Albemarle County Planning Commission
July 21, 2015

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, July 21, 2015, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

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

Staff present was Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; Faith McClintic, Director of Economic Development; Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive; Susan Stimart, Economic Development Facilitator; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission and Andrew Herrick, Senior Assistant 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.

David M. van Roijen, resident of the Samuel Miller District and Chair of the Agricultural Forestal Committee, encouraged Commissioners to meet with the members of their Agricultural Forestal Districts to know what they are and where they are.

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

Consent Agenda:

a. **Approval of minutes**: June 16, 2015 and June 23, 2015

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

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

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

Mr. Morris said the consent agenda was approved.

Work Session

CPA-2015-00001 Comprehensive Plan Boundary Line Adjustment – Boundary Adjustment for the Southern Urban Neighborhood (Elaine Echols)

Ms. Echols said she was going to be presenting the staff report and Faith McClintic, Director of Economic Development, would be acting as the applicant in this particular case. Staff has been

working on this boundary adjustment ever since the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution of intent to consider whether or not the boundary should be adjusted.

In a PowerPoint presentation Ms. Echols reviewed the consideration of a boundary line adjustment to the Southern Urban Neighborhood. (PowerPoint Presentation – CPA-2015-00001 – Boundary Line Adjustment to the Southern Urban Neighborhood)

Background Information (See staff report)

- During the Comprehensive Plan update staff provided: analysis on what our land capacity could provide, an extensive residential capacity analysis; and information on industrial land and commercial land. (Comprehensive Plan Capacity Analysis)
- Comprehensive Plan Interstate Interchange Discussions
- New Economic Development Office
- Business Prospect
- Resolution of Intent
- **Planning Commission Work Session:**
  - July 21, 2015,
  - Proposed Public Hearing August 18, 2015
- **Board of Supervisors Work Session:**
  - September 2, 2015,
  - Proposed Public Hearing September 9, 2015
- The Board of Supervisors would like recommendation from the Planning Commission by September 1st to do their work in September either to approve or not approve a CPA amendment. This is not a rezoning and any zoning activity would take place after a comprehensive plan amendment is adopted if one is adopted.

The Study Area

Area to consider for Boundary Adjustment

Current Zoning

Relationship to Comprehensive Plan

- Natural Resources
- Historic Cultural and Scenic Resources
- Economic Development
- Rural Area
- Development Area
- Transportation
- Parks and Recreation, Greenways, Blueways, and Green Systems

Slopes, Streams Mountain Protection Areas

Forest Cover and Biodiversity

Surveyed Properties – Department of Historic Resources

Rural Area, Economic Development and the Development Areas

- By-right: rural and residential uses
- 80 out of 223 acres in which development could occur
- Opportunity for Targets
- R&D associated with light assembly
- Specialty food production and distribution
- Adult beverage production and distribution
- Other small distribution facilities ancillary to a production operation
- Business and financial processing operations
- Protection of nearby neighborhoods from noise and traffic

Transportation Impacts

- Interchange needs to be upgraded – highest priority in MPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
- Truck traffic movements – no left turn; restricted cut U-turn on 29 S
- Staff working with VDOT
- General analysis until specific users are known
- Signal at Teel/Gold Eagle Drive is very unlikely – too close to interchange
- Interconnections – ped/bike needed to Regional Mixed Use Area

Relationship to Parks and Greenways

Factors Favorable

- Properties could add inventory near interchange
- Utilities and access
- 80 acres are outside of important. environmental resources
- Potential for permanent conservation or additional parkland

Unfavorable Factors

- Removal of forest resources – impact habitat corridors – but buffer could be added for species in park
- Interchange needs improvements
- No current plan of development to totally assess impacts – would occur at rezoning stage

Issues for Planning Commission Direction

- Is the area for a consideration of a potential boundary adjustment appropriate?
- Is the area identified for development appropriately located?
- Should just the developable area be added to the DAs or should all of the land be added and the undevelopable area designated for preservation?
- What information should a Comp Plan Amendment reflect?

Information That Should Be Included in a CPA

- Designate buildable areas
- Emphasize protection of habitat in Heyward Park

- Encourage creativity in site design to reduce grading
- Identify 5 Targeted Industries
- Positive relationship needed to Regional Mixed Use Center
- Protect nearby properties from any noise and odors
- Wooded buffer frontage and boundary condition
- Emphasize need for interchange improvements to keep from making situation worse; find alternatives for truck traffic
- Provide pedestrian and bike connections to Mixed Use Center

PC Action Request

- Provide direction on identified issues
- Decide what should be put in a Comp Plan Amendment
- Set public hearing for August 18, 2015

Ms. Faith McClinton, the County's newly appointed Economic Development Director, said she was acting as the applicant tonight for the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors. As the County's Economic Development Director she would like to offer some context of why the Board of Supervisors has initiated this request. She presented a PowerPoint presentation to explain why economic development is so important to our community and the reasons why the Commission should support the boundary line adjustment. (PowerPoint – CPA-2015-00001 Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendment Study on a Development Area Boundary Adjustment – I-64/Route 29 Interchange)

Why Is Economic Development Important?
- Cost of Services is More Than Taxes Paid

- The average Albemarle household pays only ~52% of the cost of providing County services to that home

Economic Development (ED): Best Practices & Successful Strategies

Localities "set the stage" for ED activities:

- "Product" – Available buildings & sites
- Land – zoned & ready for development
- Utility & road infrastructure
- Accessibility: customers, workers, partners
- Streamlined, timely permitting processes
- Competitive tax structure & affordability
- Available, qualified workers
- Minimize uncertainties & investor risks
- Encourage economic/employment diversification
- Commercial/Industrial to Residential Mix:
    - Goal is 25% / 75%

Why Adjust the Boundary?

- Unique "ideal" location at I-64 & Rt 29
- Proximity to Downtown & other local assets
- Accessible, reliable utility infrastructure
- Compatibility with nearby parks
- Provide additional "local" employment opportunities for County residents

- Over 40% of Albemarle labor force works outside the area (excluding Charlottesville)
- Limited "product" along primary transportation routes
- Only two parcels 20+ acres currently zoned LI
- UVA Research Park site limitations
- Offers site features desirable to targeted industries
- Provides options for **existing** companies to expand: 19 businesses/747 jobs
- Demand > Supply = higher costs; competitive disadvantage
- Creates revenue-generating opportunities instead of additional service demands:
  - $80-$100 million investment = $750k-$1M/yr (revenue) versus
  - ~52 lots @ $3,231 (net to County) = $168,012/yr (cost)

Comparison of Comp Plan Land Use Designations

	Land Mass	Total Acres	Industrial Acreage	% of Total – Industrial	Commercial Acreage	Total Industrial + Comr
James City Co.	142.0	90,880.0	3043.0	3.348%	754.7	3797.7
Roanoke Co.	250.5	160,332.8	3803.6	2.372%	8492.8	12296.4
Frederick Co.	414.0	264,960.0	5486.0	2.071%	4242.0	9728.0
Bedford Co.	764.0	488,960.0	6587.0	1.347%	3797.0	10384.0
Louisa Co.	496.0	327,000.0	4000.0	1.223%	4200.0	8200.0
Fauquier Co.	647.5	414,368.0	2401.0	0.579%	1068.1	3469.1
Orange Co.	341.0	218,240.0	695.0	0.318%	560.0	1255.0
Augusta Co.	967.0	618,880.0	1958.0	0.316%	2246.0	4204.0
Albemarle Co.*	**726.0**	**464,640.0**	**604.0**	**0.130%**	**221.2**	**825.2**

**** Includes property owned by UVA Real Estate Foundation (aprx 234 ac developable); lease-only options; UVA affiliation required***

Many communities on this list also have aggressive land conservation programs and explicit goals to protect their natural and historic resources; however, considering our physical size, the availability of land for industrial uses is minimal.

Final Considerations:

- County-initiated boundary adjustment – not the landowner;
- BOS wants to be responsive to this company within our targeted industry group;

- Even without an active prospect, the request is in keeping with BOS Strategic Goal #4: *Foster an environment that stimulates diversified job creation, capital investments & tax revenues that support community goals*;
- Consistent with Economic Development (ED) Goal of the Comp Plan to expand options for industrial land users ;
- Economic Development (ED) Office undertaking a comprehensive review of all properties identified for industrial use in the Development Areas & conducting detailed research & analysis of the County's competitive position;
- Business activity around major roadways maximizes ROI from transportation and utility infrastructure;
- Commonwealth of Virginia actively supports this project.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

David van Roijen, resident of Samuel Miller District, read the following statement into the record. The proposed Boundary Adjustment to the Development Areas to create a light industrial zone adjoining the junction of U.S. 29 and Interstate 64 requires some very serious examination with regard to the impacts and appropriateness of such a change, not the expedited public notification and hearings now being attempted.

The public needs to be informed as to how it is that our comprehensive plan is so seriously flawed and out of date so quickly. What is wrong with the areas's present designation? It protects the southern entrance corridor and provides a buffer to the recently donated parkland. What is it about to be raped?

"Proposed amendments to the Land Use Map should be reviewed for compliance with the general plan rather than an area-specific or parcel specific requests for a change in recommended use." However, it would appear that this guideline is not being applied and Albemarle County is now for sale and open to any business with long term planning being omitted in hopes of business revenues.

I am not opposed to a change to an area's designation if it has been well studied and is needed. This wholesale about-face to the Comprehensive Plan would not be tolerated in other districts of the county with similar areas like Crozet! I believe that before the proposed change is addressed a couple of steps need to be taken by the County:

1. The County staff and the newly hired Economic Development Officer should create a dynamic model of the positive and negative fiscal and environmental impacts of the proposed change.
2. Immediate road improvements need to be addressed: the significant Interchange\Exit traffic problems (existing design shortfalls), the creation of by-pass traffic from the introduction of the new commercial development at Fifth Street, and the increased demands and impediments to this critical junction from this Land Use change.

(Attachment 1 – Letter to Planning Commission from David M. van Roijen regarding boundary adjustment – Available with written minutes in the office of the clerk.)

Marcia Joseph expressed concerns from her email sent to the Commission. She asked the Commission to consider all other options available to businesses interested in locating in Albemarle County. The county has always developed carefully and thoughtfully. This attempt seems to be hurried and not well thought out. (Attachment 2: Email dated July 20, 2015 from Marcia Joseph to Planning Commission)

Norma Diehl said she was very pleased early on when the comprehensive plan was approved

several months ago. But, before the ink was even dry on the plan this change was being pushed. This requested change would change this area totally and the life style of that 29 Corridor coming into Charlottesville. It was just for a mystery guest, which may become a pig in the poke. The citizens have no idea at this point. She noted the Commission has a copy of her letter addressed to the Planning Commission. But, she just wanted to make two other quick comments. One, she was concerned about the critical slopes in that area because they are very essential in many environmental ways. Any consideration of the change in status of this land should not include any of the critical slope area. The other issue that she has great concern about is the I64/29 interchange, which is hazardous at best. She would invite any of you to try to come down that road at rush hour and you will know exactly what concerns we of the neighborhoods have in terms of access with the merges in the ramps. That led apparently to the request for zoning almost a half a mile south of the Gold Eagle Drive so that an entrance could be placed further away from I-64. But, that also would lend itself to commercial or strip development in that area. She did not think the change to allow this use at this time is appropriate because she wanted to protect this rural entrance into the city. She read the last sentence of her email: "I served on the Planning Commission for many years, and during that time saw Route 29N and 250E both, despite our best efforts, become somewhat blighted roadways into the city and county. I do not want to see that happen again, and would like to have this rural entrance to city." (Attachment 3: Email dated 7-17-15 from Norma Diehl to Planning Commission.)

Radford Davis spoke against the proposal due to traffic concerns; that no studies have been done on the property; and other issues expressed in his email. He asked the Commission to vote against adding this land to the growth area without customary and appropriate review. He thinks it is time to ask those questions and not hurry on and provide Mystery Industries, Incorporated the right to develop at will whatever they like on the property. (Attachment 4: Email dated 7-20-15 from Rad Davis to Planning Commission)

Jerry McCormick-Ray, White Hall resident, totally disagreed with changing the Comp Plan. The boundary line on the development and rural areas has been our guiding light for the whole Comprehensive Plan and changing that just weakens this whole process that we have been under. In weakening that boundary it is weakening it for other environmental aspects. From an environmental point of view those forested areas are vital to our groundwater supply and cleaning our air. They don't want to add more groundwater pollution to those areas. She asked the Commission to think very hard about considering this boundary change. It is a slippery slope and they have not even done the studies that would show us what kind of impact this is going to have. What is the cost to the community for the next couple of years to have to endure all the costs of noise, pollution, trucks, and the environment? It is not going to be an easy process and what is the gain? From my perspective we should stay within our land budget. If they can't develop wisely within our land area that we have and lose our rural area then our whole comp plan and vision for this county is not going to be saved or what we want. She thinks it is a dead process. So please think very hard about this boundary change.

Rich Barnett, teacher of history at UVA, pleaded against the request due to the damage it would do to the county. He has lived in the county for 41 years. He and his wife have owned property on Mountain View Drive for 10 years just across the highway from the land you have targeted for development. He is against this proposal even though it is probably a done deal since big money trumps public opinion every time. He opposed the degradation of the last remaining unspoiled highway entrance to our city. We know this will not be put to a public vote and they know you seek tax revenues and re-election funding. But, maybe we can respectfully state a few reasons why this project is going to damage the county. First, let us look at a recent routine development, the one east and opposite Willoughby Shopping Center on Fifth Street Extended.

A year ago this was a fairly pristine forest with an older store house type of structure deep inside it at the end of a pothole road. Then suddenly the siren is on with tax revenues, low wage jobs and temporary construction income. The earth moving machinery went into high gear producing the current unsightly dirt and mud desert where in about 25 acres of lifeless ground not a blade of grass was left behind. Utilities now move in to enable offices, condos, boutiques or something so new and so different to be jammed into an oily sea of fresh asphalt. There is now nothing left but an eroded mountain of clay. Green tree wood was piled up higher and wider than the County Office Building, which as green as it was burned into toxic ashes in smoldering pollution. Such are the most economical means of modern day development. He opposed Route 29S being turned into 29N. He quotes Joni Mitchell. I look about me and I see people who might remember what she said. "They took all the trees and put them in a tree museum and they charged the people just a dollar and a half just to see them. Don't it always seem to go that you don't know what you have until it's gone. They paved paradise and put in a parking lot."

Carleton Ray said this is a really lousy idea for two reasons. One is economic development never pays for itself in the long run. He comes from New York City and knows of the high cost. He asked what is meant by a natural valuable area. He was on two mountain protection committees and the bio-diversity committee in the county and spent almost 12 years with colleagues debating these things. Two factors came out. One, is a critical slope and the second is what a stream buffer is. They recommended that critical slopes be much, much less on all 3 committees than 15 percent. He did not think that 15 percent is enough due to erosion caused by heavy rains and runoff. If they care about runoff he asked them to keep that in mind. The recommendation for a stream buffer from an ecological point of view should be between 400' and 600'. That is a lot and closes off a lot of land. But, that is what you need if you are really going to protect streams from a lot of runoff. He asked the Commission to keep those two factors in mind when they think about this area in particular.

Helen Carlton, President of the Central Virginia Partnership for Economic Development, that is a not for profit public private partnership that represents the private sector higher education, which is University of Virginia, and both Piedmont Virginia Community College and Germania community College, as well as 8 counties plus the City of Charlottesville. They just got Madison County in so they have everybody now in our region from Nelson County all the way up to Culpeper. A few years ago they oversaw a comprehensive target market's report. She has been pleased to see that the Board of Supervisors in Albemarle County has embraced that report as a way to focus on economic development in very specific targets. It is not opening up the doors to the world. They are looking at what are the types of businesses that they want to keep here and help grow here so that they can be successful in the long term and have a vibrant economy. They also support the priorities that Albemarle County sets. They don't set priorities for them, but actually help them come to those decisions and then support whatever they decide. She thinks it is common knowledge that our successful businesses want to remain and grow here. They want to stay here, and if they want to retain them they just absolutely must have places for them to go. We need sites and buildings so that they can continue their successful operations here. Otherwise, they will take their jobs and our tax revenues elsewhere and they have seen that happen as you all know. She also serves in her role as president of the partnership as president of the Piedmont Workforce network, which is the region's workforce development board. In our region we need higher wage, high quality, career ladder jobs. In providing opportunities for the 40 percent out commuters to have jobs closer to home I thinks is very positive for all of us. The partnership strongly supports this boundary adjustment and greatly appreciate your consideration this evening.

Christine Davis said she would hit the high points in her email sent today. She asked the Commission to require the following additional and detailed information before voting: a funded and completed small area study of the US 29 South Corridor; a completed VDOT study; a firm date and funding verification for when the VDOT improvements to the 64/29 Interchange will be done; cost analysis and logistical plan for how water and sewer would be extended down 29; a plan to address the school bus route; and an actual cost analysis and payback period analysis of extending police, fire and other public services to the property. It should be done with detailed analysis, firm data and with caution. (Attachment 5 – Email dated 7-21-15 from Christine Davis to Karen Firehock)

Morgan Butler, Southern Environmental Law Center, noted the problems mentioned in the staff report were with the readiness in infrastructure and the location of the county's vacant industrial land. It was very hard to provide specific comments on this because of the lack of information about the uses that would follow. One of his broad concerns is that this growth area expansion has suddenly jumped in front of all of those other strategies. By allowing it to do so could establish a damaging precedent with the county adopted growth management policies to fit the desires of a business prospect rather than the other way around. The fact that the area being evaluated tripled in size between May and June and no longer seems tailored to just the one business prospect is also troubling. It undermines the urgency argument being used to push this forward on a fast track. With the more comprehensive analysis the comp plan calls for now getting underway, shouldn't we be looking with this request as a smaller area, such as the 83 acre parcel that is already in the jurisdictional area, and was the parcel originally identified when this prospect and proposal first surfaced? This goes to the first question we were asked to address tonight. The community had their public hearing and they feel there are several key questions that need to be answered before an informed recommendation can be offered. Here are two that have not come up tonight. First, the staff report mentions a potential lack of sewer capacity for at least the water intensive use until 2024. That is a key issue in light of the apparent urgency underlying this request and one on which more information is clearly needed. Second, sizeable expansions and upgrades of utilities would be necessary. All told nearly 2 ½ miles of water, sewer and gas line extensions will be necessary to make this work. How much would these cost and who would pay for all of them. Thank you for the chance to comment tonight and for your careful consideration of this proposal.

Neil Williamson, Free Enterprise Forum, voiced his concerns outlined in his letter as submitted. He noted The Free Enterprise Forum hopes tonight's work session will include a discussion of how you plan to fully restore the developable land in the development area to 5% of the land mass of the County. (Attachment 6 – Statement submitted on 7-21-15 by Neil Williamson. Available with the minutes in the office of the clerk.)

Planning Commission Direction:

The Planning Commission held a discussion with staff, which included Lee Catlin, Assistant County Executive and Susan Stimart, Economic Development Facilitator. The Planning Commission provided direction on the issues identified by staff and provided comments and suggestions on information that should be included in a CPA for the August 18th public hearing. The Planning Commission generally were in agreement with all the issues identified by staff noting the importance of protecting nearby properties from noise and odors as being something they are really interested in; however, taking the comments of Mr. Randolph and looking at an overall larger area that could be potentially ratcheted back.

The Planning Commission generally agreed with the recommendations for inclusion in the CPA provided by staff:

- Designate buildable areas
- Emphasize protection of habitat in Heyward Park
- Encourage creativity in site design to reduce grading
- Identify 5 Targeted Industries
- Positive relationship needed to Regional Mixed Use Center
- Protect nearby properties from any noise and odors
- Wooded buffer frontage and boundary condition
- Emphasize need for interchange improvements to keep from making situation worse; find alternatives for truck traffic
- Provide pedestrian and bike connections to Mixed Use Center

The Commission also noted the importance of provisions that would address protection of nearby properties from noise and odors.

Mr. Randolph listed the following that need to be addressed for him to support the CPA:

1) By August 18th the Commission needs to receive a statement from the BOS that they consider this rezoning/CPA as an isolated, single-case study and that it is not precedent-setting. In language similar to the Supreme Court in Bush v. Gore there needs to be a statement that this decision rezoning/CPA carries no precedent for any future discussion of development in other interchanges or in any other corners of this interchange. This is a single-shot rezoning/CPA that is expressly not the first step to a series of rezonings down 29 S or rezonings in other interchanges in the County such as Crozet, Shadwell and Keswick.
2) To reinforce this point, I suggest the Commission needs to view a site plan on August 18th for a 100 yard buffer on either side along the southern-most entrance, along either side of a potential entrance/exit road and beyond going all the way up to Heyward County Park, to separate the Developed Area to the north from the rural properties to the south. This buffered cordon sanitaire is designed to serve as a physical and symbolic break between the Developed Area to the north and the Rural area to the south and make it harder for the owners of the property to the south to argue that their properties should be eligible to also be included in the Developed Area. Along this buffer could run the county's access road to the park.
3) A commitment needs to be secured from VDOT that it will conduct a publicly disclosed traffic impact analysis of the truck loading that the designated new industry's traffic will produce on the I-64/29 intersection and then provide a preliminary build plan for necessary improvements at the intersection that include estimated costs, sources of funds and probable start/completion dates.
4) A commitment from the County to conduct a hydrologic study of the benefits provided to Moore's Creek by the existing unspoiled topography within the proposed Developed Area and the estimated TMDLs and water quality impacts resulting from the proposed development on this site of this industry and other(s) potentially to the north.
5) For the purposes of this project the County and the industry agree that all the slopes within this potential new Development Area are preserved so that any proposed building in this site must conform to the slopes rather than the slopes conforming to the building. The industry should also consider placing any undeveloped property contiguous to the Park under conservation easement to preserve it in perpetuity.
6) The County will commit to conducting a community meeting with the residents of Redfield for the express purpose to discuss explicitly the sizing requirements of the interceptor tie in for this industry and the probable construction time line for this work.

7) The County will share with the Commission the RSWA's preliminary estimates of water usage by this industry at this site and provide clarification of RSWA's water usage policy during drought conditions, identifying whether the industry has first or preferential rights to water from the Ragged Mountain reservoir.
8) Within six months the County should develop a preliminary plan for unified LI development within the quadrant's existing Development Area, with the goal of actively marketing the property within the next nine months.
9) The County should attempt to secure VDOT's support for pressure-activated traffic lights at the locations warranted by VDOT to maximize the current ease of travel north and south on 29.
10) The BOS may find it advisable and advantageous to authorize the Parks and Recreation Department to create a recreational use advisory committee that reports to the Department. This committee should be composed of recreational and competitive mountain bikers, hikers, other outside groups such as the Audubon Society, members of the new LI business and adjacent to the Park property owners to advise Parks and Recreation on the creation of a Recreational Master Plan for the Park. Consideration should also be given by this committee to the potential creation of a cyclocross course within the Park which will be contiguous to the new LI business.
11) The Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors should expect to receive within the next six months an updated, current inventory (following this potential rezoning) of all existing LI properties and commercial properties equal to or larger than five acres to help County elected and appointed officials strategically plan for future LI growth."

Mr. Dotson agreed that rural interchanges are not on the table for discussion and asked for the following in considering the CPA:

- Inventory of the available industrial sites and/or land.
- Information on other urban interchanges as was provided during the Comprehensive Plan review.
- VDOT and RSWA representatives to attend the CPA public hearing.

Mr. Loach agreed with Mr. Randolph's list as things that are needed before the land would be rezoned. He also emphasized the need for concurrency of infrastructure with development of any land that would be rezoned.

Regarding staff's third question, "Should the developable area be added to the DAs or should all of the land be added and the undevelopable area designated for preservation?" It was the consensus of the Commission to include all of the land in the CPA as described by staff which would allow the Commission to scale back the actual added area it recommends if it so chooses.

No formal action was taken by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Morris thanked all the Commissioners, staff and the public for their input. Please remember they are coming back on the 18th of August to have the public hearing at 6:00 p.m. They will see what the staff comes up with as far as the proposed amendment.

Mr. Cilimberg noted for those in attendance, too, and Planning Commissioners that they do have another community meeting scheduled for next Thursday, July 30th beginning at 5:00 p.m. at the 5th Street Office Building to essentially get a recap of what they heard tonight and what they will be looking at.

Mr. Morris invited everyone to be there.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the location in August on the 18th would also be at COB 5th Street Room A because the auditorium here was out of service due to some improvements

Old Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any old business.

- **Comp Plan Priority Objectives/Strategies** Follow-up to July 10th joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors (Wayne Cilimberg)

  Commissioners provided direction and agreed to continue discussion on August 11th rather than August 18th. It was the agreement of the Commission that the Commissioners will each identify their top two objectives/strategies X'ed in the 'PC Priority June, 2014' column that are not also X'ed in the 'Board Priority' column and e-mail them to staff before Monday, July 27th. Staff will compile selections and provide them to the Commission in advance of their August 11th meeting.

- Mr. Keller reported the draft Fiscal Impact Committee report has been submitted.
- The Commission discussed joint BOS/PC meeting agendas and advance preparation.
- The Commission discussed how they would like Zoning Ordinance amendments made available to them.
- Mr. Keller asked that he receive a Dropbox notification when information is available.

There being no further old business, the meeting proceeded.

New Business

Mr. Morris asked if there was any new business.

- No Planning Commission meeting on July 28, 2015.
- The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 4, 2015.

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

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:07 p.m. to the Tuesday, August 4, 2015 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

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

Approved 9-22-2015