Albemarle County Planning Commission
April 7, 2015

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, April 7, 2015, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

Other officials present were Stewart Wright, Senior Permit Planner; Amelia McCulley, Director of Zoning/Zoning Administrator; 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 was noted by Commission members:

Mr. Keller reported the Fiscal Impact Committee continues to meet weekly in their review of the Cash Proffer Policy and should have a report in several weeks. They are going point by point of elements that would be appropriate to use in the formula to create a new set of proffer numbers that are based on the formula that had been put into place in 2007. They are getting very close to that and he would like to think that in several weeks he would have a report on the specifics.

Mr. Randolph reported The Solid Waste Task Force just finished today the second of the four hour workshops on Solid Waste Priorities for Albemarle County. It was a very productive workshop and they have come to some priorities one which will be continuing to operate Ivy as a transfer station, but with an improved configuration of that transfer station and in addition with a recycling component to the transfer station. Then there was also agreement at looking at other recycling centers that might be appropriate for elsewhere in the county. It would not be a transfer station, but where the county would have a capability to have residents recycling solid waste.

Ms. Firehock reported the meeting of the National Heritage Committee was moved to next week. The Water Resources Funding Advisory Committee is meeting on Thursday.

Mr. Morris reported the Rivanna River Corridor Committee did not meet last month, but will meet later this month at a new day and time. Mr. Cilimberg noted they will meet next Thursday, April 16 at 4:00 p.m. at the Planning District Water Street Center.

Mr. Morris reported they had a meeting with the folks from the North Pointe project. There are some very interesting items coming about there that probably will be surfacing and it is more appropriate to talk about situations that developers are being faced with simply to meet environmental regulation new interpretation by the Corps of Engineers. It is cutting back on density in essence. So they have to take a look at that. It goes back to what Mr. Keller has been asking for that they really have to take a look at housing in an overall view.

Mr. Dotson reported on the following:

Regarding the ACE Committee he received an email today from our Chair reiterating a plea that he made to the Commission several weeks ago. He read the email to the ACE members, as follows, "As they all know adequate funding for ACE is essential for its survival and effectiveness. The Board will consider whether to allocate $500,000 to the program for next year or less or even zero. They would like to be at one million, which is actually what the program began with. But, if they can get at least $500,000 the State and possibly other matches will help us keep going in a meaningful way. Please contact your Supervisor with your thoughts." He would make that same request to the Commission members to weigh in with their Supervisors support of funding at least at the $500,000 level.

The PRFA (Public Recreation Facilities Authority) met recently and received. The division of labor between ACE and PFRA is ACE acquires easements and it does not steward and manage those easements. So after ACE has acquired them those essentially are turned over to the PRFA. The PRFA met recently and accepted two ACE easements on two high quality properties. The real plea is in terms of the funding for the ACE Program.

Mr. Keller asked if he would like the Commission to entertain a motion on that to the Board of Supervisors, and Mr. Dotson replied that he certainly would.

Mr. Keller questioned how it should be worded, and Mr. Cilimberg replied that Mr. Dotson had some language.

Mr. Dotson said perhaps it should say that the Planning Commission supports a minimum of $500,000 funding for the continuation of the ACE Program in order to guarantee its survival and effectiveness.

Mr. Keller said they should include something in support of the Comprehensive Plan both for rural land preservation and to focus development in the Development Area.

Mr. Dotson added this would enable the program to also leverage state and federal funds.

Motion: Mr. Keller moved and Mr. Dotson seconded that the Planning Commission supports a minimum of $500,000 funding for the continuation of the ACE Program in order to guarantee its survival and effectiveness in support of the Comprehensive Plan both for rural land preservation and to focus development in the Development Area. This would enable the program to also leverage state and federal funds.

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

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out that right now the Board of Supervisors was meeting across the hall and considering funding. Staff will send it on but it won't get to the Board of Supervisors before this year's budget consideration.

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

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – April 1, 2015

Mr. Cilimberg reviewed the actions taken on April 1, 2015.

Consent Agenda:

Approval of Minutes: February 3, 2015

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 (6:0). (Lafferty absent)

Mr. Morris noted the consent agenda was approved.

Regular Items:

a. **ZTA-2015-00004 Phase I Route 29 Solutions Business Signage Impacts**
The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to receive comments on its intent to recommend adoption of an ordinance amending Secs. 4.15.2, Definitions, 4.15.4A, Signs authorized by temporary sign permit, 4.15.7, prohibited signs and sign characteristics, and 30.6.5, Development exempt from requirement to obtain certificate of appropriateness, of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code. This ordinance would amend Sec. 4.15.2 by amending the definition of temporary sign; amend Sec. 4.15.4A to allow a second class of temporary sign permit where the temporary sign replaces a permanent signs required to be removed by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) in conjunction with certain described construction projects, and the temporary sign permit would be valid until the project is substantially complete or a permanent sign is installed; amend Sec. 4.15.7 to correct the cross-reference Sec. 4.15.4A, and amend Sec. 30.6.5 to add an exemption from the requirement for a new certificate of appropriateness for the re-erection of the same permanent sign previously required to be removed by VDOT in the circumstances described above. A copy of the full text of the ordinance is on file in the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and in the Department of Community Development, County Office Building. (Mandy Burbage)

Staff Presentation:
Amelia McCulley presented a PowerPoint presentation on ZTA 2015-4 Phase 1 Route 29 Solutions Business Signage

This zoning text amendment is very narrowly focused. Phase 1 is entirely intended to address existing business signage that will be removed with the construction of the Rio-29 grade separated interchange. They are expediting this ordinance amendment process due to the tight schedule for pending sign removal. She would give a broader view than the Phase 1 ordinance

amendment. She would explain the broader Route 29 Solutions signage program within the context of the business assistance program in addition to the specific changes proposed with this ordinance amendment. A link was sent to the Commission late in the day to the strategies under the business assistance program, which is a much better explanation than she will provide. Also, Lee Catlin is happy to come and speak further about that.

The properties that are impacted for the Route 29 / Rio interchange are shown in the slide. The project limits of construction extend from the 29th Place signal (South) to Woodbrook Drive (North) and from the Berkmar/ Rio intersection (West) to the mall entrance on Rio Rd (East). There are more detailed plans.

The most up-to-date construction schedule provided by VDOT is:

March 4, 2015 - VDOT Contractor Notice to Proceed
May, 2015 – Utility work begins
Fall, 2015 – Night road construction work begins
May 23, 2016 - Partial closure of Rio Road intersection
September 2, 2016 – Interchange complete

Staff meets with VDOT regularly with several different panels and teams. The Sign Team that is focused on signage meets again tomorrow. Utility work is slated to begin as early as this May. Night construction work begins in the fall and is planned to be limited to the hours between 9 p.m. and 6 a.m.

During the 103 day period between May 23, 2016 and September 2, 2016, traffic flows through the Rio-29 intersection will be limited to through traffic on 29 and right turns from Rio Road to 29 and vice versa.

There are over 200 businesses within the project limits (1/3 of those businesses are within Fashion Square). All of the business entrances will remain open during construction including during the 103 day period. This zoning text amendment for Phase 1 is about the situation in which 10 existing signs on which 12 businesses identified are slated to lose signs as a result of the utility work beginning in May. All of those signs are conforming to the zoning regulations. Those signs that are subject to Architectural Review Board review are actually conforming and have Certificates of Appropriateness from the ARB.

VDOT construction signage is the most critical for way for people to have wayfinding during construction. VDOT expects to have final construction signage plans finalized by July, 2015 with the road design.

A broader view of the whole package of signage will be given focusing also on this ordinance amendment. They are very intent on limiting the provision of additional signage because, again, the VDOT signage is the most important provision for signage. They don't want to just add signs indiscriminately to clutter the field of vision, which is already compromised in a construction site. In the meantime the Board has adopted a resolution to provide temporary signage to accommodate businesses impacted by construction, specifically for those businesses whose signs will be removed.

This sign work is being done in the context of a broader County initiated Business Assistance Program. The construction mitigation / business assistance programs are designed to limit the negative economic impact of the construction projects on the surrounding businesses. There is

a whole package of strategies, which was provided to the Commission today. The program details will be finalized with the Board in May. They've given a consensus for a program that includes strategies in the areas of: technical assistance, marketing, communication, signage and regulatory measures. This initiative is springing from the signage strategies.

The Board has endorsed considering amending our sign regulations in 3 phases. Phase 1 is the most time sensitive and relates to 12 businesses losing their signs that could be without permanent signage for up to two years during construction; Board of Supervisors adopted resolution of intent to address temporary signage for these businesses on March 4. The Architectural Review Board has also endorsed this phase.

There are two other phases staff has identified. Staff has not received input or done an assessment to know just how far they would go with it. Phases 2 and 3 would be a consideration of sign allowances or sign provisions both for Phase 2 temporary signage for businesses that are not losing signs and Phase 3 changes to permanent sign regulations. That is based on the fact that staff is hearing from businesses that have concerns that the construction work and the resulting grade separation will cause visibility problems for them. All that is to say that there is a pretty deliberate process they are going to undertake before staff would agree they need to add signage provisions that will involve many different avenues for receiving input from businesses. That really will be done only after they get the signage plan from the contractor in July. Then staff can evaluate where the gaps are during construction at least. Lee Catlin will be working very closely with staff and they will be using one of the subcommittees to receive input on some of the future signage needs. They are going to use lots of different venues for obtaining that input.

Regarding VDOT Construction Signage, VDOT has indicated an interest in thinking/acting outside of "the box" to assist businesses and the community with this construction project. In this case they are open to being flexible about some of the regulations regarding different signage types. The directional, detour and entrance signage are expected to be part of the sign program developed with the road plans due early July. TODS (tourist oriented directional signage) is the blue sign program that lists specific businesses that qualify under the criteria and pay an annual fee. VDOT is willing to expand the program during this construction project to allow businesses that don't meet the criteria to obtain TODS signage. It is all in the effort of trying to provide more appropriate ways for businesses to have signage, have ways for people to know how to get to them and know that they are still open during the construction. There are a lot of other signs.

The Directional signage, Detour signage and Entrance signage will all be part of the contractor's signage package that they will see in July. The district / quadrant branding/labeling is something that would be used initially during construction and probably at a fairly basic level with input from PDAP (Project Delivery Advisory Panel). The PDAP have done a survey and are going to be receiving input to help guide some construction signage that will just at a very broad generic level provide district and quadrant branding. The idea is to use colors and quadrant names to guide drivers to make decisions as to whether to take the through road or the local road to reach their destination and how to access those businesses.
With the small area plan that will include this area, the County will consider more permanent branding or Place Associations.

Another type of signage VDOT would use is a combination of the entrance signage, directional signage and the TODS signage. Orange is sort of a typical construction background for signage construction work zone. Staff explained the context of what VDOT is going to provide in those

four different types of signage that would be in the right-of-way. Some of which is something that a business would apply for, such as the TODS signage. Some of it would be signage that VDOT provides as part of the construction signage.

Staff realized in our efforts that our current temporary sign regulations really were in no way anticipating a situation like this. Temporary signage are set up for the classic sort of grand opening event, special sales event or other types of seasonal activities that a someone wants a sign. There are all these limits in terms of numbers of signs, how long it can remain up and so forth. None of that is really conducive to somebody who is losing their sign for up to a two year construction period.

The reason she is saying two years is because while the signs will be removed potentially as early as May, (staff is talking about those ten signs that are in the utility area) it is very likely that because of the work that will be done with grading easements and construction easement the business may not want to put the sign back until they know the finished grade and sort of the finished product in the best location or that sign. So it could potentially be as long as two years for their temporary construction signage. That is the purpose of this ordinance amendment.

The proposed regulations would add a new provision in addition to those sorts of special events temporary signs for a temporary replacement sign. It also clarifies that a permanent replacement sign, which would be a sign that would purchased and removed or those 10 signs that they are talking about, if reinstalled consistent with their ARB review approval that is something that would be permitted. The ordinance would say very clearly that is provided and they would not have to then go back through the whole ARB review process again.

As stated previously, it is a narrowly focused ordinance amendment for Phase 1. Phases 2 and 3 have yet to be discussed. Staff does not know what format that will take and whether there will be a difference between what people and businesses want and what staff would recommend. That has yet to be seen. There is a lot of work to be done on that.

Staff Recommendation

- Following public hearing, staff recommends approval of proposed zoning ordinance amendment addressing (Phase 1) Route 29 Solutions Business Signage Impacts – Attachment A in staff report.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff.

Mr. Randolph questioned how VDOT is going to determine the order in which businesses are listed on the signs. He recommended that it be alphabetical because there is going to be so much signage and confusion in this corridor that he thinks it would be much easier for drivers to look for businesses from top to bottom. It is critical the signage has a high degree of fluorescence so these signs stand out at night. He would hope the signage would be highly visible at a maximum distance, which is going to be critical for people to find the businesses. He did not think they could do enough as a county to help these aggrieved businesses with this construction project.

Ms. McCulley pointed out VDOT has standards they must follow and even higher standards on a primary route like 29.

Mr. Dotson noted he had a few process questions. The applications would be approved by the zoning administrator. He asked if that will be the same staff person for each of signs just in terms of consistent answers.

Ms. McCulley replied that Stewart Wright who is our senior permit planner and also sort of our sign guru is here tonight. He is working very directly with all the businesses on signage on a daily basis. They are also as part of this business assistance effort trying to consolidate procedures and not send people around to a lot of different places and make it as easy as possible. If someone has specific signage questions Steward Wright, who is probably going to be handling all of them, is happy to answer them. They did send out letters to all 12 businesses who are on the 10 signs asking them to contact us so they can provide assistance. They want to make it a pretty seamless process. Once that sign goes down staff hopes that they have already planned for replacement in identification.

Mr. Dodson noted the ordinance says the application will be processed within 7 days. He asked if our expectation is they would expedite the process and it could be less than 7 days.

Ms. McCulley asked Stewart Wright to speak to that because he does this on a daily basis.

Steward Wright replied that he predicts the turnaround time for these permits be less than 48 hours.

Mr. Dotson said he thinks that is appropriate. They mention a fee. When VDOT requires the removal of an existing sign he assumes there is some compensation to the property owner and sign owner. He was assuming that would include that VDOT would essentially be paying the fee that the county would be charging.

Ms. McCulley replied she did not think that specifically is part of the calculation of the comprehensive for the signs that they are removing. However, she knows that fees, including sign fees that they are talking about here, are something that has come up with the business assistance strategies. There is a consideration of whether there should be a fund whereby it is like a grant basis. It would be through something like the EDA to help assist businesses with some of these fees. If there is no ARB requirement the sign permit fee is very low. It is $25. However, she thinks there is still a desire to assist with even those fees because it was not through their own desire that the sign is coming down.

Mr. Dotson noted that he would think particularly with these 10 signs where it is at VDOT's instigation that would be something that the county should make sure takes place. Lastly, in the slides staff was talking about the about the exemption from ARB review under certain conditions. He thinks the vocabulary was "permanent replacement signs" in the slide. However, in the text of the ordinance it begins the re-erection of the same permanent sign. He asked if somebody wants to put up a new and better sign that still meets all the ARB requirements would that be allowed. This literally says the same sign.

Ms. McCulley agreed that it does. If the sign is changed it would need some type of initial review to see if the change is still consistent with approval. She can see somebody wanting to use that opportunity to have a new sign if they have an old sign and maybe not just reuse the old sign. Although they do understand that part of the agreement is they will be compensated for the sign and will be allowed to keep the sign. But, again, they may not want to do that. They may want to seize the opportunity to have a new sign built. She thinks it really depends on whether they are building the same thing or changing that sign.

Mr. Dotson asked if it would be possible to have the zoning administrator who is reviewing this make the determination that this new replacement sign meets all the requirements that were on the previous sign without having to go back to the ARB.

Ms. McCulley asked Mr. Kamptner if he had any ideas about how they could phrase that.

Mr. Kamptner replied yes, essentially Mr. Dotson is saying a sign that satisfies all the previously imposed conditions have the same right to administrative approval.

Ms. McCulley pointed out that would be something staff would work on in this provision.

Mr. Keller said they know that many people are often using global positioning software. He asked has any provision been made by VDOT to call attention to Apple, Google or other providers of the circulation changes. He thinks all of us have come into positions where circulation has changed and they get going in circles trying to find a place that they can't get to.

Ms. McCulley replied yes, Lou Hatter with VDOT in particular is working on it. They at one time had talked about a couple of different ideas for apps, some of which would give real time information about traffic and the best route to take particularly during 103-day period. They are working with some of the GPS providers to see how quickly they pick up on changes in routes as well as different types of apps.

Mr. Keller said he thinks that a new app is not the issue here. He thinks that having it translate seamlessly into the existing apps that people use is the concern. They all know that previous to the call phone GPS that one had to pay for updates. So the people who have the older ones are going to have trouble regardless. However, the new ones using the cell phone GPS there has to be some mechanism to get to those providers.

Ms. McCulley agreed that was a good point, which she would pass on at the meeting tomorrow.

Mr. Randolph hoped there was a way legally that the county and possibly the Chamber website could feature 2 of these businesses a day for the 103 day window of construction. It would be to identify the fact that these are the people that are victimized, or temporarily inconvenienced by the construction of the road. It was a way of trying as a county to provide some degree of visibility. However, he did not know legally they can do that.

Mr. Kamptner noted the 29 Solutions Team is sensitive to that issue. But, they are also mindful of not showing favoritism because promoting what is going on with the businesses up there and not those in the Pantops area could create some concerns. But, they are mindful of that issue.

Mr. Loach said he thought it was interesting to color code the districts and coordinate that with the signs. He thought that would be good because that is one thing they could advertise via the web what these districts are so people would become familiar with the color coding of the district that they are going to.

Mr. Keller noted having done these sorts of things his whole career that they can also overdo or over sign it. The reality is that the local patrons are going to figure this out pretty quickly and then they are going to use it. It is going to work for them. It might be frustrating, but if they want to be repeat patrons of a certain business they are going to figure it out. He thinks that it is to capture that group that is not going to be consistently using it that they have to really work on

the ways to do it. He would go with simplicity, which is why he thinks the idea of alphabetizing or something that would make it easy. They have all been frustrated by not being able to see signs at night. He was not sure about the district and all the colors. He thinks that might be over thinking it.

Mr. Dotson pointed out he liked the concept.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Neil Williamson, President of the Free Enterprise, said just to bring the Commission up to speed across the hall the Board funded from what he calls windfall an additional $250,000 for ACE which brings their total to $500,000 next fiscal year. He has grave concerns that this body should not really be weighing in on those budgetary items. The one vote against it was because those funds would otherwise be spent on capital projects for infrastructure in the Development Area, which is concurrency of infrastructure that was something he had heard a lot about here.

Mr. Williamson noted nonetheless, tonight they have before them a common sense regulatory relieve for the 12 businesses that will lose their permanent signage during the utility relocation and construction of the Rio/US 29 grade separated interchange. His longstanding opposition to this project is well recorded. He continues to believe the costs far outweigh the benefits and it sets the stage for an eventual Albemarle Express Way that will eventually disseminate a large portion of this important business corridor. Yes, lost signage is just one of the many ways businesses will be impacted by the Rio GSI. VDOT has already started discussions with the business owners about just compensation for the signs scheduled to be removed. Removal of these signs could start in just a few weeks time. They applaud staff for moving this up the agenda to assist the impacted businesses. They believe not only is this regulation change commonsensical it is clearly the least you can do. They look forward to the staff promised Phase 1, Phase 2 and Phase 3 of signage review. It is our hope that businesses that will have access albeit perhaps tortured or limited gain increased signage by right for the construction period and 6 months thereafter. Further, they have asked that they use this opportunity to set up a provision in code that helps businesses during such specific road construction regardless of location. The Free Enterprise Forum encourages the Planning Commission to approve the zoning ordinance before them and move it forward to the Board of Supervisors with all deliberate speed. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to comment.

Morgan Butler, with the Southern Environmental Law Center, said the Southern Environmental Law Center supports these changes. These ten businesses that have been identified should be able to put up a non-permanent sign during the duration of construction to replace the one that will need to be removed. He does have a question about trying to shoehorn this specific circumstance into the category of temporary signs. Ms. McCulley during her staff report made a very pertinent observation which is the temporary sign regulations did not anticipate this type of situation. The temporary sign regulations are meant for signs that are advertising temporary and seasonal brief events or activities such as a grand opening. As a result if you look at the proposed changes they have to change the definition of temporary sign. Specifically, they are striking that language that limits temporary signs to those temporary brief seasonal events or activities. His concern was he wondered if as a result of that they will start getting temporary sign permit applications for all types of non-temporary events and activities sort of off-site general advertising types of signs. He was just curious that there may very well be a good reason that this was decided to be done through the temporary sign category, but he was wondering if any thought has been given to creating a new category. It could be something like an interim construction replacement sign where it could be a separate category and have these

same provisions and allowances apply but not have to alter the definition of temporary signs and risk the potential unforeseen consequences of doing so. So that would be a suggestion. He anticipates that it probably was considered, but he thinks it is something that is worth considering if it has not been. He would be curious to hear what the concerns were with that approach if it was considered. He thanked the Commission for the chance to comment.

Karen Weiner, Mall Manager at Charlottesville Fashion Square, said again as a minimum this is very welcomed to what will be upcoming for the Corridor. The temporary signage during construction during the utility relocation needs to be taken into an aspect that the entire terrain will have changed both during and after the project. Also, with utility relocations where our current sign is located a permanent sign may not be able to be located again in the future. So that needs to be brought into consideration as well as for the location and the visibility of the sign from the roadway. At Charlottesville Fashion Square, of course, everyone says well the mall, but they have 80 businesses plus in the mall that they need to consider the visibility and viability of. So she thanks the Commission very much for considering this as a minimum to be able to help the businesses in that area.

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

Mr. Kamptner asked to address Mr. Butler's comments regarding the definition of temporary sign. They always take the opportunity to clean up some language in regulations when they are addressing the same subject matter. His initial intent was simply to update the cross reference that is in that definition. But, looking at it the current definition actually favors commercial speech over noncommercial speech and it also regulates content to a certain extent. So they addressed those two constitutional concerns by cleaning up the language of the definition. It really was not a consequence of the other changes that are part of this ordinance, but just part of the review of the regulations.

Mr. Morris thanked Mr. Kamptner.

Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Kamptner if he feels there is any need to define what is temporary.

Mr. Kamptner replied that it was defined in the regulations themselves because the types of temporary signs that they have right now are limited by the period for which each permit can be issued, which is 15 days to an aggregate of 60 days in a calendar year. It also allows us the flexibility to incorporate the regulations that they are doing with Phase 1 into an existing review framework simply by modifying the temporary sign regulations establishing for that particular type of temporary sign a period of time, which for a construction project is going to be inherently flexible given the project does not go longer than anticipated.

There being no further discussion Mr. Morris asked for a motion.

Mr. Dotson moved to recommend approval of ZTA-2015-00004 Phase I Route 29 Solutions Business Signage Impacts to the Board of Supervisors noting that staff is going to look at the provision about permanent replacement signs possibly as also not warranting further ARB review.

Mr. Kamptner agreed noting what staff can do is revise that subsection so that either re-erecting the same sign or erecting a new sign that complies with the conditions of the certificate of appropriateness would qualify.

Mr. Dotson so moved.

Mr. Randolph seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Morris noted ZTA-2015-00004 Phase I Route 29 Solutions Business Signage Impacts would be forwarded with a recommendation for approval to the Board of Supervisors to be heard on May 6. He thanked everyone who participated this evening.

In summary, the Planning Commission forwarded the proposed ordinance to the Board of Supervisors as recommended by staff with additional consideration of the following:

- Revise subsection 30.6.5(i) so that either re-erecting the same sign or erecting a new sign that complies with the conditions of the certificate of appropriateness would qualify.

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.

- PC liaisons to Places29 CACs –

Mr. Cilimberg explained as noted in his email to the Commission there was a reconstituted Places29 Advisory Council that has three sub-councils or sub-committees geographically oriented with a Northern Committee above the South Fork of the Rivanna River, South of the South Fork and East of Route 29, and South of the South Fork and west of Route 29. Places29-North will focus on the Piney Mountain and Hollymead Neighborhoods. Places29-Hydraulic will focus on the neighborhoods and businesses between Hydraulic Road and Rio Road in the Places29 Master Plan area. Places29-Rio will focus on the neighborhoods and businesses between Rio Road and the Rivanna River in the Places29 Master Plan area. Each sub-Committee will have one Board of Supervisor liaison and one Planning Commission liaison. Liaisons will be appointed based on magisterial districts within the Master Plan boundaries for the sub-Committees. For Places29 North, the BOS Liaison will be appointed from the Rivanna District and the Planning Commission liaison will be appointed from either the Rivanna District or the At-Large member. For Places29- Hydraulic, the BOS Liaison will be appointed from the Jouett District and the Planning Commission liaison will be appointed from either the Jouett District or the At-Large member. For Places29-Rio, the BOS Liaison will be appointed from the Rio District and the Planning Commission liaison will be appointed from either the Rio District or the At Large member. Mr. Cilimberg asked for a confirmation tonight as to who they agree will represent the Planning Commission on each of those.

Mr. Morris invited discussion. He asked if there were any objections. There is one item he would like to be considered. There are a couple of people on the Planning Commission that are currently not on one of the citizens advisory committees. He would really like to start getting those people involved and would like to take the advantage if Tim Keller is agreeable to really

start as a team and he will pull further and further out because this is his last year. He would really like Mr. Keller to be a part of the Pantops Citizens Advisory Committee. He says that simply from the logistics of this that based upon where Mr. Keller lives and the time that they have that committee meeting which is 6:15 p.m. on the fourth Monday of the month that would be inconvenient for him to come to the northern part of Places29. Being in Key West he can more easily handle this, if that would be amendable to Mr. Keller. However, he wanted to give him his reasoning for this. He asked Mr. Cilimberg if he saw any problem with that.

Mr. Cilimberg replied no, if Mr. Keller is agreeable and the Commission is agreeable he would think that Mr. Keller would be the Pantops Council representative.

Mr. Keller agreed.

Mr. Cilimberg said for each of these magisterial districts that correspond to the geographic area of Places29 each Commissioner would serve.

Mr. Morris agreed noting that there was not a thing that says that Mr. Keller and he can't both be at the Pantops meeting for a while, and Mr. Cilimberg replied no.

- The Commissioners agreed to following representatives on the Places29 CACs: Mr. Morris on Places29 North, Mr. Lafferty on the Places29 Hydraulic, and Mr. Dotson on Places29 Rio. Mr. Keller also agreed to replace Mr. Morris on the Pantops Advisory Council.

- Mr. Cilimberg noted the need for a public hearing regarding the Planning Commission's recommended Comprehensive Plan to address a notification oversight at the time of the original Planning Commission public hearing.
- No Planning Commission meeting on April 14, 2015.
- The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, April 21, 2015.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m. to the Tuesday, April 21, 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)