Albemarle County Planning Commission
November 22, 2016

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, November 22, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Bruce Dotson, Mac Lafferty, Pam Riley, Jennie More, Daphne Spain, Tim Keller, Chair, Karen Firehock, Vice Chair and Bill Palmer, University of Virginia (UVA) representative. Ms. More arrived at 6:04 p.m.

Other officials present were Trevor Henry, Director of Facilities and Environmental Services; Megan Yaniglos, Principal Planner; Rachel Falkenstein, Senior Planner; Elaine Echols, Acting Chief of Planning; David Benish, Acting Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director CDD/Planning Director and John Blair, Senior Assistant 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.

The following committee reports were given.

Mr. Lafferty reported:

- PACC TECH met and discussed items such as Hillsdale Drive, Belmont Bridge, a list of projects currently under review not under construction, etc.
- The MPO Technical Committee met and discussed the upcoming Long Range Transportation Plan; regional travel model update tied with Smart Scale; etc.
- Places29 Hydraulic Road Committee met last night; received presentation and discussed enrollment demographics of schools and discussed the CACS; etc.

Ms. More arrived at 6:04 p.m.

Ms. Spain reported:

- Places29 North CAC had no meeting last night due the lack of a quorum.
- Did not attend Pantops CAC meeting due to attending the Board's discussion on the courthouse.

Ms. Riley reported the following:

- Fifth and Avon Street Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) met last week with the majority of the meeting focused on discussion of transportation.
- The Village of Rivanna CAC met with the primary discussion by Elaine Echols on the CAC and the new guidelines.

Ms. More reported on the following:

- The Crozet CAC met last week and received presentation on comp plan and future predictions on full build-out and the units in the pipeline with discussion on schools, infrastructure, etc.
- The Crozet Board of Trade met last night with a review of projects that will change traffic patterns in Downtown by Joel DeNunzio, VDOT, and new businesses introduced themselves.
- Missing the last ACE Committee Ms. More asked Mr. Dotson to provide an update.

Mr. Dotson reported the following:

- ACE Committee met a few days ago and reviewed this year's applications. No action taken.
- The Capital Improvement Program Oversight Committee met with comments held for work session.

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

Mr. Keller asked Ms. Echols to explain to the public what community advisory committees (CACs) are and why representatives of the Planning Commission have spoken to the various meetings.

Ms. Echols explained that the community advisory committees, the (CACs), exist to help implement the individual master plans for the specific areas of the development areas. Each one of the Planning Commission members has one or more CACs that they attend to find out about what is going on in that area to provide input to listen to concerns from the community. The CACs provide a lot of input into implementing each master plan as well as when they are up for revision providing a lot of input into that if not managing the process.

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

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – November 2, 2016 and November 9, 2016

Ms. Echols reported on the Board of Supervisors actions taken on November 2, 2016 and November 9, 2016.

The meeting moved to the public hearing items.

Public Hearing Items.

a. <u>SP-2016-00019 Planned Parenthood South Atlantic</u>
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rio
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 061000000013A0
LOCATION: 2964 Hydraulic Road
PROPOSAL: Revise condition one (1) to impact a 15-foot buffer to allow a walkway and enhanced landscaping from previously approved special use permit (SP2000-035).
PETITION: Professional offices under Section 17.2.2(11) of the Zoning Ordinance.
ZONING: R-10- Residential- 10 units/acre; professional offices by special use permit
OVERLAYS: Entrance Corridor, Managed Steep Slopes, Airport Impact Area
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Urban Density Residential – residential (6.01 – 34 units/ acre); supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses in Neighborhood 1 of Places29 Master Plan. (Megan Yaniglos)

Ms. Yaniglos summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation.

Proposal:

This is a request to revise condition one (1) from a previously approved special use permit to impact a 15-foot buffer to allow a walkway and enhanced landscaping. The enhanced landscaping includes the removal and replacement of dead and dying vegetation; planting new vegetation and replacing the deteriorating fence along the eastern property line along Townwood as well remove three (3) parking spaces to create a courtyard. The applicant adjusted the plan so that the courtyard is not within the buffer so we are only talking about the landscaping enhancements with a special use permit.

Ms. Yaniglos reviewed a map showing the location of Planned Parenthood on Hydraulic Road with parking behind; Garden Court; Townwood Townhouses and the 15' buffer with the courtyard located outside of that buffer area.

Ms. Yaniglos reviewed the conceptual plan pointing out the landscaping to be removed, which included 11 large trees with 7 located along Garden Court and the rest are located along Townwood. In photographs of the site, Ms. Yaniglos pointed out the parking spaces and trees covered in ivy that are going to be removed; the existing fence located on the Garden Court property to be removed since the other fence on Townwood being replaced is actually on the Planned Parenthood property and so the Garden Court fence will remain; the large tree that is covered in ivy that is going to be removed; and the dumpster and some of the ivy in various trees.

Factors Favorable:
Staff found that no significant impacts would be created by the enhancements as noted in the report.

Factors Unfavorable:

None Identified

Staff recommends approval of SP-2016-019 Planned Parenthood with conditions. The condition as it is currently written from the previous special use permit does not allow for maintenance of any disturbance of the buffer to even maintain or enhance the landscaping, which is why the applicant is coming before the Commission today. Staff recommended that condition be revised, which is in the report and on the slide. Ms. Yaniglos apologized that the numbering of the conditions was mixed up; it should be #2 and it is #2 in the staff report.

Recommended Conditions:

1. Development and use shall be in general accord with the conceptual plan titled "Planned Parenthood" prepared by Nelson Byrd Woltz Landscape Architects and dated September 16, 2016 (hereafter "Conceptual Plan"), as determined by the Director of Planning and the Zoning Administrator. To be in accord with the Conceptual Plan, development and use shall reflect the following major elements within the development essential to the design of the development, as shown on the Conceptual Plan:
    - *location of buildings and structures*
    - *location of parking areas*
    - *location of buffer*

    Minor modifications to the plan which do not conflict with the elements above may be made to ensure compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

2. A buffer strip of a minimum of fifteen (15) feet in width shall be maintained along the northeast (Townwood) and southwest (Garden Court) abutting property lines with landscaping and screening to be approved in accordance with Section 32.7.9. The agent may authorize the removal of vegetation within the buffer if deemed by the agent to pose a clearly demonstrable danger to buildings or other structures or otherwise a danger to public safety. A six-foot-high opaque fence shall be placed between the parking lot and the Townwood units.
3. All outdoor lighting shall be arranged or shielded to reflect light away from adjoining residential districts and away from adjacent streets.
4. The building shall be no more than three stories in height and designed in keeping with character of the area, and consistent with the sketch plan named "Roslyn Ridge Offices" dated 7/11/00 that was approved with SP2000-035.
5. Building square footage shall be limited to 8,000 square feet.

Ms. Yaniglos offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Mr. Dotson said one of the features of this is converting some parking places into a courtyard and he did not see anything in the conditions that address that being approved.

Ms. Yaniglos replied that can occur outside of this special use permit because it is outside of the buffer so they could come in today and make that change without the enhanced landscaping as a site plan amendment so that was not addressed with the Commission.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to speak.

Zuzana Ponca, architect, with Nelson Byrd Waltz Lantz Architects, said we are working with Planned Parenthood to improve their landscape, install the courtyard, and replace the fence along Townwood Court. Ms. Ponca said since staff has explained all the issues we are dealing with at the site so well she would just walk the Commission through the design process and where we ended up with our design. This would also include the fence design as well. In August, we had a very productive meeting with the local neighbors from Garden Court as well as Townwood who expressed some concerns about a plan that we developed for that meeting including the courtyard cutting into the 15' buffer and replacing plantings some large shade trees along the parking areas. Therefore, we have addressed both of these concerns by reducing the size of the courtyard so you can see it is outside of the buffer now in selecting species of shade trees for the parking lot that are medium sized trees.

Ms. Ponca said, as staff mentioned, we are removing a number of large trees from the property that have compromised either by lightning, dead in certain cases and some by evasive vegetation such as ivy. All together, we are planting about 17 mid-size trees and enhancing the buffer as well with about 23 small trees that are all native. The tree types to be planted will be Red Maple, Dogwoods, Redbuds and Service Berries – mostly small screens focused on providing screening to the adjoining properties.

Ms. Ponca pointed out on the previous plan of the courtyard where it actually cut 7' into the buffer. There were some concerns by the neighbors about the possible noise and the desire for some additional screening. So we are providing evergreen shrubs along the fence line and the edge of the courtyard has pulled back inside of the 15'. In the section, you can see the screening in the 15' buffer along the fence line that exists now next to Garden Court. Just to recap this is the

condition of the existing fence that we will be replacing; and, then this is the proposed design. It is a friendly fence design so it will have a front face on both sides on the neighbor's side as well as the side for Planned Parenthood.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Dotson said the ivy you mentioned and you can see it in the photographs that has attacked the existing trees - how will that be prevented that from reoccurring.

Ms. Ponca replied we were working with an arborist who will actually come in prior to construction and they will remove all the evasive vegetation including there will be extensive pruning done on the trees not maintained over the last 15 to 20 years. She said we are also planting native understory ground cover and shrubs as well.

Mr. Dotson asked does the ivy originate beyond your property in the back yards; and, if it does will it creep back.

Ms. Ponca replied yes, there is a chance that it will. However, we have not looked into the other properties since they are private properties and there is a fence line. However, with English Ivy, it is common that it originates in other spots as well; but the goal at this property is that the buffer is going to be maintained from now on.

Mr. Dotson said one of the concerns he saw from a letter from a neighbor that the terrain is such that the height of the shrubbery and the trees that would be planted would not be even as tall as the top of the fences. He asked is that accurate?

Ms. Ponca asked which side of the property is it on; is it Garden Court.

Mr. Dotson replied that he did not know which side.

Ms. Yaniglos noted that it was on the Garden Court side.

Ms. Ponca explained that they do not have a survey of this area; however, the grade actually slopes down a little bit about a foot from the edge of the fence here towards the courtyard. She said we are planting shrubs that are going to be about 5' tall; the fence is 6' tall; but we are also planting trees mid-sized trees of 15' to 25' tall. She said if you look at it in elevation, the trees would screen the view to the courtyard.

Mr. Dotson asked if 15' to 20' is at maturity, and Ms. Ponca replied yes.

Ms. Firehock said she also had the misfortune of living next to neighbors where everyone planted ivy all around and she spent every weekend pulling ivy – so it would need to have constant vigilance to rip up the new ivy that would be reestablishing. Ms. Firehock suggested a very robust ivy eradication with regular maintenance on that site or else the new trees that you plant will end up looking exactly like the ones that we have seen in the pictures that have to come out. She questioned the choice of Red Maples since it is the most common tree found in cities; it is pretty; it is tough; but it also does not like to be a parking lot tree necessarily since it is impacted by impervious surfaces. She said Red Maples is not something she would pick to put next to a place where it will tend to be stressed by the amount of heat radiating off the parking space so she was just questioning the choice of Red Maple.

Ms. Ponca replied they are removing a number of Red Maples that were established here that

are in deteriorating conditions. She pointed out the tree in the Townwood area is about 6' back from the parking lot and then there is plenty of space for the roots to grow on the other side – so we are not concerned about that.

Ms. Firehock said it might have enough root area; but it might still be a hot planting site for ideal conditions for that tree and she hoped they would work with their client to come up with some kind of maintenance plan to remove the ivy.

Ms. Ponca replied yes, there has definitely been discussions about maintenance because this is a big investment to them and it is important to maintain the site.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Mr. Keller thanked the applicant.

Ms. Firehock invited public comment.

Eddie Giles, resident of Garden Court and Garden Court board member, said we realize some improvements need to be done at Planned Parenthood; but we do have some concerns about putting in an outside patio. There are residents that live over there, some are retired, and they want to sit back, relax and open their front doors; and, they are concerned about the noise if anyone is coming outside and would like to see the taller trees that can help buffer the sound. The neighbors would also prefer a lower lighting that it does not illuminate a lot of lighting. He asked if there would be smoking outside because one of the units was adjacent to this area and the concern about people outside smoking and talking with the odor coming into the unit and all of that. He said we wanted to bring some of the concerns that residents have over there when you make a decision on this.

There being no further public comment, Ms. Firehock closed the public comment and invited applicant rebuttal.

Ms. Ponca asked to respond to the comment about the lighting, which she forgot to mention. She said the light that is located there currently would be replaced with a smaller shorter pedestrian light that is going to be shielded so the glare should be less. She said our client expects that this space is going to be more of an overflow space that is going to be used by families of the patients that are going to be waiting there just for a short period. They fully expect to have a non-smoking sign in the courtyard so that should not be an issue. In regards to the tall trees, we drew some elevations and it is much less likely that you will have good screening from Garden Court with very tall trees medium and smaller sized trees are much more effective because their crown is essentially in front of the two levels of the windows.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the fence to be removed is 6' high and the one being replaced is 6' high, and Ms. Ponca replied yes.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. There being no further public comment, Mr. Keller closed the public hearing to bring the matter before the Commission for discussion.

Mr. Dotson noted the review process as brought out has actually been an example perhaps of how the neighborhood meetings work. The issue of the ivy has come out and he completely agreed with Commissioner Firehock's concerns about that. He thinks it is good that the lighting will be of the more modern and less obtrusive type; the question about the terrain had been adequately addressed; and the courtyard we really have nothing to say about that would be

allowed even if we denied this. He would observe that in all likelihood he has not seen specifically that this is like adding one more patio behind one of the townhomes, perhaps a patio behind a townhome could even be closer than this. As a former smoker many, many years ago, he shares the concern if the wind is blowing in the wrong way that he would hope that the applicant at a health facility might not allow smoking on that patio. After any discussion, he would be prepared to make a motion.

Mr. Lafferty moved to recommend approval of SP-2016-00019 Planned Parenthood South Atlantic Amendment with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Dotson seconded the motion.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Keller asked for a roll call.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller noted that SP-2016-00019 Planned Parenthood South Atlantic carries and will move onto the Board of Supervisors.

PROJECT: ZMA-2016-00018 Lucas 1278 Crozet Avenue
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: White Hall
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 056A1010011800
LOCATION: 1278 Crozet Avenue
PROPOSAL: Request to rezone the property from R2 Residential to R4 Residential to allow a second dwelling unit
PETITION: Rezone 0.897 acres from R2 Residential zoning district which allows residential uses at a density of 2 units per acre to R4 Residential zoning district which allows residential uses at a density of 4 units per acre
PROFFERS: No
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Neighborhood Density Residential – residential (3 – 6 units/acre) supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools and other small-scale non-residential uses in the Crozet Masterplan. (Rachel Falkenstein)

Ms. Falkenstein summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation.

The purpose of tonight's hearing is a rezoning to rezoned .897 acres from R2 Residential to R4 Residential to allow a second dwelling on the property. The property is located on Crozet Avenue. The property outlined in pink on the slide is located just north of Downtown Crozet. There is an existing house on the property, which is an historic home that is contributing structure to the Crozet Historic District. Most of the adjacent parcels are also single-family residential. Western Albemarle Rescue Squad is across the street and some small businesses just to the south in Downtown Crozet.

The zoning of the property right now is R-2 Residential as shown in green on the slide so most of the adjacent properties to the north are also R-2. To the south is Downtown Crozet District zoning as shown in purple on the slide. There is a very small stream running just on the corner of the property. The streams require a 100' buffer on either side. Ms. Falkenstein noted that this buffer is not currently vegetated and you can see there are many houses in the buffer. The existing house is within the buffer and most of it is turf. There are some trees along the property line.

The applicant is proposing to rezone the parcel to R-4 to allow a second dwelling unit on the property. The contributing historic structure dates back to the 1800's. A 1700 log cabin to be

used as the second dwelling unit recently was moved from the Froehling and Robertson property on Route 250 by the applicant. Ms. Falkenstein said if you have been by the property recently it is actually currently under construction; the applicant got a building permit to construct this as an accessory structure. In order for to be used as a dwelling unit, the applicant will need to rezone the property. The applicant is proposing to locate the cabin behind the existing dwelling. Ms. Falkenstein pointed out the existing dwelling and Crozet Avenue and that he is proposing to subdivide the property into two parcels and to construct the property in the back.

Ms. Falkenstein noted the stream buffer runs along the front of the property and a small corner of the proposed building will be within the stream buffer. The county engineer has reviewed this request and is of the opinion the small amount of disturbance will not cause any additional harm to the streams since it is currently not vegetated; the applicant is proposing some additional trees within the buffer to mitigate the proposed impacts. There are no proffers or concept plan associated with this application.

In summary staff reviewed the request and found two favorable factors.

1. The request is consistent with the land use recommended by the Crozet Master Plan.
2. The rezoning will allow for the reconstruction and preservation of an historic cabin on the property.

Staff found the following unfavorable factors:

1. Approval of this rezoning will result in a flag-shaped lot, which is not consistent with the Neighborhood Model; however, due to the lot shape and size, the presence of the stream buffer, and the fact that adjacent development is of a similar pattern, compliance with this principle is not essential to this proposal.
2. Approval of this rezoning will not provide a guarantee that the historic structures will be preserved in perpetuity and that the property will not redevelop to a more intense use (up to 3 dwelling units at the current size); however, the State Code does not allow for acceptance of these types of guarantees through proffers.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of ZMA-2016-00018 Lucas 1278 Crozet Avenue.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Mr. Lafferty asked how often does the stream run, and Ms. Falkenstein replied that she did not know since it was very intermediate since it was more of a drainage ditch right now.

Mr. Lafferty noted the stream has come up before us before and it was sort of a wet weather stream as he remembers.

Ms. Echols said this stream is identified in the Crozet Master Plan and over time the stream closest to Three Notched Road and west of Crozet Avenue north of Downtown has been impacted by development such that a true stream no longer exists; in places the stream is piped and in other places the stream bed is just a swale. The county's requirement for a 100-foot stream buffer limits some use of this area to allow for reuse and redevelopment in the area where a true stream does not exist; and, consideration should be given to reduction in the stream buffer.

Mr. Lafferty asked if they are currently on county water and sewer; and Ms. Falkenstein replied yes.

Mr. Dotson questioned the summary findings that a flag lot is not consistent with Neighborhood Model since he thought the Neighborhood Model does support accessory or second structures behind a more forward structure to diversify the housing supply and so forth. He asked if that pattern here would be consistent with the Neighborhood Model.

Ms. Falkenstein asked if he meant a pattern of accessory units behind dwellings; and, Mr. Dotson replied or even separate dwellings behind a dwelling that is closer to the street.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that development pattern is common and we see it in some of our newer developments with the carriage houses that do not necessarily have proper street frontage with sidewalks. The concern here was establishing a pattern of second dwellings in the back that have no frontage on streets; no access for pedestrians and long and narrow lots that are not really ideal.

Ms. Echols noted when a structure is truly accessory to the primary structure it makes a lot of sense when there are two primary structures that it starts to create a development pattern where you have the front of one house looking at the back of another house. It is something that creates "stacked lots" that do not get the building faced to the street; and flag lots are not prohibited and not the most ideal lot shape to help create a face to the street for a new residence. This was an unusual situation.

Ms. Firehock said she did not have any big objection to this particular project. However, she just wanted to make a quick comment that her concern with dwelling units behind the primary unit is really thinking about the neighbors next door who are used to looking at other back yards and now are looking at somebody's house instead. However, in looking at this site, the building envelope sketched in blue cross-hatching was not far away or deep in the backyard and, she was wondering if that building envelope is set in stone so we can rely on that the applicant was going to put the building exactly where they sketched it. Since it was a hand drawing she wondered if the building could go anywhere on that lot.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that the building was under construction and the envelope the applicant has shown is where he is building it. The applicant has a building permit to construct an accessory storage or shelter. She pointed out to convert it to a dwelling the rezoning will have to be approved first.

Ms. Firehock thanked staff since she did not understand it.

Ms. Spain said she had a point of clarification about staff's concern that the houses may not be preserved in perpetuity. However, it if was in the National Register Historic District is that not a protection.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that is not a protection; the property owner has the ability to put an easement on it to protect it in perpetuity and as far as she knows he has not done that. She noted that just being in the district is not a protection.

Ms. Spain asked did he discuss putting an easement on it; and, Ms. Falkenstein replied she had not had that conversation with him; it is not something we could require as part of the rezoning.

Ms. Spain said she understands that there can be proffers; but she did not know if it has come up.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that it has not come up that.

Mr. Keller said he would like to follow this line of thinking if we may, if staff could remind all of us how our ancillary buildings work in the county in various areas. If one were to build not talking about the cabin and just taking the existing long lot - if one wanted to build a grandparents building, a tiny house, as an ancillary unit is that allowed in this particular zoning area.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that it is allowed; however, she apologized that she did not know the particulars but there are requirements that a granny flat, as they are called, would have to meet in terms of square foot. However, she would refer that question to Ms. Echols.

Ms. Echols noted actually you cannot have an attached accessory unit except where it has been rezoned like in Belvedere and some of the other more recent developments where they have carriage houses. The requirement is that the property has to be able to be subdivided and it would have to be a sub dividable property in order to put the second unit on that. Since the Neighborhood Model was adopted that has been a goal to increase the opportunities for the accessory units so that they could be detached accessory units it has not gotten up yet on the work program yet. So that one is not in there; however, it is a recommendation in the comprehensive plan that the ability exists for a detached accessory unit.

Mr. Keller said when you have come and spoken to us in terms of density in the growth areas, setbacks and urban form this is something and he believed Ms. McCulley has also addressed before as future possibilities. Therefore, he would guess when our new planning director he would just say that he thinks that it is important for us to follow through because this is a way for us to increase density in our existing areas without having to go through what we are talking about right now. He pointed out the city does have that proviso and so the adjoining growth areas outside of our county band of growth areas do have that potential; and, it is happening in a significant way. However, it is happening so that it is part of an existing lot as opposed to a subdivision so technically there would not be the flag access that way.

Ms. Echols agreed that was correct.

Mr. Keller said it seemed given the relatively small square footage of this cabin it would not be dissimilar from a historic kitchen house associated with houses when there were those type of ancillary dwelling because there most likely would have been a dwelling as well as cooking in that unit. He said his final question to Ms. Echols is there any other manner in which we could deal with this other than setting the precedent of the flag lot given the constraints that we currently have.

Ms. Echols replied not right now; the owner does not have to subdivide the lot; they just have to be able to subdivide the property. Therefore, the owner may choose to have two houses on the lot for a period and it might be that the owner would want to retain those two together; but he may not and she thinks he has indicated that he would like to have the ability in the future to subdivide it. However, the applicant could probably talk to you a little more about that.

Mr. Keller invited further questions.

Ms. More pointed out in attachment C there is a mention of the article in the Crozet Gazette that talks about community support. There was a community meeting at the CCAC; however, she did not see it.

Ms. Falkenstein apologized that she did not mention it in her presentation; however, it was included in the staff report. She did not get the resolution of support in time to put it out with the

staff report; but one did come a couple of days ago. So yes, there was community support for this.

Ms. Riley said she had one other question about the special exception request, and so before us tonight really is just the request to rezone and if the applicant in the future desires to have the special exception they will be coming back for that or how would that work.

Ms. Falkenstein replied the Board would approve the special exception; it would only come to the Planning Commission for review if staff were recommending denial. Therefore, he has gone ahead and submitted the special exception request; and, she believed it is his intent to subdivide and so the Board will have an action on that when they hear this rezoning.

Mr. Keller asked if there were further questions before we open for the applicant. There being none, Mr. Keller opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward and present.

Matthew Lucas, applicant, said he did not have a specific presentation to give; but, he can comment to some of the things brought up. Regarding the flag part, he would just say that to the left of it is commercial. There is a greenhouse right there; and, it is sort of in a sense commercial. He asked the Commission to keep that in mind. On the right, there is a flag lot that is nearly identical, maybe smaller in scope. However, it may be possible to get another dwelling behind just the way these lots were originally structured they are long shoebox like lots. To the right there is a house with another house behind it with a flag lot. Therefore, it is not consistent with what other folks have done in the neighborhood.

Mr. Lucas pointed out that it is a real interesting historic structure. The picture that you saw on the slide that is actually on the Virginia Department of Historic Resources webpage as an example of the types of building they are trying to save. Therefore, Virginia recognized that all the way through the Crozet community they wanted to save this building. It was understood if F&R wanted to expand that there was a lot of interest in the community to find a way to keep the structure in Crozet and preserved. Therefore, the historic community has looked at it; they loved the house; and they are behind it including the CCAC, the Crozet Gazette editorialized on it, F&R and the builders looked at the site as well. Therefore, everybody has looked at this and they have received only positive attention. He said the picture was not representative of what it would look like in the end. Regarding the picture, he noted it actually did not represent what it would look like in the end because if you peel back the layer it is a log cabin. He pointed out today he brought pictures, but he did not see a way to connect to the computer. However, he could show the Commission what it looks like. He said it would be a real log cabin; it will not have siding on it; and, it will be beautiful. In terms of the envelope, yes, this is literally set in Virginia fieldstone so it is not going anywhere. He explained he permitted to put it up as an accessory structure because he could not just let it set; it would rot. The logs are in good shape, but needed to be gotten up off the ground. He noted that is one of the reasons why he took the first step and did it. In terms of historic easement, he would say that he had put his heart and soul into the house on the left. Everybody who looked at the structure were going to demolish it. There was not a single person who came along and said they wanted to save that house. It was that far gone, and he just happened to fall in love with it. He fell in love with Virginia farmhouses; and, this will be his fourth one in Albemarle County. There is so much into that property and it is so cool. Therefore, he could not imagine a scenario where someone would come and knock it down. It would defy logic to do that. Therefore, he did not think you have to be concerned about that. By the time the cabin on the right was done it will be beautifully situated in that meadow. He supposed someone could always come and knock it over; but it would not make economic sense since it would be despite the building. He did not see anybody buying it and had no offers on it to sell it. To the extent that down the road they would be sold only if there was some extreme weird circumstance. He

apologized that he did not have a long presentation but had nothing else to add.

Mr Keller invited questions

Ms. Spain said she was confused about how this house looks on the website; but you are saying it is not going to look that way anymore because the outside frame will be stripped off.

Mr. Lucas noted they were talking about the log cabin. If you peel back that siding, it is a vintage hand hewed logs and it will look like the original log cabin. The building as shown is where someone over time decided that the logs were not providing enough insulation or whatever and slapped some siding over top of it to maintain the building. However, when he gets done it will be an original log cabin with the original logs and look the way it was when it was originally built.

Ms. Spain asked are you working with someone; and Mr. Lucas replied he was working with Peter Hunter out of Batesville and he has done a number of log cabins. It is his passion and he knows how to do this log. He said he wished they wish could plug in and show the pictures. They packed every log so it will be constructed the way it was originally at least on the front part because some of the logs on the back had to be replaced. However, he was preserving it the way it was originally to the best degree possible. He said he was taking a lot of pride on that. For example, he will do a slate roof; he got reclaimed slate from Buckingham County and it will be beautiful. He would use original fieldstone and it would be done exactly correct. The chimneys will be real stone.

Mr. Keller said as a follow up on that, there are a number of log cabins built never to be exposed log; they were built to be covered with framing and he thinks that is what Ms. Spain is getting at. Since we do not know the question really is has an architectural historian observed this.

Mr. Lucas noted they have had an historic committee come in and they have gone through that building and every little detail and he learned along the way because he does not sit on that committee. However, he met them there including three or four UVA architects and it should be put back without siding on it. He agreed that it did not have siding on it originally and you had to do that all by hand in the 1700' so they just did logs and the way it should be.

Mr. Keller pointed out there were many cases early on of siding. The addition to the rear and the small building that we see in that picture will they be part of this as well.

Mr. Lucas replied the outbuildings in the back are not original to that; they are just ancillary structures. The structures including the outhouse they are not doing that and behind that he guessed was the kitchen that they were not doing that since they were modern and within 100 years old and not worth salvaging. What he did find is a vintage smokehouse from a property in Madison and he would at some point like to put that as an accessory building to complete the project. He pointed out the logs for the smokehouse were out there if the Commissioners were to drive by. He noted that was a planned thing, but he had not done that yet.

Mr. Keller thanked the applicant and invited other public comment. There being no public comment, he invited applicant rebuttal. There being none, the public was closed and the matter before the Planning Commission for discussion and action.

Ms. Firehock thanked the applicant for trying to restore our rich heritage especially in the light of the fact that our county does not have an historic preservation ordinance and we want one.

Mr. Keller agreed and wanted to say there were some things he heard that Ms. Spain eluded to

for other reasons that we need an historic district ordinance. Some of these questions, for instance, was we know that Crozet's National Register designation is about continuity over time and for many of us in the historic preservation the changes that have occurred to this cabin over time also have. In other words, you do not take it back to a certain point in time; it has authenticity through time and that is one philosophy. However, at Montpelier we have seen has been moving back to an earlier time that would support what this applicant is doing. He thinks that having our own entity within the county to think about and to work with applicants on these resources like this would be quite helpful in the future. However, in this case he would certainly agree with commending the applicant for saving what he was sure would have been a lost structure otherwise.

Ms. More echoed that same comment and she would like to make sure to thank the applicant for his work on the existing dwelling unit since we did hear from different developers over time and every scenario had that home torn down without question. She has watched the renovation of that property because she drives by it often and it was well done and beautiful to see happen. It was an opportunity to move the cabin on the property and she appreciated the applicant's willingness to do that. She knows the process of dismantling and moving and thought it was done very meticulously with everything labelled just to speak to what he was able to describe about getting the advice of bringing it back to what it originally looked like. She thinks there is a lot of expertise that went into that. If no one else had comments, she would make a motion.

Ms. More moved and Ms. Firehock seconded to recommend approval of ZMA-2016-00018 Lucas 1278 Crozet Avenue.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller said a recommendation for approval will forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration of ZMA-2016-00018 Lucas 1278 Crozet Avenue.

Mr. Keller noted he had missed the consent agenda earlier and asked if there was a motion for approval.

Consent Agenda:

Approval of Minutes: August 16, 2016 and June 14, 2016.

Mr. Keller noted he had skipped the consent agenda and asked for a motion.

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

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

The consent agenda was approved and the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Work Session.

FY2018 CIP Amendment Review Events - To review the FY 18 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) (Amendment Year) Update currently in progress including the project requests and the project rankings; and seek feedback from the Planning Commission to inform the Oversight Committee Representative. (Trevor Henry)

Trevor Henry, Director of Facilities & Environmental Services Department, said part of my role is

to chair the Technical Review Committee, which is part of our CIP process. As part of our process we present kind of an in-process look to the Planning Commission on the project requests, rankings and the information comes to the Planning Commission a couple of times during the cycle. So for tonight's agenda item the purpose is to provide a high level of review of our FY18 amendment year request, review the Technical Review Committee's ranking of projects, and provide input to your Oversight Committee member, Mr. Dotson, for the Oversight Committee process. It is a little awkward in that the Oversight Committee actually met yesterday for the first of its two meetings. He explained that by the time we got our ducks in a row on the recommendation we were late to get on the agenda, and he apologized on the timing. In a way it might be beneficial because Mr. Dotson will have some observations from yesterday's two-hour meeting. He presented a PowerPoint presentation. This presentation is similar to what he gave to the School Board and the Board of Supervisors in a joint meeting a couple of weeks ago, which is to just review the amendment year process that really is a more streamline version of the CIP process.

He gave a quick summary of the request noting he had added a subject called the initial modeling. He thought since we have presented kind of a first pass already to the Oversight Committee that the Planning Commission might want to just look at where our starting point is on the funding model for next year. There is some information they had shared with the boards that he thought the Planning Commission might find valuable is our maintenance funding, the maintenance funding levels and how we do our maintenance program. There has been a lot of discussion over the past year about maintenance and from the spectrum of we are not doing enough and we are gold plating it. Therefore, we thought we have information that goes to the Executive Office and thought that there might be some information that the Planning Commission would really appreciate. He presented a PowerPoint presentation entitled FY 18-FY 22 Capital Improvement Program (Amendment Year) Update - Planning Commission Meeting – 11/22/16.

What is our Capital Improvement Program? It is a combination of our five-year plan, which is balanced revenues and in another five-year look, which is what we call Capital Needs Assessment (CNA). The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and the Capital Needs Assessment (CNA) – collectively referred to as the **Capital Improvement Program**- represents a statement of the County of Albemarle's policies regarding long-range physical development for the next five-year and ten-year periods respectively. It is really a cross-section between financial planning and capital needs and it is the body that does that.

The Capital Improvement Plan is FY 18 – FY 22. We are required to balance that plan to our financial goals. Therefore, there are strict policies that we adhere to and it is one of the things that the Oversight Committee is responsible for in their recommendation. Our capital needs assessment, again, is that longer-term view on the horizon. We did not update capital needs this year as part of the amendment year; it is an every other year cycle. Our capital budget is the first year of that plan, which is what the Board will actually appropriate. For next year, it will be FY 18. We have a two-year budgeting cycle. Year 1 is the full needs assessment. Agencies and departments put in all requests from Year 1 out to Year 10. Year 2 is an amendment year and really, it is just looking at the adopted plan with strict requirements for modification. We currently do mark yearly project. One of our projects, especially our sidewalk projects, due to the nature of that work carry them over multiple years. Therefore, it is just an analogy and so we have multi-year budgeting as part of this process.

- **Year 2 (Amendment Year Process**): The amendment year process is the first time in since the down turn that we have honored this true amendment year cycle, which basically is saying it is going to be a streamlined review of the approved projects that was adopted in the summer and really only allow the following in the amendment year process:

- Administrative changes, including Project Management fee updates
- With the exception of re-submission of unfunded requests and/or new requests that must meet the urgent or emergency as follows
- Funding is requested to begin in **FY 18 and**…
  - addresses an immediate and critical safety, structural or operational concern
  - and/or required to continue core operations

Therefore, it is basically saying we are in this two-year cycle in an amendment year and we are just going to carry forward with what was adopted from the previous year with the exception of these criteria.

Summary of FY18 – 22 Project Requests
40 Requests totaling $175M

Based on that we received 40 eligible requests meaning they met the amendment year criteria.

- **40 Eligible Requests**, meeting Amendment Year requirements received and reviewed
  - 37 of the requests are in the Adopted FY17 Budget
    - 19 requests had no changes from Adopted Budget
    - 17 requests had administrative only changes
    - 1 request had an increases in scope and PM fees
  - 3 requests were new and reviewed/ranked by the TRC
- 5 requests were resubmitted but not considered eligible for an amendment year review

An example of an administrative change is project management fees were adjusted. We have a department, which actually is in Facilities and Environmental Services that manages many of our capital projects. It is an enterprise fund. So the funding for this project management division comes from the capital projects, and so as part of our annual review we estimate the hours that it is going to take to execute a project, those hours get turned into an hourly rate, that turns into dollars, it gets funded and it is transferred back to fund that operation. Therefore, we are capitalizing the true cost of our projects.

As a result of that we have to review every year what the projects are and what our hours are. Therefore, there were some changes to 17 projects for project management hours. He said he would go into a little more detail on this in a minute. We had one request to change in scope and project management fees and three new requests that were reviewed and ranked by the Technical Review Committee. Again, he would detail those in a minute. The refiled requests that came back in that were not previously funded and the Technical Review Committee reviewed and felt that they did not meet the definition of amendment year cycle. So they were not included as part of our process.

The next slide is a broad summary of the total five-year period, which totals 175 million dollars of requests. As noted, it is 3.6 million dollar increase over the adopted plan if everything were to be accepted and it shows a division of the funding. Schools are 50% of the overall plan, which include the 35 million dollars that were approved in the referendum in November.

Mr. Henry said he was going to step outside the PowerPoint and point out the information that was provided to the Planning Commission about a week ago included a document that was called the FY18 CIP Request Document. This document is out on our County website under the Budgeting Section for FY18. This is a good summary of the information that he just walked us through. The document introduces this year cycle and process and includes a similar chart that

we just looked at. The reason he was bringing it up was that it also shows the listing and ranking of projects that came off from Technical Review. He would come back to this in a minute.

Mr. Henry noted one last thing he thought would be worth showing, too, is that everything that is in the other 40 requests there is a summary description of all those projects in here. One of the new projects that we looked at for instance is the Scottsville Elementary School site work improvements. You can go to that link and it will take you to that section and the chapter. It provides a summary of the funding request.

FY 18-FY 22 Capital Improvement Program
Projects and TRC Ranking

- Project Request Document Overview
- Updated or New Requests in recommendation to Oversight Committee:
  - Schools Maintenance/Replacement (Updated M/R request). The school maintenance replacement program had a scope change. The scope change met our urgent requirement; we reviewed it; and it was recommended for inclusion in the budget for FY18.
  - Scottsville ES Parking Lot Safety Improvements (New Non M/R request)
- New Requests not included in FRC/TRC Recommendation:
  - PVCC Advance Technology Center (Site Work)
  - Belvedere Senior Center

Mr. Henry pointed out of the three non-maintenance projects the Technical Review Committee has recommended the inclusion of Scottsville Elementary project. That is information in here, but the summary on that is now parent drop-off busload drop-off where they are crossing paths. It is a noted safety issue and the school has created a temporary gravel path to separate that. We have work that is funded in FY18 for our school security projects that one of those sites is at Scotts; and we felt that this is an opportunity to combine these projects from a timing perspective and to meet this safety need. Therefore, Technical Review reviewed that and thought that it was warranted; it was not a lot of money, and made sense to include in the recommendation.

Mr. Henry pointed out that PVCC was a project that was new this year. This is one for a 45,000 square foot technology center. The community college funding would come from the state for the building portion of it, and the community then looks to the localities to fund the site work cost. Therefore, our share of that site work cost would be $420,000 over three years. At the time of the Technical Review Committee review, there were questions about the state funding and whether this was included so our recommendation did not recommend being included; however, some ongoing work looks like it is still in the state budget. Therefore, the Oversight Review Committee talked about that yesterday and we are modeling the inclusion of this in the budget.

Mr. Henry noted the other project that was in the request was the Belvedere Senior Center. This is a real interesting project and was a great request sponsored by the Senior Center who procured 6 acres at Belvedere. They are going into design on an up to 60,000 square foot building for the center functions. Mr. Thompson, of the Senior Center, is advocating this project and is asking for both the city and the county to provide funding towards this project; the request to the county is 2 million dollars. Technically, we reviewed this project; scored it and felt that it did not necessarily meet the amended year criteria but the Board specifically asked our committee to review it. Therefore, the committee reviewed the project and it ranked. Since there were projects that were not back in the request this year because it did not meet amendment year criteria we felt that we

needed to show how this would have fit against last year's project, which really was a pretty good ranking of 17 in the non-maintenance category. So that information was also discussed yesterday with the Oversight Committee, and we were looking at a model that might include this as well. However, there will be some other considerations certainly on that.

Mr. Henry said he just wanted to introduce the ranking and how to interpret that is you want to go back and reference it. He invited questions on this part of the process. Again, it is truly an amendment year and the Technical Review only really talked about these few projects of changes. He said we talked a lot about process that we are going to be working through, but from as compared to last year there is a lot less heavy lifting from a process perspective.

Mr. Henry explained that part of the process is to take that list of projects that we just reviewed and go back to review the adopted amended CIP, which was actually approved on July 6, 2016. This plan included the Referendum projects that were added at that time. Our long run process starts here and we update this plan with actuals with things that have happened to the budget since this point based on bringing it current and we overlay it with the work that has been going on to the two-year fiscal plan by our budget office. He said in blending those together we created a base-line model, which is what was reviewed with Oversight yesterday. It funds everything that was in our adopted CIP; it includes the changes that were made and accepted in this year's process, including the Scottsville parking lot safety project. It does anticipate a delay in courts by a year because of that simple process that is happening; and, in addition, through the Board's strategic goals over the summer the baseline plan includes another 2 million dollars for transportation revenue sharing in FY 19. There are not projects that are approved on this yet; staff is working through a priority process, but it is basically to reflect the needs that the Board had identified around urban development and revitalization. So that is money that is out there and as a reminder this is probably one of our best investments of money in that the state currently matches up to 10 million dollars dollar for dollar. So the 2 million that we are proposing in FY 19 would be matched and give us a 4 million dollar project. That is how the revenue sharing works.

Without going into a lot of the other model information as we had some better than expected fund balance at the end of FY16 as well as revenues are slightly above our model projections, which is a good thing. So the two-year modeling has also assumed some one time money to go to the CIP; if you toggle back to the amended plan, you see in FY18 there is an anticipated 1.3 pennies, which is additional revenues that we thought were needed for Referendum projects in the CIP. By pulling some one time money the fund balance by having slightly revenues than projected that initial tax rate has been bumped right by year the 1.3 which was for FY18 is now been proposed to be moved to FY19 and the 2 pennies was moved to FY20. This is a work in progress and the Board is meeting for multiple work sessions on these assumptions; however, this is also the modeling that we are using as our CIP baseline. He pointed out we did not show this with the Board a couple of weeks ago because that was still a work in progress, but this is information that we shared with the Oversight Committee. The Oversight Committee has staff taking this model and evaluating a couple different item. One other thing he should note with the audit being completed there is an anticipation of $250,000 one-time money will be allocated to ACE for this year. Just as a FYI that is an in progress activity not reflected in the model but is anticipated.

Summary:

Amendment Year – There is only a handful of changes and those changes are included in our baseline model. The Oversight Committee is still evaluating a couple other projects.

Stepping out of that process into maintenance, we saw 175 million dollar potential five-year project, and maintenance is a big portion of that. Within maintenance, local government and

schools make up more than the 64% of that overall budget so we spend a lot of money on maintenance. How do we go through that process of planning? He noted we have formal facility assessments; we have staff internal to local government and schools that physically go to all our sites and campuses and evaluate roofs, HVAC systems and things like that. We have engineers that we also hire to do that process analysis. We use recommended preventive maintenance schedules, customer feedback and maintenance history. That all is kind of a bottom up planning process that we do and we project our ten years. The past two years we have also looked at how are we doing and whether that is the right level of funding. We feel that we are keeping up with our maintenance and have looked to some industry standards to kind of double check our maintenance plans with local government and schools. We feel that we are adequate in our budgeting and scheduling of the work. There is a memo from Building Services and Public Works that has gone to the Oversight Committee that provides a lot more of the details behind the calculation. He provided examples of maintenance done at schools.

Mr. Henry noted that the Oversight Committee met yesterday and they provided some instructions to staff to do some work in advance of our meeting next Tuesday. The process out of Oversight is the memo that will include the recommendations that go to the Planning Commission, the Boards and County Executive. Then it really transitions from this five-year process more into the budget cycle for FY18. He asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions for Mr. Henry.

Ms. Spain asked where all this money comes from other than real estate taxes. You said there was a state matching fund so what are the sources.

Mr. Henry replied that real estate is the primary funding source to the general fund. There is a policy of transfer of new revenues to the capital. Therefore, the majority of the funding is just that, the real estate. However, there are certainly other revenues. Lori Allshouse would refer to it as kind of the friends and family. There are some projects, for instance, that we may have a joint project. ECC is an example, and two years ago, an 18 million dollar ECC project was funded through our capital project. We are the fiscal agent for the Emergency Communications Center and this was a huge equipment upgrade. It was 18 million accounting and he thinks our share was about one-half of that that. So we carried the full burden of the expenditure, but we bring additional revenues in from UVA and the City. So that is an example of other revenues that would come to the capital program. The revenue sharing with the state for transportation is probably the other main one that we have. There are some proffers that can still be applied that have been made previously; those are other revenues. Sometimes we have grants matching from the state that can be other revenues. However, those are typical minor as compared to just the true tax rate and the transfer that comes from the general fund.

Ms. Spain asked if the taxes would account for 80% or 90%.

Mr. Henry replied it would be 90% or more; but he would have to get that from the office. However, the majority of the source of funding is our tax rate.

Ms. Riley said in this recent surplus the Board determined to put some of it towards the CIP, and Mr. Henry replied yes.

Ms. Riley asked how much percentage of the surplus.

Mr. Henry replied he did not know the percentage of the surplus; but he believed they are planning around 5.5 million dollars to the CIP with 3 ½ of that is towards fund balance. In addition, it is to

offset what we would have received by a tax increase in ’18 and 2 million of that is really ear marked for that FY19 transportation revenue sharing. He would caution that this is a plan, it is work in progress, and the Board has two more work sessions on that so there could be some adjustments to that. However, that is the current estimate.

Ms. Riley said those transportation revenue sharing program is largely set in the development areas for improvements.

Mr. Henry replied that is the intent of it and that Andrew and David Benish’s office have been working with the Board and Commission on the priority of those programs. He believed that the small area plan work might identify some of that work as well. The way the funding works is, we have funding in ’17 for about a million seven. David Benish’s office made application in the fall or November to the state using that source of funding that we hope to hear back that it will be matched by the state. So we funded a year ahead of when we can request it. So it is kind of a delay on that; but, that is how that is how that process works. Therefore, the ’19 funding would be in the fall of the calendar year 2018 and it would then be funded for that next fiscal year.

Ms. Riley asked how regularly do we have a surplus; is it often; and is some portion allocated to the CIP or not.

Mr. Henry replied that it is antidotal and it has been less often lately. This year we seem to have a little more because of better than expected revenues. They may have a little bit of surplus at the end just to have a little bit of margin. There is always the decision on how that funding gets used. There are some goals by the Board that says it will go to CIP; but that always gets kind of in the mix of other needs that come up or other one time needs. He thinks there are some policies around that which he could get to the Planning Commission on use of fund balance that is unanticipated. He asked if she would like that to be provided.

Ms. Riley replied that she thinks that would be useful information.

Mr. Keller said he had a question about that same area; but he appreciates your answer and would be interested in that. It seems that every year we see things not funded in the CIP; and every year the money is found at the end; and we wonder if that money had been found beforehand whether it would have addressed the CIP. However, if a significant portion of it is this year, then that will be better than other years. My second question is in past years we usually see the planning related projects the numbers that are put forward and then the numbers that are actually funded in the CIP; and, it is usually pretty sad in how many more go in than are funded. He thinks a lot of the issues we have been confronting in the three years he has been on the Planning Commission and if those planning projects had been funded previously we might not find ourselves in some of the corners that we are in as a county. So my question is can you or Bruce say there were 15 that went forward and 3 were funded.

Mr. Henry replied because this was an amendment year there were no planning projects that came back in. So the quick answer is we are on a two-year cycle so there are none.

Mr. Keller said my third question is really a point and it is one to all of the Commissioners and to staff and that is we are hearing all of the wonderful things about the senior center moving and everybody seems to be talking about it in a positive light; and, I feel myself not feeling that way. He noted that right now it is on the 29 Corridor where we have mass transportation; we have made a commitment to mass transportation; there seems to be room for expansion there and yet it is being moved over to Rio Road into a suburban area where there isn’t the same kind of mass transportation planning he does not believe. Nobody has consulted us about this; and yet he is

hearing the positive moves about this. Again, he would like an opportunity for us to all ask what this transportation planning, planning for our seniors, and overall planning and budgeting where they fit together; and, it would seem that CIP would one of those places where it should fit together.

Mr. Dotson said he would like some feedback from the Commission to help plan my role on the Oversight Committee, and so he had a few questions to put before the Commission. He said that Trevor started by saying that the CIP process is sort of an every other year and that this year we are in the amendment year, which is sort of the easy year or light year. Also, Trevor said to the committee that this gives the opportunity maybe to step back a little bit from all the details and obviously there are a zillion details involved in the CIP to look at some of the process questions or some of the outcomes that have resulted from the process. So sort of building on Tim's observation about the number of community development projects, but maybe also Parks and Recreation as well as Public Works projects that are submitted to the CIP process each year and the sense around this body he thinks is not very many succeed in getting funded. We also hear that the heavy emphasis that the county is placing on maintenance, which of course is a good thing, to protect the investment you have already made. However, he asked do you think the committee should look over recent years where has the money gone; how much to Community Development; how much to Parks and Recreation; how much to Public Works; how much to maintenance; and look at the outcome of the process and then sort of step back and say are we building the kind of community as well as maintaining the kind of community that we seek. He questioned would that be something that you think would be important for the Oversight Committee, and this may actually be a follow on process, because he thinks we need to give Trevor recommendations on these particular projects; but, again stepping back, should the Oversight Committee or should the county in general be looking at the outcomes over some recent years to see have we been putting enough money into community betterment in addition to maintenance. Therefore, he would be interested in thoughts on that.

Ms. Firehock said in looking at this she knows we are in a mid-year adjustment but it is disappointing to see the low level of funding for parks and recreation, Rivanna River Corridor Planning and the things that when we are meeting with Charlottesville or we are out and about we are talking about the importance of these things. She noted we have stressed the importance of keeping growth in the urban ring and the supervisors in the last couple of years at least have been talking about the importance of making that livable; and, yet if every time we have Parks and Recreation and trails and those kind of things up for funding and we don't put any money into it. She said there is some money for revitalization in addressing blight, but we have to make things more desirable with place making. So she would just wrap this up by saying she would like to see it broken down by categories and then have that more frank and direct discussion with the supervisors in terms of are we going to indeed invest in our urban ring to make these amenities that people expect to have if they are going to live in developed areas. She gets frustrated by this process to be honest because she thinks that most of these decisions are very political and if we are always pitting public safety versus parks, police will always win. Therefore, she thinks we need to have a different way, maybe having some percent by category or other ways of looking at ways of how we fund this because otherwise when you start making the pie these kinds of things that make great communities and make people want to live here and do increase the tax base because they attract good jobs and the right companies that we want; we don't get there because we are just always in that emergency basis. Lastly, she would like to ask Mr. Henry a question since sometimes she wondered the degree to which things should be are already in an institution's base budget versus in the CIP. So many things look like should they have been things that you would have just budgeted for all along and not a special request to the CIP.

Mr. Trevor asked Ms. Firehock to give for an instance like the computers for schools.

Ms. Firehock replied things like fixing a parking lot or fixing a roof on a building.

Mr. Henry replied they have a specific definition around our maintenance projects and one of the things Technical Review looks at is to make that these requests meet that. He would say that our definitions can always be looked. He said we talked about that to some degree. But, to Mr. Dotson's point he thinks this is an opportunity to really look with Andrew coming to the county bringing a different experience with this being an amendment year with the Board's strategic plan goals he thinks what will come out of Oversight is a focused review of our process, including how we prioritize based on those goals. So we may change that review process which it tries to be objective; but, maybe we give higher value to projects that are connectivity projects in the urban area that will be competing against schools or police or fire rescue. He thinks now is the time especially in light of what our Board direction is on our strategic plan is to really look at all of those definitions. There is some work to do on it for sure.

Ms. Firehock said she would be happy to write my thoughts on it in more of a memo fashion.

Mr. Henry asked Ms. Firehock if she would like to be on a committee that reviews it; and Mr. Dotson noted that she did not say no.

Ms. Spain said the pie chart on the F Y18-22 capital improvement program the summary of project request with Community Development and only 1%, the lowest absolute amount at one time 1.9 million, does that mean that Community Development has not made those requests or is that what it is limited to that percent of the budget. What is that pie chart telling me?

Mr. Henry replied that is telling you in the request it is transportation revenue sharing and the sponsoring department is Community Development. The only request that they have in this year's CIP is transportation revenue sharing and it is at 1.9 million. He would say that what is actually being modeled now reflects an additional 2 million dollars that came through the two-year plan process. To answer your question directly, he said if you went to the .pdf that has all the different projects it would say Community Development is in our recommended funding for 1.9 million dollars. That is only 1% of the total five-year CIP, and that is what those numbers mean. He pointed out the budget process has added 2 million dollars in that category; but, it is a FY 19. He pointed out that number ties to the projects that are in this year's request and what are in the five-year plan currently.

Ms. Spain thanked Mr. Henry and said she understands. However, my question also is if there were more projects that were requested by Community Development then this percentage might differ in future years.

Mr. Henry replied that is correct and then adding the 2 million dollars that has been added will change that percentage.

Mr. Lafferty said he thought that Mr. Dotson's idea about having historical data makes a lot of sense. It has been my impression in the past years before the Board of Supervisors decided to raise the tax rate a little bit that basically all we were doing was maintenance. He said we did not have the money to do major capital projects and thinks schools are a good indication of that when we are so far behind and we have to go after 40 million dollars to try to get it up to date.

Mr. Henry said he thinks you are right that since the down turn there has been a maintenance heavy CIP. We have used one-time funding on a couple of occasions to fund projects like the Seminole Trail Fire Station Addition Expansion Renovation and Northside Library. When at the

end of the year things are better than anticipated money has gone to projects; but up until this year, it has been more kind of one offs as money has been there.

Mr. Dotson said there was a second point that he would like to float; but he does not want to cut off discussion if anyone else wants to weigh in on the first question. The second one is we have the Capital Improvement Program, which consists of the CIP Plan which is the first five years; then we have the CNA, the Capital Needs Assessment, which is a second five years, so that has got us ten years out. With the Comprehensive Plan we are planning on population projections, residential growth and other kinds of growth; we are seeking economic development that goes out 20 years. He asked do you think it is important that third period, that 10 years through the 20th year period, be documented in terms of what the needs are? It is obvious since it is in the future who knows about the costs. He suggested maybe there was some rule of thumb or ballpark kinds of cost so that better planning could take place by schools, by public works and all the different categories by having a more accurate longer term view which might open up some new strategies and some new approaches as well. He asked what are your thoughts on that question and he was not sure what you would call it. He suggested it could possibly be a mid-term CNA and a long-term CNN.

Mr. Keller said he thinks this is a no brainer and this is certainly something that was discussed with the now defunct FIAC Committee about these different pieces. He thinks Mark Graham weighed in on it from the Planning and Community Development standpoint. He said even in terms of the way that reworking proffer figures were worked because of the school pulling out and the high school not showing up in that we know that really affected it. So he thinks that we need real long range planning figures for everything and he can't believe they are not there; it is just a matter of publishing them.

Ms. Riley said she completely agreed and was curious what you would see as that process and how it would differ from what we are doing now.

Mr. Dotson replied just to not add too many new acronyms he would stick with the CNA and would say there is the mid-term CNA and the long-term CNA and would imagine a list of projects that would be geared to a map so that we could see which are in our high priority areas. He said they would fit in with our economic development strategy and it would give a whole picture of the things we needed to do to build that kind of community that attracts jobs and improves our tax base.

Ms. Firehock asked to tag onto that to go back to my parks example in which you could take future population projections and then look at what our recommended densities of parks and open space per capita per person to then see where would Albemarle County be in 40 years if we don't add any more parks in the urban ring and would that make it not an inviting place to live or just an overcrowded spaced. So that would then go into the comp plan goals and looking at that we might then say looking out 20 years we need to have this many more parks instead of just having these things in a long list that every year don't get prioritized and then we just add it to the next ten years. If we keep doing that at a certain point, we run out of room to realize some of those opportunities.

Mr. Lafferty said in the development of the Long Range Transportation Plan we have categories know as visions that are out in the future and sort of placeholders to remind us that these are important things; but we just do not have the money to do them.

Mr. Dotson asked what is the planning horizon of that long-range transportation plan.

Mr. Lafferty replied that it starts in January and it takes about two years to develop it, 20 years.

Mr. Dotson asked if it was a 20-year plan, and Commissioner Lafferty agreed.

Mr. Dotson said so to coordinate land use, transportation, public investment and facilities a consistent time frame would help.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out we update it every five years; but it is sort of a constant process depending on the kinds of funds we get from the federal and state government.

Mr. Dotson said those will be two things that he would bring to Trevor and to the Oversight Committee. There is a third one, which is more specific, and maybe more of legal question than a policy question. One of the things that he has learned is the school division fairly often signs long term leases on portable classrooms and that is treated as an operating expense rather than as a capital expense. If it is the case that you can only include in proffer discussions things that are in the CIP, and that is a legal question, then it seems we should consider because those are legitimate cost capacity expansion needs resulting from residential growth that either those portables should be in the CIP rather than operating or perhaps the legal department can tell us they could be considered without being in the CIP. He did not know the answer to that; but, he thinks that would be an important question to address because he thinks rather than building schools we are signing long-term leases for portables. He noted the quality of classrooms and again in terms of building a quality community to attract jobs and industry that it has consequences.

Mr. Keller said there was also discussion in the prior proffer world order that the portable classrooms were actually meeting capacity; and, therefore, one could not ask for more new space because it was already being met in a portable. He noted in his mind that is craziness, too.

Mr. Dotson said since schools are the single biggest local government expenditure that becomes a very important thing. He asked would you agree that should be a question.

Mr. Keller noted that the Commission agreed.

Mr. Dotson said those are the three things that have been on his mind as he started to serve on the Oversight Committee. In terms of the projects, he is still trying to get his head around all of the numbers; but he would just comment that he concurs with the question about the location of the center at Belvedere and transportation access to it though he thinks it was an important service and facility to have in the community. He pointed out our former Planning Commission Chair Cal Morris serves as a citizen's member of the Oversight Committee and he pointed out that 30% of our population and that number is going up are seniors and so to have the public invest in that to some degree makes a lot of sense. He would also say in terms of the PVCC Advanced Technology Center that he thinks as in the last year we have put a lot of attention into economic development we use to say people follow jobs and we kind of end the discussion. However, right now with what we know, and Faith has agreed with us, is those jobs follow people – we need to have the skilled workforce. Recent reports have shown that out of ten new jobs in the future seven of them are not going to require a four-year college degree or a graduate degree; they are going to require certificates and national standard training in advanced technologies in the kinds of industries that we have identified in our target industries report. He also believes that is an important project. The Scottsville Elementary site work improvements he thinks is important in terms of safety considerations. He said that is just to let you know sort of what my take is on those and that is what it is.

Ms. Spain pointed out we had just been talking about creative cities in my class and the emphasis is on how do you make a place that is attractive to outsiders and one of my students asked well how do you develop what you have on residents already. How do you develop the creative class or those who are prepared for the new economy who are already here, and she thinks that is an important issue and PVCC certainly feels some of that. But, in our economic development conversations we are talking about bringing in firms and people from the outside and if we had more investment in human capital here then perhaps we could have some of that growth with local residents.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Blair to weigh in on the legal and then we will have a public comment. He asked Mr. Henry if what we have heard from Commissioner Dotson wraps up the reason that you are here.

Mr. Trevor Henry replied that he believed that Mr. Dotson will carry that to the Oversight Committee for discussion and then actions will come out of that process that would submit the Commission's needs and has provided good input to that process.

Mr. John Blair said just very briefly obviously we will take a deeper diver, but the new proffer legislation allows for proffers for off-site facility proffers, which would be school facility proffers, if they have a substantial impact. The definition here talks about whether it is classified as operating expense or capital improvement. It must expand the capacity of the facility. So there is not a distinction if you want to call it operating or capital as far as the new proffer law is concerned; it is more about does the off-site impact increase capacity or he should say does it request an increase in capacity.

Mr. Keller invited public comment. There being none, he asked moving ahead if anyone had other public comments. There being none, he thanked Mr. Henry for the thorough presentation.

Ms. Spain pointed out she told her students they could leave at 8 p.m. even if we are not finished.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Other Public Comments.

Mr. Keller noted that they had already invited other public comments and would move to the next item.

Old Business

Mr. Keller invited old business. There being no further old business, the meeting moved to the next item.

New Business

Mr. Keller invited new business.

- **2017 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule – Distributed for review, comment and future adoption.**

Mr. Keller said Ms. Echols would present the amended 2017 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule.

Ms. Echols noted that the document on the top says draft November 27, 2016. This is our current recommended schedule that staff uses to put together the development review schedule for applicant as well as for the applicant to know what to expect.

In January we have no scheduled meeting on the 3rd; a public hearing on the 10th and the 31st; and the work session is on the 24th. She added underneath January 18th a tentative work session with the Board of Supervisors for the small area plan. Last night at one of the CAC's in the Places29 area the consultant spoke with the representatives about what he would be presenting to the community on December 12th. So there is a community meeting for Places29 Rio and Hydraulic area, but not just that CAC to present three alternatives for the Small Area Plan concentrating on the corridor and Nodes. We are trying to keep this moving and so the idea is that after the community meeting on December 12th the consultant and staff will work together and the consultant will make a recommended alternative and he will want to present that to the Commission and Board together. We are looking at January 18th; it is not firm yet. So if you could put that on your schedule and see if that would suit you and let us know if there is a problem. We would like to have enough people there so that you all can get the presentation, ask question, get answers and then it will come back to you all for your further discussion and recommendation back to the Board of Supervisors in February.

Mr. Keller asked which Commissioners would be available on January 18th. First, he asked if the presentation given at the December 12th would be available on the website.

Ms. Echols replied it will be after December 12th.

Mr. Keller suggested that the Commissioners that did not attend the December 12th CAC meeting could look at the presentation before the joint meeting with the Board of Supervisors, and Ms. Echols agreed.

Mr. Keller asked if the dates would work for all Commissioners, and all Commissioners agreed.

Ms. Echols thanked the Commission.

- **December 21, 2016 Joint BOS/PC public meeting potentially scheduled on proposed rezoning for former Barnes Lumber site in Crozet.**

Ms. More noted that this was an item she thought staff would bring up; but that tomorrow we would find out if we have a need for this meeting possibly tomorrow or early next week. There is a potential for some changes to happen on the phase 2 of the former Barnes Lumber property and staff are working swiftly to try to figure out what the best way for the applicant to address this. It is very fast paced and it is very time sensitive to take advantage of this opportunity to have a new business move onto to the property. So we are still waiting to see if this is something they can handle administratively or if it would require a joint session between the Planning Commission and the Board.

Ms. Echols pointed out it will need a public hearing and it will need a rezoning and December 21 is the preferred date for the joint Planning Commission – Board of Supervisors public hearing.

Ms. More asked if that was the final determination of the Zoning Administrator, and Ms. Echols replied yes.

Ms. More noted the question does the Commission recognize that December 21st is a busy week for people that travel and what we are trying to do if the applicant has been given that direction they would need to have their application in on Monday completed is my understanding and that would allow the county to meet their advertising requirements legally to meet on the December 21st as a joint session if people are willing are able.

Mr. Keller asked to start with Mr. Dotson if he was available on December 21st.

Mr. Dotson, Ms. More, Ms. Riley, Ms. Firehock, Mr. Lafferty and Mr. Keller replied that they would be available. Ms. Spain noted that she was not sure.

Mr. Keller said that they definitely have a quorum for your benefit.

Ms. More thanked the Commission.

- **January 18, 2017 Joint PC/BOS work session for Small Area Plan. (to be confirmed with BOS).**

- **January 24, 2016 Joint City/County PC Affordable Housing Joint Work Session.**

Ms. Riley said she was hoping we could have a brief discussion about the upcoming joint Planning Commission meeting between the city and the county. At our last meeting we had talked about having it focused on affordable housing. There was one of the city planning commissioners had recommended that we get a little bit of a presentation on the RCLCO study that had been done for the city; but, there now has been housing advisory committee recommendations to the City Council on policy items that can potentially be reviewed or shared with us. But, she believed it had been scheduled for January 24th and she asked if that was correct.

Mr. Gast-Bray and Mr. Keller replied yes.

Ms. Riley said she just wanted people to get it on their calendars. She pointed out that she and Ms. Firehock were going to be meeting with Ron White on December 8th to get an update on the units that have been currently proffered and/or to understand a little bit more clearly about the process that we have in place to make sure that to make sure that there are families that are qualified are able to purchase those homes so we are not losing those units to market. However, we will also be talking to him about this joint meeting. She thought this would be an opportunity to get people's input on what they would like to have happen at that meeting.

Ms. Firehock asked to make a quick addition to that as well. She said we did get copies of the past committee structure for the Affordable Housing Committee that the county used to have regarding their charge and how they worked. We will also talk to him about that because one of our charged from our work session was to come back with a proposal of some sort that we would then forward on to the Board of Supervisors to reestablish the Affordable Housing Committee. We did not want to just start from scratch so this has taken a little while for us to claw those out of the chests of time or whatever to find out what we use to do and then we will talk with him about how we might improve it or come up with some sort of structure to bring back to you.

For clarification Mr. Keller pointed out on January 24th – Affordable Housing Joint Work Session with City Planning Commission.

Mr. Keller announced the following:

- There will be no meeting on November 29, 2016. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, December 6, 2016 at 6:00 p.m.

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

Adjournment

Mr. Dotson moved for adjournment of the meeting to December 6, 2016, which was unanimously approved by a vote 7:0.

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m. to the Tuesday, December 6, 2016 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Room 241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

David Benish, Secretary

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 6-20-2017
Initials: SCT