and Route 20. It was impacting the property owner's ability utilize the property. This was reviewed by the Advisory Council and also requested be removed.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff.

Mr. Lafferty realized that removing the connection throughout Route 20 removes the possibility of any eastern connector and 250 going down that way at Pantops is probably a "F" now and would go to a "F-" very quickly.

Mr. Sorrell replied that is correct in that it would remove the cut through taking that traffic from 250 and avoiding that intersection at Route 20. People could still potentially get to an eastern connector, but they would have to go through the Routes 20/250 intersection. That intersection handles a lot of traffic as Mr. Lafferty said. But, again the connection will likely be there as the property developed because it is likely advantageous. But, again it will be a private as opposed to a public road.

Mr. Morris pointed out that the Pantops Advisory Council discussed the topography of the proposed road and noted that near its connector route it is hazardous and construction will be very difficult. It needs to be altered in some way. These were the opinions of the Advisory Council.

Mr. Lafferty noted that the eastern connector at best was going to be very expensive if they could even get it because crossing the Rivanna River there is a lot of floodplain. The bridge would be very expensive. There is some talk about putting in a pedestrian limited access bridge further down from Cosner Brothers to cross the Rivanna and allow transit, bicycles and pedestrians to go across it as a way to try to minimize traffic. However, that is long range.

Mr. Morris pointed out that was further down 250, which is not affected at all by the proposed changes. On the existing property at Aunt Sarah's there is already a way of going around Rite Aid, which makes that road already connected.

The Planning Commission discussed the Shadwell property at the interchange and Mr. Franco questioned if they should be thinking about it right now.

Mr. Loach asked for clarifying language on agric-business.

Ms. Echols replied that there were different ways this could be dealt with. It might be easier right now if the Commission does not want it to be considered as part this Comp Plan update to not talk about it with the Pantops stuff, but may be at the end of the conversation bring that one back up. If the Commission thinks they want to add it to the Development Area, now might be the time to talk about it.

Mr. Franco said he was not proposing either way. However, the question really is what they have been asked to support some more intense uses that don't fit in this undefined agri-business mold, the warehousing, and some of those other things. For clarity, he asked what the Commission's reaction is to that proposal.

Mr. Lafferty suggested the Pantops Advisory Committee discuss this before the Commission.

Mr. Morris agreed with that because in the three years he has been on the committee they have never discussed increasing the size of the Pantops Area. However, the committee needs to talk about it before

it is vetted. Therefore, it would not be in this plan. He would bring the issue up to the Advisory Council at their June meeting.

Public Comment

Mr. Morris invited public comment. There being no public comment, the matter was before the Commission for discussion.

Related to the above topics, the Commission discussed and requested the following:

- Staff informed Commissioners that the Pantops Master Plan is the first Master Plan to be updated after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted by the Board of Supervisors.
- The Commission agreed with the recommendations from the Pantops Advisory Council to modify the plan to remove the two roads which had previously been recommended for removal.

Places29

Andy Sorrell provided a brief presentation on changes to the Places 29 Master Plan maps. Staff recommends changing the designation of the Forest Springs Mobile Home Park, which is currently zoned R-15. Places29 designates that in the Light Industrial category and staff proposes an update to change that designation to better reflect the existing zoning that is there today, which is Urban Density.

Ms. Echols noted that one of the property owners in this area has talked to staff about the potential of some changes in designations in this area. There are some changes in elevation that could make parts of this a little more difficult to develop in a Light Industrial or Office R&D Flex way. However, staff has suggested that to come up when the Places29 Master Plan is updated rather than trying to get into the specifics of it now. All staff is comfortable with at this time is making this one change. However, in the future when the Places29 Master Plan is updated there may be some additional discussion about the designations in this particular area.

Mr. Sorrell noted that next is the NGIC area.

Ms. Echols explained after discussions with the Fort Belvoir office staff at this time thinks it is most appropriate to leave the plan as it is. This does not interfere with any of NGIC's expectations, needs, and uses of the land.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Public Comment:

Travis Pietila, with the Southern Environmental Law Center, said the Commission's recent discussions suggest there may be significant changes to the draft plan presented to the public for the April public hearing and currently available on line. This is especially true regarding material that may be eliminated from the plan. They respectfully ask the Commission to add a final public hearing or comment opportunity at the Commission's July 23 meeting once the public has had the chance to review staff changes to the draft.

Wendell Wood, developer, pointed out Ms. Echols had informed him about 15 minutes ago that the Places 29 Master Plan would not be updated until after Crozet and the Village of Rivanna Master Plans. He said this meant their proposal to modify the Development Area boundaries near Rivanna Station would not be coming forward any time soon and would be delayed for at least a year in the master plan review. He said he has been working with staff for the last five months.

Mr. Wood said that he is planning to move forward in this area in cooperation with the government on another project they are getting ready to do there. He said he believed a different parcel than the one formerly under consideration near Rivanna Station should be added to the Development Area. He said he thinks the only difference they had was they were suggesting an area to the north to be added to the plan. However, they wanted it just a little to the east because of terrain. He said the area he wanted to add had no difference in acreage from the one staff previously had suggested. The pieces of land that the County had previously suggested might be added to the Development Area would be on the wrong

side of the hill for providing sewer service. On the plan they are looking at he thinks they wanted to put an area identified as "D" in the Development Area and he was asking for a different property just to the right of "D" to be added. He asked if they will now be prohibited to discussing "D" and a possible swap with the land that they have been asking for two years.

Mr. Franco suggested to Mr. Wood that he could always submit a comp plan amendment outside that process. What he hears is that it would rely heavily on the Citizen's Advisory Committee from that area to weigh in on the comp plan amendment. So there is a process that exists it is he would have to go through that process and then a rezoning.

Mr. Morris invited Mr. Wood to attend the Places29 Advisory Council meeting.

Mr. Lafferty said it was an open meeting. The next meeting will be on Thursday, June 19 at 4:00 p.m. in room 241.

There being no further public comment, the matter was placed before the Planning Commission for discussion.

Related to the above topics, the Commission discussed and requested the following:

- The Commission agreed that the land south of the mobile home park near the Airport which is already zoned R15 should be designated for urban density residential and not Light Industrial.
- Staff explained that since the last discussion on the area near Rivanna Station, staff had been in conversation with Fort Belvoir planners and the owner of the properties near Rivanna Station. The end result was that Fort Belvoir could support the land uses shown on the existing Places 29 Master Plan for this area.
- The Commission discussed whether or not there was a basis for modifying the Development Area boundaries near Rivanna Station, but concluded that they would not want to do this without public input from nearby owners and the Places 29 Advisory Council.
- Commissioners suggested the property owner approach the Places29 Advisory Council with his proposal to expand the Development Area boundary for residential use
- Commissioners confirmed that, with the exception of the land near the mobile home park, designations for the Places29 Development Area should remain as presented in the Draft Comprehensive Plan. However, if the Advisory Council could support an expansion at this time, the Commission would consider it.

Village of Rivanna

Ms. Echols provided a brief presentation on changes to the Village of Rivanna Master Plan. Staff has been talking about just doing a clarification map. In some places the map is not consistent especially as it relates to the Parks and Green System designation. Staff recommends that they add the revised map to the plan as the map that identifies the floodplains, steep slopes and such are part of the green systems. Then staff can put this map out on the web for consistency with the other land use plans. The revised map just adds to and clarifies the existing plan.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that staff ran the map change by the Village of Rivanna Regional Advisory Council and everyone was enthusiastic about the map change.

Public Comment

Mr. Morris invited public comment. There being no public comment, the matter was before the Commission for discussion.

Related to the above topics, the Commission discussed and requested the following:

- Commissioners agreed with staff recommended changes to the Village of Rivanna Master Plan Land Use Plan map to standardize colors.

Crozet:

Ms. Echols provided a brief presentation on changes to the Crozet Master Plan. There are no changes proposed.

Public Comment
Mr. Morris invited public comment. There being no public comment, the matter was before the Commission for discussion.

Related to the above topics, the Commission discussed and requested the following:

- Commissioners made no recommendations for changes to the Crozet Master Plan.

Old Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business.

- Mr. Loach raised concern about public appeal changes that may be proposed in the upcoming Subdivision Ordinance amendments, but noted that can be taken up by the Commission when the ordinance amendments come to them.

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

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- THE NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL HELD ON TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 2013.

There being no further business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m. to Tuesday, June 4, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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