Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 3, 2015

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, February 3, 2015, 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, Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair; Bruce Dotson, and Tim Keller. Thomas Loach was absent. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Staff present was Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Claudette Grant, Senior Planner; 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 6:00 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.

Committee Reports:

Mr. Morris invited committee reports.

The following committee reports were given:

Mr. Lafferty reported the MPO Policy Board discussed unallocated funds from the bypass; the nomination process and the need to rewrite the process for the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee; and received an update from CAT, Jaunt and UVA Transit Service. Ms. Monteith noted a new bike sharing program (UBikes) was just opened on UVA grounds that was open to the community. Anyone interested can go on the University website and take a look.

Mr. Kamptner arrived at 6:02 p.m.

Ms. Firehock arrived at 6:03 p.m.

Mr. Randolph reported on the following:

- The Rivanna Community Advisory Council to set agenda for this year; look at transportation on the 250 Corridor and how open space affects the Village.
- The Historic Preservation website progressing and they discussed demolition permits and ways to be able to photograph and record the house prior to its final destruction.

Ms. Firehock reported the Natural Heritage Committee had a lecture on the problem of invasive plants and ways to rescue rare and endangered plants when there is a development proposal.

Mr. Lafferty provided an update on the 29 Solutions proposed amendment to exclude basically the Culpeper District which would kill 29 Solutions.

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

Consent Agenda:

a. **Approval of minutes**: September 16, 2014 and July 8, 2014

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

Motion: Ms. Firehock moved and Mr. Dotson seconded for approval of the consent agenda.

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

Mr. Morris said the consent agenda was approved.

Work Session

CPA201400003 Woolen Mills
Request to Clarify Land Use Expectations for Woolen Mills Area in Recommended Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan. (Elaine Echols)

Ms. Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation regarding CPA-2014-00003 Woolen Mills regarding the request to clarify land use expectations for the Woolen Mills Area recommended Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plans. Also, Claudette Grant has been working on this and should this proceed to a rezoning she may be the planner. She has had a lot of involvements in the floodplain aspects here and might be able to explain some questions as they go through this.

Purpose of Work Session

- Review the recommended changes to Woolen Mills Neighborhood description in the Southern Urban Neighborhood Master Plan as noted in the staff report. They are mainly clarifications with some explanation.
- Review recommended changes to the Land Use Categories and Guidelines, which is a table at the end of the chapter.
- Provide recommendations to Board of Supervisors.

Ultimately after the Planning Commission has finished the discussion tonight there needs to be a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors that staff will provide to them at their meeting next Tuesday.

Woolen Mills is a neighborhood that is located on the east side of Charlottesville. Our boundaries in that particular area are not the river because right across the river is the State Farm building. The property that started this discussion was the Old Mills property. She pointed out the City of Charlottesville, East Market Street and Broadway Street, which would serve as the access into the property.

The Planning Commission spent some time working on this with the Southern and Western Neighborhood Master Plan recommendations. They may recall that this is recommended as a Center in this area. This is an existing industrial area. She pointed out the Moore's Creek Wastewater Treatment Plan. As they also remember there is a lot of floodplain. The floodplain is located next to this parcel and it actually covers a good part of that parcel. The property owner who owned the Mill Property at the time came and talked to the Commission about the extent of the green that is Parks and Green System shown on the recommended plan. The property owner asked the Commission to move that green off of his property. The Commission explained to him that green represented where the floodplain was. However, if the floodplain boundaries were ever changed that they would consider that change to go with the green so that if it came out of the floodplain it would no longer be considered as part of Parks and Green Systems on the plan.

Since that time and during some of the Comprehensive Plan work staff has been talking to a contract purchaser for the property about redeveloping the historic mills site. Susan Stimart, who is part of our Economic Development staff, is here in the audience. Ms. Stimart has also been working extensively on this project from the standpoint of growing our employment opportunities in the County. So the applicant for a change in land use has been talking to us about the floodplain, the proposed redevelopment of the site, and the opportunities for economic growth that relate to that particular site.

Applicant's Request

- Initially – "transitional" land use designation
- Desire for mixture of uses – light industrial type with residential and some commercial
- Clarification of amount of residential that could be done with Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial designation

Background on Woolen Mills Recommendations
Initially, the applicant wanted to have a "transitional" land use designation that they are not using any more in our list of uses. However, as they talked more and more it became clear that what the applicant wanted was a mixture of uses definitely with an industrial and employment component to it, but also with a fair amount of residential. What staff has been telling him was that as long as it was less than 50 percent or less than half, meaning as long as the residential was a secondary use with our interpretation being less than half, then it would be in keeping with Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial designation that they had shown on the plan.

As they also remember during the development of the Comprehensive Plan they wanted to retain those properties that are currently zoned industrially so that they could continue to grow the economy in the County. The applicant basically agreed with us as long as it was clear that they were talking about less than half and not getting more specific than that. For example, is it 49.5 percent or 45.9 percent and not to worry so much about the precision since land use is about guidance. But, to be clear in the recommendation that says you can have residential provided it is secondary and not primary.

Staff has taken what the Planning Commission looked at and recommended to the Board of Supervisors with the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan and modified it to put more emphasis on the preservation of the historic buildings to give a better description of what is there now. It was also to talk about the fill in the floodplain and then the less than half of the total built square footage to be used residentially.

Recommended Changes
- More comprehensive description
- More emphasis on preservation of historic buildings
- Explanation of relationship to fill in the floodplain
- "Less than half of the total built square footage" to be used residentially

One of the reasons it has taken so long to get to the Planning Commission is because of this issue with the floodplain. The floodplain right now is based on topography that our County Engineer believes could be updated to better reflect the actual floodplain. There have been changes to the topography in our Development Areas over time. The owner of the property has submitted an application to FEMA using current topographic information to make a case that the floodplain really is not this extensive. When it is all said and done our County Engineer believes that while the buildings may still be in the floodplain the floodplain boundary will be less than what is shown in this particular area. That is important because it will then present an opportunity for fill in the floodplain, which would allow for the buildings to no longer be in the floodplain. The mechanics of that are a little bit complicated. They are things that they would be considering in conjunction with a future special use permit and potentially a future rezoning.

What they are trying to do tonight is to talk about setting the stage for the future use of land in this particular area especially as it relates to the floodplain. That is important because it is such a valuable historic resource. Retaining the buildings that are part of the Woolen Mills Historical District is just a very important thing. It gives the character to this particular area.

In the language provided in the staff report staff looked very carefully at the Land Use Guidelines. One of the benefits of being able to spend a year on the Comprehensive Plan recommendations is they find places in our recommendations that may be improved. They found some general edits in the Land Use Guidelines. Also, since they are going to be using those Land Use Guidelines for the Village of Rivanna as well, even though there are only three categories, they wanted to make sure they got the Village Center in the legend. It just says go to the master plan, which describes what the Village Center is.

They found that our Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial designation was not as close to the Places29 designation as they had intended. Therefore, staff provided some suggestions. They also wanted to clarify how Parks and Green Systems are interpreted when it comes to land use density. It is something that has been very near and dear to the Village of Rivanna in terms of if one sees green on a piece of property is the area that is shown in green available for calculating density. The answer is no, and staff was trying to clarify that.

In just going through these changes to the Land Use Guidelines it important that staff tells them about this because it does again relate to the Woolen Mills project, which is shown for Office\R&D\Flex\Light Industrial. Staff wanted to describe it as the category that is sort of light Industrial. This designation represents a category of employment-generating uses with the lightest impacts in the industrial use category, but has fewer impacts other than perhaps traffic. Uses in this designation may generate significant employee traffic, depending on the size and use of the facility.

These are primary uses that can be done individually or in any combination with these other uses except for Light Industrial. Light Industrial has to be combined with other uses in the category. So it is not the primary use.

Office - which includes commercial office buildings that may house a variety of users and professional offices, such as medical or real estate office

Research and Development (R&D) - which includes design, experimentation, development of prototypes, engineering, scientific applications, and administration, especially in the fields of medical technology, communication systems, transportation, multi-media, and development of electronic technology, communication systems, or information systems.

Flex includes businesses with several integrated uses, such as very light manufacturing facility, warehousing, showrooms, and space that can be reconfigured as a business grows or adds products. Flex has to do with a building's capacity for being reconfigured as it does with the kinds of uses that might go in an area.

Light industrial - light manufacturing, fabrication, and distribution, but must be combined with Office, R&D, or Flex uses and have few impacts on surrounding uses (e.g., noise, vibrations, and odors).

Secondary Uses
Our secondary uses did not talk about retail/commercial, but about residential. Retail and commercial uses are supportive of primary uses in the Office\R&D\Flex\Light Industrial and need to be available for that particular category. That is what was done with the Land Use Guidelines in the secondary uses.

Parks and Green Systems Description
This designation represents areas for parks, recreation, environmental preservation, and areas otherwise not intended for development. Land with this designation cannot be used to calculate available density for a parcel of land. That is for the Land Use Plan and not for zoning, which is totally different. In terms of providing land use guidance this is saying that if it is green it is not to be developed residentially. If someone was looking for how much density can be on a piece of land if there is green shown on it, you can't use that. That is the way it has been in all of the comprehensive plans. However, it needed to be clarified because it was giving some of our residents some concerns that it was not clear.

Parks and Green Systems Primary Uses
Parks, and playgrounds, play fields, greenways, trails, paths, recreational equipment and facilities, outdoor sitting areas, and natural areas. Also includes preservation of stream buffers, floodplains, known wetlands, and slopes of greater than 25% adjacent to rivers and streams. Property may be owned publicly or privately.

Ms. Echols said staff would be happy to answer questions. The applicants are here for the transitional land use designation, but they have talked so extensively that is no longer what they are asking for. However, they may have some other things to share.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff. There being none, he opened the work session to the applicant and to public comment. He invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Pete Caramanis, attorney representing the applicant, said they look forward to the possibility of redeveloping this site, preserving it for future generations and making it a vibrant part of the community again. He thanked Ms. Echols for the summary. As Ms. Echols said they filed this comp plan application initially because our proposal involved more residential than 49 percent. They believe they would need that designation to transitional to allow us to do that. Through the discussions with staff about the project there were basically two sticking points. One was the floodplain, which they talked about. The other was the percentage and ratio between the residential use and the light industrial/commercial use. They have over time continued to reevaluate that.

Mr. Caramanis explained that the residential component is very important to the redevelopment from an economic perspective as far as what is required to actually get the funds to do this work as well as the ability to preserve these buildings without too much renovation that actually would then disturb their historic nature. In looking at the designation and as it is described on page 5 of the report it says less than one-half of the total building square footage will be used residentially they have determined that seems to be potentially a feasible way of doing this. It would avoid our need for a comp plan amendment and allow us to go directly to the rezoning. Our intention is to rezone to Neighborhood Model and allow for this mixed use project. Also, the special use permit for fill in the floodplain would take those buildings out of the floodplain. So that is where they are now. The increased residential would still be helpful in getting the project done. However, our focus at this point is on trying to meet what staff has told us as well, which is that they prefer a higher ratio of Light Industrial because they feel there is a need out there for that. They are certainly willing to explore that and try to get this project to meet within their requirements. He pointed out Brian Roy who is the manager of the entity that is the contract purchaser is here. He is going to share with the Commission some more specific details about the project. Then either of us would be happy to answer questions.

Brian Roy, representative for the contract purchaser, said he was going to put a visual on the computer so that they can get a feel for the project. It is his pleasure to introduce this tremendous development opportunity and it is a somewhat undiscovered diamond in the rough in the county right on the edge of the city. The heart of the Woolen Mill neighborhood is such a unique property that offers the ability to preserve a valuable historical asset. It traces its roots back before the Civil War and when this property was arguably the gateway to Downtown Charlottesville. It is at the end of Market Street and at the intersection of the Rivanna and Moore's Creek. So it offers a tremendous opportunity to engage the river. He provided views of the property that shows the four-story main building, along with the two buildings that are actually connected, but can serve as kind of independent buildings. This type of project is more prevalent in cities across the state, including in Roanoke, Lynchburg and Richmond where the Tobacco Row Warehouses have been redeveloped and converted to primarily residential loft apartments along the river. They have revitalized an otherwise depressed area. Most of these buildings preserve the historic character of the original structure and allow for a touch of the historic and the industrial ambience. Such is the case here with Woolen Mills, but even more so given the tremendous quality of the buildings that were constructed in the raw condition as they remain today. Luckily the property has not seen a major renovation over 100 years, which keeps the charm intact, and it only enhances a project like this given that historic character. Unfortunately, as you would expect from buildings this old they are desperately in need of an adaptive reuse.

Mr. Roy said the site also allows an unprecedented opportunity to engage the river and expose the community to an area that has never been seen unless you are trespassing on private property. The idea is to open the eastern portion of this property at the end of Market Street essentially to the public and maybe even make an expansion of Riverview Park and expose that area to provide for outdoor activities and even a business centered on the river like a kayak rental or guide service. The Rivanna Trail actually has a trailhead that sits on the edge of this property. But, it does not offer a connection to the trail on the south side of Moore's Creek. As many joggers know they start at Riverview Park and they generally head north on the trail. If they are doing the entire 20 mile loop they finish at the Rivanna and in the last 100 yards they have to trudge through the water and along the bank of the Rivanna to get back to their cars at

Riverview Park. Therefore, he thinks this is a tremendous opportunity to connect that trail. His plan contemplates a bridge to cross Moore's Creek, which is about 100 feet. It would connect the trails directly from the existing trailhead to the trail side on the south. The other purpose for that bridge is such as if you get on the other side **of** Moore's Creek you can look back at the retaining wall of the property. That retaining wall is actually the original Mill that existed from the mid to late 1800's. It ccollapsed on itself and now that serves as the retaining wall on Moore's Creek. So it is a valuable historic piece of history that has not been seen.

Mr. Roy noted he wanted to focus a little bit on the visuals to give an idea of what the property looks like. It has tremendous windows across the entire building. He explained the views along the retaining wall along Moore's Creek and the original mill that is now serving as that retaining wall. It is a beautiful development and a one of kind opportunity. However, there exists some significant challenges with the most significant the floodplain. The map has been redrawn and has been submitted to FEMA. When they looked at the original floodplain that Elaine Echols showed it covered the majority of the building. By checking the calculations and redoing the survey of the Rivanna at points south and north and seeing the impact on this property it now reflects that the floodplain has been lowered roughly by about 4'. It takes the floodplain out of the finished first floor elevation. The property still has a little bit of exposure to the floodplain, but now it is along the basement line such that if they are able to fill in the basement that conceivably gets the building out of the floodplain with the basement wall now serving as the retaining wall. The floodplain right now goes up to the level of the windows. It comes down under the basement portion by lowering it. If the arches are filled in that becomes by default a flood wall, and as such takes the building out of the floodplain and allows for some development to occur in the buildings. The water tower has a tremendous historic value that predates the buildings back into the 1800's.

Mr. Roy said obviously, the other major challenge that exists is conforming to the current Albemarle County Light Industrial (LI) zoning. He has tried to put together an attractive plan that allows for a mixed use site that will attract a defined light industrial user that could compliment the residential portion and yet still provide the economic necessity of the project. He did not yet have a committed user. So adjusting to the county parameters of the majority of the property is nonresidential versus residential is a significant challenge. It might be too much to overcome, but to attract a LI user with rates that are commemorate with what those businesses are willing to pay versus what is required to fully preserve the building in its historic capacity might not match up. So what he has proposed is the build a new building that would more in line with what a light industrial user might like. On the western side of the property in taking advantage of the topography this building footprint could be about 23,000 square feet. So having a 2-story structure could add up to about 46,000 square feet. It would allow for an entrance on grade on the high side, which could be offices and more industrial usage on the low side. So they could have a 2-story structure that would have plenty of parking and dedicated uses from both sides. He hopes this plan gives the Commission a good background of the efforts to date and the tremendous potential of the property. As it sits this plan allows for 51.4 percent of nonresidential versus 48.6 percent residential.

Mr. Morris invited questions for Mr. Roy.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Roy to detail some of the challenges he sees in trying to retrofit LI into those two buildings in terms of the columns and configuration of the building.

Mr. Roy replied the amount of windows in the structure is not energy efficient. There is a balance that needs to be struck when doing historic preservation by keeping those windows as it was 100 years ago for a LI user. As such the costs to preserve this building are pretty substantial and could be argued potentially greater than if a new structure was built. As they know a LI user probably would only want four corrugated steel walls and to keep their rent low. They don't need the historic character, which would be wasted on some light industrial users. So it makes it a significant challenge. The other problem with this property is the access. If they needed a loading dock they don't exist really on this site. There is an artificial one that is just a concrete base, but it does not allow for good access to transport goods in that way. That is why a new building taking advantage of the topography could allow for up-to-date parking and loading docks that would allow for a LI user. There are potentially LI users that could compliment the residential piece. He hopefully has talked to some, but nothing has been committed to.

Mr. Randolph asked in terms of FEMA are they are doing their floodplain analysis based on 100 year storm.

Mr. Roy replied that was correct. The maps have been submitted to FEMA and are in a 45 day window of review. They should get that back in early March. When that process is completed FEMA will issue a letter of map revision which says they accept the new drawings which will essentially allow this property to move forward.

Mr. Morris asked while doing the research if there are any records available as to the results of the back to back 100-year floods in the 1973-1974 time frames.

Mr. Roy replied absolutely. It is a great question. It is kind of ironic that FEMA says that this building has a chance of flooding based on calculations when the building has withstood 100 years and has seen 2 100-year floods. In Hurricane Camille in 1969 was the largest ever recorded rainfall theoretically possible. The parking area on the eastern side of the property did flood. Areas under the basement did get exposed to water. They can see the level in the basement of where that flood existed. It is still a good 10' away from the finished first floor. The beauty that they have of this property is it has only had one owner since it was an operating mill, and that owner can attest to that there has never been any water damage on the first floor. As such they have history that tells us if they enclose those basements and extend the retaining wall along the floodplain designation you will not have any exposure to potentially another mass flood situation.

Ms. Firehock said the presentation was very helpful especially with the arches and floodwalls. She really commends him for on this site. It is really difficult to do these types of project. A 100 year flood is always a confusing thing for people. It just means a one percent chance in any given year that you would have a flood of that magnitude. It is a percentage and not a timeframe. Given the location of the project along the Rivanna and Moore's Creek, both of which are impaired waters, if they have a lot of parking up at the top part she was wondering if he would consider looking into permeable pavement and other low impact development approaches since it was in such a sensitive landscape that the development be as green as possible.

Mr. Roy replied yes, definitely that is absolutely an intention of the project. They have already reached out to the various institutions that can help in that regard. They have also engaged some engineers and landscape architects to start that discussion. Certainly it is hinging on the floodplain, but there is no question that the whole site is going to take on a historic and environmentally sensitive preservation.

Ms. Firehock said she would love to see it be a model green development. The county is currently considering a new storm water system to either recoup some of the funds it is going to cost to do a lot of mitigation. One avenue the county may go in is to have a storm water utility fee or a service district. She is hopeful for those landowners who do a good job in reducing runoff that they can have a rebate on that. This might be great timing to do it green.

Mr. Roy said a rebate sounds outstanding. He thinks the challenge of the site in a way is preserving the buildings historically yet mitigating the flood and floodplain, which work somewhat against themselves. They can't alter the site too significantly; otherwise it will impact the historic preservation and the ability to get tax credits to preserve the building. He thinks there is a delicate balance that is going to exist. That will unfold. Luckily the parking area is actually on the high side of the property. What he has discovered if that you can now enter the large four-story building from the third floor. It has access point on the third floor. There is a significant separation between the high sides where the parking is versus where Moore's Creek is. He appreciates the comments. It is absolutely at the top of their list to consider and figure it out and to look at it as a whole site. There is a tremendous opportunity to engage the entire site that has been fenced off and really open it up particularly as it relates down towards the Rivanna.

Ms. Monteith asked if he was suggesting feeding the property as far as the circulation flow from the west side.

Mr. Roy replied yes, the primary entrance would be off of Broadway which has been essentially unused right now.

Ms. Monteith pointed out that he just does have a cognitive map of where Broadway is, and Mr. Roy agreed.

Ms. Monteith said she knows this property well although she agrees you can only get close and not in there.

Mr. Roy agreed. He pointed out for the original mill actually Market Street was the race that came down and powered the mill. Obviously, when it gets to this property Market Street gets very narrow and the neighborhood is very sensitive to cars. The idea was not only to try to include as much residential as possible given the impact, but also to drive the traffic up off of Broadway such that it would temper the need to continually go down Market Street. He thinks that is helpful because Broadway is already set up to handle that type of traffic.

Mr. Keller asked because of looking for a formula in this mixed use would this project be 100 percent go as an adaptive reuse for residential in a historic structure with no new construction.

Mr. Roy replied yes, he would be able to do that and was definitely preferred.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Roger Schickedantz, of 1858 Scottsville Road, said he was in the Southern Neighborhood speaking for himself. However, he had been in conversation with people in our neighborhood about how to continue to improve it. He was addressing this in the context of that. He very much supports this project because it is a good example of mixed use. It is great that there is a mix of historic and new development coming together to create a vibrancy alternative living higher density bringing people that could live and work in one place. It would help negate traffic congestion in other places in the county. He thinks it is a good model. It is something the Southern Neighborhood would like to do. They don't have old buildings that they could convert. However, there is a possibility like they are showing of taking buildings built in one period and converting them in the future. Where they can start to break down boundaries and segregation of use types he thinks they are better off. If they can plan that into the comprehensive planning in the future then they could prevent the straight jacketing of areas that are confined with large building types, large parking lots and don't have the ability to easily adapt and be flexible over time. Over a year and a half ago he submitted a memo to the Commission suggesting a way to have industrial buildings that could step down in the terrain that fit into the landscape of green roofs and smaller footprints. He would like to recall their attention to that. There is another alternative here. So he would encourage the Commission not to perpetuate this division of use types but to broaden them and rather than saying residential use can only be a secondary use allow it to be a primary use.

There being no other public comment, Mr. Morris closed the public input and invited the applicant to cover anything Mr. Schickedantz commented on.

Mr. Caramanis said he saw a comment from another member of the public that was submitted by email that was also very supportive of the project and an increase ratio of residential. Again, they are certainly willing to work it in the framework as discussed. He was sensing that there may actually be some support to allow greater residential, and that is obviously something that they would like to see. That is originally why they did file the application. He just wanted to mention again that they were willing to work within the framework of the 51/49, but if the Commission sees fit to allow a greater percentage of residential they certainly welcome it.

Mr. Morris closed the public comment section to bring it back to the Commission for discussion and input.

Mr. Cilimberg suggested it might be a good idea if Susan Stimart could speak to the job direction side of this. There was an interest in our own internal conversations with making sure they were retaining the possibility for a strong employment component on this site not in the historic buildings. They understand

the situation with those. In fact, the residential really enables those to be preserved and utilized, but the importance of also not losing the potential for industrial or job producing kinds of developments there on that property.

Mr. Morris asked Ms. Stimart if she would like to address specifics on that.

Ms. Echols pointed out it would be the importance of retaining the area for employment uses and not so much additional residential use on the site.

Susan Stimart, Economic Development Facilitator for the County, asked if the Commission was familiar with the County's Target Industry Study published in 2012. They had several targets bio-science industry sector, business and financial services, and then the third one information technology and defense. They can even think about the fourth target agri-business. The first three types of companies she mentioned are constantly looking for spaces. She has been talking extensively with Brian Roy for the last few months about opportunities and options for some of these existing enterprises to potentially expand in the building landscape that he has described. She actually had a meeting today with one of our business financial services companies that is a R&D in information technology sector providing platforms for companies like Amazon and so forth. They would love to have that cool space that they are not really finding in the county. They would be a perfect candidate to go into that outer saw tooth building or potentially even in the newer building that he is discussing. Another point she wanted to bring up additionally was she walked the entire property of the existing buildings with Mr. Roy looking for ways where they could incorporate some of these smaller scale start-up companies that want that cool flex space. They were really careful with trying to keep in mind the requirements of historic preservation for eligibility for tax credits. There were certain modifications that did not really lend themselves very well for some commercial use. One thing that did not get brought up, for example, was the larger building does physically connect to the smaller saw tooth. So that is a wrinkle in the architecture that would be difficult to accommodate once you think about how businesses need to have secure space. She just wanted to point out that there are some really specific aspects to the architecture that do make Flex a great idea, but it gets down to details of how these enterprises can fit together.

Mr. Morris asked has this been coordinated with the city in discussions.

Ms. Stimart asked if that was in regard to employment generation and types of company expansions, and Mr. Morris replied yes.

Ms. Stimart replied yes, that some of the prospects that have come to both the city and the county that Chris Angle and she have done some advance marketing of this building considering that it could be appropriate types of uses particularly in the newer space.

Ms. Echols pointed out they have also coordinated with the city and the residents because many of the Woolen Mills residents actually live in the city. However, they have coordinated with their Planning Department on this. The work that is being done already on the Rivanna River Corridor has considered this as well. The city and the county both know what is going on in this particular area.

Mr. Lafferty said that was good because that is sort of a priority of both the City and County Planning Commissions.

Mr. Roy noted that he did introduce the project to Chris Angle in the city so that they are aware that something is happening since it does impact the city.

Mr. Morris thanked Mr. Roy for his input.

Ms. Echols said she would also like to add that a lot of the specifics on the project, which they see, the things the Commission would be looking at for a zoning map amendment. They have tried to really hard to try to keep those separate so that anybody who might be coming in whether this works for them or anyone else that they are clear on the direction so the next step a rezoning and special use permit has the information they need. She would also like to note they are using the direction of the Board of

Supervisors in relation to our industrially zoned properties and the designations in trying to retain those. If there was a desire by the Planning Commission for this to be primarily residential it would not have this land use category and a different land use category would have to be applied to it. That just needs to be clear now that if they are not in agreement with the recommendations of staff, then it is going to have to switch into a different direction.

Mr. Morris asked if increasing the percentage of space for residential by 60/40 percent would that then have to generate a different look at things.

Ms. Echols replied yes, it was a different land use category altogether.

Mr. Keller said this is a wonderful project that needs to go forward. He appreciates staff's efforts to try to figure out how to respond to economic development directives and historic preservation and make all of these things better. He wondered if the light industrial is still a holdover from our past. Other pieces that are here really are a good fit with residential. These are going to be relatively high end loft spaces and so the implication that people who are living there are going to be working in light industrial does not seem like a fit. Yet they hear about the bio-tech and the desire for people in the bio-tech area to be able to live close to where they are going back and forth to check experiments in the labs and those sorts of things. So that seems like a good fit. It seems like all the pieces that she has presented are fit except for that light industrial.

Ms. Echols noted the way they have dealt with this in the past with light industrial if light industrial is not desired and she would say that it is probable desirable in some form or fashion that it has fewer impacts. That is why it is a very light industrial category. There are places in our Land Use Plan that identify where light industrial is not appropriate and given them this designation because it made a lot of sense. Some examples are the UVA Research Park and Fontaine Research Park. Some of those that are more sort of office and medical related have specific language in the plan that says industrial uses are not appropriate here. She asked Ms. Stimart to speak to whether or not light industry would be appropriate in this location or how it could be appropriate that would probably be beneficial.

Susan Stimart said her best answer would be to take them on a tour so they can see this modern face of industry that they are talking about. They have worked very hard, Wayne Cilimberg especially, to update our zoning ordinance to be more reflective of this modern face of industry. So if they look at the LI District in particular or the definition of industrial it gives a broad understanding of what can happen in this district. It is really pretty remarkable that they have gotten calls from other communities because they did such a great job in updating this particular section of the zoning ordinance to be flexible, again, to capture in that modern face of industry. It is the bio-tech and the information technology companies. As Ms. Echols alluded to it is LI light and there is not a lot of impact. R&D firms tend to be smaller scale. There are instances where, for example, they are talking right now with a particular brewery that has a certain scale to it that would not be appropriate in this location. However, there is other smaller scale brewery that might for example. That is the kind of enterprise that is better suited for that industrial district so that people recognize that there is some level of impact that is different from a straight office zoning. For example, there are some delivery trucks coming in and out with the micro breweries. There could be some odors and things of that nature. So people just need to be aware that there is an expectation that some things can happen even with their high end condos.

Mr. Cilimberg said some Commissioners were involved with the ordinance amendments for industrial uses not only in the industrial district side where they were trying to really get focused on categories of industry, but also recognizing there is a lot of blend these days that is not like it used to be with the smoke stacks of industry. It is many times a blend of actually production, sales and affiliated kind of activities with the industrial uses. But, they also actually worked on and now have allowed industrial uses in the commercial zoning districts in the county because there is sometimes a blend or ability for them to co-locate in areas and not impact each other. In terms of what this calls for versus the standard light industrial designation this is really more directly connected to our targeted industries in the county and the ability to accommodate them in a setting that may also include these other uses that they see defined for the category.

Mr. Keller said maybe it is just semantics, but it does say light industrial. All of the discussions have been about things that they are thinking about as the future.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out some of that light industrial is by category and definition light industrial. It does not mean that it is impactful. It is usually very co-existing kinds of activities. When they get into some production activities that involve even very small scale production they are going to qualify as industrial since they don't fit under other kinds of categories. So that is why having that as part of a mix was kind of trying to make sure they don't miss something that might really be appropriate in that location. It will all be dealt with as part of a rezoning where they will be able to further kind of understand and identify.

Mr. Randolph commented that the target industries that the county has identified have been on public record for three years. This property has been available for a period of time and these target industries have not moved into this building. No one has bought this building. He asked if that is correct.

Ms. Stimart replied that the building went on the market with this floodplain situation. It has taken some time, as Mr. Roy can attest, to work FEMA. There is a real challenge in trying to get financing for a property with this condition. They had a similar situation happen in Scottsville. They were trying to market that for other users who wanted to own their own facility. There are two different markets if they want to think about those types of businesses who want to lease and those types of businesses who want to own their facility. The floodplain can be an impediment to both types of businesses either with obtaining financing for a purchase endeavor or obtaining appropriate business insurance. They have to be careful about the specifics of this property with the existing floodplain designation that Mr. Roy is actively working to address.

Mr. Randolph thanked Ms. Stimart that it helps, but as public record will also indicate no target business as yet looked at this building. There is no public corporation that has come along and identified this building as a potential site to operate a business in a light industrial zone.

Ms. Stimart said she had personally shown the building to several commercial ventures. She thinks Mr. Roy has worked very hard with the owner.

Mr. Randolph asked that the public record reflect the fact that remarks are made here about target industries. Somehow the impression that is left with the Commission is somehow if they were to look at this that in fact the site should have greater residential than 49.9 percent, which would change its classification here from the LI Flex to more of a residential dimension. The remark that was made to say that might be a dangerous thing is that might jeopardize the use of this site for the magical target industries. He would like to establish for the public record that no such target industries have come to the owners and provided a valid contract and say they would like to move their target industry into this building. The only development proposal that they see as a Planning Commission is Mr. Roy's proposal to put a residential facility into this site. He asked if that was correct.

Ms. Stimart replied that she thinks he is mischaracterizing the situation because there have been several of our magical target industries who have been expressing interest in the space. However, under its current conditions they have been reluctant to move forward for a purchase or lease circumstance. It is a lot to take on for an individual business endeavor that is focused on its industry rather than the mechanics in the work of site development.

Mr. Randolph thanked Ms. Stimart. He said his second remark will be that he thinks this project is very important for us as a Planning Commission because what is at stake here is they talked last week about the urban ring. They talked about their concern about deterioration on the early urban ring development in the northwest quadrant of the City of Charlottesville, which would be west of 29. He thinks it is really important that they get this project right and they do it right. There is very clearly a recreational dimension that is here and a benefit for the county. The question comes down to how much residential there should be. He pointed out he has the benefit of having been inside all of the buildings here and he will say as a follow up to Mr. Roy's remarks about the challenge of retrofitting in the current two skylight buildings right along the river that those two buildings do not lend themselves as easily to light industrial as they do to residential as Mr. Keller has pointed out. So he would like to see the Commission have some discussion

about what is appropriate for the buildings that are there. What he gets is a sense that the county would like to shoehorn into the site as much light industrial and flex as possible when in fact the existing building in which part of it would go might not be suitable. The new building can clearly be built with light industrial capacity and capability to it. He would like to have a discussion of what is the appropriate mix for those historic buildings among his colleagues. He was not settled about that at this point about what is the best use as they move forward. The one thing that might be appropriate as a compromise would be to say let's go ahead and leave the western most existing building as a potential Flex/LI and give Mr. Roy a period such as two to three years and to see if he has a high demand for light industrial to move into that building. If no one expresses an interest at the end of two or three years then he would say if the rest of the project moves forward residentially then clearly what the market is saying that area is most suited for residential and therefore it should be allowed to go residential rather than defining the way this project should be here according to what the preference might be on the county level.

Ms. Monteith said her general observation is that this is a primarily residential neighborhood at this point. She is not talking about necessarily the county context, but the city/county context which is most of which they think of as Woolen Mills. At one time that was manufacturing and what one could call heavy or light industrial. However, that is not really the character of the place now, and she thinks they should be thinking about that. If they think about a LI use, yes it could be appropriate and it could be most inappropriate. If it were a livery development or somebody who made kayaks or something like that, it could work out well especially if there was a recreational component. However, there could be a lot of LI uses that could really be detraction in this neighborhood. She thinks they need to be very careful when they talk about the LI use because that is a designation and not something we can control.

Mr. Roy asked to make a point in procedural clarity. He pointed out the specific percentages and things are going to come out when they file a rezoning application, which is obviously the next step. They are here today talking about the comp plan designation. That is essentially a facilitator. Whatever the comp plan designation is will allow us different options as they file the rezoning application, but not necessarily approving any specific percentages just through the comp plan designation. That is his understanding and he thinks unless someone disagrees the comp plan designation offers us certain flexibility or certain limitation based on what it is for the next step of the rezoning. The rezoning itself will be the application that determines the specific percentages. He only brings that up to make sure everybody is understanding that at this point it may be an imposition of a limitation or allowing greater flexibility, but not necessarily determining a specific percentage at this time.

Ms. Firehock agreed that what he said is correct, but the zoning should be in accordance with the comp plan. It does not have to be, but it brings up a host of other potential problems if it isn't. She was sort of one of those Commissioners who like to use the comp plan as a Bible. She wants to get the comp plan right. The one thing that hangs her up on this is that percentage. From her experience in Charlottesville as a Commissioner there they tried to do a similar thing with trying to allow for residential and business in the same buildings on Main Street and they came up with these percentages that met City Council goals. Then years went by and these buildings did not fill up. They ended up having to go back and change what they had said and they all filled. She did not think that being so prescriptive in the market at this place makes a lot of sense. She thinks it is a very residential neighborhood and she did not want to doom this application by coming up with something like it has to be 51 percent business. She would like us to maybe explore something different than what is presented tonight for consideration in terms of the percentages. She suggested maybe there was a different category they should be looking at or if there was a possibility to have a range.

Mr. Dodson said he had two questions for the applicant. One, he has sensed that he could live with and would feel like he had succeeded tonight with the language that staff has proposed. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Caramanis replied yes he thinks in a theoretical concept. He has not explored businesses that could occupy that space. However, with some flexibility of that 50 percent he would try hard to make it transitional from the main building, which would be all residential and with maybe a restaurant component transitioning to the saw tooth buildings. It may be a live/work component that would allow some flexibility,

but trying to keep the nonresidential piece as far away from the main residential piece as possible. The short answer to the question is yes, but.

Mr. Dotson said the second question is that his image is that the primary tool he would use to adjust the percentage would be how much nonresidential they constructed. He asked if that was correct. In other words, there is probably going to be the same number of housing units on the site whether they said 50 or whatever they said the difference would be in how much nonresidential they put there just to have the percentage work out mathematically. He asked if that is true.

Mr. Roy replied by keeping the number of units primarily in the main building maybe squeezing down their size to get to that magic number. He agreed that it was a challenge and needs some refining, but he has not been able to get to that point until he had some more clarity on the floodplain which it seems like they have gotten closer to that point.

Mr. Morris noted what he sensed was a strong desire on the part of the Planning Commission to be far more flexible as far as a percentage of square footage allowable for residential. He asked what would be the Commission's options on this if they wanted to take away that less than 50 percent.

Ms. Echols replied there were a couple of options that could take place. One of them would be they would look at staff's recommendation and if the hang up is on the percentage of residential they pass that on to the Board of Supervisors tell them that is the Commission's desire is to see something different. The Board would then decide on how they wanted to deal with it. That might have some advantages because the idea of retaining that property, the properties that are currently designated and currently zoned, really came from the Board of Supervisors very strongly as what they had wanted to do. That puts that question in the hands of the Board. Another alternative would be for us to come up with a different designation. This is a very unique site. This does not happen throughout the county. When they have very unique situations like what they have in Downtown Crozet in that employment area, It really required its own category and something like that could be developed and then brought back to the Commission. Those are the two options that she sees right now. She asked Mr. Cilimberg if he sees other options.

Mr. Cilimberg said in either case they are making a recommendation to the Board and they are trying to finish our work with them. If the Commission's concept is they like everything but the percentage then they make that recommendation that they recommend this as described without the percentage saying to the Board that they don't know that they feel comfortable in locking a percentage in. Then staff can work with the Board on how to make that happen whether it is a special designation for this area or a different category of use.

Mr. Morris agreed that he had hit the nail on the head. He sensed that is what the Commission would like.

Ms. Monteith agreed and suggested they could say that they want some flex on the flex.

Mr. Lafferty said he thinks back on all the conversations about not having enough Light Industrial (LI) in the country and he would go with the flex with the flex. As far as the vacancy there is a building that they just created two soccer fields on Broadway. Regarding somebody not buying this property they would have to recall that they are coming out of one of the worse recessions since the 30's. He did not have a problem with somebody not buying this. He thinks it is great that staff has been as creative as they have been.

Mr. Morris pointed out he thinks that is what the Commission wants and where they would like to have them go. He thanked staff very much.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the consensus is everything without the percentage.

Mr. Morris asked the Commissioners if there was any disagreement. There being no one in disagreement, Mr. Morris agreed. He really thinks the way the conception is it is going to be an absolute jewel in the Rivanna River Corridor.

Mr. Keller noted that this is kind of out of order and it should be new business. However, because our Economic Development person is going to be leaving in a moment, he would like the Commission in new business to discuss inviting Ms. Stimart to come for a work session so they can all try to be on the same page. He thinks that they all are interested in economic development for the county. However, he thinks there are special issues and special resources they have had the opportunity to think about and would like to share those with her and have a dialogue so they can all be working together.

Mr. Morris said he would gladly work with Mr. Cilimberg on this to set up a work session.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that Ms. Stimart could probably not make all the calls regarding that work session. But, he does know that there is very soon to be announced an Economic Development Director for the county. So at some point very soon that person is going to be coming on board. There will probably be a good reason to have that person introduced to a lot of folks including the Planning Commission and to hear from you. It might actually pose a good opportunity for Susan Stimart as well.

Mr. Morris agreed that was a good idea.

Mr. Dotson suggested the chart was another piece of this that they need to talk about.

Ms. Echols replied she did not hear any comments on the chart. She did not know if that means that there are no comments on the chart or if the Commissioners are okay with the changes that staff recommended.

Mr. Dotson pointed out that staff made them small enough because the chart was hard to read.

Ms. Firehock agreed since they don't know what it says.

Mr. Morris pointed out he thought this was something that the Commission ought to take up at a later date.

Mr. Cilimberg said this is guidance since this is the chart that is in the comp plan. These are just adaptations.

Ms. Firehock noted that she needs to buy a magnifying glass.

Mr. Morris said even with a magnifying glass it does not help.

Mr. Dotson said he does have a problem with the chart. However, he thinks that it is easily resolved. In the Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial that they have just been talking about and in the category of the purpose and intent it never mentions Office/Flex/R&D. Those are discussed under primary uses. So he thinks the smaller paragraph in the chart needs to be recrafted because the only use it mentions is Light Industrial.

Ms. Echols agreed that staff can make that change.

Mr. Morris agreed that was a good catch.

Ms. Echols said staff would be glad to do that. She asked if there were any other changes.

Ms. Monteith noted in other words they need some more flex in the flex.

Mr. Morris thanked staff for their work.

In summary, the Planning Commission **AGREED BY CONSENSUS** to staff's recommended language in the **updated** Comprehensive Plan text clarifying uses allowed in Woolen Mills as part of the Southern Neighborhoods Master Plan and in the Land Use Categories and Guidelines Table with the following:

1. Remove any reference to percentage of residential/non-residential in Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial
2. The smaller paragraph in the Land Use Categories and Guidelines Table needs to be re-drafted because the only use it mentions is Light Industrial.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:21 pm and reconvened at 7:28 p.m.

Work Session

CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan Update/Amendment
Report on Board of Supervisors Actions to Date on Comprehensive Plan Update. (Elaine Echols)

Staff Presentation:
Elaine Echols presented a report on the Board of Supervisors (BOS) actions to date on the Comprehensive Plan Update in a PowerPoint presentation.

Background:
- July 2011
- PC Recommendation August 2013
- BOS – Election November 2013 – Changed schedule for review
- Staff – all updates from PC – January 2014 version
- BOS public hearing March 12, 2014
- April 2014 – Topics to discuss - turned out to be everything
- May 2014 – BOS began review

Basically, the Board added in addition to changing the format a little bit the importance of healthy ecosystems and a physical environment that supports healthy lifestyles. The Board was very supportive of the concept of sustainability, which is why they put in the things for current and future generations.

Changes to Vision:
Anchored by a strong economy and excellent education system, Albemarle envisions a thriving County that honors its rural heritage, scenic beauty, and natural and historic resources while fostering attractive and vibrant communities.

Albemarle County envisions a community of
- *abundant natural, rural, historic, and scenic resources*
- *healthy ecosystems*
- *active and vibrant development areas*
- *a physical environment that supports healthy lifestyles*
- *a thriving economy and exceptional educational opportunity for current and future generations.*

Background Chapter:
- Retained Sustainability Accords reference
- Emphasized importance of sustainability.
- Joint PC Goals – historical rather than directive*

The sustainability accords they basically said were principles they continue to aspire to, but not put in as goals and objectives. To date the Board has said the joint Planning Commission goals were historical rather directive. However, staff is going to be bringing that back to them to ask about that because everything that the Board has done is in keeping with those recommendations that were made by the joint Planning Commissions. Each chapter had the particular strategies that related to it and the Board has not said anything about that. Staff just wants them to be clear on the fact that although at the beginning they said it was historical do they still want to keep those on the pages. Staff thinks they will, but they have to be asked.

Growth Management Chapter
- Emphasized importance of natural resource protection

- Emphasized importance of Development Areas as great places* that did not get in the growth management strategy. It is probably going back in there.

There will be more discussion at next week's BOS meeting

Natural Resources Chapter

- Changed goal to emphasize importance of ecosystems in natural resource preservation
- More emphasis on water resource protection – resulted in overall reorganization of water section
- Removed recommendations for mineral resource extraction overlay
- Retained recommendation for education of property owners with mineral resources
- Biodiversity is important in Development Area as well as the Rural Area

Historic, Cultural, and Scenic Resources Chapter

- Brought back existing plan's recommendations on Monticello. The Planning Commission's recommendations were not the ones they decided to use.

Economic Development Chapter

- Added information on new Economic Development Program and hiring the new Economic Development Director. That was not in the mix when the Commission went over the chapter. However, it has been a few years since the Commission made the recommendations.
- Added emphasis to regional partnerships working with UVA, City of Charlottesville and other regional organizations

Rural Area Chapter – Biggest Change

- Put agriculture and forestry as first objective
- Emphasized natural resource protection
- Removed recommendation for restaurants in crossroads communities in new buildings. The Board wanted historic buildings to be available for use in crossroads communities by special use permit as something to explore. However, they were not as comfortable in the recommendation that new buildings could have restaurants in the new crossroads communities.
- Removed recommendation related to regular commercial events at individual residences. The idea was very large estates.
- Removed recommendation for lodging in RA. The Commission spent many hours discussing this topic. The Board of Supervisors in one meeting said the Bed and Breakfast regulations in the Rural Areas are sufficient and they don't want to go any further than that.
- Changed recommendation to update zoning ordinance for recreational facilities to "study whether or not updates are needed" The Board decided there were a lot of impacts for recreational facilities in the Rural Area and they were not ready to go as far as making recommendations to change the ordinance.
- Changed "promote a significant tourist economy" to "promote rural and historic landscapes which enhance the visitors' experience and give historic sites as authentic a setting as possible."
- Directed updates to reflect state legislation on farm breweries and events at bona fide agricultural operations.

Housing

- The Board did not alter the Planning Commission recommended change related to cash proffers for affordable housing. In the cash proffer policy there was a change to be clear if the developer was paying cash proffers they don't get a break on the affordable units. They would have to pay cash proffers for the affordable units as well as all the rest of them if not providing units, which was the Planning Commission's recommendation. The Board said okay, but they are still working on updating cash proffers so something else might happen.
- When the Development Areas came up the Board wanted to re-discuss the accessory unit recommendations in the context of existing neighborhoods. The recommendations are that they change the zoning ordinance to allow accessory units that would be outside of the existing houses like carriage apartments, garage apartments, and that kind of thing. There was some concern about occupancy in existing neighborhoods that are in transition. Therefore, they will be re-discussing this probably in March with the Board of Supervisors when they are looking at the red lines.

Development Areas

- Change "walkability" to "multi-modal" in goal statement
- Change tenor of text – Development Areas should be great places, not just high density places so the Rural Area (RA) can be preserved
- Context sensitive infill and redevelopment
- Neighborhood preservation
- Recommend adding strategies for incentives for redevelopment for new employment centers

Place29

- The Board supported Planning Commission recommendation not to amend PL29 north of NGIC. The Planning Commission's final conclusion on that Wendell Wood request for the area north of NGIC was that it should come in with the Places29 Master Plan, and the Board agreed with that.
- The Board sent the Colonial Auto Center Expansion (CMA) Borches property to the Planning Commission. The PC made a recommendation, and the Board heard and accepted the recommendation including making note of the recommendations about the timing of the small area plan.
- The Board changed the Planning Commission recommendation to change the mobile home park property from Light Industrial to Urban Density Residential. That area is currently shown on the Places29 Plan as Light Industrial. Because the zoning on the property is a higher density and the owner of the property had asked for it both the Advisory Council and the Planning Commission thought it would be okay for it to move to Urban Density Residential and the Board said no. The Board did not want to lose what is currently recommended in the plan and they said change that back to the Light Industrial.

Pantops

- The Board affirmed removal of the two (2) roads on the existing plan.

Village of Rivanna Master Plan

- Add information on history on Village of Rivanna
- Clearly explain density calculations for Land Use Plan
- Add strategy to update zoning regulations for Neighborhood Model District (NMD) related to calculating density
- Add recommendation to Development Area (DA) to review new water regulations and relationship with intermittent streams. There was some concern about intermittent streams and whether or not intermittent streams should have stream buffers on them. Many of the members of the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council felt that even on intermittent streams they should have stream buffers and designate that area as Parks and Green Systems. Staff suggested they look at the new State Storm Water Regulations about intermittent streams before taking any steps to change the colors on the map.

Mr. Randolph has talked to the Planning Commission about some of the comments that have come from the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council. Most of these changes came from the concerns of the Advisory Council.

Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan

- The Board recommended small area plan for County-owned land near Monticello Fire Station and High School. Last summer there was a community meeting that several of the Supervisors held for the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods. One of the outcomes of that with the Board of Supervisors is they want a small area plan as a strategy in the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan for that area. The convenience center spurred a lot of interest into that particular area.
- The Board changed the recommendation for the Parham parcel. Because it came to the Board of Supervisors when the Spring Hill Village had been recommended by the Planning Commission, the Board decided to approve the Spring Hill Village Development on the Parham parcel and retain the existing land use designation on that property.
- The Board referred Woolen Mills to Planning Commission.

- The Board referred the Lofts at Meadow Creek to Planning Commission. Just as a matter of information the applicant has asked the Board of Supervisors for a deferral. The Board would have been looking at that next week, but the applicant asked for a deferral until May. The applicant was not in agreement with the recommendation, but decided not to have it continue as part of the current Comprehensive Plan Update. The applicant will be coming back to talk to staff and then figure out where they will go next.

Transportation

- The Board directed staff to change Rural Traffic Calming to non-location specific recommendations, but put in the reference documents the techniques that can be used for Rural Traffic Calming.
- The Board wanted to add a flowchart for a citizen to understand the process of "how a concept becomes a road" or "how an improvement gets made" going through the process of who to contact, who has to make the decisions, and where does it go next.

Parks and Recreation, etc.

- Added strategy for draft standards for review for a rural park preserve that was a result of Arrowhead Farms. The Board said they need to add a strategy not necessarily to have this as a new standard, but to look at what standards might be for this kind of a park. If they decide they want to pursue it, then they will add that kind of a park for other parks like Arrowhead Farm to then be added to the County's park inventory.
- Added strategy to develop more indoor recreational facilities.
- Added strategy to further study the need for public "neighborhood" parks, especially for existing neighborhoods without parks.

Community Facilities

- Make changes to solid waste
- Added language about the need for the County to practice environmental stewardship
- Add strategy for providing support to volunteer fire/rescue organizations

That was all of the big changes that the Board of Supervisors has made to date. They have made wording changes, edits in grammar and little things here and there. The question is what happens next.

Board of Supervisors Now

- Reviewing redlines next week. The redlines and text are all on line for chapters 1 – 7 of the Comprehensive Plan and can be found on the County website.
- Prioritizing strategies – The Board will use the information provided by the Planning Commission in June, 2014.
- Final copy for public hearing – end of March?
- Adoption – Staff hopes the Comprehensive Plan Update will be ready for public hearing in March and adoption in May. However, it is up to the Board when it will be adopted

Mr. Morris thanked Ms. Echols for the update.

Ms. Echols noted that they may have to come back to the Planning Commission for a public hearing that relates to the Airport and the NGIC area. Staff will explain it at that time if it is necessary.

Mr. Morris noted there was no public comment. He invited questions for staff.

Mr. Lafferty commented that CTECH is going to be working on the concept "from an idea to a road" and are thinking about doing a public information academy on transportation.

No formal action was taken by the Planning Commission.

Old Business

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

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- 29 Solutions Board Discussion Time
- No Planning Commission meeting on February 10, 2015.
- The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 17, 2015.

There being no further new business, the meeting moved to adjournment.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:52 p.m. to the Tuesday, February 17, 2014 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Auditorium, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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