An afternoon-adjourned meeting and a regular night meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on July 8, 2015, Second Floor, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The afternoon meeting was held at 3:30 p.m., Room 241, and was adjourned from July 1, 2015. The night meeting was held at 6:00 p.m., in the Lane Auditorium.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Ms. Jane D. Dittmar, Ms. Ann Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Ms. Liz A. Palmer and Mr. Brad L. Sheffield.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Thomas C. Foley, County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Clerk, Ella W. Jordan, and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by the Chair, Ms. Dittmar. Ms. Dittmar noted that the Board would go into Closed Meeting following the meeting with the Planning Commission.

At 3:30 p.m., Mr. Morris called the Planning Commission to order.

Agenda Item No. 2. **Joint Meeting with Planning Commission**:

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Bruce Dotson, Mr. Richard Randolph, Mr. Calvin Morris, Chair; Mr. Tim Keller, Mr. Russell (Mac) Lafferty, Ms. Karen Firehock, and Ms. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia.

ABSENT: Mr. Thomas Loach.

STAFF PRESENT: Deputy County Attorney, Mr. Greg Kamptner Director of Community Development, Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Planning, Mr. V. Wayne Cilimberg, Clerk to Planning Commission, Ms. Sharon Taylor and Principal Planner, Ms. Elaine Echols.

Item No. 2.1. Development Review Task Force – Implementation of Recommendations

Mr. Mark Graham, Director of Community Development, said he had provided the Board a summary which was shared with the Planning Commission last fall, and gave them a brief presentation. He said he has provided a one-page summary of what has happened within the last 10 years.

He said starting in 2006, the Board formed the Development Process Task Force, and in 2007 the Task Force provided a series of recommended priorities for the County primarily directed at Community Development, which staff worked to implement. He said in 2010, staff presented to the Board on the annual work program and showed that Community Development had completed work on implementing those priorities, except for one that had to do with notifications involving citizen engagement, was delayed because of cuts in staffing and resources.

Mr. Graham said that starting in January 2010, the Board came up with an economic action plan, originally called an Economic Development Action Plan and later called Economic Vitality Action Plan, which set Community Development in another direction. He said they came back and spoke to the Board in June 2010 about additional things that could be done in response to those strategies in that Action Plan and came back again in September 2010 about the rezoning special use permit process.

Mr. Graham said that was followed in August 2011 with a joint work session which had the Architectural Review Board and Planning Commission involved. He said they then worked through a series of ordinance changes, the first of which was the site plan changes which were approved by the Board in October 2012, next was the legislative process changes pertaining to rezoning special use permits, done in December 2012. Mr. Graham noted with the legislative process changes of 2012, a step for a community involvement meeting prior to anything going to public hearing was added in an effort to increase citizen engagement, partially in response to the outstanding priority from the Development Process Task Force to assure there was an opportunity to engage the public long before the idea came to a public hearing.

Mr. Graham stated that in December 2013, they adopted a series of changes for the subdivision process. He said in addition to that, he listed a number of other things that had been done either as part of process improvements or which incorporated process improvements to the ordinance change.

Ms. Dittmar said Mr. Morris had made a point yesterday that there were several people on the Board and Commission who went through that process, and thought that for those who are newer to the

Board and Commission they would like to hear about their experiences and how they feel about how the progress is going.

Ms. Mallek said she was the citizen appointee and it was fascinating to her, and Mr. Graham had spent lots of time working through the changes, and staff very successfully made things more linear by consolidating the forms, having a single point of contact, and other improvements. She commented that while it may be faster not to engage citizens, the changes to have the citizen meetings have been hugely successful, and are appreciated by the development community as well. Ms. Mallek said this provides a conversational chance to really learn what people's thoughts are and to be able to make adjustments before they begin the process of change.

Mr. Boyd said a couple of things are driven not necessarily by the Development Review Task Force but by legislation at both the state and federal levels, such as the wireless service laws, winery legislation, and the dam break, which were based upon the regulations that were imposed upon localities. He said the whole concept behind the Development Review Task Force was an effort to streamline the process for development to get done in this County, because at the time it was taking 18 months to two years to get through the process. He said they were hearing complaints from the development community that this was very expensive because it was a long process, and they put together the Task Force to see if there was some methodology that could be streamlined to make it not so arduous for the developers and businesses. He said if there was a new business that wanted to come here and find a location to build on, it could take them 18 months to two years. He stated he observed a couple of businesses that walked away from doing business in the County, and there may have been some good jobs from those businesses. Mr. Boyd said there are two aspects, to take some of the pressure off and cost that development can contribute in reducing the cost of housing for more affordable housing, and to make an environment that would make it more user friendly to make it easier to do business in the County.

Mr. Bruce Dotson said there was a theme as the Development Review Task Force got underway, and that was to address things that were unnecessarily time consuming or costly. He said what he believes they have done is to review many aspects of both procedures and code with that question in mind, and shifted a number of things from a legislative arena to an administrative arena but with very clear standards so the development community and the regulatory community are seeing what is required and necessary. He said they are moving towards "rigorous efficiency," which does not mean the County is lowering its standards, it is just doing it better.

Ms. Mallek said there is a wide range of timeframes during the process, and with two recent projects, one took eight months start to finish and the other took six years. She said that is just a fact, with both of those projects involving the same staff and same rules, so they just need to continue to try to improve and do the best job they can.

Mr. Boyd said there was never any intention for the Task Force to reduce the quality of life in the community, or what the vision was for the overall community and the saving of the rural areas, but was just a matter of doing it efficiently.

Mr. Morris said that when this Task Force was in place, the County started to have quite a reduction in staff yet was trying to have a rigorous, efficient operation going, and asked Mr. Graham how it is going.

Mr. Graham answered that with the ministerial functions, the site plan and subdivision changes, they are working pretty well, and as far as the citizen and public engagement he believes there is better participation because people are notified earlier and are being informed about the site plan review meetings and know who to call. He said the legislative side of it has been tougher because they have not had a significant number of large or major rezonings come through. Mr. Graham said they have learned with the smaller ones, the process of having a community meeting early on in the process is good for everyone and helps the developer to understand what the concerns are so they are not blindsided when they come to the public hearing. He said it also helps the Planning Commission and Board by having that community input rather than hearing it for the first time at those public meetings, and noted that there are a lot more discussions going on in the front end to help everyone focus on ways to balance all the issues.

Ms. Palmer asked how much of the first community meeting was initiated by the developer or applicant and how much staff was involved.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that under the ordinance and the procedures adopted after that, staff provides the applicant/developer with a form letter they can use, they do not have to follow it exactly, but it outlines information and a list of those that should be notified including the Commissioner and the Board member representing that district, and it is the applicant's responsibility to send the notification. He said at least one staff member attends the community meetings, and they have been able to make sure the meetings are scheduled at the latest within the first forty-six days of review, so they have not delayed when the Commission would have a hearing based on the need to have a community meeting. He said that some applicants have decided by staff's advice or on their own to do a community meeting even

before they make their application, the pre-application process is beneficial in that regard because when a particular project in a pre-app meeting is perceived to generate a lot of interest, staff suggests to applicants that they hold a community meeting before making application, as the community meeting might inform them and influence that application. He said in some cases the community meeting will stand on its own as meeting the community requirements, so the applicant will not have to hold one after making application, or they will have another just because they want the community to be aware of anything that may have changed. Mr. Cilimberg said the pre-application process has been value-added for them because it helps an applicant hit the ground running.

Ms. McKeel said that with one of the pre-application meetings in her district, she assumes they will come back with another community meeting with a plan, but from what he is saying they might not. She also stated they scheduled that meeting with the community on a Board meeting night, so she would not have been able to attend because they were rushing it so fast. She said she had just wanted to raise a red flag about that.

Mr. Cilimberg said when an applicant decides to hold a community meeting before application, which is really on their own, and staff is not necessarily giving them all the notification information that will be given once they made application. He said staff would then determine after application if that community meeting had been sufficient to meet the needs and if staff was able to attend, and they could make some judgements. Mr. Cilimberg said he is not stating that every time an applicant made a pre-application community meeting, they do not have to do it once they apply. He said that on occasion, because of the community meeting's timing and the information that went out, and the attendance of staff and Board members being there, staff has said that a community meeting was not necessary, but that is not a standard.

Ms. McKeel said she had another situation where changes were made and staff came back and asked if they felt they needed another community meeting, and she took it to the neighborhood association and they all said "no." She said she would ask that if an applicant had a pre-meeting and suddenly decided not to have the community meeting, staff would notify the Board.

Ms. Mallek said that would be highly unlikely because if they have an early meeting and only invited twelve people who support it, that completely negates the reason they have a community meeting, and they would be required to have another one.

Mr. Cilimberg said that in the last few months, in order to avoid the potential of what is being mentioned, Mr. Benish had all the planners get in touch with the Board Member and Planning Commissioner in that district, if there was a question of whether a second meeting was needed.

Ms. McKeel responded that is what she is looking for, and thanked him.

Mr. Randolph stated this process is still new to residents in the County, and it might be helpful to review the protocol of the community meeting because recently there was a situation where the applicant contacted both Ms. Dittmar and him and asked if they were going ahead and call the meeting and notify everyone about it, so there is a very different expectation. He said there still is some confusion out there, and it might be valuable to look at the checklist to make sure the applicant is well aware that they need to schedule that meeting first and foremost around the facility, but also to make sure it works on the schedule of the Planning Commissioner and the Supervisor so they do not have contending commitments that prevents them from being there. Mr. Randolph said that part of the value-add for the community meeting is to get input early on and hear what people are thinking and help shape some of that thinking and frame some of the issues with the applicant, to either increase the likelihood of success for the applicant or at least identify the objections so that the applicant can tailor the project accordingly to make it more user friendly for community members.

Mr. Morris stated that adding Emily Kilroy to staff was helpful, as she can really coordinate things well and has put together a rather complex presentation of three applications at the last Pantops Citizen's Advisory Council meeting, and it had gone quite well.

Ms. Mallek said that for the four or five different projects which have come through for their community meeting, having it at the advisory council meeting is really great because it is already on their calendars and citizens are used to coming at that time. She said that many people come for something different on the agenda but are pleased to find out that there is something else there they want to know about.

Mr. Cilimberg said that on occasion staff does take initiative to contact the applicant regarding the need for the community meeting, and staff provides information on how the notice should be sent, who should receive that notice, and staff's willingness to work with them to determine a location and date. He said that on occasion staff has found that applicants are talking to others about that meeting, so if a Board member is contacted by the applicant about holding one of these meetings, they really need to be talking to staff and not the Board. He also said staff had recently implemented a policy of copying the Board and

Planning Commissioners with the initial notice sent to the applicant telling them they need to hold a community meeting. He also said if they have an issue with a situation, Board members should let staff know so they can help. He also said that as part of the pre-application process, staff is giving detailed comments to applicants after their mandatory meetings so they know what to put in their applications, and that is helping on both ends by providing a check list for them and helping staff get what they need. Mr. Cilimberg stated that staff clears the application before they accept a fee, so no one is having to pay money without knowing their application will be processed right away.

Ms. Dittmar asked Mr. Graham, per Mr. Morris's point, if any part of the timeline is problematic due to resources in the department.

Mr. Graham said staffing can be an issue but it has not been for quite some time. He said there are two reasons: staff getting better, or retention of really good people, perhaps due to the recession. Mr. Graham said they have one of the best staffs he has seen, not just with the County but in any other place he has worked. He said they produce and manage a lot more work than other places, but beyond that the resource allocation goes first to applications. Mr. Graham said he had presented this to the Board previously in the context of a need for additional resources, because where they come from is pulling staff from other work program priorities. He said this means putting them on applications, which means that other work program priorities such as ordinances, amendments or other items will slow down while staff works on the applications, as that is their first priority.

Mr. Boyd said it is important to recognize that as Supervisors and Planning Commissioners they can create work for staff, and years ago they put the policy in place that they would work on applications first and then Board Directives and Planning Commission Directives after that.

Ms. Mallek stated there are some of those Board directives that, if small adjustments are made in processes or ordinances that will save them trouble in the future, then they can find that middle ground in balancing workload. She asked staff not to hesitate to inform the Board when they are approaching that capacity line, because they want people to spend enough time to do a really good job but not be overworked so badly that they will leave.

Ms. McKeel said she remembers at one point when discussing the five-year financial plan and the outlook, she was surprised the Community Development department was only projecting out one new employee while other departments were projecting needs of two to three. She said as Ms. Mallek had pointed out, they do not want to get in a situation where they will not have enough people to do the work.

Mr. Graham said that is an excellent point and when they did those projections, they were looking at the resource requirement for the work that was before them now as well as what may be the Board's interest in the future. He said a great example was that last year they added a Transportation Planner and now they need a Natural Resource Manager, which are on a list of 17 positions developed as potentials depending upon the Board's interests.

Ms. Dittmar asked if it is fair to say that they have implemented the things the Task Force wanted, and that those things are going smoothly and did not need refreshing.

Ms. Mallek said from where they started in 2005, they are doing really well.

Mr. Morris said he hopes that future Boards and Commissions will have an annual or biannual update so they do not start to backslide.

Ms. Mallek said things are always evolving because the legislature made changes that have to be addressed.

Mr. Graham said he truly appreciated the Board Members and Planning Commissioners sharing with staff any concerns or issues they heard, as staff is not perfect in its knowledge.

Item No. 2.2. Discussion: Comprehensive Plan Implementation

Mr. Cilimberg said the last information the Board had received regarding the implementation of the Comp Plan was in April as a Consent Agenda item that were Planning Commission priorities from about a year earlier, and what they had identified as Board priorities during the review of the Comprehensive Plan with the Board. He said some of the strategies the Planning Commission has worked on has changed or are fundamentally different after the Board did their work, and there may have been one or two of the priorities of the Planning Commission that did not show in the Board's packages only because they did not exist any longer in the form that had been reviewed by the Planning Commission. Mr. Cilimberg said the Board had indicated during the review of the Comp Plan that they appreciated what the Planning Commission had provided the Board, and they wanted to have a chance to finish with the Comprehensive Plan and revisit those priorities. He said they provided those at the end

of that process waiting for the adoption of the Plan, and following that they may have identified some things from that work that were important. He said ultimately the staff work on the Plan would be dependent on the work program that Mr. Graham will be submitting to the Board in August. He asked Mr. Graham if he wished to speak on his expectations of the work program's capacity.

Mr. Graham stated that per the current fiscal year, he had provided a brief overview to the Board in February and laid out that the emphasis is expected to be on the small area plan at Route 29 and Rio Road/Places 29 also an update on the Pantops Master Plan which now includes consideration of the Rivanna River Small Area Plan. He said beyond that, they will be resource limited and are looking to future fiscal years. Mr. Graham stated he has tried to present a four of five-year plan to the Board to consider what the priorities are, it will help Community Development for Board members to try to identify those two or three things they feel are important to be completed the next couple of years, and to identify those in August.

Ms. Mallek asked if the list they will focus on is the Comp Plan implementation list or some smaller list that is already in process.

Mr. Graham said that within the current strategies is the list they have, but if they look at the other Comprehensive Plan strategies, if there are issues there that the Board believes are important to be completed within the next few years, they should try to identify those in August.

Ms. Dittmar said that Ms. Mallek's question is relevant in terms of what list they should look at and whether the Planning Commission has already weighed in on it.

Mr. Foley said Mr. Graham had made reference to the Strategic Plan, which pulls some of the priorities out of the Comp Plan implementation plan, which the Board has already looked at but may have not looked at in the context to this discussion. He stated the Strategic Planning Retreat scheduled for September 25 also identifies a section of the Comprehensive Plan on development area policy, which the Board had said is really critical to discuss. Mr. Foley said in August, Mr. Graham will need to get the input from this meeting and identify what those items are. He said the Board may have to look at this a little more at the Strategic Planning Retreat level, when they have a lot more time to think about major priorities. He said he wants to make sure the Board has the full perspective on the Strategic Plan and even the Strategic Planning Retreat that is coming up. He acknowledged it might make this joint meeting more difficult, but it is important for them to address.

Mr. Graham said he will take all the input he has, which includes what the Board has already done and what has been laid out for the Work Program for the next year, which is primarily focused on the small area plan on Rio Road and Pantops. He said beyond that, there are a number of other strategies laid out, and he will be looking to see what is most critical for the Board because that is how staff will be prioritizing things moving forward.

Ms. McKeel commented it is a shame the timing works out as it does, because there are limited opportunities for the Board and Commission to get around a table together.

Mr. Foley said if there are big picture items this group feels really should be given some consideration, that is probably the best way to approach this, and then Mr. Graham will have to do some work back and forth. He said rather than getting on a specific list, if there are broad issues that need some attention re: implementation and staff work over the course of the next year, they should talk about them. He said a few emails have circulated among certain members, and those are the sorts of things not factored in that should be heard today.

Mr. Boyd said he believes the priorities are driven by budget concerns more so than personnel availability, and he does not know where the money is coming from to do some of the things he would like to see them working towards.

Ms. Mallek said it still is important work for them so they know exactly how much money to get to bring it about, and she hopes he will not be held back by that. She mentioned four particular items for them to think about: the special events category, which she hopes they will address based on what they are seeing in applications coming forward that are creating real dilemmas with the implementation of 15-year-old ordinances compared to the much newer, such as the updated ordinances for wineries and farm breweries; transient lodging and how they might make improvements to address the 300+ places that are under the radar and not paying taxes, are not participating in safety inspections, etc.; the country crossroads businesses that are told to wait until the Comp Plan before moving forward with their plans; and the uses for historic properties, learning centers, and teaching facilities, and what they should do with these enormous properties that are not the size the average family can handle.

Ms. Dittmar said Ms. Mallek has some very specific items to be addressed, and at a very broad level there are resource questions, and asked whether they should get some consensus next in August or wait until September to get to the point where they can give good direction.

Ms. Palmer said she was looking through the implementation plan, and a lot of the items are already in motion, so she has to think back to what degree they are in motion such as the natural resources implementation and TMDL measures that are already underway and funded.

Mr. Graham said it is helpful for him to hear this, as there are issues the Board wants on the table for consideration, so he can make sure they are in the work program.

Ms. McKeel said as they were discussing earlier, there is limited staff time, and resources, but issues such as transient lodging, for her citizens and her neighborhoods, that is becoming really important. She stated that during the budget cycle, it was really important for the Board to hear what positions are most needed in order to accomplish the priorities.

Ms. Dittmar asked Commissioners for their feedback.

Mr. Morris said that the Commission has not yet had time to review the priorities the Board had just adopted as the Implementation Plan as Chapter 13 of the Comp Plan.

Ms. Dittmar noted that it is online.

Mr. Foley said a lot of this has happened really quickly.

Mr. Graham stated it is a lot to ask of the Board to prioritize the whole list, but if there are certain items that keep coming to the top for them, that will be direction to staff as to where to focus their efforts.

Mr. Cilimberg said it might be helpful if they have some ready reference where they can see what the Planning Commission's priorities are and see those priorities that were identified during the Comp Plan work. He said he can provide the list of priorities and noted there are over 400 strategies in the plan, but he has narrowed down 40 priorities. He said he can provide the comparison of what the Commission has identified and what staff thinks they heard the Board identify as a starting point in providing input.

Ms. Dittmar said if there are forty priorities, there are really no priorities, especially given resourcing constraints, and asked if the Commission will have time to discuss this, or if Board members should seek their own Commissioners' feedback.

Mr. Morris said he thinks they can find that time within the next month and half.

Mr. Cilimberg said Mr. Graham will need to provide the Board something within the next week to make an August work session.

Ms. Dittmar said that perhaps they can conference with their own Planning Commissioners.

Ms. Firehock said she is new to this, but her understanding is that there is a Comprehensive Plan which the Planning Commission has adopted, and then they go through the priorities and prioritized them, which were given to the Board, and the Board went through them, and then the Comp Plan was redrafted, so in some respects the priorities have changed, and now they are going to cycle back through them. She noted the time limitations given the Board's timeline for the work session.

Mr. Cilimberg said he can provide strategies that the Planning Commission has identified that are still in the plan, and those that the Board has identified as well. He noted that Chapter 13 is the new list, but what he will send them is the focused list. Mr. Cilimberg said there may be a few that were included last year but are not there anymore as part of the review process, and this is probably the best reference to use at this point to be updated quickly.

Mr. Dotson said maybe an overall topic that actually spans between item 2.2 and 2.3 will be Chapter 13, which is organized for each topic, there are indicators of progress, and a lot of indicators of progress. He said the Planning Commission is obligated under law and procedure to provide an annual report to the Board of Supervisors, and those in the past have been very administrative, how many meetings, how many rezonings, etc. He stated he envisions some subset of those indicators of progress being folded into a "rigorously efficient" annual report for the Planning Commission. He said what this raises is an issue of workflow and timing, which they are seeing at this particular meeting with the priorities list. Mr. Dotson said if the Commission gives an annual report in January or February and it is going to be useful in the budget and CIP process, that is already fairly far along although final decisions have not been made, and strategic planning done in the fall is also out of synch. He suggested the Board looks at the overall workflow and sequence re: how the Board and Commission interrelates, so they will each have a chance to review what the other has done, with timing such that it can fit into the work flow/program.

Mr. Foley said there has been a lot of hard work done on this by everyone around the table, and Mr. Graham usually does his Work Program in January, but he kept putting it off because the Comp Plan was going to drive it significantly. He said the Comp Plan has just been adopted and it will be great to get the Planning Commission's input to the Board of Supervisors so that it feeds into the retreat in September, which will then drive Mr. Graham's work plan. He said the Strategic Planning Retreat will ultimately lead to a work plan for the whole County that will then feed into the budget process, so if the Planning Commission can meet and talk through this so it can be presented for the retreat in September, that will get everyone back on track.

Ms. Mallek suggested having the annual report from the Planning Commission in June and some summer discussions with the two Boards to help it flow along would help too.

Mr. Keller said Mr. Foley's response to Mr. Dotson is excellent. He said there are blank dates that can be meetings, and he believes his fellow Commissioners feel these opportunities can be more discussions rather than just responding to the issues that flows through. He stated he would like to see them use those dates for that purpose, and he believes the joint Planning Commission dialogue is outstanding and a model for the kind of discussions they can have internally, and he hopes in the future they will have the same kind of opportunity with the Board of Supervisors so there is an opportunity for give and take. Mr. Keller said the Board will be holding their strategic retreat in the fall, and the Planning Commission has been interested for a year or more in discussing housing issues. He said they are seeing many issues on the Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee and as Planning Commissioners, and are hearing a lot from developers and citizens about issues of housing and especially affordable housing. Mr. Keller said it would be really interesting to know of the units approved at the Supervisor levels, how many of those are actually affordable housing one year out or five years out, because they are hearing from developers that because of being able to go to market rate, a lot of units approved as affordable housing do not even begin to be affordable housing. He noted there are also the constraints of keeping affordable housing affordable over time, and said that is one example of many of the sorts of things they would like to share or discuss with the Board. He said the second major issue he sees is related to their roles as future planners, in their charge from the state, he encourages them to begin thinking about design guidelines for all the I-64 interchanges. He said it would be good to be ahead of the development, as they have seen enough examples, regardless of where they stand philosophically on the issues, they have not prepared for that development. He said they have interchanges that add to the qualities that people find very important that are noted in the Comp Plan, and they will change, but they can affect their physical form and makeup going forward. He encourages the Board, in their strategic planning, to be thinking how that will be addressed, and whether it will be done in house, done with consultants, or what type of community involvement there will be.

Ms. Dittmar said if the Planning Commission is to going to get together before the strategic planning retreat and talk about the key components they would like to help inform the Board for their own thinking, she suggested that Mr. Keller work with the Commission on his ideas to see how they evolve. She stated staff will be meeting with their counterparts in the City of Charlottesville in September, and asked for suggestions as to what they should discuss.

Ms. Mallek said the joint Planning Commission meetings include discussion of the Rivanna River.

Mr. Morris said it is the river, as well as the area of Franklin Street, and with those two items at the forefront of their minds collectively, it made the meeting very productive.

Mr. Keller said everything they discuss in the Comp Plan, economic development, historic resources, natural resources and, from the joint planning effort of the two jurisdictions, the issues of that interface. He also mentioned the steep slope issues, where both the City and the County both have relatively new ordinances. Mr. Keller complimented the staff on their excellent work, and said that both senior to junior staff were articulate with the issues they were facing, and it made him proud to be a County Planning Commissioner.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the Franklin Street discussion centered on an application the Board will be seeing in September, stating it goes to the Planning Commission the following week and has already been once and deferred. He said that in August or possibly July, the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission will have another meeting in which they will summarize and bring forth what it has observed as the recommendations or interests in pursuing river corridor initiatives.

Ms. Mallek said on October 2nd and 3rd the River Basin Commission will be hosting a conference in the County Building, featuring out of town speakers as well as lots of opportunities for local people to get involved. She said it will be focused on solving problems with access and other technical issues so hopefully lots of staff who work in that area from around the state will come.

Mr. Cilimberg stated it appears the week deadline is now lifted, and staff will focus with the Planning Commission on discussing this and other items from the implementation plan.

Item No. 2.3. Discussion: Board/Planning Commission Roles and Protocols

Ms. Dittmar reported the Chairs and Vice-Chairs had met twice in the previous year to discuss the role of the Board of Supervisors and role of the Planning Commission and how they can weave together. She said they went back and forth between the Commission and the Board, and thought the closure on that process would be a brief discussion on how it is working and what the expectations are, which can be used by new members of each body going forward.

Mr. Morris said he likes what Ms. Dittmar had stated, and stated it is important to identify good process so that things are done in a timely manner.

Ms. McKeel said the meetings were very productive, and it is important to remember there will be new Supervisors and new Planning Commissioners, so process and orientation are really going to be important because they really have so much thrown at them. She commented there are some things that rise to the level of critical understanding over other things.

Ms. Dittmar said that sharing what has worked is a good idea. Ms. Palmer asked for additional clarification as to what she means. Ms. Dittmar said the community meetings work well, and Mr. Randolph will get the information first and if the applicant wants to meet with her, she will meet with them and include Mr. Randolph so they do not jump over the Planning Commission process. She said after it goes to the Planning Commission, she will read the minutes and meet with Mr. Randolph in the event there will be a public meeting.

Mr. Randolph said the thing they have tried to work on very hard is that many applicants want to get the ear of the Supervisor because they know the Supervisor is really the decision maker. He said they want to try to rush the process and involve the Supervisor prior to the recommendation coming to the Board from the Planning Commission. He said that Ms. Dittmar, to her credit, has tried to avoid that by saying at this level until a recommendation comes from the Planning Commission, it resides with the Commissioner from that district to hash it out. Mr. Randolph said the Supervisor will then look forward to what the Planning Commission recommends and consult with them. Mr. Randolph said that saves the Board of Supervisors from being involved every step of the way, so it is the role of the Planning Commissioner to serve as a deputy to gain information, consolidate it and pass it onto the Board, and provide perspective when needed. He said this spares the Supervisor from committing their scarcity of time and mental resources and focus on a topic that is premature, because until they get into the body of the deliberative discussions, they are not really sure where all the angles are. Mr. Randolph said it is helpful to have that dialogue, and they have discussed in the past how Planning Commissioners can be more responsive to the community and help the Supervisors be more effective.

Mr. Morris said instead of putting this in stone as a process, it is something that should be left up to the Supervisor and the Supervisor's Commissioner, because not all Supervisors perform the same way, and some would prefer to be the one sitting across the desk and talking to the applicant.

Mr. Lafferty said it would be nice to have an outline as to what the agreement or discussion is, not that they would have to follow it.

Ms. Dittmar said they have memorialized the process somewhat.

Ms. McKeel said that is pretty much how she has been operating, although they have not had that many projects in her district, but she has people contact her about projects in other districts, and her response has typically been that it has to go to the Planning Commission. She said it is not because she does not want to know about the project, it is that she wants it to go through the process.

Ms. Dittmar said the people send the Supervisor to that seat, but the Supervisor chooses the partnership with the Planning Commissioner, and that is a key relationship. She stated this model also means they are relying on their Planning Commissioners, so the caliber of those individuals is important.

Ms. Palmer said she wonders about Ms. Monteith's feelings about this and how it affects her, because she does not have a Board of Supervisor Member.

Ms. Monteith said that it has been a continuing issue, but she has never had a Supervisor so she does not know if it is a problem. She said that sometimes Commissioners hear things from their Supervisors and she is out of the loop and does not hear those things, so sometimes she is surprised by things others are informed about. Ms. Monteith said that when told to come up with her priorities, she does not have a Supervisor with whom to work with those. She said that she assumes she can give her comments to Mr. Morris, and she depends upon him more than other Commissioners might because she does not have that link to a Supervisor. She clarified for the public that she represents the University of Virginia as a non-voting member of the Planning Commission, and thus does not have a Supervisor or district.

Ms. Palmer said that she knows of things she might ask Ms. Monteith because they are looking at some development or potential changes that are near the University.

Ms. McKeel said one of the things she and Mr. Sheffield had discussed at the last PAC meeting was affordable housing because there is a strong link between Albemarle, Charlottesville and the University relating to affordable housing, and UVA is certainly very important in the community.

Item No. 2.3. Matters not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. McKeel asked the Planning Commissioners to think very carefully about the impacts of new developments as it relates to existing older neighborhoods, especially as they bump into each other. She stated there are two projects going on in the Jouett District, one commercial and one residential, and it is interesting seeing some of those impacts. Ms. McKeel stated there are proffers and regulations pertaining to these, as part of a new wave of infill development.

Ms. Firehock said a citizen came to the Planning Commission talking about the Comprehensive Plan and wanting to do some implementing, and he was focused on Dark Skies, which she sees in Chapter 13. She stated that one thing that concerns her as a Commissioner in the County is there are many great ideas in the Comp Plan, but when they are stacked up against priorities such as the small area plans and the schools, things like the Rivanna River and Dark Skies ends up low on the list. Ms. Firehock said that in her past role in Charlottesville as Chair of that Planning Commission, one way they got work done was to have work groups or study groups who worked on an idea, fleshed it out, did the research, and brought forth to staff a more fully fleshed out package or proposal of options. She said there may be other topics as they look at the strategies of Comprehensive Plan implementation that fall off the top tier priority list, and she is suggesting that they leverage the wealth of knowledge in this community, not side-stepping the staff, but doing some heavy lifting so that they can have something more polished as it is brought forward.

Ms. Palmer asked if this is something that has to go through the Board of Supervisors, or if it is something that can be instituted on a Planning Commission Level.

Ms. Firehock said this is something the Planning Commission has already voted on, with agreement this can be proposed.

Ms. Dittmar said it probably needs to be parsed out in terms of if they need any staff support at all and is ad hoc, noting the Board has advisory groups starting at the Board level all the time, but they do require staff time and lots of meetings, follow up and support. She said that distinguishing those that need staff resources is important because of limited staff resources.

Ms. Firehock said they have two hybrids, with one having staff attendance, but some Commissioners are professional facilitators, and the group can take their own meeting notes. She said they would not want the groups to be a burden, but at the same time would not want them to be going rogue.

Ms. Dittmar stated that is the difference between an informal group and one that requires legal notices and everything else that is part of the process.

Ms. Mallek said they did have an example of sort of an ex parte research group, comprised of the Rivanna Conversation Society, a professor at the University of Virginia, and members of the SELC, who did a huge amount of research on storm water, erosion and run-off issues and what the legislative requirements were for all the counties in the Central Virginia area. She said that the group then came to the Board with suggestions of where the hindrances were, where some of the ordinances made problems worse, then brought that information back to the Board. Ms. Mallek said it absolutely expedited renovations of the storm water ordinances in lightning time, and said the staff was able to take that work to bend it and conform it as needed. She commented it was fabulous, so she is very much interested in hearing where this idea from the Commission will go.

Agenda Item - Adjourn

At 4:55 p.m., Mr. Morris thanked everyone and adjourned the Planning Commission portion of the meeting to the next regular meeting on July 14, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. in the Lane Auditorium.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

Approved PC 12-15-2015 (Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)