Albemarle County Planning Commission
November 11, 2014

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, November 11, 2014 at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Cal Morris, Chair; Richard Randolph, Thomas Loach, Karen Firehock, Tim Keller, Bruce Dotson and Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair. Ms. Firehock arrived at 6:09 p.m. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Staff present was Claudette Grant, Senior Planner; Ron Higgins, Chief of Zoning; Trevor Henry, Director of OFD; Lindsay Harris, Budget Analyst with OFD; Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; David Benish, Chief of Zoning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order

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 including the consent agenda items. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

Committee Reports

Mr. Morris invited committee reports.

Mr. Keller reported the Fiscal Impact Committee met and decided to meet every two weeks in review of the proffer policy.

Mr. Dotson reported there are two items on the agenda that have been before the Places29 Community Advisory Committee recently:
- Colonial Auto Center expansion - There was no issue raised with that expansion going forward.
- The Neighborhood Model Setbacks and Yards – The staff report has an attachment that outlines the questions that came up at the meeting and the staff responses.

Mr. Lafferty reported the following:
- MPO Policy Board met and Okayed the construction projects for 29.
- MPO Tech met.
- Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) met and discussed ways to get the public/community more involved now that the LRTP has been approved.

Mr. Morris reported the following:
- Free Bridge Congestion Relief Project Committee will meet on November 19 to wrap up the Free Bridge Congestion Study.
- The Rivanna River Corridor Committee met and will meet again on December 9.

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

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – November 5, 2014.

Mr. Benish reviewed the Board of Supervisors actions taken on November 5, 2014.

Consent Agenda:

a. **CCP-2014-00004 Glenmore Ground Storage Tank, Pump Station and Water Main**
b. **CPA-2014-00002 Colonial Auto Center Expansion**
c. **Approval of Minutes: June 17, 2014 and August 5, 2014**

Mr. Morris asked if any Commissioner would like to pull an item from the consent agenda for further review. There being none, he asked to address items a. and b. separately and take a voice vote on this.

Motion: Mr. Randolph moved and Mr. Lafferty seconded for approval of the consent agenda item a. CCP-2014-00004 Glenmore Ground Storage Tank, Pump Station and Water Main.

The motion carried by a vote of (7:0).

Motion: Mr. Dotson moved and Mr. Lafferty seconded for approval of the consent agenda item b. CPA-2014-00002 Colonial Auto Center Expansion.

Mr. Morris invited discussion.

Mr. Dotson noted it had been clarified that is a resolution.

The motion carried by a vote of (7:0).

Motion: Mr. Randolph moved and Mr. Dotson seconded for approval of the consent agenda item c. approval of the minutes for August 5, 2014 and June 17, 2014.

The motion carried by a vote of (7:0).

Mr. Morris said the consent agenda was approved, which includes the following.

CCP-2014-00004 Water Tank at Glenmore – The Planning Commission found the location, character and extent of the proposed Water Tank at Glenmore is in substantial accord with the County's Comprehensive Plan.

CPA-2014-00002 Colonial Auto Center Expansion – The Planning Commission adopted the resolution of intent to amend the Comprehensive Plan to change the land use on Tax Map 04500-00-00-173 from Urban Density Residential to Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial, as follows:

RESOLUTION

- **WHEREAS,** the Future Land Use Plan and Transportation Network section of the Places 29 Master Plan includes land use designations, parks and green systems, and the future transportation network, within the Places 29 Master Plan for the Northern Development Areas within Albemarle County; and

- **WHEREAS,** a petition was received requesting that the land use designation under the Places 29 Master Plan for Tax Map and Parcel Number 04500-00-00-17300 (the "Property") be changed from Urban Density Residential to Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial; and

- **WHEREAS,** the Property abuts on Berkmar Drive to the west and the Colonial Auto Center on the east; and

- **WHEREAS,** changing the land use designation, with a corresponding change to the zoning of the Property, would allow Colonial Auto Center to expand onto the Property; and

- **WHEREAS,** upon a request by the County or a property owner, the Comprehensive Plan may be amended by the Board of Supervisors, acting upon a recommendation by the Planning Commission, in response to criteria first adopted by the Board of Supervisors on April 17, 1985, and amended December 11, 1991, effective April 1, 1992; and

- **WHEREAS,** one of the criteria is whether there has been a change in circumstances since the land use designation was established for the property in issue; and

- **WHEREAS,** under the above-referenced criteria, the Planning Commissions finds that changes in circumstances have occurred relative to the Property because the impending Rio Road and Route 29 intersection improvements will impact the Route 29 frontage of Colonial Auto Center and because Greenfield Mobile Home Park, which was located on the Property when the Places 29 Master Plan was adopted, has since closed and the Property is no longer used for residential purposes.

- **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good land use planning practices, the Albemarle County Planning Commission hereby adopts a resolution to consider amending the land use designation of the Property from Urban Density Residential to Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial; and

- **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposed by this resolution, and make its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, at the earliest possible date.

* * * * *

Public Hearing Items

a. SP-2014-00013 Broadway Street Soccer (Indoor)
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 07700-00-00-040J0, 07700-00-00-04-K0, 07700-00-00-04-L0
LOCATION: 1740 Broadway Street
PROPOSAL: Establishment of an indoor soccer training facility within an existing building.
PETITION: Request for an indoor athletic facility [Section 22.2.1(b)(24)] permitted via Section 26.2 as a "general commercial use." No dwelling units proposed.
ZONING: LI-Light Industry - industrial, office, and limited commercial uses; no residential use.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Industrial Service – warehousing, light industry, heavy industry, research, office uses, regional scale research, limited production and marketing activities, supporting commercial, lodging and conference facilities, and residential (6.01-34 units/acre) in Neighborhood 4 of the Development Area.
(Claudette Grant)

Ms. Grant presented a PowerPoint presentation on SP-2014-00013 Broadway Street Soccer (Indoor).

Proposal: The applicant requests a special use permit to establish an indoor soccer training facility within an existing warehouse building on the property as described above.

The applicant wishes to open a new business that would allow for an indoor soccer training facility. The training and all activities will occur indoors. The applicant plans to rent approximately one-half of the 51,000 square foot building providing three (3) small soccer fields, which would be 50' X 100' in size. There are no plans to change the exterior of the existing building or the property. However, minor changes to the interior of the building will need to be completed in order to accommodate the proposed indoor soccer use. The applicant anticipates that any changes he does to the interior of the building can readily be reverted back to its original light industrial use. The applicant can speak in more detail about this. However, the applicant wishes to remain in the building for up to three years, which would allow him time to find a more appropriate commercial use space for his business. The owner of the building is also working to lease the other half of the building.

Staff has identified factors which are favorable and unfavorable to this proposal:

Factors favorable to this request include:

1. There are no anticipated detrimental impacts on the adjacent property resulting from the proposed use.
2. Allows a vacant building to be occupied.
3. Allows the start up of a new business.

Factors unfavorable to this request include:

1. The proposed use is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed commercial use will result in a potential loss of inventory in the industrial district.
3. Potential loss of the central location for industrial uses.

Based on the findings described in this staff report and factors identified as unfavorable, staff does not recommend approval of SP-2014-00013 Broadway Street Soccer (Indoor).

Should there be a desire to approve this special use permit request, the following conditions are recommended:

1. The indoor soccer facility is limited to fifty percent (50%) of the production area, as shown on the Data Visible Corporation Landscaping Plan, prepared by Wiley & Wilson, and dated 4/7/87 (Attachment A in the staff report). All parking for the facility shall be located in areas designated on the landscaping plan, referenced above. Any additional buildings or other site changes, except for those required by the conditions of this permit, require an amendment to this Special Use Permit;
2. All improvements needed per the letter from Jay Schlothauer, Building Official, dated September 22, 2014 (Attachment B of the staff report) shall be completed prior to the release of the Certificate of Occupancy (C/O) of 1740 Broadway Street; and
3. SP-2014-00013 shall expire on [three years from BOS approval date].

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff.

Ms. Firehock asked if staff has any information on how long this space has been vacant.

Ms. Grant replied the building has been vacant for several months to a year.

Ms. Firehock noted part of the concern about using the site for this particular use, which was not originally intended, is that it could be better used as industrial space. If the space is in high demand or it was vacant she wondered if they were not to approve the request.

Mr. Lafferty noted as he understands it the actual building can be subdivided with a great deal of the square footage available for one, two or three different firms to go in there.

Ms. Grant replied yes, that is correct.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the request is for no longer than three years and maybe shorter, and Ms. Grant replied yes, that is correct.

Mr. Lafferty asked if it would revert back to light industrial.

Ms. Grant replied that would be the intent.

Mr. Benish pointed out special use permits run with the land unless there is a provision that sets a time limit on it.

Mr. Kamptner noted the parcel will always be zoned Light Industry unless they change the zoning. If a condition puts a life on the permit, then it just expires.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the Commission could do that, and Mr. Kamptner replied yes.

Mr. Dotson noted the site plan indicates over 50 parking spaces. He asked if the available parking is

adequate both for this use and the uses that could go in the other half of the warehouse.

Ms. Grant replied the parking is adequate although it depends on what the other use might be. However, at the present time there is plenty of parking available.

Mr. Keller asked if there were any projections on the number of car trips per day that would occur for this particular use.

Ms. Grant replied the applicant said he would use only about 20 parking spaces for his use. She did not know if that is 20 parking spaces for the whole day over a period of time or if he is thinking that is 20 parking spaces per individual folks that are coming to use the space each time.

Mr. Benish suggested the applicant could best answer that question.

Mr. Loach said he had a question on staff's suggested motion. In the staff report it says the building is currently vacant and provides the space needed for three small soccer fields. He thought staff said that the applicant may want to increase that. However, the recommended action calls for a condition of 50 percent. He asked if 50 percent would allow him to expand or if the 50 percent is predicated on the three soccer fields that are in there. It is a technical question. He thought staff said the applicant was planning to expand.

Ms. Grant replied no, the applicant may expand to a different location, but not within this building.

Mr. Randolph noted his observation of having frequented an auto body shop business on this street where there is very low volume of traffic that comes onto this street. Therefore, the addition of an indoor soccer facility is not going to create a burden at the intersection affecting Broadway in any way. People will have to proceed at the double stop signs if they are proceeding to the right because there is only a one way passage underneath the railroad. He personally has not observed a traffic problem in this section.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out they could come down Carlton Avenue and get to the same place without going under the underpass.

There being no further questions for staff, Mr. Morris opened the public hearing for the applicant and public comment. He invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Thomas Weber, six-year resident of Albemarle County, said they were trying to start a unique business to fulfill a long standing need in this community. There are not many facilities in which one can play indoor soccer. There is no commercially zoned warehouse available anywhere in the county to have such a business. That is why they have asked for a special use permit to start the business at least in a building zoned Light Industry. Essentially, it is a temporary measure because he did not want to stay in the building forever or change the zoning. He just wants to use the building to get his business off the ground and help kids play soccer year round instead of being subject to the rain and other elements. Eventually he hopes to build a warehouse or commercially zoned facility that could help sustain the growth of the business.

Mr. Weber said he would provide answers to some of the questions. He has been looking for a space for the last six months. There are now 13 other warehouses facilities in the county that are available for rent or lease. This particular place has an appropriate distance between the posts. A lot of these big warehouses have posts every 25', which as one could imagine would make it hard to play soccer. This warehouse has a 50' expanse and he can go 120' in the length direction. The warehouse space is approximately 40,000 square feet and they would just be renting one-half or 20,000 square feet. He did not plan to expand at all from that. They would build a firewall per Jay Schlothauer's request that would divide the building in half and allow for two separate or more entities to exist. This warehouse has been for lease since March or nine months with very few applicants besides himself. The business will have a minimal impact on the building itself allowing it to easily revert back to its light industrial use. He could roll up the turf fields, take down the nets and walk out. Then they could start building rockets the next day.

The business would employee 10 to 15 coaches, 10 to 15 referees and a cleaning staff, which will bring employment to the area. It will provide immediate rent or tax support for the owners of the warehouse. Again, it has been sitting empty as have many other warehouses in the community.

Mr. Weber projected the maximum need for parking is 20 parking spaces. The busiest times would be 4:00 p.m. to 9 p.m. He would expect approximately 15 to 20 cars per hour. Typically, these kids train for about an hour and then they go home. Because of its location parents could drop the kids off and go to a local restaurant or grocery store. Currently, the closest place is Richmond in Short Pump. There are a lot of kids from our community that drive 80 miles regularly sometimes 4 nights a week to play soccer on turf fields in an indoor facility because they have none of that here. He can't afford retail space because some of the other facilities are looking at $12 to $15 a square foot. That just does not make ends meet in this kind of business. Again, because they have very little infrastructure to change they could start in January. However, some of these other heavier or light industrial companies could take 6 months to a year or 18 months to even begin production.

Mr. Weber reiterated one of the favorable factors was there are no detrimental changes to the property. They won't be producing any waste, but just sweat in allowing the start of a new business. Regarding unfavorable factors he read through the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan draft from January, 2014. Section 2e specifically talks about the arts, designs, sports and media being complimentary industry clusters identified in the target industries study businesses and industries provided these facets to help provide jobs in specialized sectors that use the skills of many of the residents of the area. County staff should continue to provide information on ways these communities can successfully locate and operate in Albemarle County. Again, proposed commercial use will result with potential loss. He feels there are 13 other very usable warehouses that would be available to do light industry and the central location of at least two other warehouses that are centrally located off Avon Street. Again, in objective 5, page 6.10 the County values its local businesses and industries and recognizes that job growth occurs more often with existing firms and new firms that might move to the county with small start of businesses with potential for expansion and growth. For that reason the County's efforts are aimed at helping local business and industry and encouraging local start ups that bring strength and diversity to the economic landscape. Essentially, they feel this is going to be very low impact on the available space for light industry. There are no other retail facilities that he can use to do this type of building because it would be way too small and certainly the rent too high. In this area of industrial space the proposed indoor soccer use will not impact the traffic flow in that region. It will provide a very important piece for children's recreation and a new business. He welcomed any questions.

Mr. Morris invited questions for the applicant from the Commission.

Mr. Keller said he was a big supporter of football and watched football all levels all through the week all over the world. He has had sons that have played football and continue as adults to play football. They had an opportunity to play at an amazing facility outside in Johnston, Iowa and in Richmond. As a planning commission he has real questions about the proposed location about the number of parking spaces and the car trips. They are talking about parking spaces, but he thinks they are still car trips. He asked if they are talking about 11 member teams or smaller teams.

Mr. Weber replied that is correct, but typically there are 4 to 5 children per side. However, the main use of this facility is for individual and small group training. Therefore, it is not going to be a giant complex where he tries to have tournaments from everybody from Richmond. That won't be the intent. The intent is to have specialized training. SOCA, MONU and Charlottesville Soccer Academy all do a very good job with the big teams. The proposed use is for kids that want to play more and maybe play in college. They come and work on their individual skills in a facility that is open 365 days a year. As you may well know with SOCA being in a flood plain many of the kid's practices are cancelled. When it rains it gets wet and they can't play and members of this club that again want to play more on those rainy days come over to our place. That is where those numbers would be low because they can't have 30 kids in there at one time coaching. It is, again, much smaller groups. With the 3 fields they would separate it so there might be 15 to 20 kids per hour. The kids will carpool and be dropped off. So car traffic would be roughly in that15 to 20 cars per hours.

Mr. Keller said this is more like a small team size as opposed to the full size he was referring to.

Mr. Weber agreed noting it would be much closer to the size of a basketball court than the 120 yard by 80 yard full size soccer field. Basically, they could fit 3 or 4 of his little fields in one outdoor soccer field.

Mr. Keller noted therefore a 20 car count is more realistic than an 11 person team with 15 players with 30 cars.

Mr. Weber replied that was exactly right because the main purpose they want to do is to provide for individual training. There may be some small leagues, but again these are going to be very small sided teams such as 4 on 4 and 5 on 5 on these smaller fields.

Mr. Keller asked if he says it is the interior structure and the dangers provided in that interior structure that creates the problems for a lot of the buildings that he has looked at that would be in areas that were more readily accessible.

Mr. Weber replied that is correct because he has looked at the airport and all over. In the .pdf floor plans he has gotten a lot of these warehouses with only a 25' span. It is really hard to do anything sports related within 25' without running into one of the posts.

Mr. Dotson said as a follow up question he had mentioned 10 to 15 coaches and 10 to 15 referees and it is a training facility. He did not understand referees in a training facility.

Mr. Weber replied part of the idea would be to have some small leagues, and again not 10 to 15 people at once but needing a pool of people to choose from. Because there is no indoor facility right now kids play indoor soccer on gym floors in the county in the public schools, which quite frankly is incredibly unsafe. Last year his daughter ran into one of the posts that had no padding on it. So they would look to have some small leagues that would have 4 kids versus 4 kids and he would need referees for that in primarily the winter season. Again, its main purpose is for individual training. To get started and get off the ground to be able to pay these nice people rent he may need to have some small leagues. However, it would not be a regional tournament center where he was going to have people from all over the state come to use parking spaces and clutter the area.

Mr. Lafferty asked do you plan to serve food from the café type thing that is there.

Mr. Weber replied they would consider that if it was at all permissible. However, it would primarily be sports drinks and energy bars to start with. If it helped to bring in revenue and was reasonable with the county conceivably they would have hot dogs and pizza slices potentially, but no five star restaurants.

Ms. Firehock said they don't know what the other potential tenants would be down the road that would be sharing the building with him. She understands the use would primarily be from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m. However, there could be some overlap with other potential industrial clients. She was thinking about the families and children arriving and whether or not there could be a 12 year old running across the parking lot at the same time the 18-wheeler is going through. She did not look at where loading docks were located here. However, she was just trying to think about how he can segregate his young and boisterous group from potential industrial users that may be compatible.

Mr. Weber said that was a great question. He pointed out essentially there are 110 parking spaces altogether and 55 of them are in the front. He said his business would take up only the parking spaces where the main entrance is located. The available parking for the other half of the warehouse includes the entire back parking lot, which is another 55 parking spaces. That traffic could go straight from the entrance back. The kids walking across the parking area would be nowhere near that main traffic for the other half of the warehouse.

Ms. Firehock suggested if it became a problem they could put some kind of blockage there to help.

Mr. Weber agreed they would need to have good signage to identify which direction for the other people

to go.

Mr. Randolph asked the time frame he intends to initiate the use and the end date if he received approval from the Board of Supervisors by January 15.

Mr. Weber replied he would like to start early next year and at least 3 years would be ideal. It would take 36 or 40 months to get it off the ground. What he would like to do is create enough business that they then could go and build their own facility, which would serve the community and county at large in a commercially zoned area where it would be approved. Again, it would be a source for new business development in the area. They could go on and on about regional tournaments at that point. There is a field hockey club in town that is very excited about any potential indoor space. Similarly the lacrosse club would be the same thing. So this could be a start of a large business development in time. He would prefer to eventually have his own place to pay himself rent. It does get expensive to just keep paying rent. Therefore, he would want approximately 3 years or 40 to 44 months.

Mr. Randolph said he had mentioned the series of different employees. He asked how many of those people would be full time versus part time.

Mr. Weber replied probably 2 to 3 would be full time. They would need a manager of the facility to register kids, work on their signing up for the training sessions and then probably 2 head coaches. Then they would like to employ part time coaches and referees to help fill in.

Mr. Keller said when he mentioned field hockey and lacrosse that again starts to imply more numbers. Is this something that would happen after the use of this building in the grand plan for a larger facility or is it something that would begin while using this facility.

Mr. Weber replied the idea is those types of other sports would be added in a new facility. If the field hockey team called and said it was raining and they did not have anywhere to practice in the county can we rent your space for an hour once a week, he certainly would see that as a reasonable use of space. It would be a very small number of people. Again, they were limited by space but it would not be 500 field hockey people every weekend. He would again be looking for some sources of revenue as he grew, but it would not be in the case of high traffic volumes.

Mr. Keller noted although in that case if they are talking about a full team of teenagers that are driving in individual cars they could be talking about 20 cars just from that one group.

Mr. Weber replied that was why he said 15 to 20 cars were fairly reasonable, but not 50 cars.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Scott Houlaitan, a resident of Albemarle County for two years, said he relocated from northeastern Ohio. A facility such as what Mr. Weber is proposing would be a success in northeastern Ohio because weather is less than ideal in the winter months for practicing soccer. They had buildings that were racket clubs at one time since there was a booming racket club development in the 1970's. When the racket clubs went away they had a lot of big spaces that kind of sat empty, and it worked out perfect for indoor soccer facilities. Soccer has become a much faster growing sport in northeastern Ohio in the last 15 years. However, just because of the weather alone and for the kids to do something in the winter months it was an excellent use of the space. The other point was about safety. He had a 9 year old soccer player who has played with indoor leagues inside gymnasiums and quite frankly it is not very safe. They have walls with no padding, the bleachers are close by and the kids are falling on the floor. The real winners here all total will be they have got the building that is empty right now that they are being able to do a new business development. But, more importantly the kids that want to practice and work on their skills can do it in a safer environment that is going to improve their physical well being as well as their skills and their interest in the sport.

Craig Brannon, a soccer professional in town, said he had been coaching soccer for the last 20 years after graduating from the University of Virginia. He played soccer at the University of Virginia and is here

to give a perspective on what this facility could do for the soccer community. In the winter months it is a time for lead athletes to focus on things that are going to give them a competitive advantage during their seasons. A lot of times the things they would focus on in a small space indoors would not necessarily be playing games or trying to do scrimmages. It would be more to try to develop the individual skills of that particular athlete or group of athletes. A lot of times it would be strength building or things they don't really work on during the season. That is something that would be great for the best athletes here in town. He takes teams and players to Richmond right now to compete. This past year he went to Score, which is in downtown Richmond. In this next year he is taking some teams to Midlothian to compete in an indoor league. Down the road he could see a big use of teams and soccer players in town wanting to play indoor soccer if such a facility existed because there currently are a lot of people that are traveling to do so from our current community. He was here just to give a perspective of the soccer community since he thinks it could really be beneficial for our soccer players. There is a lot of passion in this community for soccer.

Alex Jensen, one of the owners of the building, said from the owner's standpoint he understands and agrees with the long term plans of the county. They have a small light industry business in the building. If someone stepped up today wanting to go in the building with a small business classified as light industry they would happily rent it to them. However, they pay $32,000 a year in county taxes on that building and need to generate some income to keep it going. He pointed out Tom Weber has a short term plan and the use can revert back to the long term plan intermediately after Mr. Weber is through with the building. Since the proposed use offered is a clean operation he did not think it is going to cause any trouble for the county. However, it will provide some income so they can keep the building operating and pay the taxes.

Kelly Strickland said he was in support of the application. He wanted to make a couple of quick points about the comprehensive plan since it seems like that is the main argument against recommending approval for the special use permit. He grabbed some stuff out of the proposed draft version of the comp plan under review along with the master plan for the south side area. For economic development there are some things that kind of jump out. He did not see anything in the staff report that directly said this use was not in compliance with the comprehensive plan. However, it sort of related to it. Therefore, he wanted to go through and specifically look at what was in the comp plan ensuring that economic development efforts are supported with the county's growth management policy and consistent with the comprehensive plan goals. That objective did not really tie in with this application. But, the second one provides for the first economic opportunities that benefit county citizens and existing businesses by basing policy decisions on efforts which support and enhance the strength of the county. In section 2.e it says to provide assistance to target industries providing jobs in the arts, designs, sports and media. He thought this was a direct tie in providing assistance with the sports side of it. There are 2 or 3 other ones in there, but he was going to jump over to the master plan part. He knew the Woolen Mills area of the master plan has an existing mixture of industrial residential green space and community recreation uses, and is right in the center of this site. Portions of the property are recommended for Office R&D Flex and Light Industry use. Flex is a word that he wanted to kind of dive in on there. He pointed out Tom Weber is a doctor and a surgeon over at Rockingham Memorial Hospital. He did not mention that, but this is not his job running recreational facilities. It is probably not the county's job, too. There is not a whole lot of support in the county to promote recreation. However, it is great to have people like Tom Weber that want to bring this forward and get it going on the private sector. If the Commission can support it through the special use permit process it is a huge benefit for our community.

Mr. Strickland pointed out regarding flex space that what Mr. Weber is proposing as a training center is not a restaurant, a clothing store or a use one would see in a shopping center. If he put this facility in a commercial shopping center it would look ridiculous. They would get visitors, but it would not be like the uses that are there. The proposed use is much more appropriate intensity wise to a light industrial park and a light industrial use. Therefore, the use works here because what Mr. Weber needs is a warehouse space and it is in the staff packet that he is looking for a warehouse.

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

Mr. Benish pointed out if the Commission has questions that representatives from our Business Development Office are present.

Mr. Lafferty said given the number of other square footage available elsewhere in the county and this has been on the market for nine months, if they can set a time limit on the use and it reverts back to light industry or stays light industry he sees it as basically supporting one of the businesses here in Charlottesville. This is a huge building and it is going unused right now. Therefore, he would support the effort.

Mr. Dotson said he had a question of staff. It was mentioned that on occasion perhaps due to weather that a field hockey group might come in here and the wording in the draft motion condition is soccer facility. He asked would it be appropriate to say soccer and similar sports just to make sure that it is not so narrowly drawn.

Mr. Ron Higgins replied that it would be helpful.

Mr. Lafferty suggested it be plain sports.

Mr. Higgins replied that they were trying to split hair about what sports would be played.

Mr. Morris agreed it was a good point.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks it is important to be mindful that on this street these businesses have not been thriving. Car Quest was located at the end of Broadway and closed a year ago. To his knowledge no one else has moved into that facility. So that business generated a fair amount of traffic because they provided parts for many car repair shops in the area. It was also a retail business and all of that traffic was off Broadway. Other businesses don't draw a lot of traffic. On weekdays Broadway is fairly dead in terms of the traffic volume and number of vehicles on it. He sees a situation where they have an opportunity to use a light industrial facility to become an incubator to help a business get established in Albemarle County, which hopefully somewhere within the neighborhood he would like to have more certainty about the time period because he did hear Mr. Weber say 36 months and then 40 and 44 months. He thinks it is really important if they grant it that it be provisional and the temporary special use permit be related to a very specific figure of an amount of time. However, given an adequacy of time he would have every confidence that Mr. Weber will be successful in establishing his viable business in Albemarle County and thereby will be able to transfer the business hopefully to a site also in the Scottsville District where they can see a full indoor soccer facility locate. With the addition of that precise time frame he would be supportive of the application as Mr. Lafferty has also indicated support.

Mr. Morris said having served businesses that have been in that area for a long time through Piedmont Virginia Community College he thinks it is an excellent building for exactly what he wants. He was sorry they don't have industry there. But, he had a question for Mr. Kamptner because he hears an awful lot of support for this. He asked if this is recommended with approval with a specific time limit that does not go with the building and it will come back to light industry. Then they won't lose it for the light industrial inventory.

Mr. Kamptner replied a special use permit does not affect the underlying zoning district. It just allows this additional use in the district.

Mr. Keller pointed out this has brought up a number of interesting issues. The idea that it is an incubator in an incubator space is really important and they might want to think about that more in the future. He is really curious about what the traffic count is actually going to be. Everyone that has driven that area knows what that underpass is like. It is an accident waiting to happen. When he hears about teams practicing he thinks about young teenage drivers that might not be paying attention in that area. He has reservations, but can support it with a shorter timeframe.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out they don't have to go under that railroad underpass.

Mr. Morris noted there are four ways in and four ways out of the site.

Mr. Randolph said before he makes a motion he would like to ask the applicant what is the time period he feels comfortable with 36, 42 or 44 months.

Mr. Weber replied that he would love to be out there really quickly, but he just worries a little bit about painting himself in a corner. If the Commission would accept 3 ½ years, that would great. If it must be 3 years he would accept that also. He prefers a little hedge room just to provide these guys a good lengthy contract. He did not think he needs 5 years. However, he would like a little more than 3 years, but hopes to be out in 3 years.

Mr. Randolph asked if 4 years would be acceptable, and Mr. Weber agreed that would be great.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out the Board of Supervisors would have to approve it.

Motion: Mr. Randolph moved and Mr. Keller seconded to recommend approval of SP-2014-00013 Broadway Street Soccer (Indoor) with the conditions outlined in the staff report, as amended, for a time period of four (4) years.

Mr. Kamptner recommended some minor revisions to the conditions. In condition 1 indoor athletic facility is the use classification in a commercial district, so athletic facility would be the term. In the last sentence in condition 1 he would suggest that any additional buildings or other site changes related to the athletic facility use be added because this building is only partially used right now and the other half may need to make some site changes. This is just to clarify that this condition is pertaining only to the athletic facility.

Mr. Kamptner noted in both conditions 1 and 2 there are references to attachments A and B and those are mislabeled. He thinks attachment A in condition 1 should be what is attachment B to the staff report and the letter that is referenced in condition 2 is something else. Staff can correct that so that it is an attachment to the Board's staff report.

Mr. Randolph and Mr. Keller agreed to add the modifications as suggested to the motion.

Mr. Morris invited further discussion. There being none, the roll was called.

The motion passed by a vote of (7:0).

Mr. Morris noted that SP-2014-00013 Broadway Street Soccer (Indoor) would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval with the conditions, as amended, on a date to be determined, as follows.

1. The indoor **athletic facility** ~~soccer facility~~ is limited to fifty percent (50%) of the production area, as shown on the Data Visible Corporation Landscaping Plan, prepared by Wiley & Wilson, and dated 4/7/87 (~~Attachment A~~ **Attachment B of staff report**). All parking for the facility shall be located in areas designated on the landscaping plan, referenced above. Any additional buildings or other site changes **related to the indoor athletic facility use**, except for those required by the conditions of this permit, require an amendment to this Special Use Permit;
2. All improvements needed per the letter from Jay Schlothauer, Building Official, dated September 22, 2014 (Attachment B) shall be completed prior to the release of the Certificate of Occupancy (C/O) of 1740 Broadway Street; and
3. SP-2014-00013 shall expire on [~~three~~ **four (4)** years from BOS approval date].

Note: Conditions 1 and 2 references to attachments a. and b. are mislabeled. Attachment A in condition 1 should be what is attached attachment B to the staff report and the letter that is referenced in condition 2 is something else. Staff can correct that so that it is an attachment to the Board's staff report.

b. ZTA-2014-00003 Neighborhood Model Setbacks and Yards – The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on its intent to recommend adoption of an ordinance amending

Secs. 18-3.1, Definitions, Sec. 13.3, Area and bulk regulations, Sec. 14.3, Area and bulk regulations, Sec. 15.3, Area and bulk regulations, Sec. 15.6, Building separation, Sec. 16.3, Area and bulk regulations, Sec. 16.6, Building separation, Sec. 17.3, Area and bulk regulations, Sec. 17.6, Building separation, Sec. 17.8, Height regulations, Sec. 18.3, Area and bulk regulations, Sec. 18.6, Building separation, Sec. 18.8, Height regulations, Sec. 19.7, Height regulations, Sec. 19.8, Building separation, Sec. 19.9, Setback and yard regulations, Sec. 20.8.4, Height regulations, Sec. 20.8.5, Building separation, Sec. 20.8.6, Setback and yard regulations, Sec. 21.4, Height regulations, Sec. 21.7, Minimum yard requirements, Sec. 21.9,Building separation, Sec. 26.4, Structure height and setback, Sec. 26.5, Minimum yards, and adding Sec. 4.11.5, Setbacks and stepbacks in residential districts, and Sec. 4.11.6, Setbacks and stepbacks in conventional commercial and industrial districts, to Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code. This ordinance would amend Sec. 18-3.1 by adding a definition of "infill," amend Secs. 13.3 through 26.5 identified above by establishing new minimum and maximum setbacks for front yards (street or sidewalk setbacks) and providing for different setbacks for front yards on streets qualifying as infill, adding a minimum garage setback in residential districts, amending minimum sideyard setbacks (building separation), continuing existing rear yard setbacks, adding new minimum stepback requirements for buildings more than 40 feet or 3 stories in height, and allowing various minimum and maximum standards to be modified by special exception. The new standards would be in new Secs. 4.11.5 and 4.11.6 referenced above. This ordinance also would make technical changes to sections being amended. A copy of the full text of the ordinance is 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. (Ron Higgins)

Mr. Ron Higgins noted this is an effort the county has been involved in for many years since 2001. He would first like to point out that in the staff report he actually titled this Neighborhood Model District Setback. That is a missed number, which was his fault, and Neighborhood Model Districts have their own setbacks. They are not changing any planned development districts other than conventional districts. This is for the Development Area Conventional Zoning Districts only.

Over the years they have had a number of efforts to discuss and had resolutions of intent to have work sessions and the like. However, they have never come to an agreement on the Conventional District Neighborhood Model. They have looked at setback reductions in every direction. What he would like to start with is a series of slides from the Places29 efforts and other efforts that they have been working on that will show the Commission what they are trying to achieve.

In the slide presentation he gave examples of how the Neighborhood Model form and concept can work in the Development Areas. He showed examples of what could happen when they start applying reduced setbacks and Neighborhood Model principles with pedestrian orientation, relegated parking, etc. for infill and new development. This is an effort or one of the tools that could be used to make the Development Area a place you want to be as they start infilling and redeveloping sections with reduced setbacks. As development occurs in a Neighborhood Model form and as it continues to infill it starts to provide the kind of street they are looking for.

The Neighborhood Model District was adopted in 2003. It was used extensively in new development and new rezoning for Planned Developments and new developments. All of our resolutions of intent since 2005 have been focusing on this effort to look at conventional districts.

At the work session the Planning Commission asked staff to come back for a public hearing after they put together a presentation and graphics, photos, a simple explanation and provided it with the Community Advisory Councils (CACs), Building Official, Fire Marshall and other important folks in the effort. Staff actually went out to find examples where some of these adjacencies might create issues with some of the new setbacks, and they have had a hard time finding them. They found examples all over the county, illustrated them, took them to the CACs and showed them how it would play out in the existing proposed ordinances. Tonight staff handed out a chart or table form of what they are going to illustrate with these drawings. These are the before and after setbacks for the proposed changes. (Attachment - Three charts or tables summarizing the proposed changes regarding the Proposed Residential Setbacks, Proposed

Commercial Setbacks and Proposed Industrial Setbacks. Attachments are available with the written minutes in the office of the clerk). Staff explained the different scenarios.

Staff proposes creating a building zone for the front setback with a maximum of 20' and a minimum of 5'. They are also looking at garages and trying to make sure that they are at least 3' behind the front wall of the residence and 18' from the back of the sidewalk or the property so they could have enough room for a vehicle in front of the garage. It provides a little bit of flexibility and allows the houses over time to be closer. Staff also wanted to address infill because they have lots of old neighborhoods in the development areas that have fairly well established patterns. They don't want to do something that automatically has a row of houses being faced with a new house that is 5' from the street. So staff created an average. They defined infill as when you have 40 percent of the residential lot that are fronting on the street within 500' in both directions. If the lots are developed, then that establishes the average. The examples show that with the conventional right now they could put the house anywhere from 25' back; whereas, in a new development they have the ability to have it at least be no further back than the furtherest and no closer than the closest. Over time it would start to begin make a more compatible infill.

There is a current provision that if you go over 35' in height the entire building has to move away from the rear, side and front setback. That is awkward and very difficult to do. Staff applied that to a bunch of sites in the county and it just did not seem applicable. It would not really change the outcome. The exception is in the R-10 and R-15. Those are the highest density residential districts and the only residential districts where you can exceed 35' in height. Because of that they may have an adjacency with such a small setback to begin with of 10' to 15' depending on where you are or a 20' rear setback. That may be an opportunity to have an additional setback when it is adjacent to single-family or rural area. Therefore, staff proposed the following:

R-10 & R-15 Additional Setback

- In cases of both "non-infill" and "infill" in R-10 and R-15 districts, building separations and side yards as well as rear yards would be required to increase the entire setback one foot for each additional foot the building exceeds 35 feet in height when abutting residential other than R-10 and R-15, Rural Areas, or the Monticello Historic District.

This is the way it is now when adjacent to commercial. There is no side or rear yard setback, but the front is 30'. The proposal is to have 10' minimum with a 30' maximum. The minimum is based on what they now require as a minimum for parking. The maximum is what they now require as a minimum. Over time these streets will start to transform.

The same thing would apply when adjacent to residential in rural area. There is a 15' side yard setback and 50' rear yard setback, which is not being changed. That has been part of the issue in previous attempts of changing the side and rear setbacks and the adjacency got too uncomfortable for some projects. So the side and rear would remain the same. The front is going to have a built to or a maximum band, which would be 30'. That came out of the CAC meeting at Route 29.

Staff gave a presentation to the Crozet and Places29 Community Advisory Councils (CACs). The Crozet CAC was generally supportive. A lot of this actually comes out of what they do now in their Downtown Crozet District. So the Crozet CAC saw it as a positive. The Places 29 CAC group was generally supportive. However, some businesses had concerns about the 30' maximum for car dealerships or a drive in lane or drive in window. That is almost impossible to achieve in 30'. The answer to that is uses like that have to get a special use permit for vehicle display or for a drive in lane or window. Then you would be able to address a special exception. If they were willing to grant a special use permit, then they would be able to consider a special exception when the Board adopts the special use permit. Special exceptions have been built in for all of the minimum/maximum and extreme that they put in the diagrams.

In the industrial currently there are no setbacks in the rear or side and 15' minimum front setback. Staff proposes 10' minimum and 15' maximum. Again, in our industrial districts it is not changing the side and rear when adjacent to residential or rural area. No change is proposed for LI, which has a 50' setback, or HI, which has a 100' setback.

Mr. Higgins reviewed the chart layouts and explained the proposal with examples, which included the following special exceptions.

- Minimum/Maximum infill street setbacks.
- Maximum non-infill street setbacks.
- Minimum/Maximum Commercial/Industrial Street setbacks.
- Minimum building height "stepbacks".
- Minimum residential separations/side yards.
- Minimum Commercial/Industrial Side & Rear yards abutting single-family or RA zoning.

Generic example: Detailed examples in staff report show this separately for Residential, Commercial and Industrial districts with front setbacks different for each.

Recommendation

- Staff recommends approval of the proposed ordinance changes –ZTA-2014-00003 as presented in Attachment A.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff.

Mr. Dotson noted this proposal has been before two of the CACs. He asked has there been any meeting of developers to give feedback on these. Some of the things he finds difficult to judge the practicality of and it would useful to hear from somebody who does development.

Mr. Higgins replied there was two ways to answer that. One is there were some developers or people who develop at the Places29 group and staff has actually heard individually from some. This has been published beyond just the CAC's. The other answer though is that in our experience on a daily basis with people who are doing development in the Development Area there is a certain amount of frustration that they don't have the ability to do this. Staff has been getting a sense that developers have been waiting for something like this for a while but they never have quite put something together that they all could be comfortable with.

Mr. Dotson said his other general question is in looking back to refresh his own mind about the 2001 Neighborhood Model Study and looking at the setbacks, building heights and so forth that a distinction is made between standards that are appropriate in the fringe area versus the general area versus the core area. There are actually four different areas. He asked if they have considered applying these. Right now his understanding is that they apply in all four exactly the same. He asked have they considered applying it in some of the more urban and intense areas and maybe looking at the fringe a little differently.

Mr. Higgins replied that staff looked at those four areas. What he is talking about actually had five zones and went all the way through the rural area. It looked like a way to gradually have this transition occur. When they looked at the practical applications of this in all of the conventional zones they got a series of zoning maps that would show how many properties like this apply and if it is a vacant property, etc. Staff did a lot of iterations and kept finding that it did not make a whole lot of difference for two reasons. One, is they are not messing with the side and rear setbacks very much. In previous iterations they really were dramatically messing with the side and rear especially when commercial was adjacent to that. So they did not really have that kind of adjacency that created a friction. The other thing is that they just did not have that many examples of it. So it is easier to apply this particular set to all four zones. It obviously does not apply to rural or village residential. It took staff months to come to that conclusion.

Mr. Dotson noted that it was a little bit of a jump to arrive at the same conclusion. He understands it in the center and as he moves out it is harder to understand. He thinks that one of the objectives is to provide different kinds of areas so people can chose different lifestyles with footprints on the land. He has a little

concern that if they don't within the development areas allow some fairly green appearing streets that might impel people to jump over into the rural area.

Mr. Higgins noted that was a good point.

Mr. Keller said he thinks it is going in the right direction, but he has concerns with historic districts and accessory apartments. He voiced concern that the proposed front setbacks would affect the front rhythm of existing development.

Mr. Higgins pointed out when you do an average it gets to be a burden on the applicant because they would have to survey it to determine what the average is. It is a burden on the county because they have to be able to administrate it in a relatively easy way. Another way of looking at the furtherest one back and the closest one is that it is pretty easy in the field for a field inspector to know whether or not they have the right setback. He was worried about whether or not it had a practical application for the staff carrying it out. So staff kept it kind of simple and took a first step.

Ms. Firehock asked how they are factoring in a more urban model where they have the sidewalk and then a buffer between the sidewalk and the street where they wanted a planting bed. She was trying to figure where they start counting the setback.

Mr. Higgins replied currently if they have a sidewalk they are going to start at the back of the sidewalk. A lot of sidewalks in Albemarle County end up on the private property. If they don't have the sidewalk, then it is the right-of-way width.

Ms. Firehock asked if the tree planting bed would be counted as part of the setback.

Mr. Cilimberg replied in the classic case it would not because it would be between the street and the sidewalk. The setback is measured from the back of the sidewalk.

Ms. Firehock noted concern with installing a lot of sidewalks without a buffer next to fast moving traffic such as on Route 29.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks it is great they have a definition of infill. It will be helpful for developers.

Mr. Morris opened the work session for public comment.

Valerie Long said she was not present representing any particular client this evening, but was just interested in the resolutions. She thinks the resolutions will impact so many of her clients. It is the case that many of the proposals here will make things easier in many districts, particularly the reductions in the front setback minimums. However, her main concern has to do with the imposition of new regulations that impose a setback maximum in her read in every zoning district where there are no maximum setbacks today unless the developer specifically and voluntarily proffers them as part of their code of development. However, right now in the R-15 zoning district you can build an apartment building and you can have it setback from the road as far as you might want it to be setback, which among other things it allows for a row of parking in front of the building. Under the proposed regulations there is a new setback in all residential districts, which would include R-15 and in fact PUD zoning. She thinks the front setback could arguably apply to a project like Branchlands. However, specifically the example she is most concerned with is in a R-15, R-10 or PUD zone where they can build an apartment building they now have this new requirement that your building cannot be further away from the road or the edge of the right-of-way than 30'. Among other things it severely restricts if not completely eliminates realistically the opportunity for parking in the front. She pointed out that was a huge impact on multi-family apartment projects or even a smaller apartment project of townhouses or duplexes that want to have parking in front.

Ms. Long noted that relegated parking is a Neighborhood Model element. However, that is a significant change on a by-right use. It is one thing to start requiring relegated parking, which they do as part of rezoning and special use permits. Applicants know that going in and she informs her clients this is probably what they are going to have to agree to. But, there is a lot of R-15 zoned land out there or other properties that were zoned under rezoning approvals that don't have that maximum setback in place. All of a sudden by her read there are going to be hit with that and they have not planned for it. Likewise, it

applies to the C-1 and CO zoning districts. Similarly, it will have a similar humongous impact on property values to not be able to have parking in the front of your building. She does not think the staff report explained that very well. This is the first that she knew about these coming up. There were roundtables three years ago. She thinks it would have been very helpful to get the development community together. They talked about it today at the Free Enterprise Forum since it was new to all of us that these requirements were coming this way. She would ask the Commission to consider that very strongly. She has a number of other things including the new requirement that garages all be setback.

Mr. Morris noted that her time was up.

Ms. Long said she had other questions and concerns that she would love to talk about if someone would ask.

Mr. Morris invited further public comment.

Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, said he shares many of Ms. Long's concerns. First and foremost, this is a process that they have been working on. He attended the roundtables and remembers the discussions as far back as 2002. This really goes back to the idea of Disc and Disc II and these issues coming forward. It has been interesting that the more flexibility that is necessary seems to be the harder thing to get. The relegated parking, which was mentioned by Ms. Long, was something they got done in about five years from the time Disc came about. This is now 2014 and this is moving forward. He shares Ms. Long's concern about maximums. However, he was happy to see it moving forward. He did not want to push too hard against the proposal because he thinks there are a lot of good things in here. He hopes the Commission will listen to some of the concerns. He understands the Commission wants the regulations to mirror the Neighborhood Model goals of relegated parking. There are real good reasons that they might want to have parking in front, such as ADA, and to prohibit by ordinance in this manner seems backwards.

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

Mr. Loach asked staff to address exceptions and if they apply, and Mr. Higgins replied that the special exceptions would apply to any of the standards in the chart.

The Planning Commission held a discussion with staff on the proposed ordinance language based on the information presented regarding the following issues:

- Minimum/Maximum infill street setbacks.
- Maximum non-infill street setbacks.
- Minimum/Maximum Commercial/Industrial Street setbacks.
- Minimum building height "stepbacks".
- Minimum residential separations/side yards.
- Minimum Commercial/Industrial Side & Rear yards abutting single-family or RA zoning.
- Infill residential says structures within 5'. What if it is an existing barn or detached garage? Should it say "residential structures"? (Staff suggested possible change to "primary structure".)
- Potential of a lot of trouble to do average, but to take one that is an odd ball and making it the norm is questionable.
- Cost of surveying average setback will be smaller than the potential gain.
- Concern with the setback on garages in front of the house and the appearance from the street.

- Having the opportunity for the building to be as close as the parking on the side and rear certainly does not hurt anything if the design lends itself to that.
- Change industrial maximum setback to what is in current ordinance.
- Mr. Keller strongly supported "anti snout" development.
- Needs another round of conversation not only thinking about setbacks but thinking about built to lines so they are really getting what you want out of the final approach. Perhaps there is some formula for setbacks that could be thought about that does not become some over the top mathematical experience.
- Have more specificity on what the exceptions would be so they would know when they would be eligible for the exception.
- Support the proposal, but it should be studied more with input from the development community.

Mr. Morris invited Ms. Long to address her other concerns.

Valerie Long commented to the new requirement that the garages be setback 3'. Again, she was not alleging that is not an unreasonable goal. From an aesthetic perspective goal as others have recognized it does look better to have garages either side loaded or be set back. There are two concerns. In many neighborhoods, especially with newer Neighborhood Model Development Districts lots are smaller and a side loaded garage requires a wider lot. Those are probably not going to be side loaded because there is not enough room to fit the lots in because they are smaller. At the Planning staff's request as part of the code of development there is a provision in the code that says the garages have to be setback 3'. They knew that as part of the rezoning and our client was comfortable with that. They talked about it with all their proposed home builders and said make sure they could comply with this. Other projects out there have not made those plans and arrangements. This will be a new burden that they are not aware of. Perhaps it is achievable to accommodate it, but her concern is it a new regulation that they are not aware of that could have a significant impact on a project that is in the plans or has been approved and there is flexibility on this in the current approvals. It is a principle of the Neighborhood Model that is being imposed now in every single zoning district she thinks without good public discussion about it among the development community. That is her concern as well on that as well as the maximum setbacks that will apply to all zones. The development and business community needs to be brought into this discussion. She pointed out on the whole the ordinance if they stripped out the maximum setbacks and the 3' setback for the garages, everything else is very positive. It does provide the flexibility that has been discussed and it is beneficial. The special exception is another huge time commitment obligation and a huge cost increase for the landowners to have to worry about whether their special exception will be granted or not.

The Planning Commission delayed action on ZTA-2014-00003 and directed staff to meet with the development community for input and then bring the ZTA back with updated ordinance language to the Commission for action.

The Planning Commission took a break at 8:08 and reconvened at 8:15 p.m.

Work Session:

7a. FY2016-2020 CIP

Trevor Henry, Director of Facilities Development and Lindsay Harris, Budget Analyst of Office of Management and Budget, presented a Power-Point presentation regarding the FY 2016-2020 CIP that included an update following TRC/FRC, review rankings from TRC, current CIP State and initial CIP scenario, and to provide opportunity for Commission input that will inform Mr. Randolph, Planning Commission representative on the Oversight Committee (OSC). No formal action was requested. (PowerPoint Presentation on file with written minutes in Clerk's Office)

Mr. Henry discussed the following issues with the Planning Commission:

- Update following Technical Review Committee (TRC) / Financial Review Committee (FRC) Phase
- Review rankings from TRC
- Current CIP State and initial CIP Scenario
- Opportunity for Planning Commission input that will inform PC representative on Oversight Committee (OSC)
- Process Schedule
- Technical Review Committee Project Submittals and Review
- Guiding Principles: 1 – 11
- FY 16 Summary of Requests
- Project Ranking & Criteria Categories
- Mandates/Obligations (Priority funded)
- Maintenance/Replacement Requests
- Non – Maintenance Project Requests
- Initial Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Recommendation (5 year Plan "Scenario 2")
- Oversight Committee's Charge

Summary/Next Steps
- Summary of today's meeting
- First OSC meeting: Monday, November 17, 2:30 p.m.
- Next CIP update to Planning Commission anticipated on December 16, 2014.

The Planning Commission discussed the issues as an informational session only with no formal action taken, and provided comments and suggestions:
- asked for additional information on the ranking process;
- suggested identifying other funding sources such as pursuing available grant funding, volunteer programs, etc.;
- getting more public participation and input on projects; and
- provide a column in the chart that shows budget # for each item and at bottom show overall % of projects that got funded.

Presentation:

7b. 29 Solutions Projects (Mark Graham)

Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, presented a PowerPoint presentation on the 29 Solutions Projects for informational purposes only.

The Planning Commission received a presentation, asked questions and provided comments. No formal action was taken.

Old Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business. There being no old business, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- Joint City/County Planning Commission work session will be held on Tuesday, November 18, 2014 in meeting room 241.

There being no further new business, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:32 p.m. to the Tuesday, November 18, 2014 Joint Albemarle County and City of Charlottesville Planning Commission meeting at 6:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, 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)