Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 2, 2016

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, February 2, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room 241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Mac Lafferty, Daphne Spain, Karen Firehock, Vice Chair; Pam Riley, Jennie More, Bruce Dotson, and Tim Keller, Chair. Bill Palmer, UVA Representative, was present.

Other officials present were Rebecca Ragsdale, Senior Planner; Sarah Baldwin, Senior Planner; David Benish, Acting Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; Wayne Cilimberg, Acting Deputy Director of Community Development; Mark Graham, Director of Community Development and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Keller, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Committee Reports

Mr. Keller invited committee reports. There being none, the Commission will talk about the committee assignments one last time during old business.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public:

Mr. Keller invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda.

Neil Williamson, Free Enterprise Forum, asked that action be taken tonight on the cash proffer policy FIAC recommendation since Albemarle County was in violation of the State Law. (Attachment – Comments to the Albemarle County Planning Commission February 2, 2016 submitted by Neil Williamson – Available in clerk's office with written minutes)

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

Consent Agenda

a. **SUB-2015-00221 – Harry F. Yoder – Private Street Request**
Private street request to serve the proposed residential Lot B3 on 3.5 acres from Bleak House Road (SR 662) (Chris Perez)

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

Mr. Dotson said he had a number of questions he would like to talk about in order to understand the request better, and Ms. More agreed.

Motion: Mr. Dotson moved and Ms. More seconded to pull SUB-2015-00221, Harry F. Yoder – Private Street Request from the consent agenda in order that Commissioners could ask several questions before acting on the item.

The motion passed by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller suggested the Commission move it to the end of the agenda. However, it was the pleasure of the Commission to discuss the item first.

Mr. Dotson asked how staff would like to proceed.

Mr. Keller asked if the individual staff member that worked on this request is out sick today.

Mr. Benish replied that Mr. Perez is out today; however, he would explain the request. The applicant is proposing a third lot in this subdivision referred to as lot B3, which is a division of an existing lot served by a private roadway. The applicant is requesting in lieu of the ordinance, which would require access from the existing approved roadway for this subdivision, to have an additional access beyond the previously approved private road. Any subsequent subdivision would take access from that roadway. In this particular case due in part to some topographic issues the best building site on this residue area is on the east side of the roadway that would require a private road across the stream. The applicant has requested in lieu of the private road being extended across the stream to take access from Bleak House Road. Given the fact that the proposed lot is 3 acres and cannot be further subdivided the private road you have been asked to approve is essentially a driveway and would not serve any other development. There isn't any increase in development and the same by right lot, but the choice of a lot is on the east side of the roadway and is accessed via an approved private road. However, essentially there is no standard for that roadway and there would only be one lot serving it. It would be like an additional driveway accessing off of Bleak House Road. In order to approve that private road the Commission would be approving a subdivision being served by more than one street and then approving the private road with the condition that it would not be extended in the future to impact the stream buffer area.

Ms. More said she wanted to be sure to be clear about option 1 coming off the existing drive. From what the letter states it creates a sufficient impact and by creating the second drive those are avoided. She questioned the way the building site is situated on lot B3 because the new roadway looks like it goes into the buffer.

Mr. Benish replied that exhibit A is being proposed and what the Commission would be acting on. He noted the new roadway is drawn through the buffer; however, there is a note that says no construction within the stream buffer. It should not have been drawn on there, but the condition precludes that.

Mr. Dotson noted on exhibit A it says two-lot private street, but Mr. Benish was explaining that it would be serving just one.

Mr. Benish explained that private streets are generally considered 2-lot private because otherwise it is a driveway. Based on the size of the lot and the development rights the private street can only serve one lot.

Mr. Kamptner pointed out that B-1 has access off Buck Mountain Road, which would require a maintenance agreement.

Mr. Dotson suggested changing the condition to reference exhibit A and changing no construction to no disturbance is permitted within the stream buffer for this division or any subsequent division. He suggested that the applicant provide any comments he had.

Mr. Keller invited the applicant or other members of the public to speak on this matter.

Roger Ray, land surveyor in Albemarle County, said he prepared this document for the request and this is a unique situation. He has been doing this since 1962 and this is the first time he has ever encountered a situation like this where it makes more sense to have the second private road than it does to extend the initial private road. It is a condition of the ordinance Section 232.b.2 that gives the agent the authority to approve a private road provided that road only contains 2 lots and the private street will serve only those 2 lots and will be the sole and direct means of access to the public road. They already have a private street from Buck Mountain Road that serves the dwelling on this tract of land.

Mr. Ray explained that to be able to get to the building site on the east side of the road is either to cross the stream in the stream buffer with a long 100' driveway to get there or to come off of Bleak House Road with a very short driveway to get to the building site. However, to give that road appropriate frontage they would have to call that a 2 lot private street. That is where it gains its frontage for that lot existing. Therefore, the 2 lot street has to extend through the stream buffer to the boundary line of the current track of land. That is just a technicality of the ordinance. However, we do not want to build the driveway within the stream buffer so we are saying we are creating it to allow us to create a lot; but, then we are saying we do not want to use it. The agent could have approved this if we had wanted to go through the stream buffer with the roadway. But, it is just a technicality and is difficult.

Mr. Ray further explained that a 2 lot private street is the same in the zoning and subdivision ordinance and is what is known as safe and convenient access. Safe and convenient access is a driveway or a road that is a 10' travel surface with 14' vertical clearance and no steeper than 16% grade, which ends up being a good driveway. He had worked with the staff for a long time to be able to come up with a good plan to protect the environment by not building a driveway through the stream buffer. They have to show the driveway to the property line; but, the final plat will have a condition that there will not be any construction within the stream buffer.

Mr. Keller invited follow up questions.

Mr. Palmer asked Mr. Ray what the maximum grade was, and Mr. Ray replied it was 16% except a waiver can be requested from the county engineer and fire official. However, we won't be approaching that 16%.

Mr. Keller asked if there were any further questions or discussion.

Ms. More suggested clarifying the language to state no disturbance of the road or any construction.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Kamptner if they should put that as part of the motion to approve, and Mr. Kamptner replied yes.

Motion: Ms. More moved and Mr. Dotson seconded to approve the consent agenda for SUB-2015-00221 Harry F. Yoder – Private Street Request as recommended by staff with the conditions, as amended, in a) to change "construction" to "no disturbance".

The motion to approve the consent agenda carried by a vote of 7:0.

SUB-2015-00221 Harry F. Yoder – Private Street Request

14-232 and 14-234 – The Planning Commission recommends approval of a second private street to serve the subdivision of Lot B1 into two parcels with the following conditions:

a) No disturbance is permitted within the stream buffer for this division or any subsequent division.
b) A private street maintenance agreement shall be submitted and approved prior to final plat approval.
c) VDOT entrance approval shall be obtained for the new entrance.

Mr. Keller noted that the consent agenda was approved and the meeting would move to the item.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Public Hearing Item

B-2015-02132 TWR Dominion Power Antenna Platform Co-Location
PROPOSAL: Alteration to an existing 110 foot power tower to add antenna on a 10' wide platform for wireless communication at a new top height of 120 feet and ground equipment in an approximately 400 square foot lease area.
WAIVERS: Yes – 5.1.40b (2) (c)-Projection of antenna beyond 18 inches from the tower structure for the proposed platform.
ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA Rural Areas
LOCATION: 195 Georgetown Road
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 060A0090000400
(Rebecca Ragsdale)

Ms. Ragsdale presented a PowerPoint presentation on Verizon Wireless Dominion Power Tower Collocation Special Exception Application entitled Albemarle County Planning Commission - February 2, 2016 195 Georgetown Road Charlottesville, VA 22901 "SEMINOLE SQUARE". The request is for a waiver modification associated with a new personal wireless service facility to be collocated on an existing Dominion Power transmission line on Georgetown Road. The Planning Commission is asked for comment and recommendation on the request. As a special exception it is not actually required to come before the Planning Commission. However, it is our policy since staff is recommending denial to bring it before the Planning Commission. Ultimately, it will be scheduled for the Board of Supervisors to act on the request. As part of the special exception process and a requirement of the ordinance the abutting owners have been notified. The regulation in Section 5.1.40 of the Zoning Ordinance has an extensive detailed set of regulations that regulate wireless service facilities. This type of facility would normally be a building permit if it complied with the antenna projection requirements. Staff will go into a little bit more detail about that.

Staff included background in the staff report about the Wireless Policy that was developed in 2000. In 2005, revisions were made to the ordinance to comply with the 1996 Telecom Act and FCC regulations. However, the regulations are geared towards, as staff noted in the report, addressing the visual impacts of facilities.

The site is located along Georgetown Road between Hydraulic and Barracks Road. The property is zoned Rural Areas and in the rural areas of the Comprehensive Plan on the border of the development area. It is a 3 acre site with a single-family residence on it near the Hessian Hills neighborhood. Staff pointed out the location of the Dominion Powerline Structure on the property, which also gave some context for the existing neighborhood and where the trees are located. There are a number of single-family residential lots abutting the property and some apartment complexes in the neighborhood.

The powerline easement is about 100 feet in width so there is a clear zone around the tower. The proposal is to use the existing driveway. There would not be any tree disturbance associated with the request. There would be an associated ground equipment area near the base of the tower that would be screened from adjoining properties. Those aspects of the proposal comply with the ordinance. The top of the existing power structure and the platform structure would be extended 10' high above it; the platform is 10' in width; and the mounting pipe is about 6" in diameter that extends above it. (A detail was shown in the slide.) The ordinance would require that the antenna be flush mounted and project no more than 18" from the power structure.

Staff had some concerns about the request, as noted in the staff report, about this particular site being within a dense residential area. The Wireless Policy speaks specifically to these types of structures and collocations, and while recognized opportunity sites there are existing structures that wireless providers can collocate on. Staff has particular concerns about this type of antenna platform not being mitigated or camouflaged in any way and adding to the visual impacts of the structure. For those reasons, staff recommends not to approve this special exception.

Staff has found some factors favorable. It is an existing structure that already has visual impacts in the neighborhood and they would be utilizing that. It is not in an avoidance area since it is not on a property that is within an historic district, along a scenic highway, agricultural/forestal district or conservation easement property. As mentioned, the abutting property owners were notified and staff has not received any objections. So those were the factors favorable that staff found.

Staff recommends denial of the special exceptions and would be happy to answer questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Mr. Lafferty asked if staff had any idea of the amount of additional coverage or how many new people this would serve.

Ms. Ragsdale replied that in the written justification for the special exception there was a need to provide additional coverage and capacity in this area. However, the applicant can give a better sense of what that need is and referred the question to the applicant.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out there was a request shortly coming up for a tower near Albemarle High School. He asked would that take care of the coverage.

Ms. Ragsdale replied she was not familiar with that request or if it was from a different provider or not.

Ms. Baldwin noted that the special use permit has not actually been filed yet. However, it is the same applicant and they can probably speak to that as well.

Mr. Kamptner asked Ms. Ragsdale to go back to the findings slide. The first favorable factor is the facility would fill in the coverage gaps. Just to be clear for the record that is based upon Verizon's assertions in their documents that they submitted and not staff's independent analysis.

Ms. Ragsdale agreed.

Ms. More said she had a question about any concerns expressed from neighbors. She asked if the adjacent property owners are notified by letter, or what is the process that staff would hear from neighbors.

Ms. Ragsdale replied that adjacent property owners receive a notice in the mail. One property owner called to get some more information, and she emailed him the copies of the plans and everything, but have not received any objections.

Ms. Riley asked has there been other applicants with these top hat antennas approved in other locations.

Ms. Ragsdale replied yes, there have been at least one recent example from 2012. Each site is reviewed on a case by case basis based on the topography, the tree cover and the visibility of the site. However, they are few and far between. There are some examples in the county that predate the Wireless Policy. One example on Barracks Road from 1996 is in the Wireless Policy; and, she thinks there may have been two within the last three years.

Ms. Riley noted the preference for the flush mounted antennas and asked if that is an option in this situation.

Ms. Ragsdale replied that the applicant can give a little bit more background. Since the adoption of the Wireless Policy Dominion Power had a change to their safety guidelines that require these platforms and all the work to be done by the Dominion Power employees on the tower.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Lori Schweller, an attorney with LeClair Ryan in Charlottesville representing Verizon Wireless, and Stephen Waller who was a zoning consultant with GDN Sites and Verizon Wireless represented the request. She presented a PowerPoint presentation to explain the proposal for a special exception.

This is a Tier One Personal Wireless Facility so the collocation is permitted by right. However, they are requesting a special exception because the standoff of the proposed antennas, the distance from the monopole to the antennas, is greater than the restriction permitted under Albemarle County's current Zoning Ordinance. This is a very densely populated area with a lot of traffic, lots of single-family homes, multi-family homes and businesses. It is very difficult to construct a personal wireless service facility in a residential area, which is not favored in Albemarle County. So this is an excellent opportunity to bring the necessary service without constructing a new tower. That is one of the reasons why existing power towers are considered

opportunity sites in the Comprehensive Plan and the Wireless Policy, which is part of the Comprehensive Plan.

The next slide shows just a view of Georgetown Road driving north. She takes this drive every day to take her son to school and actually had not noticed the site before because it is not in your field of vision when you are driving southbound. However, when you turn in the distance or foreground you can see some existing poles in the Dominion Power easement. The first white one in the far distance is the one they are proposing to add the facility to. So with very little visual impact we can add a full wireless service facility in a very densely populated residential area. We consider this a prime opportunity site. In the full view looking down the driveway of the residence where the lease area is located you can see the tower.

So again, we are simply requesting the Planning Commission's recommendation for approval of the special exception because of the standoff, which currently is only permitted to be 18". In 2012, Dominion Power came up with new guidelines for installing wireless facilities on its existing towers. Previously the carriers had been able to install the facilities themselves. However, that is no longer permitted at all. Dominion Power does this for safety reasons and there are new guidelines for installing those facilities. Antenna array design is necessary to comply with Dominion Power safety guidelines (2012). Telecommunications antenna arrays must be above the static line, not below. Therefore, it needs to be taller than it used to be. It used to be they could squeeze them in as low as possible. Also, the array needs to incorporate a platform for technicians to stand on. They were sent a bulletin, (Division of Occupational Safety and Heath Bulletin - 2013) by one of the engineers at Dominion Power when she was working on the zoning ordinance in Chesterfield County. Chesterfield County because they were concerned about these safety concerns of Dominion Power have a different standoff standard for power towers than for a communications facility that a carrier or tower company might construct. The standoff for power towers in Chesterfield County is 7' from the tower. She would show the Commission why that makes sense in the next slide.

Robert Capehart at Dominion Power sent photographs at that time to show some facilities. Those are flush mount arrays constructed on top of power towers that they consider unsafe designs. Because of the way the engineers have to climb the poles to install those towers there is nowhere for them to stand, which obviously makes it unsafe for installing and maintaining the tower. Ms. Schweller noted the types of facilities that Albemarle County has preferred in the past. Another example of a poor design was noted because of where the antennas are located, which was contrasted to a design showing technicians standing on the platform being able to reach the antennas. You can see the power tower under it and how relatively small the array is compared to the existing tower itself. Next, she pointed out the prototype of the platform that Dominion Power would like to see, which is quite similar to the one being proposed. She noted the context of an antenna array on top of an electric power tower. There are many of these in Albemarle County. An example is at the intersection of the Bypass and Hydraulic Road.

We are trying to minimize the standoff in the proposal since we understand the concern. Because we are using a smaller pipe mount we are able to do a standoff that is 5' instead of 7 ½', and so the distance on each side of the triangle is a total of 10'. Again, though power towers are opportunity sites collocations are not a good option and are inferior both for safety purposes and for providing the service that we are trying to provide. We have done these in the past. Of course, the tower needs to be at least 10' taller because we need all of our services. Verizon Wireless provides four different services and all of those need to be provided on the antennas. So you will need two sets of flush mounted arrays, which they have done in the past. However, it is much inferior to just having it all in one location. As she said, with Dominion

Power's new safety concerns it is not an option. Again, we consider these opportunity sites. The Wireless Policy although acknowledging these are opportunity sites, prefers not to see the full arrays. However, this is the direction we are going because of the safety concerns and the need to provide this services. She would also submit that it does not greatly increase the visual impact given how large these towers are already existing.

Ms. Schweller pointed out an example where the antennas are not attached where they replaced an existing tower that was structurally insufficient at our antennas. This is an option where we can just put a new pole and take down the old tower; and, then you have a slimmer profile and a much stronger facility. Verizon Wireless did this in 2014, and at the time the Board of Supervisors was very supportive. Supervisor Palmer was very pleased about opportunity sites and lauded the Owensville site as a "wonderful site" – the idea of placing cell tower antennas on power towers was a great plan that should be supported without obstacles -- and asked staff for a list of similar sites and information on obstacles to making zoning such sites easier. The Board fully supported our placement of that tower and using non-flush-mounted antennas. We hope when the county addresses the upcoming personal wireless service facilities zoning ordinance amendments for standoff and for antenna sizes that we can add to that a discussion about increasing standoff for Dominion Power towers for the reasons she discussed, and also replacing weak towers as a by right modification for safety reasons and not adding to the visual impact. She would be happy to take any questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the increase in height is due to getting the antennas above this because every time one of the carriers come in they are always increasing the height.

Ms. Schweller pointed out this existing electric tower is 110'. Therefore, there is a need to increase the height by 10' to install the antennas. That is typical. As mentioned about the flush mounted antennas if we had to do 2 sets of antennas, like we did at Colthurst Farm, we would need to increase it 20' because you need the separation between the antennas. So we are keeping this as low as we possibly can. It is not even a 10 percent increase, which would not be a substantial increase under the spectromat if that were to apply here. So it is a minimal increase.

Mr. Lafferty said when you increase the tower with a monopole are you talking about the tower being the lattice tower.

Ms. Schweller replied in that case it was since the Owensville Road tower was an old typical power tower with the arms and lattices. That was replaced with a monopole, which is what this is, a monopole with the arms.

Mr. Lafferty asked does the monopole go all way to the ground and you are replacing the whole lattice work.

Ms. Schweller replied yes. In this case what we are doing is attaching a pole to the top of an existing pole.

Mr. Lafferty said it would certainly be less visual impact if you replace it with a monopole, which he assumed is much more expensive than just tagging a pole.

Ms. Schweller pointed out it just can't be done if the structural evaluation in the case is not strong enough to hold the antennas. So it was just not feasible and more expensive to replace it.

Mr. Lafferty asked do you determine that or does Vepco.

Ms. Schweller replied that Dominion Power does.

Mr. Keller invited other questions for the applicant.

Mr. Dotson noted further out Barracks Road we saw a slide showing one of the top hats. Just going out there today there was also a flush mount a few towers back from that. He asked was that done before Dominion's 2012 policy and how that was able to happen or is there something else going.

Ms. Schweller replied that she was not familiar with that site and did not know whether those were Verizon facilities. However, having done a number of LTE upgrades with Stephen Waller she asked him to comment.

Stephen Waller, consultant for Verizon Wireless with a company called GDN Sites, said that was the site that Ms. Schweller was speaking of, the Colthurst site where we have two sets of flush mounted arrays. It was done while Dominion was developing this policy; but, it was before they took a real hard line on the policy. It has two sets of flush mounted antenna stacked one above the other. So in that case if there was really concern for increasing the visibility or the visual impacts of the site we actually increased it by going up. With going up with two sets of arrays stacked vertically we increased the viewshed of that tower. So it basically expands the area from which that tower would be visible whereas in this case we are only going up 10', even though we are going farther out with a 10' spread on the antennas. In a perfect world or in a likened like situation of dealing with the same elevation with the same topography and types of trees around them that tower with the flush mounts would actually be more visible than this tower would be.

Mr. Dotson asked Ms. Schweller to respond to Commissioner Lafferty's question about the Albemarle High School site.

Ms. Schweller apologized to Mr. Dotson because she did not realize he meant that site. Around that same time we did do some other LTE upgrades that were full arrays. It depended on the site whether we were going to minimize the height or whether that was an important site. She was glad Mr. Waller was able to answer that question. She responded that the Albemarle High site was not a Verizon Wireless site. However, she represented the applicant, Milestone Communications, and that site was proposed for the school board to have the top level and AT&T to have the second level. So it is not within the Verizon Wireless network.

Mr. Lafferty asked how many additional customers will be served by putting this array in place.

Ms. Schweller replied they have propagation maps that she did not receive in time to submit with the application for the special exception. However, she does have the propagation maps to describe and pass around

Mr. Lafferty pointed out at one time the Commission requested having those so they could see the actual impact of what the neighborhood would be versus the visual impact.

Ms. Schweller passed out the two propagation maps. (Two Attachments - Proposed Coverage only Seminole Square @ 116' AGL and Existing Coverage Seminole Square 02-02-2016 submitted by Lori Schweller) (Available with written minutes in the clerk's office) The first map was computer modeling that is showing coverage that exists in this area without the requested site. The green area is showing excellent coverage for both building and car coverage. The yellow area shows less good coverage, but is sufficient. The red area shows minimal coverage. The white areas are where there is no coverage. So you can see in this area there is a white spot, excuse me yellow spot, where coverage is not as good as in the surrounding green. The proposed facility will provide coverage in that area. We are not talking only about coverage, but also about capacity. There are areas that may have coverage, but don't have sufficient capacity because of the number of users in the area. This is a relatively tall tower so this signal will go all the way out to shops at Stonefield, for example, and won't only serve the residential neighborhoods. So then when you turn that on within the existing network it fills in that gap so we have continuous coverage all up and down Georgetown and surrounding roadways.

Mr. Keller invited public comment. There being none, Mr. Keller invited the applicant for rebuttal.

Ms. More asked if the maps being passed around show the coverage gaps and if they are assuming there are coverage gaps along Georgetown Road currently.

Ms. Schweller replied that was correct. She pointed out that Verizon Wireless when it needs to fill in coverage gaps or add additional capacity to an area always looks for existing towers before asking to construct something new. That is good sense both on a zoning and planning perspective, and from an economic perspective. So this tower is where it needs to be for us to attach antennas to accomplish that.

Mr. Keller asked as a hypothetical if this was not approved what would be your next move. Would you be looking for another stand-alone site?

Ms. Schweller replied that it is very difficult to construct a tower in a residential area since the parcels simply are not large enough. There is already a tower on this site so it would be ridiculous for us to request a special use permit to construct a new one on the very same parcel that already has a tower on it. So if you were not to recommend approval and the Board did not approve this special exception she was not sure what the next step would be. She would have to consult with Verizon Wireless. It would unusual since she has never had a special exception request not granted because normally it is considered reasonable to deviate from Albemarle County's limitations when the upsides justify.

Mr. Dotson said he had a question of the applicant or perhaps staff. Ms. Schweller mentioned revisions to the County's Personal Wireless Facility Policy and he knows she has worked on that with staff. He asked where that stands. He knows the Commission has seen pieces of it, but did not know if they have seen all of the pieces or whether there is more working taking place.

Ms. Baldwin pointed out the Commission has not seen all of the pieces and there is more work taking place. Staff hopes to bring the next zoning text amendment (ZTA) in front of the Commission within the next couple of months.

Mr. Dotson asked if this particular situation has not been addressed thus far in those revisions.

Ms. Baldwin replied it has not, but staff has been talking about it.

Mr. Dotson asked as a staff member does it make sense to do something like what Chesterfield did to have a different standard for power towers.

Ms. Baldwin replied that we have been seeing more power towers come in. From a staff perspective it has been difficult for us to figure out ways to approve them or administer them with the policy. She thinks it would be worth looking into what other localities do to see if we can make some changes.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing to bring the matter back to the Commission for discussion and action.

Mr. Lafferty said that he drives by this site all the time and he had to go out and look for the towers. About the only way you can see it from Georgetown Road is to line yourself up with the transmission lines and look down through. He also knows a person who lives at what is known as 301 in Attachment A, which is contiguous with where the tower is going to be, and he has never noticed a tower from her house. So in looking down the transmission lines there are already lots of lines and stuff that would be an eyesore. However, it is already there and we need it. Since the tower was on the land of the house next to it that he assumed they were getting some benefit from this. So he would be reluctant to turn it down.

Mr. Dotson said he shared the observation having gone out and looked at it today. Even with the leaves off the trees today, it was not that highly visible except when you look down the easement area. So he agreed with Mr. Lafferty. He understands the safety concern and Dominion's policy. He did not want us to lose this kind of opportunity site so was probably leaning positively toward this with the notion that it would be a good idea for staff and those that they are working with to consider a Chesterfield kind of approach as the rest of the ordinance amendments are brought forward.

Ms. Spain said she was confused about the policy that staff is working on. It seems as though staff is trying to follow the policy and it does not yet include the power tower considerations. Is that the basis of your decision and the explanation for our differing opinions?

Ms. Baldwin replied that the policy does consider existing powerlines and we have approved some. This particular one seemed a little bit bigger and beyond and the visual impact was something staff thought was worth bringing before the Commission to have that discussion.

Mr. Lafferty noted as he understands it one of our overall concerns is with the visual pollution. He thinks this is minimized in this case because you have to look down the powerlines that has all those powerlines going right over your head going to this tower. He was sensitive to the visual impact, but he was just not sure this can be seen from that many neighbors.

There being no further comments, Mr. Keller asked for a motion.

Mr. Lafferty noted that he could not say it will have no negative visual impacts, and Ms. Firehock suggested he could say minimal.

Motion: Mr. Lafferty moved and Ms. Firehock seconded to recommend approval of the modification (special exception) for B2015-02132 TWR Dominion Power Antenna Platform Co-Location based on the determination it will have minimal negative visual impacts.

The motion carried by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller noted that B2015-02132 would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval of the special exception (modification) on a date to be determined

Presentation

Review of Community Development Work Program (Wayne Cilimberg)

In a PowerPoint presentation Mr. Cilimberg presented the Community Development Work Program in part because of the new Commissioners and an interest in what opportunities we are seeing in this coming year for work under the comprehensive plan implementation as well as other initiatives. About a year ago Mark Graham came before the Commission to discuss the 2015 Work Program, and he wants to go back and give a couple of highlights from that work program as well as talk about 2016. (PowerPoint Presentation entitled Community Development Work Program – February 2, 2015 available in the office of the clerk with the written minutes.)

Each year staff actually works with the Board of Supervisors to establish the department's work program. A number of those items end up being items that the Planning Commission reviews. This year noting those things for the Commission that we have discussed with the Board of Supervisors regarding 2016 and potentially preparing you for discussions as the year goes on regarding future work program interests might be a result of presenting this tonight.

2015 Work Program Highlights

Comprehensive Plan Adoption
- Update with Strategies
- Economic Development
- Cash Proffer Policy
- Affordable Housing

Ordinances and Programs
- Wireless Amendments – Phase 2, FCC, Misc.
- Rt. 29 Business Signage – Phases 1, 2 & 3
- Neighborhood Model – Setbacks, yards
- BZA Process
- Fee Update in zoning ordinance
- Distilleries (with wineries and breweries)
- Signs – Reed Supreme Court Case
- Wireless – Public Notice
- Drive-through
- Subdivision Ord. "housekeeping"
- Natural Heritage Modeling
- Artist Communities

First, he was going back to 2015 and just hitting on some highlights that were reflected in the

Work Program, some of which are still ongoing. Obviously one of the big accomplishments of 2015 was the Comprehensive Plan adoption. During the year the Planning Commission discussed priority strategies that were incorporated in the ultimate adoption by the Board of Supervisors. So that was a major undertaking for the Planning Commission for several years as well as for the Board of Supervisors. In having that behind us now has allowed us to begin moving forward with some other initiatives.

A couple of things carried over from last year that are not done as yet relate to the Comp Plan regarding Economic Development Strategies Policy in the New Economic Development Office. Community Development will be assisting with this, but are not leading that work. Obviously that was an important component of the Comprehensive Plan and, in fact, one of the priority strategies the Commission identified.

The Planning Commission last year and again just last week dealt with the Cash Proffer Policy, obviously another carry over item and one for the future that has not gotten a completion date as yet. With the work program for this year he would talk more about that and Affordable Housing. In areas of ordinance and program initiation there were several Wireless Amendments last year. There were sign amendments particularly for Route 29 and in association with the 29 Project to make sure businesses were getting good visibility and opportunity for visibility during the construction project. There were ordinance amendments for setbacks and yards during the year consistent with the Neighborhood Model. The BZA Process Amendments actually were in response to State Code changes. There was updates of fees in the zoning ordinance; amendments that would incorporate Farm Distilleries as well as some additional winery and brewery amendments last year that, again, were a result of State Code changes. In response to the Reed Supreme Court case there was amendments for signs also for last year.

As noted earlier there are continuing amendments to be considered for Wireless Phase 1 as a carryover regarding public notice from last year; but, also there will be amendments related to Wireless design, as referred to by Ms. Baldwin, that will be coming to the Commission. They have just seen this year the drive through that started last year that they hope will be completed with the Board of Supervisors. Probably further out during the year will be Subdivision Ordinance Housekeeping amendments that they are now working more actively with the National Heritage modeling, which Ms. Firehock is familiar with. It is something that has carried over for a while, but now has some activity and hopefully finality ultimately this year. To be determined is Artist Communities, which is another item discussed last year, but still has work to be initiated based on some decisions that the Board of Supervisors will probably be making in the near future

In talking about 2016 and beyond he referred first to some of the objectives of the County Strategic Plan that Community Development has a part in and has been part of why the Work Program is what it is. He would also talk about staff availability and then the Work Program itself.

2016-20 Overview

- County Strategic Plan Objectives - CDD
- Staff Availability – Workload / Expertise / Priorities
- 2016 Work Program, 2017-2020 Initiatives

The Board in adopting the Strategic Plan for the county put emphasis on some major areas that Community Development staff are actively involved with. The CDD Priorities are as follows:

CDD Priorities

- **Major Strategic Plan Efforts**
  - Rio / Route 29 Master Plan (small area plan as part of Places29 and the ultimate update of Places29)
  - Pantops / River Corridor Master Plan
  - Revitalize Urban Areas (Note: Building Maintenance)
  - *Transportation*
  - *Natural Resources*

- **Minor Strategic Plan Efforts**
  - Urban Service Levels
  - Water Resources
  - Economic Development (Assessment Results)

Transportation and natural resources are two areas of great interest to the Board. In fact, they have dedicated new positions in each of those areas, so those objectives are considered adequately staffed. So the CDD Priorities all play a role in our work program.

When staff talked to the Board of Supervisors in October of last year about the 2016 Work Program they asked us to further consider some additional items or some greater activity in items already identified. The Board's direction to staff included the following additional initiatives to consider before it came back with the 2016 Work Program.

Board Direction

Additional Initiatives to Consider

- Economic Development, Implementation
- RA Small Churches
- Dark Skies/Lighting
- Transient Lodging
- RA Events
- Stormwater
- Wineries, Breweries, Distilleries
- Crossroad Communities

Economic Development assessment is anticipated to require a Comp Plan amendment in following year.

A number of these actually were implementation items that were identified in the adopted comprehensive plan. However, these were among those initiatives that the Board wanted us to consider for the work program. In doing so we really had to look at what our availability is from a staff standpoint including looking back to see where we have added staff or may have lost staff. The capacity in the work program particularly lies in the area of planning for taking on work program items. For the Board staff did go back and look at about 10 years of change in the department size, in particular the Planning Division size within the department. We have a smaller staff size now, particularly in the Planning Division for taking on those initiatives that a work program would address.

Last year staff showed the CDD staff availability in a pie chart that really indicates where our work program has an opportunity to utilize staff resources. It is part of being able to balance the

work load of those things that are ongoing activities such as applications and basic day to day items with those things that might be considered discretionary for new work or continued additional work by staff. Those are a piece of the pie that can be devoted to the work program exclusively. However, as you can see in the chart in the PowerPoint presentation it is not a large piece.

The work program utilizes remaining resources after other mandatory functions are served. This means the time available for the work program is affected by the number of applications and also means it can be somewhat difficult to accurately estimate how much time will be available a year from now.

Ultimately we came to present the Board a work program with adjustments that was in the package, which is the work program that we are working with for this year and the coming years as well. This work program really adjusted to emphasize a few things:

1. The interest the Board had in making sure we were taking up more intermediate additional amendments for wineries, breweries and distilleries in the rural area because of the concern or possibility that the existing provisions may enable impactful activities in the rural areas that would not be desired.
2. Along with that, looking at other Rural Area (RA) event allowances in our ordinance.

So those have been two items that have been pushed into this year to undertake with the staff we have available. With that it has meant a delay in our initiation of any work on the Rivanna River Corridor to much later in this calendar year as well as a delay into next year in taking up amendments for rural area churches, particularly smaller churches in the rural area.

Ms. Firehock questioned what the colors meant in the key in the Community Development Work Program, which said board review time.

Mr. Cilimberg replied the key is at the bottom of the second page and the staff development time is the work that staff would be undertaking.

Ms. Firehock asked if this was just what the different bodies would be doing.

Mr. Cilimberg agreed that it included staff time, then the Planning Commission in yellow and the Board time in green. Our part and probably the most intensive part of our staff time would be in the gray because that is the real preparation. He pointed out the Rio/29 small area plan is very definitely a major activity in this year. Also, the multi-modal transportation options the Board wanted staff to be working with this year. The transportation planner can now help with that. Another focus for staff is making sure that we are addressing urban areas and urban area initiatives particularly in place making and revitalization. Not shown here, but obviously also part of the staff's work this year, will be the Cash Proffer Policy and more work on Wireless. There are some things that are not shown directly here that are assumed to be ongoing as other parts of the pie so to speak. We will be supporting economic development.

Mr. Cilimberg pointed out on the second page it gets into some of the comprehensive plan related initiatives and strategies. Those generally are not items that we will be actively involved with at least in a Community Development lead this coming year and are to be determined as we look at future resources. The funding of ACE is really not a staff resource priority, but more of a capital improvements resource priority. Affordable housing is one we would support. Ron White is really the lead person in doing that work and there will probably be some additional

discussions with the Commission about affordable housing during the year. However, it is really at Mr. White's lead with our support. Then we will be supporting, again, economic development.

Mr. Cilimberg further explained that the bottom line is the existing staff we have and the time we feel is available with that staff because there are certain commitments the Board has asked us to make that is part of the Board's approval of the work program that has been reflected here. Staff wanted the Commission to be aware of it. As the Commission begins to consider those things they feel are important they might hear that resources are not there to be working with an item at that time. He suggested putting those items in a parking lot for discussion as we look at the work program beyond this year and potentially something the Commission might want to discuss with the Board of Supervisors as the year progresses. With that he offered to answer questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Mr. Lafferty asked how we are going to check on the impacts in the rural area about the special events and if we have a mechanism in place.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that there is a zoning clearance process that staff can use to create a record as the requests come through the clearance process under the ordinance provisions that exist. Occasionally they would see special use permit applications. But, under the existing ordinance provisions it is more likely going to be those things that come through the zoning office. There was a commitment when we first passed the distilleries, breweries, and wineries provisions in 2014 to come back in two years and provide some information on what we have seen happen since the provisions were enacted.

Mr. Lafferty said they would see how much impact these decisions are going to make. He thinks there is some reluctance in the committee to back off and wait to see what is going on. In looking at the Crozet Master Plan update it looks like staff gets it at the end of the first quarter in 2018.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that was correct.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out it says the update is due in 2016.

Mr. Cilimberg replied again, it is based on staff resources.

Ms. More suggested that a correction, though, would be the update was due in 2015 since our last plan was done in 2010.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that he would make the update.

Ms. Spain thanked staff because the information is very useful.

Mr. Cilimberg asked if there were other questions.

Mr. Lafferty said it certainly gives us an indication of all the issue that you have to attack with the limited staff.

Ms. Riley asked if they are planning to hire any additional planning staff.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that in the budget submittal for the department additional staff are identified. Of course, it will have to be a part of this upcoming budget process with the Board. So it is going to be very resource dependent with the overall finances that the Board of Supervisors has to work with. He can safely say we are not the only ones that will be asking for new department resources for work. In addition to the two hires that occurred in the last year we've included for the next budget year beginning July 1 positions that would enable us to better address the needs and projects on the list.

Mr. Dotson said back when the Commission discussed the comprehensive plan they spent several meetings talking about tracking or monitoring in an annual report. Obviously that has some data needs we never resolved. He asked if there was a bigger report that would maybe happen every other year or whatever. Since that is not included he was wondering how much contingency is implied in here but not stated for things like that, such as applications or things that might come out of the legislature this year or things along those lines that are difficult to anticipate. He noted there is nothing like a 20 percent contingency or anything stated here.

Mr. Cilimberg replied this has been designed around the part of the pie shown in red some of what he has mentioned that we are accounting for under the other parts of the pie so to speak. However, there could be an impact if, as an example, the General Assembly were to pass new code requirements for amendments in our zoning ordinance. We anticipate some of those every year. However, if they had a large number of Code changes that we had to respond to that could have an impact. We always do an annual report and have actually talked about this year having the annual report of last year have a little more information and begin building towards the kind of report the Commission had identified during the comp plan work you wanted to have. It may not be the full blown report that addresses all of those things that you felt were of interest as the plan was moving forward and onto the Board; but, take some steps this year at least towards that to provide some additional information in addition to the basis report you have gotten. So some of what we can do is based on how much of it is normal versus beyond the normal things that are added that would be unanticipated and might affect other parts of the work program. The things listed are dependent on our standard workload remaining fairly constant and the ability to add a staff person to take on these types of discretionary projects.

Mr. Dotson asked if there is a process for amending this.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that actually in January staff went to the Board to talk about an amendment of the plan as it had been previously adopted in 2015 for 2016 to address these modifications regarding wineries, distilleries, and breweries. They have two zoning text amendments that deals with artist communities and the Clifton Inn that staff are discussing with the Board tomorrow. Staff is telling the Board how that fits within the work program to be work to be done. If the Board directs something different we will have to once again amend. If the Commission were to identify something during the year that was extremely important we would want to forward that to the Board and tell them how it fits now and find out if they would want to amend to try to fit it in sooner.

Mr. Keller asked if the Planning Commission will be involved in the search process for your successor.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that he can't address that because he is kind of on the sideline and would need to have Mr. Graham get back to you on that.

Mr. Keller said in the areas where you are having to push things forward that have been priority

areas in discussions for some time is there an opportunity to hire a private sector or NGO consultants to work on some things such as area plans, just as an example. Are there monies in the budget for any of those kinds of things?

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the monies are somewhat limited, but he can identify one pot of money that we did actually designate for this year for the Rio/29 Small Area Plan that we are trying to save through grant sources. As we might be able to identify outside resources that can be utilized to do the project it depends on the project because some outside resources don't save a lot of resources in house, but some can. Then there is the possibility that we can work on a project in the master list so to speak using that outside resource. There are not a lot of grant opportunities out there. However, we have already gotten grant assistance on the Rio/29 Small Area Plan and are continuing to work on finishing the scope of that and determine how to potentially find resources for the balance. However, that could free up money in the budget for other purposes. However, we don't have a big pot of money to go out and hire consultants.

Mr. Keller asked if this body hears concern from the citizenry about one of the topics that we are seeing here that have been heard what would be the process. He asked would the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors through him and Mr. Benish.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that he would think they would want to do that in a meeting; or, they may identify it in a joint meeting. At some point the Board usually in late spring or early summer has a joint meeting with the Planning Commission. Between now and then if there are some priorities that you don't feel are being addressed the Commission might want to identify them for the Board in that kind of a meeting.

Mr. Keller said he sees from the rules of procedure that we have an opportunity as our body to call special meetings. So if there are topical areas the Commissioners are interested in, discussed and would like to have further discussion on is there a mechanism to do that. The question he has that relates to the topic that he has brought up is how we work this so we are not infringing on staff time because it is not something that is planned for in your budget. However, he knows from speaking with individual members that pretty much everybody on the dais has an area that they would like to have further discussion on.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that you would choose your agenda items certainly working with Mr. Benish. He would suggest that the Commission has one meeting a month where that is kind of set aside for that kind of thing, which staff would call a work session meeting. So if planning ahead with Mr. Benish you see a particular meeting that you would like to have those things identified it is really the Commission offering four of those things you feel are important for us and then determine how we can proceed with those. It is probably not so much about getting started on a particular project unless it actually is something you are interested in that we are working with anyway. But, at least to have it identified so that at some point it can be shared with the Board of Supervisors and maybe trying to figure out what the best approach to do that would be.

Mr. Keller said it would be fair to say that staff has been doing that in the past year. That is how the affordable housing piece has come forward, for instance. So he thinks they are in that process. However, he just wanted to clarify for this new group of Commissioners what our process will be and that we will be thinking about that over the next several months.

Ms. Firehock added that last year there were some topics that we as a commission brought up that we wanted to have more discussions about. Some things were discussed and some were

not. So what Mr. Keller and I have talked about is picking up four topic areas that once a quarter they would do in depth. As an example, a topic that we had a very short discussion about last year is affordable housing. There were a number of questions the Commission were not able to get to so we would like to take a more active role in scheduling those out for the year during our work sessions. They would and send an email to everyone suggesting some topics and ask each commissioner which topics they would like to have more of a roll up your sleeves work session where we delve into the issue. The reason she brought up affordable housing is it is an area where developers have been coming forward and talking about how they are providing affordable housing and yet we are not sure that is what they are providing or the way the county advertises it is adequate, etc. The Commission would like to have a more involved discussion than just 20 minutes and probably invite guests to come and talk to us about the issue. Perhaps it could be more of a sit around the table rather than at the dais, which changes the dynamic considerably. She did not want to see is the Commission waiting for the Board of Supervisors to say it is okay for us to delve into a topic. She has been talking with Supervisor and Chair Palmer and she is supportive and encourages the Commission to take on issues and do planning and not simply wait to see what is available for people to work on. If there are actions that come out of those discussions that they would like staff to help us with, then we can identify them at that time. But, she did not want us to not have the conversation on some of the topics simply because they are not on staff's work plan. We have time and expertise as a body and know other experts in the community that we can also call on who can inform us. She suggested they talk a little more with our chairman and send an email around with sort of let's start brainstorming some topics and go ahead and get those scheduled.

Mr. Cilimberg said one of the examples of an item that came up last year somewhat in association with the comp plan was the Dark Skies ordinance provisions and further work on that. Ultimately, it did get to the Board for the question of resources to undertake. However, he thinks it works well when you identify what important topics are for discussion; but, just give staff a little advanced time so we can make sure we can get it scheduled and if we need to have some people in attendance. It is not really about prep, it is just people who can answer questions.

Ms. Firehock said that is why she thinks it makes sense because they know what a lot of those issues are and could think of them over the next week or so. She suggested they could schedule them out like once a quarter so it would not be an overwhelming burden with endless work sessions on everything under the sun; but know that in this quarter they were going to discuss the issue in depth. It would also give Commissioners a chance to do homework. In my experience sometimes we get the agenda for this meeting on a Friday for something that is happening on Tuesday and don't really have time to go and do all the research for a discussion topic. So it would give us a lot more time.

Mr. Keller thanked Ms. Firehock. He asked Mr. Cilimberg if he had anything else.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that he did not, but he would welcome any questions. If you have questions after the meeting or if something come up, just get in touch.

Mr. Keller thanked Mr. Cilimberg and that the meeting would move to old business.

Old Business

Committee Appointments
(Tim Keller)

Mr. Keller said he thinks they have very successfully dealt with our committee memberships, except there is one remaining. He asked Mr. Lafferty for a clarification. From earlier discussions you had expressed that the CTAC was open and we have had interest from Ms. Riley to serve in that position. However, like they did last week maybe you two could work that out and let us know.

Mr. Lafferty replied that he thinks that is fine. He was actually appointed to that committee before he was appointed to the Planning Commission. Also, Mr. Dotson said that he probably should not serve on both committees, CTAC and MPO Tech.

Ms. Firehock said he would be sending advice up to himself in a sense.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out that they were not subservient and thinks it would be great.

Ms. Riley thanked him and said she would look forward to at least beginning to learn more about the long range planning and the transportation.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out this is the time to do it because they are trying to put together public presentations such as how did that road get there.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Benish and Ms. Taylor to finish the committee list because he thinks we have this final piece. He asked if anyone has any question about when their committees will meet so they go forward to your new committee assignments.

Mr. Benish pointed out if there are any questions to give him a call and he would answer them or get them to the right leader for that group.

Mr. Lafferty asked if we will be notified, for instance, will Will Cochran be notified.

Mr. Benish replied for that particular case you will be put on the mailing list as a representative.

Ms. Firehock asked staff to make sure there was not a meeting coming up soon. Last year by the time she understood when they met she had missed yesterday's meeting.

Mr. Benish noted that he would take a look at it and make sure we give an early heads up. Sometimes it is the legalistic of getting on the mailing list and such.

Mr. Lafferty noted he would talk to Mr. Cochran and tell him.

Moving to the next item, Mr. Keller noted there are two persons who would like to say something about proffers, Mr. Kamptner and Mr. Dotson.

Mr. Kamptner addressed Mr. Williamson's comments regarding the illegality of the County's Cash Proffer Policy. The first thing is to recall that the Cash Proffer Policy is part of the Comprehensive Plan. So it is merely advisory. He will recognize that the County and the development community have followed that policy very closely since it was adopted in 2007. But, it is simply a policy document. The other reference to the change in state law, and he was assuming he was referring to the one in 2013 which required that cash proffer be applied either to new facilities or if they are going to be applied to existing facilities that they have to expand

capacity. Since 2013 any cash proffers that were already received have been applied at that manner. We met with staff periodically when there were questions as to whether or not a particular capital improvement project was increasing capacity. The amount that is in the current cash proffer policy exceeds what was recommended by the Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee. The amount adjusting for inflation, for example, for a single-family dwelling is currently approximately $20,000 under the cash proffer policy. FIAC's recommendation was around $5,000. So what we had advised staff and what the development community will learn as they come through the process is that the maximum cash proffer amount will be based on, for as long as the current policy is in effect, those numbers that the Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee recommended. We will go from there. It will become a fluid document as the CIP and the CNAs are readopted from year to year.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Dotson for his comments.

Mr. Dotson said this is just a follow-up to our meeting last week when the Commission asked that a conversation be held with staff to clarify the additional information that we looking for. That took place today and he thinks it is now clear and understood and seen as workable as well particularly in light of the conversation we just had about the work program and the time available. He thinks there was an effort in the conversation to avoid paralysis by analysis, and instead do what you needed to do in order to have due diligence so that the Commission felt comfortable in forwarding whatever recommendation onto the Board of Supervisors. There was also reference back to the charge back in September of 2014 to the Fiscal Impact Committee to advance these as soon as possible. So, again, there was an effort to only ask for information in a way that was doable within existing resources in a short period of time so that a response would go back to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dotson noted that part of that was to maybe break apart some of the concerns that we had and to set the highest priority on additional data related to the maximum dollar value of the proffer. That would be the highest priority for staff to emphasize. The second would be new credits, which is particularly appropriate as a subject for the Planning Commission because the credits that have been discussed are credits that would serve to incentivize implementing the Comp Plan, the Neighborhood Model and the master plans. The third thing, which is more a matter for the Fiscal Impact Advisory Committee if the Board of Supervisors so directs and requests would be looking at alternative models. That would be a longer term project. So he thinks staff seeing that breakdown into those three categories felt like what we were looking for regarding the more intermediate decision was doable in a relatively short period of time, no promises, but perhaps later this month or early next month. So he can report that has taken place.

Mr. Keller thanked Mr. Dotson.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Old Business

Mr. Keller noted the next meeting would be held in Room 241 and so they would be adjourning to February 23, 2016.

Mr. Benish noted that night is the Board of Supervisors public hearing on the budget. If similar to previous years it will be heavily attended and the parking lot will be full.

Mr. Dotson asked to make one comment about the schedule. March 1 is primary day and the Commission is scheduled for a meeting. That is something that ought to be looked at.

Mr. Benish said he did not think they have any items scheduled. There are two items on February 23rd that might have public to come to the meeting and there may be further complications. Therefore, they had discussed the possibility of moving one or both or those items to that next meeting. But, that is a good point that the primary may affect the availability.

Mr. Keller suggested they might want to move it to the next date.

Mr. Benish pointed out staff would discuss that a little bit further next week. Staff is also getting some feedback from the applicants whether they are willing to delay for a week, too. So it may be out of our hands. As of today, there are no items scheduled for the March 1 meeting.

Mr. Keller noted that Mr. Benish had suggested that we might want to split it because of a smaller room for four public hearings and this other public hearing going on at the same time.

Mr. Benish noted there might be a work session on the Adelaide rezoning and that date was February 23, but the applicant has not confirmed.

Mr. Kamptner asked for a motion to adjourn to February 23 to room 241 at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. Lafferty moved and Ms. Firehock seconded for adjournment to Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. in County Office Building - McIntire, Room 241, Second Floor, Charlottesville, Virginia.

The motion carried by a vote of 7:0.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m. to the Tuesday, February 23, 2016 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting at 6:00 p.m., Room 241, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

David Benish, Secretary

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