Albemarle County Planning Commission
May 13, 2014

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, May 13, 2014, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Cal Morris, Chair; Karen Firehock, Richard Randolph, Thomas Loach, Bruce Dotson, and Tim Keller. Absent was Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair and Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia.

Staff present was Ron Higgins, Chief of Zoning; Rachel Falkenstein, Senior Planner; Amanda Burbage, Senior Planner; Amelia McCulley, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator; David Benish, Chief of Zoning; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 6:01 p.m. and established a quorum.

From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

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

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – May 7, 2014.

Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the actions taken by the Board of Supervisors on May 7, 2014.

Consent Agenda:

a. **Places 29 Advisory Council feedback on CCP 2014-00001**
(Rachel Falkenstein)

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

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

The motion carried by a vote of (6:0). (Lafferty absent)

Mr. Morris said the consent agenda was approved and was for informational purposes only

Work Sessions:

Amendment to Zoning Ordinance to Address State Code Requirements for Agricultural Operations & Farm Breweries

In a work session Ms. Burbage presented a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance to address State Code requirements for Agricultural Operations and Farm Breweries.

The genesis of this zoning text amendment is in response to two pieces of legislation that were before the General Assembly this year, Senate Bill 51, which dealt with agricultural operations, and Senate Bill 430, which dealt specifically with farm breweries. Both of those bills were signed by the Governor and will go into effect on July 1, 2014. Staff is hoping to move this amendment forward on a fairly tight timeframe so that they can adjust our ordinance in response to the State Code changes.

The two bills were similar in some respects in that they both limit localities ability to regulate activities on farms and at farm breweries unless there is a substantial impact on public health, safety, or welfare. They also both stipulate that regulations must be reasonable and must take into account economic impact and the agricultural nature of the

activity. The way the bills differ is in their treatment of activities that cannot be regulated. For agricultural operations basic operations that involve production and harvesting cannot be regulated. For farm breweries, very similar to farm wineries, there are a number of usual and customary activities that are listed in the legislation that cannot be regulated by localities. Those include production and harvesting, sales, tasting, on-site consumption, storage and warehousing with those kinds of activities.

ZTA Process History:
On March 25, 2014, the Planning Commission held a work session and adopted a Resolution of Intent authorizing staff to undertake a zoning text amendment specific to farms and farm breweries to ensure continued compliance with State law. At the work session the Planning Commission discussed several elements of our current farm winery regulations, which are working fairly well and staff feels can serve as a model for adopting our regulations for farms and farm breweries. A number of different elements of those regulations were discussed at the work session and again at a public roundtable held on April 16, 2014. There were about 30 attendees at the round table with representation from the agric and farm winery community. There was focused discussion on two topics.

Staff started out with a list from the Virginia Cooperative Extension and modified based on input received at the round table as to activities that are both usual and customary and are subject to local regulations because they are potential for substantial impact. (See Staff Report) This is not an exhaustive list, but gives examples when they talk about regulating substantial impacts of the kinds of activities that would be regulated. Also, in order for these activities to occur there has to be bonafide agriculture happening on the property, which has to be the primary use of the property in order for these other activities to occur.

The second topic discussed at the roundtable was thresholds for substantial impact. Three of these thresholds already exist in our current regulations. Those involve events over 200 attendees, farm sales structures, and outdoor amplified music. The threshold that does not currently exist, which was talked about at the round table, is the notion of regulating agri-tourism type activities on agricultural operations that are on parcels that are under five (5) acres. The idea is that a smaller parcel is more likely to have impacts on adjacent neighbors. They talked about restricting activities that would involve the public like Agritourism and requiring a special use permit if the parcel was under five (5) acres. A lot of good feedback was received on this at the public round table, which was mostly negative. A lot of attendees felt that a minimum parcel size was not going to be effective. If the location of the activity was at the edge of the property boundary, then it does not really matter how small or large the parcel is. It is still going to have an impact on an adjacent land owner. Also, they talked about how a lot of agricultural operations in the county can be on smaller parcels to be a berry farm or a honey producer since it does not require a lot of acreage and to have regulations that are more restrictive for smaller farms would be treating them unfairly. This input lead staff to consider four proposed standards for regulating substantial impact.

DISCUSSION:
Taking into consideration feedback received to-date, staff has proposed the following standards to regulate substantial impacts that may arise from activities associated with bonafide agricultural operations occurring at farms, farm wineries and farm breweries. Staff notes that there are certain bona fide agricultural operations such as production, harvesting, storage, and product shipment that cannot be regulated.

1. Events
The County's farm winery regulations require a special use permit for events exceeding 200 attendees at any given time. Impacts associated with larger events, such as traffic, sewer, water, and public safety, are addressed through the conditions of the special use permit. So far this attendance threshold appears to be working well at farm wineries and the County has received minimal complaints associated with their events. While staff considered several approaches to further addressing substantial impacts based on event frequency, parcel size, and the type of roads serving the property, it was a challenge to identify a logical threshold that could be applied fairly across-the-board to farms, farm wineries, and farm breweries. As a result, staff recommends keeping the current 200 person threshold established in the farm winery regulations and applying it to activities and events occurring at farms and farm breweries. If adopted, staff will monitor the impacts and determine if any further regulation of special events is necessary.

2. Sales Area
Section 5.1.47.b.2 of the Zoning Ordinance establishes a maximum size threshold for permanent structures used for farm sales. Under current regulations, structures used for farm sales are limited to 4,000 square feet of sales area and require a zoning clearance. To be consistent with the new state enabling legislation, staff proposes that farm sales

structures with up to 4,000 square feet of sales area be permitted by right and structures with more than 4,000 square feet of sales area require a special use permit. This would only apply to new farm sales structures that are established. If a structure exceeds 4,000 square feet but the sales area is under 4,000 square feet that is what they are regulating and not the entire structure. Parts of structures that are allocated to storage or other event spaces or that kind of thing would not be subject to this regulation. The area of structures used for production, processing and storage of agricultural products would continue to not be restricted.

3. Outdoor Amplified Music

Sound from outdoor amplified music at farm wineries is subject to the maximum decibel levels outlined in Section 4.18.04 of the Zoning Ordinance (60 dBA day and 55 dBA night for the Rural Areas district). For events requiring a special use permit, the Board has imposed additional conditions for the use of outdoor amplified music, including testing sound equipment before an event and self-monitoring noise levels during the event, to ensure compliance with the County's noise regulations. These measures have successfully addressed noise complaints from property owners adjacent to a farm winery. As a result, staff recommends that any farm, farm winery, or farm brewery wishing to have outdoor amplified music be required to obtain a zoning clearance to allow staff and the applicant the opportunity to verify that they can comply with noise regulations during events. Only one zoning clearance would be necessary and would apply to any future event on the property. Establishments that are already using outdoor amplified music at the time the ordinance changes would be grandfathered in. This would allow staff to review the equipment, visit the site and make sure that the establishment would be able to meet the noise ordinance regulations before the event is actually occurring. This happens right now through the special use permit process. When someone wants to have an event and they want to have outdoor amplified music a lot of times there will be a condition of the special use permit that requires testing and preplanning. This would create a process that would allow staff to anticipate and mitigate impacts associated with outdoor amplified music.

4. Setbacks/ Minimum Acreage

FOCUSED DISCUSSION:

Staff requests the Planning Commission's feedback on the fourth or final regulation proposed that is in response to the push back received on the minimum acreage requirement. As an alternative to a minimum acreage requirement staff requests the Planning Commission to consider a setback standard that would apply to parking and outdoor activity areas. Those outdoor activities areas would include things like patios, decks, seating, and areas for congregation, but would not apply to things like pick your own berries. That would not be considered a gathering space. Staff is proposing using the swim, golf, tennis setback standard, which is (75 feet from the property line and 125 feet from an existing dwelling on adjoining property that is not part of "the farm"). The setback would apply only when the adjacent parcel is not part of the farm or under the same ownership. If they have adjacent parcels but they are all part of the same farm the setback would only apply when one gets to a different owners property line. Again, existing establishments would be grandfathered from this requirement. Like our other setback regulations in the ordinance they could potentially be reduced with the consent of the adjacent property owner.

Staff requested feedback on the following two items from the Commission on using the following standard to regulate certain activities involving the public and occurring at a farm, farm winery or farm brewery: Setbacks/Minimum Acreage.

1. Whether or not the Commission feels setbacks for parking and outdoor activity areas or a minimum acreage requirement should be used to mitigate impacts associated with bringing the public to an agricultural operation or a farm brewery.

2. If a setback is recommended if the Commission feels the swim, golf, tennis setback standard (75 feet from the property line & 125 feet from a residence) is adequate.

Mr. Morris opened the work session for public comment and invited anyone who desires to speak to come forward.

David vanRoijen commented he was part of the earlier focused discussion and thinks staff has done a good job of incorporating a lot of this. One of the major points made at the focused discussion was the number of events have not really been addressed regarding the peace and quiet for someone living in the rural area and farming. He realized that 200 people once or twice a year would have no big impact on him as a farmer and his peace and quiet.

However, if they are doing this every weekend it is something else. The number or frequency of events is important and needs to be addressed. He questioned the impact and if the 200 person limit should be changed.

Marcia Joseph, rural area resident for 20 years, said she understands the intent in the zoning ordinance that there is a lower level of service in the rural areas. She has to have a mini cell for a cell phone. The computer connection is iffy from time to time. She knows it is going to take longer for fire, rescue squad and police response. Her access to entertainment means she has to pay more for gas in her car. Also, her water and sewer is her responsibility. She does not have curb or gutter or sidewalks. She has dark skies, quiet, no complaints from neighbors about her dogs, and low volume of traffic on the rural road. She has normal usage of water from her neighbors so she does not expect a down draw often at all because they don't use that much. She asked the Commission to please protect her health, safety and welfare. She moved out to the rural areas and has an investment. It is based on the fact that there is peace and quiet and not a lot of traveling on the roads. She asked that they take a look at the current supplemental regulations since a lot of the uses that are allowed in the rural areas are related directly to farming. It includes farmer's markets and sawmills, which have hours of operation that are limited; lighting that is limited; water use that is limited in many areas; and VDOT approval for entrances. She was wondering what would happen with the storm water management on these. If they compact the soil and park cars they are going to have more runoff than they normally would have. They have been talking about the city now requiring fees for storm water management at the Board level and what are they going to do. Now all of a sudden they are opening up vast areas for parking and soil compaction. When the soil is compacted on some of these prime agricultural soils it makes it difficult to reuse. Therefore, she is asking that they also look at the scale of these things. If everybody on 10 acres or 11 acres decides that this is the way they are going to make money, there is going to be a lot of activity on her road.

Ben Rowe commented that these farms and farm wineries have been here as well as the residents. They are making good use of their land and their property produces products and value for Albemarle County. The existing regulations and the way they are is a reason why the state began these bills this past session and why they were passed by our state and local leaders. He recommends the Commission please keep this in mind as they review these regulations and remember that farm wineries and vineyards are also members of the community and contribute to the community and the environment as well.

Mr. David King, of King Family Vineyards of Crozet, Virginia, and Chair of the Virginia Wine Board commented this process started way back in 2006/2007 with the farm winery in the General Assembly. It has been carried forward in the last session on the farm activities piece. Albemarle County to its great credit has taken the lead, at least at the winery level, of incorporating what the General Assembly had decided into its local ordinances. He thanked them for that. However, this is an ongoing process. He thinks staff has proven to be very knowledgeable in addressing the issues that have come up over the last seven years at the state level, including all of the issues that have been raised tonight. These requirements are, in his view, very reasonable. It does not mean that they address everything that they might like to address. However, again, with the starting point of what the General Assembly has done at the state level and with the requirement that the localities take that and do what localities are supposed to do, which is to make it fit the localities, he thinks this is a remarkably good start. In his view, it continues Albemarle County's leadership at the state level of how to address this on farm activities for both farmers, wineries, and who knows what will be the next permutation of this in the wave of the future of agriculture in the Commonwealth. Like it or not it is just the way it is. Parcels are getting smaller and farmers are constrained by all kinds of things. The Commission's job, of course, is to decide what those constraints may be. He would support staff's recommendation.

Neil Williamson, with the Free Enterprise Forum, pointed out since about 1999 he has done work in the Virginia wine industry. Events are a big part of the wine industry as well as agric-tourism, which makes the rural areas open and sustainable economically. He tends to look and speak across the Commonwealth about the Albemarle County Winery Ordinance as one that has kind of found the right place since it raises concerns where concerns should be raised. They are now looking at farms and other operations and say they are doing this right and he suggests moving forward with that. However, he has some concerns about the setbacks. He has no concerns about the noise ordinance because it is good the way it is set up at the property line and it is self regulating. He questions when they look at outdoor activity area as 75 feet from the property line. If they were to look back at the last slide they saw an image of a bride and groom on a back drop of a mountain. That could be a park and the adjoining property owner could be the national park or the new state park in the county's development area, which is another story. But, the idea of 75' from that area worries him a little bit for that very reason. In addition, when they did the farm stands regulation they looked at the parking and in reality put the farm stands near the road where the customers happen to

be. Then they back the truck up to the fence line so they can buy the produce and pull out. They know in White Hall by Joe Jones' store there is a business operator that works very well. He would hate to see such real world solutions removed by an ordinance that is seeking to do the right thing but may inadvertently do the wrong thing.

Charlotte Shelton, of North Garden, said Albemarle Cider Works is her family's operation. In listening to this she would just like the Commission to remember there are unintended consequences of anything they attempt to regulate. If they are going to keep the land open for agriculture for uses such as an apple orchard, the use would not pay for itself without what they are doing with the apples and their ability to sell what they make from the applies on-site. None of what they are saying would apply to where they are in particular. She agreed with David King's point about the future of agriculture, particularly in Albemarle County, in that the Board of Supervisors for years has been trying to keep it available. When they tried to regulate because someone is concerned about losing dark skies or something like that they have to remember that just because they have moved into a territory they don't therefore get to use by right everyone else's atmosphere and property around it. Sometimes if they try to regulate too tightly they end up doing that. Good common sense takes us a long way in letting that operate within the framework of the ordinances that they already have and it seems to be highly desirable.

Jeff Werner, Piedmont Environmental Council, made comments:

- They were not discussing or debating farm winery regulations at all. This is a completely different piece of legislation that they all understand. He thinks farm wineries achieve being bona-fide agricultural activities by being licensed through a state process. What they are here addressing is what triggers the need for a special use permit for an activity or an event at a rural property. There is no definition of bona-fide agricultural activity. He proposed county staff take a tougher stance than some counties and define bona-fide agricultural activity in the ordinances. He suggested in a preamble or recital at the beginning of the text they should say this is how they understand this to be in relationship to bona-fide agricultural activities that are a function of usual and customary activities, which are and happen to be in Albemarle County X, Y and Z.
- The concern was when true bona-fide agricultural activities become non agricultural activity. There are a number of ways they could do it. They could define it since the legislation is vague. He suggested they go out on a limb and try to say how they understand it. They have got the duration of events and the hours of events. He asked if they were ongoing or seasonal or once a year or every weekend? Is it in a historic district or near a scenic byway? Is it near a winery? They might have a series of small events, but there are five of them on the same bad road and all of a sudden that pushes the limit for those folks on that road. He thinks whatever the intent of the General Assembly was he thinks it is unacceptable to tell folks in the rural area since they understand the sounds and smells and the events that surround agriculture. But, increased traffic, late night music, large crowds, non-agric commercial activities is not what they bought into. He thinks the Commission needs to address some of those things so there is a trigger at which this community can say no that goes too far.

Morgan Butler, with Southern Environmental Law Center, offered specific recommendations.

- First, the buffer issue is not a question of the 5 acre or less special use requirement or buffers. The buffers became relevant when they were thinking about 20 acre parcels or larger and saying that just the fact that it is 20 acres or larger does not mean it is not going to impact the adjacent property if it is right up next to it. So in that instance that is where buffer is still protected if they are talking about a large parcel in the location of where that event will be. He thinks it still makes sense to require a special use permit on the smaller parcels for the farmette because those by virtue of their small size tend to have a threat of having a greater impact on adjacent properties.
- There are a couple of other points to consider that were not necessarily asked by staff tonight. He thinks Mr. Werner makes a very good point that State Code does not define bona fide. Therefore, the county has some flexibility to decide the length they are going to require between production and legitimate agricultural activity and then qualifying for these various allowances and uses they are talking about today. He would noted in the industrial and commercial zoning categories there is a requirement if you are going to consume more than X gallons of water per site acre per day that they have to a special use permit requirement. None of these different parameters they are discussing tonight get set water consumption and none of them get at sewage. He thinks that a similar type provision might be appropriate here. This was raised by prior speakers. However, requiring a special use permit for any Agritourism activity that occurs outside of certain hours of the day similarly may require a special use permit if there is going to be overnight camping. He was thinking these music festival type things can have a large impact. The point

that is important here, which the first speaker brought up, is that one way it manifests itself is the frequency of events.

- The idea that they can take what seems to be working well for wineries and just apply that now to this larger category of Agritourism events is questionable. They have a good sense of the frequency of events and what type of events by virtue of them occurring on wineries. Maybe this 200 person limit has sort of worked as an effective gate. However, with Agritourism events he thinks they are talking about things that could happen more frequently. They should be considering some of the ideas he put forward tonight as a way to try to capture against uses that could have impacts, which are uses that they might not necessarily see proposed at wineries.

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

Board Discussion:

The Planning Commission held a discussion with staff on the information presented regarding the following issues/concerns.

- Whether to treat farm breweries the same as farm wineries?
- definition of bona fide agricultural operations
- Adequate buffers with adjacent properties.
- Setbacks vs. minimum acreage
- Preamble for new ordinance sections.
- water consumption/groundwater issues
- cumulative effect/impact – traffic volume
- special use permit threshold
- when does scale issue come into play
- adequacy of land for parking
- should they use State's terminology to avoid competing regulations
- thresholds including Agritourism and usual and customary activities on parcels under five acres, special events exceeding 200 attendees, structures for farm sales exceeding 4,000 square feet, and use of outdoor amplified music.
- A way to help allow the rural area to develop would be to have master plans like the development areas. (Mr. Loach's suggestion)

In summary, the Planning Commission generally supported Mr. Keller's suggestion to treat farm breweries the same as farm wineries and have a lower special use permit threshold than 200 attendees at any one time for events at agricultural operations. (5:1) (Dotson, Randolph, Firehock, Keller and Morris - yes) ((Loach no) (Lafferty absent)

Note: Mr. Loach disagreed because he supported staff's recommendation for the special use permit thresholds and setback requirements at agricultural operations.

The Planning Commission provided the following input:

- Agreed that the threshold for number for attendees at events be at any one time and not over the course of a day.
- Asked for additional information on event attendance thresholds less than 200 attendees (50 and 150 discussed) and frequency of events (24 events/ year discussed).
- Asked for definition of bona fide agricultural operations.
- Asked for clarifying preamble for new ordinance sections.

The Planning Commission requested that staff do additional research and set follow up work session date.

The Planning Commission recessed at 7:52 p.m. and reconvened at 8:01 p.m.

ZTA-2014-00003 Neighborhood Model Setbacks and Yards-
Comments and Recommendations

In a work session Ron Higgins presented a PowerPoint presentation on the proposed amendments to the Zoning

Ordinance to address Neighborhood Model Principles in the Development Areas by amending the County Code/Zoning Ordinance to modify setback and yard requirements in development area zoning districts to support the Neighborhood Model goals and objectives. (See Staff Report)

Staff requested that the Planning Commission respond to the following:

- Is use of minimum/maximum street setback for "infill" as defined acceptable?
- Are the other minimum/maximum street setbacks acceptable?
- Are proposed side building separations/side yards and rear yards acceptable?
- Is proposed front only "step back" for buildings in excess of 40' or three stories in height (whichever is less) acceptable?

Mr. Morris opened the work session for public comment and invited anyone who desires to speak to come forward.

Neil Williamson, Free Enterprise Forum, supported staff's recommendations. He suggested if the goal of the comp plan is to pull houses forward why not allow houses to come forward in conventional infill development. He supported special exceptions, particularly for infill development cases where there are natural or physical barriers on a parcel, and preferred that they be administrative.

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

Board Discussion:
The Planning Commission held a discussion with staff on the information presented and provided the following feedback:

- Is use minimum/maximum street setback for "infill" as defined acceptable?

Yes. There was emphasis on maintaining the character of the neighborhood with any infill development. The Commission generally agreed with Mr. Williamson's comments.

- Are the other minimum/maximum street setbacks acceptable?

Yes.

- Are proposed side building separations/side yards and rear yards acceptable?

Yes.

- Is proposed front only "step back" for buildings in excess of 40' or three stories in height acceptable?

Yes, but with request that staff provide information on where the side or rear yards of R-10, R-15, commercial and industrial zoning exist adjacent to single family residential and Rural Area.

The Planning Commission directed that the public hearing be scheduled without a roundtable and requested the following:

- Synopsis of amendments in normal language be sent out to Citizen Advisory Councils.
- Provide photographs in addition to diagrams that show examples so public can better visualize the proposals.
- In diagrams indicate front and rear as it is not clear which way building is facing.

Staff will do further research, develop draft ordinance language and schedule public hearing.

Old Business

Committee Report regarding revisiting the priorities for the Comprehensive Plan strategies (already recommended to the Board)

Mr. Morris thanked Mr. Keller and Mr. Dotson for providing the results of the committee meeting on Rural Areas. (Attachment A – Attachments on file with the printed minutes in the office of the clerk) This is an example of what

a report might look like. If other committees want to modify it in any way, please do. He liked exactly what they have included as what are the areas of high priorities and the rational of what is important.

Mr. Keller asked for feedback from staff on whether this is the right direction.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that staff will get back to the Commission on that. However, it does address the idea of what are the important priorities in this particular case. He suggested they pay attention to measurable success factors and indicators.

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. Cilimberg recognized Cal Morris for ten years of service with Albemarle County with a certificate of appreciation and gift to show appreciation. Mr. Morris' hard work and dedication are appreciated.

- Mr. Morris asked how many Commissioners plan to go the 2014 LUEP Legal Seminar on May 29 in Charlottesville.

Mr. Keller, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Morris expressed an interest in attending this seminar. Mr. Morris noted that Mr. Lafferty had expressed an interest in attending. Mr. Dotson noted that he would be participating as a panelist.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that he would follow up with Mr. Graham to see if funding for the seminar registration is availability and get back with the Commissioners.

- CASH PROFFER POLICY ROUND TABLE TO BE HELD ON MAY 15, 2014 AT 4:00 P.M. IN ROOM 241 OF THE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING.

- Mr. Kamptner asked the Commission to adjourn to the May 15 round table if 3 or more were attending.

Mr. Morris noted that all Commissioners planned to attend the roundtable on May 15th.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the Commission would adjourn to May 15 and then will take an action on May 15 to adjourn to May 29 if more than three Commissioners plan to attend the seminar.

- THERE ARE NO PLANNING COMMISSION MEETINGS ON TUESDAY, MAY 20, 2014 AND TUESDAY, MAY 27, 2014.

- THE NEXT REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BE ON TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 2014.

Adjournment:

Mr. Keller moved and Mr. Dotson seconded to adjourn to the Cash Proffer Policy Round Table on May 15, 2014, at 4:00 p.m. in Room 241 of the County Office Building.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0. (Lafferty absent)

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m. to the Cash Proffer Policy Round Table on May 15, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. in room 241 of the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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