Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 24, 2015

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, February 24, 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; Richard Randolph, Bruce Dotson, Tim Keller, and Karen Firehock. Absent was Thomas Loach and Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was absent.

Other officials present were Mark Graham, Director of Community Development; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; Gerald Gatobu, Transportation Planner; 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.

Neil Williamson, with The Free Enterprise Forum, said one of his New Year's resolutions is to be more positive. Tonight that is part of these remarks. It really is the little things that make a difference. Tonight he has a present for the Planning Commission and members of the Albemarle County Community Development staff. First, he has a story. At the end of last year in a meeting with a couple members of Albemarle County Board of Supervisors and a number of Albemarle County business leaders he shared what he considers his famous pencil story. Back in the 1990's not unlike Albemarle in an earlier age the Greene County Planning Department consisted of two people in a relaxed but efficient operation. Applications were generally filled out right there in the Planning Office often with the Planning Director alongside the applicant to walk them through the paper work. Many applicants were arriving with an idea of what they wanted to do, but they did not know how. In addition, they often came in without a writing utility as they did not know they had to fill out any specific forms. Recognizing the need and after losing a large number of office pens someone came up with the idea to give applicants a Planning Department pencil to fill out the required paperwork. In a moment of sheer brilliance they came up with a tagline to put on the pencil, "Permit us to permit you". Those five words summed up the administration's position on planning, zoning, development and redevelopment. It was as simple as that. This "permit us" philosophy does not suggest staff takes and approve everything approach. Instead it positions staff as a trusted guide working with applicants to find legal ways to achieve their goals. After the Albemarle meeting one of the business leaders offered to fund the printing of such pencils. Based on that generous gift he was here presenting a "Permit us to permit you" pencil to each member of the Albemarle County Planning Commission as well as the staff present. In addition to being emblazoned with the "Permit Us" philosophy each and every pencil is also equipped with a very effective implement on the non-sharpened edge. The eraser will work equally well for applicants and staff to correct those areas in need of revision. In addition he has three bags for Mr. Graham to share with the department. For over a dozen years the Free Enterprise Forum has been proud to work with the Commission and staff on positive policy direction. They look forward to another year of pleasant persistence pushing the envelope to help make our community strong and welcoming to all. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

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

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – February 4, 2015, February 10, 2015, and February 11, 2015.

Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the Board of Supervisors actions taken on February 4, 2015, February 10, 2015 and February 11, 2015.

Consent Agenda:

Approval of Minutes: December 16, 2014

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

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

The motion carried by a vote of (5:0). (Lafferty, Loach absent)

Mr. Morris said the consent agenda was approved.

Long Range Transportation Plan LRTP) Lessons Learned
(Bruce Dotson)

The Planning Commission held a work session to review MPO's LRTP Lessons Learned Report and the draft of a comment letter on the process from the Commission.

Mr. Morris noted the next item was Long Range Transportation Plan Lessons Learned. He asked Mr. Dotson to discuss the proposal and tell them where they are going with it.

Mr. Dotson pointed out in the Commission's packet were two items, one being a draft letter and the other is a draft prepared by the MPO staff of lessons learned in the most recent Long Range Transportation Planning Process. The Commission was involved in that process in two ways. Commissioner Lafferty serves on the Citizen Committee advising the Policy Board, and he (Commissioner Dotson) serves on the Technical Group again advising the board. Over a year ago it occurred to a number of people that while the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) was being formulated based on a performance approach that in a sense the ultimate measure of performance should be the two localities comprehensive plans. So what then happened is that a suggestion was made that the Commissions should be involved in this and it would be appropriate to have the Commissions look at what had been happening and comment on how this related to the comprehensive plans. It is probably an exaggeration to say it was a disastrous experiment, but not much of an exaggeration because he thinks the staff and Commissioners were frustrated by this at the time and it did not work very well. The MPO staff are trying to now look at any situation of those things that worked well and did not work so well and try to collect those in a Lessons Learned Report. He asked Will Cockrell, with the MPO, to step to the microphone to tell us about his role and what the purpose is of the 2040 Lessons Learned Report.

Will Cockrell, Project Manager for the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Transportation Program at the Thomas Jefferson District Commission (TJPDC), thanked the Commission for the opportunity to come and speak as well as for the memo in the packet. They actually agree with all the points there and plan to include that in the appendix of this document and also rework the document to add these comments as well. The Lessons Learned Report is really intended to serve as an internal guide for us at the MPO because he is now the project manager for the MPO and also for the transportation program at the TJPDC.

Mr. Cockrell pointed out The Lessons Learned document is really intended to internally take a look at how they went through this process, what went right, what went wrong and how they can improve and build on that for the next time. As they can see from this document they are already thinking about the next update of the plan. However, Mr. Dotson and the committees have also started talking about other efforts to lay the foundation on the next update in terms of training our Planning Commissioners, Board members and other local officers because it can be very confusing. By putting the ground work in now in terms of training and getting people up to speed on those MPO processes is part of that effort. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Mr. Dotson pointed out that training goes two ways. The fact that Mr. Cockrell is here tonight to listen to our discussion he thinks is testimony that the MPO is trying to learn from this process as well and perhaps undergo some amount of retraining itself.

The Planning Commission held a discussion on the proposed draft letter in reference to the Long Range Transportation Plan Lesson Learned and made comments regarding the following issues.

Mr. Randolph made the following comments:

- Both the City and County Planning Commissions were brought in late to the process. In fact, in a letter sent by the city to Kristin Szakos, the Chair of the MPO Policy Board, it stated that we respectfully request that both the Charlottesville City and Albemarle County Planning Commissions be more fully integrated into the process during the next five year update of the plan. He believed they were brought in at the tail end of the plan, which was really too late for us to provide the kind of overview and feedback that he thinks would have been helpful.
- Secondly, he agreed with the point raised that we would add a significant value in aligning the values and goals of the city's comprehensive plan with the LRTP and we should be included earlier in the process in a more intentional way. He would ditto that for the county because he thinks that our ability to deliver given that they have worked on the comprehensive plan would have really been beneficial.
- Thirdly, Mac Lafferty is not here so he has to represent the bicycle interests of the county. He feels the LRTP expresses a bias as the members of the City Planning Commission indicated towards vehicular mobility over connectivity in place making. Given the amount of emphasis on multi-modality that is in a comprehensive plan they need the MPO to be a partner for our vision of the county and for the city commissioners as they are working to try to have an integrated approach especially in key transportation corridors.
- Finally, the city brought up a point that there was a collective sense of deflation once they realized the vision expressed by the LRTP seemed in many ways to be in conflict with the key points of emphasis in the comprehensive plan. That was some of the frustration that he thinks came out that Mr. Dotson refers to, which is the reason why there was a bit of disconnect.
- Therefore, he thinks the major lesson learned is correctly stated here by our peers in the City Planning Commission to bring the two planning commissions in earlier; look for them to provide feedback in terms of the comprehensive plan and how it works with the LRTP. In addition, let us help in trying to understand the multi-modal approach, which they are all working towards, and less of a vehicular centric approach. He thinks that would have resolved some of the frustration.
- His personal frustration at the time as he raised was some of the proposed projects really provided a very minimum benefit for tax payers within the County of Albemarle. Now yes some of those individuals as he recognized do work in the county or work in the city, but they are still primarily asking for people within the county to shoulder the inconvenience of the road improvements primarily designed to accommodate outside county interests. He thinks they have to be very mindful of that in how they spend tax dollars within the county and who the benefits are delivered to as they look at plans and move forward. Certainly they need to do intra-county planning. There is no question about that. He was not saying let's get into insular planning here. However, some of those projects he just knew were not going to fly in the northern Scottsville District because people are looking to see 250 widened. If they see that projects are occurring on Black Cat Road and on Milton Road and they have a higher priority than Route 250 that is going to create a lot of frustration and antagonism. He thinks having us participate with them earlier, using our eyes and ears in giving them feedback on how to rank things and prioritize them he thinks can be valuable and will reduce the frustration factor that arose. He thanked them for the opportunity to direct those comments.

Mr. Morris said a lot of what Mr. Randolph is saying really is tied into the first paragraph on page 2 of Mr. Dotson's letter regarding the timing and nature of planning commission involvement where he suggested they do it earlier. In talking with Mr. Lafferty today he was mentioning as his committee and your committee go through and are talking about and debating certain projects that they should bring it back to the commissions and let us start looking and thinking about what the MPO is thinking about. It could be Black Cat Road or a lot of these. They ought to think about it even before they start the comprehensive plan process so that they have as much knowledge as possible. He recalled when Mr. Cockrell

presented the PowerPoint presentation about the Long Range Transportation process to the Planning Commission in room #241, which was about four months after it was over, he wished that he had that presentation early on. He loved the way Mr. Dotson has put in suggestions and would like to add that suggestion and the suggestions that Mr. Randolph made.

Mr. Keller said he was not a member of the Commission then, but he went to a number of presentations and had a number of discussions with your predecessor about the data that was used. She often apologized for ten year old data. He asked specific questions about the relocation of the Martha Jefferson Hospital and the impact current data would have had in planning for those areas. Many times she talked about her frustrations in not being able to get updated data because of the funding possibilities; however, at the same time talking about new technologies that are allowing us with the cameras on the lights and satellite imagery to be able to do traffic counts and destination studies in ways that they use to hire student interns in the summer to work with VDOT or planning units. He would challenge that within the next five year plan they should now be talking about how to get more up-to-date data to use. If that has to get into the political realm he suggested having the planning commissioners involved so they can speak with our supervisors and our city counselors to try to bring some monetary support to those needs. That is another reason to have the planning commissions engaged. Therefore, he encourages them as they enter the next five years to please try to get more up-to-date data so that they don't have garbage in garbage out.

Mr. Morris noted they learned something last night at the Pantops Advisory Council that was fascinating. A member of their council who works at State Farm indicated that for the last three or four months they have had a night shift, which means approximately 1,200 employees move along 250, 20, and so and the night shift ends at 11 p.m. They are doing away with that night shift and those 1,200 people will now go in on the normal shift. Also, 400 to 800 people are now on a weekend shift. He just thinks this is something that someone needs to know to say we are going to have a tremendous shift in the traffic along 20 and instead of five minutes to get off and get on to Route 20 try 10 to 15 minutes. He questioned who they would get this information to.

Mr. Cockrill replied that he thinks that would be the MPO and VDOT.

Mr. Morris said he wondered if VDOT and the MPO really have a close tie with Martha Jefferson Hospital and State Farm since there are a bunch of people working at those two operations and it affects everyone.

Mr. Dotson pointed out the draft letter makes a point of two kinds of standards being the measured or quantitative and the narrative. He thinks what sometimes happens, and this may come back to the data as well, if it is a several year planning process change which happens during that time period they know some of the changes that have taken place, will learn some more, Will Cockrell may find out about them, and by including a narrative approach as well as this measured approach they can put in things that they know are important that are happening and in some cases put numbers on it and in other cases it is difficult to put numbers on it. However, it is important. He thinks if that narrative can continue it is a way of updating some of the data. It is an important issue and the commissions can certainly contribute in that way. His question to the commission is if he continues to act as the scribe on this is whether they are comfortable with him adding a paragraph or two to reflect the things that have been said, finalizing it and giving it to Mr. Morris and the county to transmit to the MPO or whether they would like to see it again.

Mr. Keller said he was comfortable with him doing that.

Mr. Randolph agreed that he was comfortable with Mr. Dotson's excellent recommendations. However, the only thing he would suggest is maybe to give a whole listing of recommendations.

Ms. Firehock agreed with Mr. Dotson's recommendations.

Mr. Morris agreed and thanked Mr. Dotson for taking his time.

Mr. Cockrell said in response that he totally agrees with what Mr. Keller was saying to start now not only with the data, but also with this conversation. He would love the MPO staff to be in front of the Commission and Board more often talking about transportation issues. They have a great new transportation planner on staff at the county who is very talented as well, and he is working with him. Regarding topics like the hospital he pointed out they were in Culpeper yesterday and got a really thorough update on that. The issues that would really affect you as a county they would love to talk about more often, be at your meetings and provide updates on what is going on across the state. He agreed with starting now to talk with each of you and build that relationship with your comp plans, other plans and your policies to make sure they are aware of everything that you are doing in your policies and intentions. That is going to help us not only with our LRTP but with all the other plans and processes that we have at the MPO in making sure they bring the county and the MPO closer together with these relationships. They would really love to do that if you are open to that.

Mr. Keller commented it would be great to see it quarterly or twice a year as they are adding things that don't necessarily require more staff time. However, as they have updates from county staff he thinks this would be a logical area.

Mr. Morris agreed.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out after their last joint meeting with the presentation of the Long Range Transportation Plan basics he thinks there was some expectation that the city and county planning commissions might meet together on HB2 as one topic at least. Whenever it was possible, he would like some dates so they could find some time. He introduced Gerald Gatobu, the County Transportation Planner, who would now be one additional connection with the MPO as well as the state's transportation work.

Mr. Dotson invited Mr. Gatobu to introduce himself.

Gerald Gatobu, Albemarle County's Transportation Planner, introduced himself noting that he was not new to Albemarle County since he had worked here for seven years.

The Planning Commission welcomed Gerald Gatobu as the new Albemarle County Transportation Planner.

Mr. Randolph said as a follow up to Mr. Keller's remarks he thinks there would be a real value for the Planning Commission to talk about transportation issues twice a year, but probably one of the times with our counterparts from the city.

Mr. Morris noted that it would get them used to doing it once they get into the Long Range Transportation Plan. As memberships of the commissions change, then they get used to it. It is an excellent idea. This would also be a wonderful way of possibly inviting members of the MPO to advisory council meetings because it might hone in on what is going on in their particular area.

Mr. Dotson said he had a question for Mr. Cilimberg. Our comp plan has a 5-year update cycle and the LRTP has a 5-year update cycle. It seems like they are almost on the same cycle in terms of real time on the calendar. He asked is that true, and if it is not true could they tweak it slightly.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that it was actually intentional to have the city comp plan, county comp plan and the long range transportation plans coincide in their updates this last round. In part that was a by-product of the Liveabililty Grant, which gave us a chance to actually tie those planning efforts together and do a lot more public outreach. It was a great benefit of having that grant and to have a closer tie among the goals, objectives and strategies that were common to the three plans. The city's comp plan has been adopted for over a year. The Long Range Transportation Plan was adopted last May. They don't have our county plan adopted yet, but is something that will happen by early summer. The next time around when the city, county and the Long Range Transportation Plan updates will occur there will need to be some discussion about whether they can have them all work together again. Ideally he thinks that would be a very good thing to do as it was this past time.

Mr. Dotson added that it might work best if just the transportation element were looked at maybe even a year ahead in the sense that it would allow a focus. One of the difficulties when you are dealing with the whole comp plan is that it is overwhelming and there is so much. If because the city has moved out ahead of us in a sense maybe we could get on their schedule in terms of the transportation element.

Mr. Cilimberg said it makes sense for our plan because so much of what they say in our transportation section is tied into the Long Range Transportation Plan as the guiding major plan document for our area and certainly for the city and the MPO study area of the county.

Mr. Randolph agreed there was a real value of getting transportation done a year ahead of working on the comp plan.

Mr. Cilimberg agreed as long as they know they have the land use. When they start talking about data being current he has found this probably is the dynamic that changes with each Long Range Transportation Plan. Howevert, there is always the key element of updating the transportation modeling. So all of the traffic zones need to be updated for their current dwelling units and employment forecasted as well, which is tied into your land use plan. So they want to make sure they are working from a land use plan that is not going to change in any significant way when they are going through the modeling process for the Long Range Transportation Plan. He thinks the modeling piece ends up being under serious review and development two years before the actual Long Range Transportation Plan gets adopted and you need to have some real lead time with that.

Mr. Cockrell said he would take off his MPO hat for a moment and put on his rural transportation hat. They are starting this upcoming year to update our Rural Long Range Plan, which is essentially the rural version of the LRTP. With that coming up they certainly want to start those conversations now with all of you on the plan. They don't have a deadline for when that would be approved with the MPO. Since they are more of a creature of the federal government they are held at very tight standards for when these updates occur. With the Rural Long Range Plan that is more of a state initiative and they have a little bit more flexibility on when they can approve that. However, they wanted to make sure that they mentioned that and start the conversation on that update as well.

Mr. Morris opened the meeting for public comment. There being none, he closed the public comment period.

After discussion, the Planning Commission agreed by consensus to the Mr. Dotson's draft letter and proposed changes as follows:

- Mr. Dotson to tweak the letter making the noted changes, provide it for Mr. Morris' signature and send to the MPO.
- Staff requested to schedule future work sessions, possibly with City Planning Commission, to review transportation issues with MPO staff.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

CPA-2013-00001 Development Area Infill & Redevelopment

Review of Development Areas Chapter Updates for Promoting Livability in Existing Residential Neighborhoods. *This topic is a continuation of the work session of the Planning Commission held on January 27, 2015. (Elaine Echols)*

Staff Presentation:

Elaine Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation on CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan for Development Area Infill and Redevelopment.

The Planning Commission received in the staff report several things that are red line version of the Development Area chapter and a clean version. At the end of January staff was reporting on the Board of Supervisors meeting from November where they had made some requests for changes to the chapter.

BOS Meeting November 11, 2014

- ✓ **New Neighborhoods**
- **Concerns with**
  - **Infill**
  - **Redevelopment**
  - **Neighborhood preservation and improvement**

New Objective: Promote Livability in Existing Neighborhoods

One of the big ones was in the change of tone for how this would be written and especially as it related to existing neighborhoods. The Board said the new neighborhoods are really looking good and are functioning as they want them to. However, with existing neighborhoods they are having issues with infill, redevelopment and any existing neighborhood preservation and improvement.

Staff brought the Commission just a little piece of the Development Areas chapter and it really did not make a lot of sense out of context. Therefore, staff provided the context for the changes that the Board asked for. Staff will talk a little about that objective, but also about some of the other changes. One of the most important pieces obviously was to promote livability in the existing neighborhoods. If the Development Areas are going to be the places where they want people to be and where people want to be they need to in some ways be improved to reflect our goals for our Development Areas. Therefore, four strategies were added to Objective 3 about promoting livability in existing neighborhoods.

New Objective: Promote Livability in Existing Neighborhoods

- **3a: Use Community Advisory Councils (CAC's) to identify needs**
- **3b: Invest in improvements that are necessary, such as sidewalks, drainage improvements, road improvements, interconnections, and those kind of things**
- **3c: Establish expectations for property maintenance**

They had a discussion on the issue of property maintenance. At the last meeting staff told the Commission that the Board really was trying to introduce the concept and not solve the issues, but introduce the concept for future work. That really started with establishing what the expectations are for property maintenance. It was not to figure out how to improve properties, but start at the beginning on that. Staff gave some text with that

- **3d: Identify needed connections**

These were not necessarily interconnections for neighborhoods from one to the next, like opening up a cul-de-sac. Although that could come out as something that is needed, but mainly to help people get from their existing homes to places of employment or shopping using better methods of transportation and also road improvements to make those road connections work. Objective 3 is really what they want to be focusing on tonight.

Objective 5: promote density to create new compact places

- **Distinctions between "infill" and "greenfield"**
- **High end of density for greenfield**
- **Within density range for infill – depends on context – don't assume high end is most appropriate**

The other changes that they made to this chapter to try to respond to the Board of Supervisors request were to provide some greater distinctions between "infill" and "Greenfield" development. There have been some rezoning that have taken place over the last several years where a lot of density was proposed near existing neighborhoods when the Comp Plan says the density should be at the highest level. It also says that there should be care taken when you are in an infill situation. The Board wanted more language about compatibility. Staff split those concepts up into the "infill" and "Greenfield" matters. Infill and Greenfield are really kind of soft fluffy terms and are not closely defined. Some of it is a matter

of the eye of the beholder. However, what they are trying to get at is if there are people who are very close in an existing neighborhood that might be affected by new development they need to be part of the process. The highest end of density may or may not be the most appropriate there. So it really depends on the context.

The other issue had to do with infill and compatibility, Objective 6: promote infill that is compatible with surroundings

- The importance of the Neighborhood Model principles needing to be applied reasonably. That is something that already exists in the plan, but it apparently was not obvious enough to the Board about what and when to apply it. Staff gave some more text and explanation to that.
- Encourage developers to meet with neighbors sort of reflecting the new process. Staff also made a note that they have a requirement for a neighborhood meeting for rezonings, special use permits and 2232 compliance with the Comp Plan. However, they can also encourage developers in by-right situations to have neighborhood meetings.
- Use designs to help new development blend (in infill situation use to blend). When somebody is designing a development in an infill situation use the existing design and architectural characteristics of that neighborhood to help it blend better so that something is not so starkly different.

Other Changes:

- **Review new water resources requirements – do intermittent streams need to be buffered?**
- **Differences between density calculations in Zoning Ordinance (ZO) and Comp. Plan – review to see if ZO needs to be changed**
- **Continue joint work with City, UVA, and Scottsville**

Concerns came from the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council about whether or not stream buffers should be put on intermittent streams. They don't know the answer to that question because they are still looking at the new state and federal regulations. However, that is something the Board said let's look into that and see if they need to have stream buffer requirements on intermittent streams and if those should be taken out of the area that would then be available for development. The Board really likes the cooperative work that has been done to date with the County/City Planning Commissions and they want to see it continued. So they bolstered that recommendation as well as with University of Virginia (UVA). In addition, they wanted to make sure they did not leave out Scottsville in conversations about things. So that is now in what the Commission reviewed.

The bulk of the conversation tonight, staff is hoping, will be on Objective 3, which is what the Board asked the Commission to provide feedback on. The feedback, suggested changes or recommendation then would go to the Board of Supervisors. If the Commission has other comments on other sections, please feel free to provide those. Staff can make changes to basic editing or clarity before putting it in the final form. Staff wants to get it to the Board of Supervisors in the best form for them to see. But, if there is something substantive, that really is going to be a separate matter that the Commission would need to suggest to the Board separately. Staff's request would be there are no substantive changes. First, the Board wanted to get the Commission focused on just Objective 3. They are so far in the process now that staff is hoping to get things tidied up. The Board has said they want to have the comp plan adopted by June. Therefore, they don't have a lot more time. She asked for the Commission's recommendation after they take public comment.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff. He encouraged the Commission focus on Objective 3.

Ms. Firehock said she had some questions and comments, but will stick to Objective 3 as requested. One of the questions she had is under Objective 3, Strategy 3c establish expectations for maintenance of properties within neighborhoods. She is looking at 8.28 on the track changes.

Ms. Echols said it was easier to look at the clean version.

Ms. Firehock said she remembers the conversation so understands how this got to be the way it is. The first sentence at the end of that paragraph says, "For a few of the County's older apartment complexes and mobile home parks, maintenance is needed to ensure that broken elements such as windows and stairs, are fixed or replaced, and trash is picked up." She is concerned about whether they are setting up a higher expectation than what the county has the ability to meet. The note she wrote to herself was whose job is that. Sometimes when neighborhood associations or advisory committees get together and there is power in numbers and then they can go talk to landlords who are not being good actors or not as aware of the maintenance needs of their facilities. That can be a very useful tool, which she certainly has found that in her experience. The way that it was worded she wondered what is the County actually saying about whose job that would be.

Ms. Echols replied: the answer is they don't know yet and that is sort of for the establishment. She was trying to give an example of what she saw while out looking in the neighborhoods that represented some of the issues that one might be dealing with regarding property maintenance. In terms of who should do what she thinks that is part of the activity that would take place after establishing what is the expectation and at what level they want property maintenance to be taking place if they want to be involved in it at all. Her understanding to date of how change has taken place has been with different staff members sort of informally. In the last staff report she pointed out that sometimes the police have gotten involved because of situations that have taken place mostly in apartment complexes where there was crime occurring. They contacted the property owner and said some of this might be eliminated if they did X Y and Z just in terms of their property maintenance. Some of it has come from Social Services and the Housing Office. It is just different people who are not formally saying you have to do this but making suggestions because it affected groups of people that they were dealing with. The discussion about how or if there should be some requirements developed has to start somewhere. That is where they are starting. If she thinks maybe those are not great examples staff can certainly reword things.

Ms. Firehock apologized that she did not come tonight with specific language. However, she was feeling like there needs to be some reworking of that text to be clear. Obviously, the county does not have a blight ordinance at this time. That is something that may or may not be considered in the future. They do not have these councils in place. There are state laws for landlord tenant rights, etc. She guessed it was just a little too muddy for her comfort level. Maybe they should talk more about how they would want to see these councils or committees established to help to have a way to facilitate this conversation. She worried that the way it was worded now if she was reading it and just a citizen of Albemarle without being a planner she would be very confused as to what the county was saying about its authority, interest and level of intent to get engaged in private property issues, etc.

Ms. Echols noted just to be clear about our advisory councils. Places29 is being reconstituted. However, as soon as that gets resolved at the Board's level and they appoint the members there will be advisory councils there. As soon as the comprehensive plan is adopted with the Southern and Western Neighborhoods advisory councils will be appointed at that time. So she would expect early in the summer they are going to have all councils in place. If there is a question about community advisory councils hopefully the hyperlink will help.

Ms. Firehock said she was not questioning whether there should be advisory councils. She was just saying that it reads as if there is a lot more power on the part of the county than there actually is. That is the concern.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that within the City of Charlottesville there is an ordinance that sidewalks must be shoveled within 24 hours. He was at a meeting today and had to walk the sidewalks. He found that probably a third of the sidewalks he walked on were not shoveled. Thereby, he walked on the road. He was conscious that a car was behind that slowed down because he was walking in the road. To follow up on Ms. Firehock's point he asked can the county meet these kinds of expectations. Who is going to be available on county staff to determine that there are broken elements such as windows and stairs that need repair or replacement? Who is going to cite somebody for when trash has been littered in a yard? He wanted to keep Mr. Williamson's point in front of us here to permit us to permit you. He did not think anyone is interested in seeing 12 additional people hired who will be the neighborhood enforcement staff and will be out there writing tickets on low level kinds of infringements on ordinances in the county. He

thinks what is missing in here, which is the devil in the details, is how we are going to get there. They are going to need some wording in here about a neighborhood enhancement program that is going to need some muscle in it. The muscle is going to have to probably be volunteer-centered and neighborhood based. He did not see this being effective if appointed from the top. He did not see the Board of Supervisors being able to have people come to them and say they want to be a part of a CAC that is going to clean up and cite neighbors for violations because they are littering the neighborhood. It really is going to have to be people that are in the neighborhood that want to take on this role, that are prepared to step up and say their property values are dependent on the protection of that neighborhood. That is volunteer-centered, neighborhood-based and is not government created where they can have ownership taken by residents in the neighborhood who help county employees, the police, social worker, planning commission and planners, etc. go ahead and see these changes. He thinks it is going to be a while before this county is prepared to undertake a blight ordinance. If the County is not program-centric, things will continue to deteriorate. He would hate to see us get involved with that at the tail end when things are worse than they are today. There are some neighborhoods and streets that are a real problem currently and probably will not get better.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Morgan Butler, with the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC), provided SELC Comments on the Development Areas Chapter - County Planning Commission Work Session 2/24/15.

"The primary focus tonight is on the new Objective 3. We've reviewed that section and agree it's an important objective and we're glad to see some additional emphasis being put on this issue. We don't have any major concerns with the language.

We also took advantage of the opportunity to review the revisions to the Development Area chapter carefully, with special attention to Objective 7 and Strategy 7a, which address the availability of industrial land – an issue we've been involved with throughout this process. We're concerned that some of the recent changes to the language in Strategy 7a could give the mistaken impression that there is an insufficient amount of land designated for industrial uses in the Development Area, which could lead to the new economic development director focusing attention on expanding the Development Areas. In fact, the analyses that have been done indicated that there's a sufficient amount of land designated for industrial use, but that there are some challenges with some of that land, as well as places where work needs to be done to get the land into the desired use.

On this important point, there's new language in the Economic Development chapter that summarizes the situation well – Strategy 4a on p. 6.13: *"As part of the background work for this Comp Plan update, an analysis of land area available for industrial and office/R&D/flex/light industrial uses was done. The result of the analysis was that overall acreage is sufficient for future needs, but much of the available land is in small parcels and lacks the needed roads to be marketable to new and expanding target industries."*

We request that the language on this point in Strategy 7a be made more consistent with the language in Strategy 4a, and that the focus be on steps to be taken to make the designated land in the Development Areas more available for the desired use. These steps include:

1. Rezone industrially designated land to industrial zoning.
2. Look at ways to combine smaller industrial parcels into larger ones.
3. Look at ways to provide better infrastructure and utilities to industrial parcels.

In addition, there's another important point we request be emphasized better in the text, and that's the 2013 zoning text amendment that made commercially zoned parcels available for more industrial uses. In the assessments of industrial land availability that have been done to date, commercially zoned parcels have not to our knowledge been taken into account. And while market forces may put some constraints on how much commercially zoned land may be used for employment and industrial uses, we can't just ignore the commercial land issue, either. So a fourth important piece of work will be to identify vacant commercially zoned parcels that could accommodate employment uses and which possess the needed characteristics for the target industries.

In sum, there are plenty of good and necessary steps to be taken within the development areas to get the appropriate use out of industrially designated land, and we should be emphasizing those – and that overarching context – in this section of the Comprehensive Plan. Our concern is that some of the new language in Strategy 7a could make it sound like overall industrial land availability is an issue, and could thereby inadvertently suggest that it's already time to be looking outside the Development Areas."

Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, recognized with regards to infill development and maintenance that there are individuals within the County who chose to live in developments specifically because they do not have homeowners associations due to restrictions under the covenants. Due to the challenges he did not believe the County should get into the "lawnmower police" that he has seen other localities actually attempt. There is an issue with the level of intensity the county placed on the citizens' advisory councils of elected bodies of well-intentioned citizens that may or may not have the wide view the Planning Commission and others may have on mixed infill development use. With regards to Mr. Butler's comments about Strategy 7 he would raise a different concern since the way he read that it really allowed for some flexibility especially for existing businesses. They have existing businesses that literally cannot expand because of the development area boundaries. It seems reasonable and rational that those job producing businesses should be allowed if they have an opportunity to expand from the Development Area into the Rural Area. He strongly encourages the Commission to support flexibility in this comprehensive plan rather than what they see with our 16 year old growth development area boundaries. He thinks the jobs are critical to the Economic Development Plan and how you look at infill. He thinks they are going to be seeing in the future more mixed use infill and he did not know if they are really ready for it. He did not think the community advisory councils are ready to accept infill mixed use within the neighborhoods.

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

Mr. Randolph pointed out he liked the comment in Mr. Williamson's remarks. He would cite that in the case of Carter Myers this body did agreed with a comp plan amendment and unanimously recommended it so that there would be expansion of an existing business into a residential area. Secondly, they also were unanimous as a planning commission behind the multi-use aspects of Woolen Mills and actually urging that there be more residential because it seemed appropriate to the objectives of the developer. They are very conscious of that. In both cases he was pleased to say the Commission was unanimous in its agreement that these needed to move forward. He just wants that to be on the record.

Mr. Dotson said he had a few comments with Objective 3. In going back to the discussion that the Commission had the last they looked at this he was troubled by the wording "utilize community advisory councils." It sounds almost manipulate to say utilize. What he would propose is "work with community advisory councils and/or other neighborhood groups." They had a considerable discussion about whether community advisory councils were the only groups that might get involved here. So he would not want to leave it just at community advisory councils. In the next line the word "those" needs to be moved after the word "make" so it says "make those", which is a minor typo. That being his only comment he thinks Objective 3 is good as it stands though he has heard the concerns of the other commissioners. On Objective 6 he had sent out some thoughts to Commission members a number of weeks ago. He thanked staff for giving us the whole context. He thinks Objective 6 addresses the things that he was concerned about. So he thanked staff for providing that advance look at that.

Mr. Keller said it seemed with the work staff has done on the design guidelines for existing neighborhoods and the physical changes documents that it seems that there is going to be an infill. Staff knows the numbers since they have looked at these neighborhoods. So maybe they are far fewer than he would think. However, in these older subdivisions there would be undeveloped lots or double lots with one house on them to have the development potential. So the only piece that seems to be missing in terms of strategy is a strategy that is actually addressing design and how new construction fits within the character of those existing neighborhoods. Staff has done it in terms of the public infrastructure, such as sidewalks, drainage and that sort of thing. He wondered if it needs to be called out as a separate strategy. He would cite the discussions that the city had in the Fryer Spring neighborhood a while back. There were

very interesting discussions from developers who were interested in taking advantage of zoning, other folks that wanted zoning changes, and the ancillary building discussion. It was a concern of at least one Commissioner and Supervisor about how that could become problematic as opposed to the carriage house units that they are encouraging in new development that they are seeing as a positive density increase or possibly even an affordable housing component. Maybe this is something they start with the next comp plan update. However, he thinks they do need to be thinking along these lines.

Ms. Echols asked if he had looked at Strategy 6b. It is not in Objective 3b, but it is in Strategy 6b.

Mr. Keller agreed that does it, which gets him to the point of what Mr. Butler was saying about the industrial. He asked is there a way for us to kind of cite when these things need to be interconnected across these points and is there a way that they can reference back so they don't have to be redundant.

Ms. Echols replied yes.

Ms. Firehock said she agreed. In 6b at the bottom it says the county may want to consider such guidelines for the development community, etc. In her notes she wrote yes! However, she also thinks they need to create some density design information geared at citizens. This talks a lot about ask your neighborhoods and people what they want. In her experience a lot of times people, for example, have been against townhouses because they see them as not well constructed, not very attractive townhouse development in Albemarle County and they think that is what all townhouse developments look like. Or they think density is a dirty word and all density is ugly and terrible. When you show them pictures or new ways to do density they say oh actually I like that. When asked if they knew it was 7 units per acre, they respond that they had no idea it could be that nice and it could still have open space. She thinks they should definitely provide some kind of guidance for the development community on what they think good infill and good density is. However, she also thinks that they should not overlook the community. If they ask the community what they want they can only comment on what they know or what they have seen. If they have not seen a good example, they are not going to come up with something new. To push it a little farther she would also like to figure out a way to do this with the community. They could have some guidance that is perhaps written for the lay person. She would be happy to work on some sort of future work group with her colleagues about establishing some of this guidance and easy to understand imagery.

Mr. Morris said that he would focus on primarily the 3 areas that staff asked the Commission to look at. He liked what was written. It sounds great. He would have to go back to Ms. Firehock's comment about how they are going to do it. Unfortunately, when he sees investments in public services, improvements and sidewalks, drainage, public parks and so on very nice affluent subdivisions come to mind, which includes such as Fontana, Ashcroft, Franklin, etc. where they like it without sidewalks except there is nowhere to walk. So they are darn if they do or darn if they don't. He asked how they are going to get it done. In a lot of communities, such as my own, as Ms. Firehock brought out they have let the covenant lapse and they now call the county and complain about blight. However, there is nothing the county can do about it unless they break specific rules and regulations. But, what they have written here are strategies and as strategies they are wonderful. He just has to look at and ask how we are going to do it.

Ms. Echols replied it would be with the master plans. In our Development Areas they have in our master plans the list of improvements that are needed. If there are improvements that need to get on that list through the master planning process through the comp plan updates some of those improvements would be added to the list. She thinks there is a big distinction between public improvements and improvements on private properties. So things like drainage and sidewalk improvements some of those are already on the list for the master planned areas. Through the updates of the master plan they would expect more might go on those. So that is sort of the community advisory council role in the public improvement realm. When the Board asked that this be added to the strategies she thinks the Supervisor was trying to make a point that they have a lot of capital improvements project needs and they need to recognize them and somehow get them going. A lot of them are in our neighborhoods that maybe are not as old as Fontana. It might be a lot of the older neighborhoods where there are problems that result because of age and not because of the development style. So in terms of the advisory councils for that particular aspect she thinks that was how they intended that to play out.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the reality is that anything they do in the plan as an initiative that moves forward through an implementation is going to have a resource requirement connected with it. A lot of this would be the capital improvements program, which of course has to have budgeted monies to be successful or they are accomplishing it through other means that might involve volunteerism and citizens that are not on the payroll and initiatives that are not in the capital budget. But, he thinks what he is saying is that for any of these things it might be considered whether it is some kind of a program that better addresses some maintenance needs or investment in new infrastructure that there has to be an analysis of how to bring the resources to bear to do that. That is just basically a statement they could include in here. That is a fundamental piece. They have to identify the resources that can make it happen.

Mr. Morris said he did not know what the legal process would be for a community. He asked how they reinstitute it if they let it lapse. He understands that almost 100 percent have to agree to it.

Mr. Kamptner replied that he was not well versed in that area of the law. However, he would think that any lot owner within the subdivision would have to consent in having the covenant recorded against their property.

Mr. Morris said he would love to see it because it is wonderful and a great strategy. But, how do you do it.

Mr. Keller asked to go back to the infill. Because he had looked at Strategy 6 it seems that there are two scales of infill that they are talking about. Strategy 3 is a lot within an existing neighborhood and Strategy 6 talks about that. However, Strategy 6 is really talking about a small subdivision that fits in where there is land that has not been developed between other subdivisions. He thinks there needs to be a distinction made between those two. The design guidelines and development process is going to be different, especially if the encouragement is to get higher density through a rezoning or special use permit for multiple units. Perhaps that is splitting hairs at this time, but in the future they need to think about those types of development differently because they have different needs.

Ms. Firehock said along those lines there is a section that talks about encouraging side-loaded garages so that most of the experience of the unit is at the front. When she thinks about trying to encourage density and infill then that becomes challenging. She has worked with some clients in other localities where requiring side-loaded garages made it very difficult to achieve density because of having to spread so much that way and the extra driveway length coming around the side. So they ended up with wider lots than what the design was trying to achieve. She was going to put her Storm Water Committee hat on for a moment because they are trying to find ways to reduce excessive pavement in the county as they try to go forward with reducing storm water. There are some conflicts within this chapter in terms of the objectives that it is trying overall. That is why she feels they need to be clear on what they are talking about. They are talking about infill brand new development. Any brand new development she did not think they should be pushing so hard on that level of design.

Ms. Echols asked Ms. Firehock to show her where the side-loaded garages are because rear loaded is what they have been talking about for relegated parking so they would have access from the rear. If side-loaded was in the language, it was not intentional.

Mr. Randolph made a recommendation in 8.35 to change to "hoofed animals."

Ms. Echols asked to go back to Objective 3 to bring that one to closure. She reiterated her biggest take away from this was:

- The point Mr. Dotson made in 3a working with advisory councils and/or other neighborhoods groups.
- It captures the kinds of things that Mr. Randolph was saying about needing to get volunteers and other neighborhood residents involved in whatever happens with those particular neighborhoods.
- In terms of the expectations for maintenance in 3c rewriting this so that it is clearer that this is about they are establishing expectations as well as the methods. The first step is the expectations

and the next step is the methods. There is not a perception that the county is going to be doing all of these things before we know what all is involved in it.

- If there is a place for us to be a little clearer about levels of infill sort of small versus large. If there is a way to work something like that in there with the 6a and also making sure it is clear they are supposed to be hyperlinked back so it is not repeated. They can try to incorporate that. She asked if that was a fair assessment of what she was hearing so they can rewrite so that it more closely follows the things the Commission was saying.
- The other thing she would like to respond to with regards to the other Objective 7 is that they are trying if the language is in one place that it needs to be very closely if not exactly the same in another place and this may be a place where they did not get those two lined up exactly right. She appreciates the comments about that and will take those comments to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dotson said he would agree with that summary. For his own sake he would say also the comments that Mr. Butler offered seemed very much on target and sensible.

Mr. Morris agreed that it was well done and the Planning Commission recommended approval of this chapter with changes to staff's recommended language.

Summary - CPA-2013-00001 Development Area Neighborhood Preservation, Infill & Redevelopment - Planning Commission Recommendation

The Planning Commission **AGREED BY CONSENSUS** to staff's recommended language in the **updated** Comprehensive Plan text clarifying uses allowed in the new Objective 3 for preservation of existing neighborhoods:

- Modify Strategy 3a to reflect the need to work with advisory councils and/or other neighborhoods groups.
- Revise Strategy 3c to be clear as to who should be doing the work related to property maintenance. The Commission believes that it is important that the County not expect to set up a program requiring property maintenance as the first step. There are other ways to help improve properties that should be explored as the first step, such as neighborhood enhancement programs that are volunteer-centered and neighborhood-based.

The Planning Commission also provided suggestions on other changes to the Development Areas chapter for clarity:

- Be clear that Strategy 24o related to redevelopment ties to Strategy 6b regarding use of architectural techniques to create more compatible design.
- Objective 6 related to infill should also relate to redevelopment. See if you can find a way to distinguish between different levels of infill, such as small vs. large infill.
- Make sure you have good hyperlinks.
- In Strategy 6b, include laypersons with developers for groups who should be included for receiving more detailed guidelines for infill and redevelopment.
- Make the wording in Strategy 7a more consistent with the language in Strategy 4a from the Economic Development Chapter. This would focus the new Economic Development Director's attention on steps to be taken to make the designated land in the Development Areas more available for the desired use. The way it is currently written, it appears that expanding the Development Areas might be intended as the outcome for making more industrial land or land designated for employment uses the first step.
- In Strategy 8.35 consider changing "pigs and cattle" to "hoofed animals," to represent the types of animals that are not appropriate in the Development Areas for urban agriculture. Otherwise, someone might think that llamas and alpacas are ok in the Development Areas because they are not pigs or cattle.

The Planning Commission recessed at 7:27 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 7:32 p.m.

Work Session:

Community Development Tentative Work Program
(Mark Graham)

In a PowerPoint presentation Mr. Graham presented the Community Development Tentative 2015/2016 Work Program, which was a repeat of the Board's presentation on February 11th. He noted the following items as primary points for discussion:

1. Review Progress with Current Work Program
2. Review Staff Availability for Next Year's Work Program
3. Review Priorities, Recognize Comp Plan Strategies not yet prioritized
4. May 2015 – Finalize FY 16 Work Program, FY17-19 Work Program Following Strategic Plan Retreat

This year they are doing it a little different in that they are relying on a lot of the strategies out of the comprehensive plan which they have not yet prioritized in trying to understand which items they want us to work on. Staff decided not to get the Work Program set in February, but to start the discussion to see if there are other things outside the comprehensive plan that they were interested in. Then they would come back to them hopefully in May when they had those comp plan strategies prioritized and try to put the two together. Within the current work program they just kind of updated that the comp plan was ongoing as far as the update. Then they are ready to go with strategy input implementation there. They did a number of ordinances and programs this last year, the Virginia Storm water Management Programs are a mandated program as was the Flood Hazard Overlay. Then they had some Wireless items they were working on with Phase 2. The Wireless Phase 3 deals with some of the FCC mandates. They are behind this year on the fees update because they wound up taking a lot of our resource capacity and diverted it to Route29 Solutions, which at the time they developed this work program last February was not on anybody's radar screen. It is a good illustration of how things can pop up on us. Then they still have some things out there in our parking lot, transient lodging, ARB Guidelines as well as drive-thru/parking garages and outdoor display trying to update our standards.

Comprehensive Plan
- Update
- Strategy Implementation
- Artist Communities

Ordinances and Programs
- VSMP
- Wireless, Phase 2
- Flood Hazard Overlay
- Steep Slopes (Critical Slopes)
- Offsite Signs
- Wireless, Phase 3
- Fees Update
- Subdivision "housekeeping"
- Zoning Ordinance Recodification
- Natural Heritage Modeling
- ARB Guidelines
- Zoning – Neighborhood Model Setbacks
- Transient Lodging
- Drive-thru / Parking Garages / Outdoor Display

The next thing he always tries to make sure everybody understands is how our work program fits into there. In a PowerPoint presentation Mr. Graham reviewed several graphs and a pie chart regarding the resources they have available. (See PowerPoint presentation) The purpose of that is just to illustrate the work program is what they do with the available slack resources for anything that is above and beyond what they need for processing of applications.

Next, he went over a couple of graphs that he thought were important for them. This is the first year that they started getting some of our staff back after they downsized during the recession. In the last year they added 3 ½ positions in engineering and 1 building inspector. The building inspector was very important because they were seeing a considerable uptick with the building activity. They are basically returning to the pre-recession levels or close to it. The engineering positions were all related to the mandate that they had with the Virginia Storm Water Management Program. He reviewed the building permit activity graph.

Next he reviewed the Zoning Violations: Total and Per Compliance Officer. This is our highest priority as far as needing resources dealing with code compliance. In looking at the number of violations they had and then adjusting with the number of Code Compliance Officers they had what they have seen is almost over a 40 percent jump in this time period. Then it dropped off this last year, which was because it got so bad they were delaying so much on follow up they had to come up with a new strategy for how they were going to do these things. Rather than treat them strictly as violations they started doing a more aggressive effort at trying to get out there and work with people to solve this without us having to actually go to the effort of writing it up as a violation. They found that they were having pretty decent compliance with that, which allowed us to drop the numbers there.

The last one is special use permits, which is one of the things the Commission sees from us. Those continue to drop this last year. But, it also illustrates some of the variability in that last year they had 22 applications, but just in the month of January they had 10 applications. So they had a half year worth of work in one month. They will see what happens in the future here. They do expect a significant jump on that mainly related to wireless facilities. They had about 40 applications, either building permits or type 2 site plan applications last year. Based on our pre-applications they are anticipated they will probably have over 100 in the first 6 months of this year. The industry is really adjusting to the 4G, LTE and changing their facilities quite a bit.

Summarizing Workload - FY 16 Crystal Ball

- Maintaining development activity
  - Most development programs have returned to "normal" levels
  - Staff has limited capacity for new initiatives
  - Process improvements have offset workload increases, but few remaining opportunities without scaling back programs
  - Caution for the future
  - Increasingly important to retain trained staff

FY 16 Staff Recommendations

1. Legal Mandates – Those measures required by Federal or State Law
   - County Ordinance Enforcement - Respond to State Changes
   - Conservation Easement Monitoring
   - Comprehensive Plan Update
   - County Initiatives – Objectives established by the Board
   - Strategic Plan (TBD)
   - Comprehensive Plan Implementation (TBD: Board work sessions)
2. Other – Ordinance Amendments underway or per policy
   - Cash Proffer Policy
   - Wireless
   - Fees
   - Zoning Ordinance Recodification
   - Entrance Corridor Guidelines

Staff's "Straw Man" FY 16

1. Ongoing
   - Cash Proffer Policy
   - Wireless Phase 3, anticipated mandate from FCC
   - Development Fees, overdue under Board policy
2. Added Initiatives
   - Entrance Corridor Guidelines Update , coordinated with master plans and small

area plan
- Zoning Ordinance Recodification, overdue effort to simplify ordinance (e.g. Route 29 Small Area Plan, Pantops)

3. Comprehensive Plan Implementation
   - Pantops Master Plan Update, overdue
   - Route 29 / Rio Road Small Area Plan, anticipate 2 year project

Mr. Morris asked if they would be working with the city on the Entrance Corridor Guidelines. One of the things he remembered when they were looking at the comp plan is there is kind of disconnect between their requirements and ours.

Mr. Graham replied yes that one was part of it, and the other is to actually start looking at more corridor specific guidelines. Different corridors may have different approaches to these architectural standards. That would work hand in hand with the master plan updates or the small area plan that was being developed. He invited questions.

The Planning Commission discussed and asked questions of staff:

Ms. Firehock questioned the asterisk placed where resources are limited, and Mr. Graham replied unless the Board prioritizes it staff will do it as time becomes available or if they reprioritize something.

Mr. Keller questioned where it is broken down residential versus commercial building permit activity. Mr. Graham replied the building permit activity reports break down residential versus commercial building permits and the data shows the new residential is what is growing here.

Mr. Dotson asked in the category of residential how single-family detached compares to the other categories.

Mr. Graham replied if they look at this last year this is the first year that they really saw a jump in the single-family detached housing. Surprisingly they were seeing a big jump in the single-family detached housing in the development areas. In the prior years they saw a lot more townhouses being built and there were a number of apartment complexes that came on line just as a side. Apartments tend to run in waves. You will see 3, 4 or 5 of those big apartment buildings get built within a 1 1/2 or 2 1/2 year period and then the market kind of goes dead for a few years. They have kind of run the cycle on that one now and it will probably be a few more years before they see any big apartment complexes getting built. The townhouses are still staying fairly strong, but not as strong as they were earlier.

Mr. Cilimberg said he wanted to make sure the Commission has gotten the year end building reports. In looking at the numbers last year 309 of the county's 475 units were single-family detached?

Mr. Graham pointed out there was a big jump this last year in the number of single-family detached. There was some increase in the rural area development in rural area versus development area. However, it was not a huge jump and it is still nowhere close to what they saw in those pre-recession levels.

Mr. Randolph complimented staff on the graphs provided that were multi-year based. Now they can really look at trend analysis, which is a real forward step and very helpful. When he looks at the FTE he feels the four FTE needs identify a scheme for an intern to come in who is either in a master program or a doctoral program in planning and could do a project around that. Thereby, it would provide the staffing that would be at no additional cost to the county and yet they would get a tremendous professional benefit from that. That is just a thought of a way to cover costs.

Mr. Morris thanked Mr. Graham for his presentation.

Old Business:

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting moved to the next item.

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- No Planning Commission meeting on March 3, 2015.
- The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 10, 2015 in room 241.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:58 p.m. to the Tuesday, March 10, 2015 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Room #241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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