Albemarle County Planning Commission
December 13, 2016

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, December 13, 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.

Other officials present were J.T. Newberry, Senior Planner, Rachael Falkenstein, Senior Planner; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director of CDD/Director of Planning 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 Report

Mr. Keller invited committee reports.

Ms. Spain reported that she had attended the Places29 Community Advisory Committee Meeting the previous night with Commissioner Dotson for all three combined CACs. She reported that they heard a presentation by Renaissance Planning Group about three possible designs for the area, which incorporated information and feedback from the first meeting they sponsored a few months ago. Ms. Spain said that the Renaissance Planning Group was going to take the comments, pros and cons, and anything else about the design or the type of land use that would be most preferred by citizens there, and take those into consideration to come up with a report to planning staff. She asked Commissioner Dotson what else he would add.

Commissioner Dotson noted that those outcomes would be brought forward in January or February in a joint presentation with the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

The meeting moved to the next item.

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. Hearing none, the meeting moved to the consent agenda.

Review of Board of Supervisors meeting – December 7, 2016

Mr. Gast-Bray reviewed actions taken on December 7, 2016 and items of interest to the Planning Commission – notably, the County Biodiversity presentation given by David Hannah, as well as the two-year fiscal plan, which involved a number of financial planning items mentioned in the course of discussion and interest. He noted that if the Commissioners were interested in such things, that resource would be available to them.

Mr. Keller said the meeting would move to the public hearing items.

Public Hearing Items.

SP-2015-00024 Field School of Charlottesville
PROJECT: SP201500024 Field School of Charlottesville
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Jack Jouett
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 06000000006800, 060000000068E0
LOCATION: South side of Barracks Road, west of the intersection with Montvue Drive
PROPOSAL: Construction of new private school for up to 150 students
PETITION: Private schools under section 10.2.2 of zoning ordinance; no dwellings proposed
ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots)
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes
AIRPORT IMPACT AREA: Yes
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Area – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources; residential (0.5 unit/acre in development lots)

Mr. Gast-Bray stated that he would like to interject one point for the education of the public, and said that the County had received a lot of emails regarding support for the Field School application – but this body's task is to review the location and the impacts of that location on the community rather than the quality or any of the issues that are related to applicant or the school. He stated that he was delighted to see such a mobilization of the public to engage with the public process, but cautioned that comments about quality of the school or applicant itself were not pertinent to this discussion. Mr. Gast-Bray emphasized that their discussion related to the impacts of school and its location, and thanked the public for their understanding and for allowing the Commission to deliberate on the matters at hand.

Ms. Rachel Falkenstein summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation, stating that this request is for a special use permit for the Field School to construct a private school in the rural area of the County, as required under Section 2.2 of the zoning ordinance. She stated the property is located on Barracks Road and is currently two parcels, one of which is split into two pieces. Ms. Falkenstein said that the property is approximately 31 acres, with the proposed school use taking up about 25 acres of the property and leaving a 6-acre parcel. She noted that the surrounding uses include the Colthurst and Montvue subdivisions, and some of the adjacent parcels to the east are residential and planned residential zoning districts. Ms. Falkenstein said that the Comprehensive Plan designates this property as rural area, and it is about 1,000 feet from the closest development area – the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods development area.

Ms. Falkenstein presented an aerial view of the property, stating that it is mostly wooded with a three-acre pond on the property that has a water protection ordinance buffer around it – which the applicant proposes to leave with the school site. She noted that there is also an area of clearing with the site, formerly a fill and waste site, which was put there by the previous property owner. Ms. Falkenstein said that the property is mostly wooded, and there are some thicker woods along the back of the property and in the front along Barracks Road.

Ms. Falkenstein reported that the applicant is proposing a private school for 150 boys, grades 5-8, and the hours of operation are proposed from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m., with occasional after-school sporting events, and they are not proposing any outdoor lighting or amplified sound. She presented the concept plan, noting the areas representing critical slopes and a buffer area the applicant is preserving and enhancing with vegetation where needed. Ms. Falkenstein said that the concept is for a four-acre school campus site and a three-acre multipurpose ballfield area, the

majority of which would be in the area already cleared. She noted that the applicant is requesting areas of critical slopes disturbance – but many of them are manmade from the previous fill site on the property and for the construction of the entrance of the road. Ms. Falkenstein referenced an exhibit from the applicant as to how the property could develop, but it is not a final design, and the main features proposed are three buildings: an academic building, a gymnasium, and a dining hall. She stated that the applicant is requesting a central sewage system, which the ordinance defines as anything with more than two connections – and it would be approved by the Board, not the Commission. Ms. Falkenstein stated that the closest residence is about 350 feet from the edge of the proposed building envelopes. She said that the applicant is proposing, as required by VDOT, left and right turn lanes from Barracks Road.

Ms. Falkenstein reported that favorable factors include the fact that land disturbance would only occur on about one third of the site – 8 of 25 acres; the disturbance would be restricted to an area that was already partially disturbed for the fill and waste area; the site has infrastructure available to it that most rural area parcels do not, including public water and an established roadway that can easily handle the traffic load. She stated that unfavorable factors are that the use is more intense than what would typically be in the rural areas and more intense than the by-right use of the property. Ms. Falkenstein noted that there would be some impacts to natural and scenic resources, but this is in the Entrance Corridor, so the ARB would have final review of the site and would provide for additional screening. She added that central sewage would typically not be recommended for the rural area, but upon analysis of this particular request, staff feels the system would cause less environmental impact than separate systems for each building.

Ms. Falkenstein stated that staff's recommendation is for approval with eight conditions included in staff report. She mentioned that the applicant had concern with Condition 4 in terms possibly increasing the number of persons allowed to non-school related events, which she has asked him to speak about at this meeting since it was a last minute request.

Mr. Keller stated that because there were so many young people in audience, he wanted to explain the process and procedure for the public hearing. He explained that staff reports, the Commissioners ask questions, a public hearing is held, the applicant speaks, then members of the public, then the applicant again; then the public hearing is closed and the Commission talks with staff and among themselves. Mr. Keller noted that Ms. Firehock as Vice-Chair runs the public session.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Ms. Firehock stated that the applicant is requesting hours of operation at 9 a.m., and she felt that was somewhat late as teachers and staff would need to be there earlier to open the school.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that 9 a.m. is when the school day starts – so teachers would show up earlier.

Ms. Spain noted that point #3 on screen identifies 8 a.m.

Ms. Falkenstein clarified that school instruction starts at 9 a.m., so staff made the condition 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. to allow for some flexibility.

Ms. Firehock commented that she wanted to make it as open as possible so they don't have to adjust the times.

Ms. More said that the staff report indicated that critical slopes would be disturbed by making the entrance more appropriate for this use, and asked for clarification that those along the ballfield site are manmade slopes from the previous use on property.

Ms. Falkenstein confirmed that this was correct, referencing an image showing the slope disturbance and noting that those up front were part of the previous fill site and part of entrance installed to access the site when it was a fill site – and they are all manmade; those in the back of the site are most likely natural slopes. She mentioned that the applicant did an analysis and said that 80% of the slopes to be disturbed were manmade, and the others were natural.

Ms. More commented that the staff report said that those to be disturbed, particularly for the roadway, would be redone as a more gradual slope and not such a steep slope.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that this was correct, stating that staff's recommendation is for them to meet the ordinance design standards, so the slopes would probably be 3 to 1 rather than 25%, so they would be more gradual.

Ms. Spain said that the staff report mentions that the applicant is working with staff to clear up outstanding problems on the property now when it was used as a fill site.

Ms. Falkenstein confirmed that it has already been cleared up by the previous property owner.

Ms. Riley said that regarding the frontage and sight distance for the entrance report, the staff report said that VDOT indicates that the reviewers have no objection and it is in accordance with their standards, and she asked what the actual sight distances are.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that the applicant stated they have 500 feet of sight distance, and VDOT will review this with the site plan – but that is an adequate sight distance for this use. She added that VDOT has also said they will require both left and right turn lanes for the entrance.

Mr. Keller stated that the Commission would open the public hearing and hear from the applicant.

Mr. Todd Barnett, the applicant and head of the Field School, addressed the Commission. Mr. Barnett reported that the Field School is a school for boys, grades 5 through 8, founded in 2007 with a mission "to develop well-rounded boys of character and accomplishment." He stated that it is an academically rigorous school and genuinely accomplished – with boys primarily being public school kids coming to and from local public schools. Mr. Barnett said that the school relies primarily on tuitions to fund the school, yet has managed through careful shepherding of resources to extend families 100% of demonstrated financial aid over the past 10 years. He stated that the school's makeup and mission has remained unchanged, and they have no plans to do anything different in the future – remaining a school focused on boys during crucial middle school years. Mr. Barnett stated that they have found many parents in the area who need something different during these years to allow their boys to develop fully in high school with confidence and preparation.

Mr. Barnett said that when he started the school, he had run an outdoors camp in Charlottesville for eight years, and many of the parents knew that he had been an administrator and teacher at an all-boys school outside of Washington, D.C. – and every summer he would get the same question from parents: "Why don't you start a boys school here in Charlottesville. You need one as a partner to the Village School." He stated that he was having lunch one day with the founders of the Village School, Pearl Hartwell and Jamie Nore, and Mr. Nore encouraged him to look for a

site somewhere outside of town so the boys could get outside more. Mr. Barnett said that this resonated with him as the director of an outdoors camp, then in Free Union, as the boys thrived being outdoors with lots of physical activity and adventures. He stated that they have since been in two locations in Crozet – first at Crozet Park with 22 acres of fields and forest, and now at the old Crozet School with 8 acres of fields and a bit of fringe forest. Mr. Barnett said that they go outside regularly for a long morning recess, for afternoon sports, for walks to the Crozet Library, for art and science classes, and on regular hikes. He emphasized that getting outside – largely regardless of the weather – makes the school better, with more focused and happy kids and more productive and meaningful lessons. Mr. Barnett stated that the Field School is excited about the prospect of having a conveniently located camp near campus with a three-acre pond, a big forest, a half-mile hiking trail, a big playing field, and a view of the mountains. He added that if they were interested in educating the next generation to truly appreciate the outdoors and care about protecting and nurturing rural areas, then all schools should all have a pond and a forest, a trail and a view of the mountains – as well as at least a few teachers who take them out regularly.

Mr. Barnett stated that among the letters supporters sent were 40 from students and their history and civics teacher, and he surmised that this was the first time any of them had been asked to get involved with local politics. He said that he appreciated the County's response to them, and he genuinely believes that this will serve as a spark to become involved with their county, state and nation. Mr. Barnett stated that he had a "crazy idea" that young people should be given the right to vote, but people tell him he is wrong because they wouldn't make good choices. He said that one of the boys wrote to the Commission about the failings of the current school building – the County-owned Crozet School – and commented on how hot it is in August and how cold it is right now, and it is true. Mr. Barnett stated that the dress code does not allow jackets to be worn indoors, but it is hard to enforce when it is so cold in the building. He stated that the fact is that they do need a new building, as the current one was built in 1923 and not much has changed since – and it is not a proper school building. Mr. Barnett emphasized that the County abandoned it 40 years ago, and while it is charming, the school needs to have a path forward in finding a long-term property. He said that he felt they have been doing everything right in this process, which has been going on a good six years now, and they were looking for the Commission's support for their work.

Mr. Barnett said that for the last 10 years, he has driven from Charlottesville to Crozet every day, going to and from school on Route 250 West. He stated that on that route, he drives through five compromised intersections in the 10 miles from the bypass to Crozet – the railroad underpass by Bellaire Market, the point at which Owensville Road traffic is trying to make a left onto Route 250, on Tillman Road, under the train trestle where 240 meets 250, and at the Crozet stop sign beside a railroad bridge. Mr. Barnett said that if he is driving the bus, he pulls the bus into the left lane so he can make the right turn and get onto that street without running into traffic on the other side. He stated that from years of experience on this road, these are the places to be especially vigilant, and if their site switches to Barracks Road – a big, wide road that is relatively lightly traveled with about half of the trips per day, one mile off the bypass with no compromised intersections – the population will travel about 10 minutes less to school each day. He added that this would ease area congestion and minimize pollution, while causing less traffic and improving safety on County roads generally.

Mr. Barnett stated that the school was given the condition to have no more than 12 events per year exceeding 200 people, and they currently have three school time events – graduation and two parent visiting days – that would draw more than 250 people if they were full. He said that he would like to ask to move 4 of the 12 dates up to as many as 300 people. Mr. Barnett noted that the school's engineer, Justin Shimp, would discuss the technical aspects of the plan.

Mr. Justin Shimp addressed the Board and presented several images of the site, noting the location at the old Crozet Elementary School and presenting an image from Route 810 out of downtown Crozet. He referenced the land mass per the comprehensive plan around the Field School's current spot, stating that they are within the boundary of the Crozet growth area, with rural areas around all sides. Mr. Shimp said that the school's proposed site is much closer to town and transportation infrastructure, along a major collector that leads to a principle arterial that leads to an interstate – so the best road networks available access this site. He pointed out that Jack Jouett Middle School and Albemarle High School are in the rural area as well, so perhaps in this corner of the County, it is not unusual to have a school that is outside the growth area so close to a large population center.

Mr. Shimp said that the comprehensive plan shows that the site touches Neighborhood 7, the Places 29 Master Plan, and the City of Charlottesville – with many students in that vicinity. He stated that half the students are in this area closer to town, so bringing the distribution point closer in would reduce miles traveled on the roads. He presented a color rendering showing the three proposed buildings, the field, and the zone of disturbance with approximately eight acres disturbed and the balance to remain in its natural condition as buffers. Mr. Shimp noted that the site was disturbed previously, as staff noted, and it contains public water – another unusual element of a rural area site –, which makes it a great candidate. He said that staff's unfavorable factors had some caveats, and the central sewage system, with three combined into one, had less disturbance to drain fields and costs less to maintain, as well as being one permit. Mr. Shimp said that the applicant also does not view the critical slopes as a negative, as they would be making them all right.

Mr. Keller asked if there were further questions.

Mr. Dotson asked about the pavilion building shown on the illustrative plan and its use, as he does not see a road leading to it.

Mr. Shimp responded that there would be no road, just a trail, as it is a nature pavilion built in the woods outside the tree buffer – and it would serve as a spot to gather by the lake.

Ms. Spain commented that Mr. Barnett mentioned driving the bus in addition to running the school, and the staff report says it is not clear how many the bus would be bringing in to the new site, and asked for comment on the expected ridership.

Mr. Barnett responded that he did not know what it would be, and the other side of driving the bus was always a challenge – finding places to pick kids up and driving them out. He stated that this close to town, he did not anticipate nearly as much ridership as they have now, with people going from Charlottesville to the school. He said that in discussions with County staff, they have not wanted him to encourage commitment to doing that in the future because of issues of enforcement, adding that the school has provided a bus for 10 years but he does not want to remain committed to it if it's something the population is not going to use in any meaningful way.

Ms. Spain asked what percentage of students use the bus currently.

Mr. Barnett responded that about 40% of their 86 students use it now.

Mr. Shimp pointed out that the calculations and trip analysis they submitted to VDOT used standard private school measurements – assuming low ridership – not discounting for bus

ridership.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the school owns the land required for the acceleration and deceleration lanes.

Mr. Shimp replied that it does, and it is all on their property.

Ms. Firehock invited public comment and said that each speaker had three minutes, stating that speakers can say they agree with a previous speaker or ask for a show of hands – and the Commission tries to keep this an orderly hearing, with no clapping or hooting and hollering.

Ms. Blair Williamson addressed the Board and stated that she lives almost immediately adjacent to the site and has a pond that feeds the school's pond. She expressed support of the Field School's request, stating that she has lived in Colthurst for 13 years, during which time the proposed school site was mostly used as a dump for construction debris until it was cleaned up a few years ago. Ms. Williamson said that this site is perfect for the Field School as it is close to town and offers the space required for their needs, as well as being architecturally appropriate for the neighborhood. She stated that she did not think the school would negatively affect property values, as a larger planned unit development could, and would be easy to live with in congruence with the neighborhood. Ms. Williamson said that while there will be increased traffic on Garth Road, it would mostly occur outside the normal peak times, and the site plan shows the required turning lanes for safe access to the site. She stated that her construction company did the work to widen Garth Road, and most of the site would be left as greenspace, and the school would have considerably less negative impact than a house development or any other potential commercial use – and she hoped the Board would approve this special use permit and allow the Field School to move forward with plans for construction.

Ms. Maureen Perriello, a science teacher at Field School, spoke in support of the request. Ms. Periello stated that from the school's inception, the science program has been a top-notch middle school program in the community. She said that her colleague from the school is a true outdoorsman, a conservationist, and an expert on just about everything. Ms. Periello stated that using the outdoors and focusing on preservation and community has been a part of the school's mission and a focus of the science curriculum he wrote 10 years ago. She said that the boys begin their year with a hike and a lesson in the woods, and from the start are outdoors learning about the environment around them. Ms. Periello stated that her science class has 10 boys, and for this demographic, outdoor education is the "mother of all learning opportunities." She said that they want to make their campus conducive to firsthand experience, and the science classrooms would open to the outdoors and enrich experience for the boys. Ms. Periello stated that the boys would tend to the school and the gardens, and the central location would allow them to easily access the many varied opportunities for learning off campus that are too far to reach from the current location. She said that the boys need and deserve a place to call their own, and the school feels this is a perfect site. Ms. Periello commented that it is important as adults to give young people options in an environment in which they can succeed, and an all-boys middle school is by far the best option for some kids – and thus is an asset for the entire community. She noted that she sees many boys present who are thriving at Field School, and she hoped the County would welcome them as their neighbors.

Ms. Erika Fennell addressed the Commission and said that she was a school parent and wife of a longstanding faculty member of the Field School, and has been a proponent of the school since its inception. Ms. Fennell said that she has dropped in on the school several times a week for almost as long as it has been operating, stating that the building of a permanent home for the Field School would be a dream come true. She stated that the boys need a property better suited

to the boy-specific programming; those living in Charlottesville would spend less time on the road getting to school; the athletic fields and gymnasium allowed by the size of this property are much needed for the students and visiting teams; the boys themselves are respectful hard workers, working hard to help those in need; at school they do assigned jobs to learn responsibility for their school and grounds; and their willingness to learn new ways to be useful on their property is impressive – such as learning how to clear and maintain trails that are used for biking and cross-country practice. Ms. Fennell said that her son is in sixth grade at the school, and she loves that the school encourages him and his classmates to be outdoors, with the students coming away with a great appreciation of the outdoors and environmental protection. She stated that she has been a supporter of several independent schools in the area, and the Field School is a charming environment for boys to learn both academically and socially in a space just for them. Ms. Fennell said that during their years there, they go from little boys to towering teenagers, having fun while they are at it. She encouraged the Commission to support the Field School application.

Ms. Jennifer Buckett addressed the Commission and stated that this is her eighth year teaching English at the Field School, where she also coaches cross-country and Frisbee, manages the school library, and has directed their outdoor leadership program. She stated that the proposed location off Barracks Road is an ideal site for the new campus because of its location and its rural setting that is also close to town. Ms. Buckett said that the school emphasizes environmental stewardship through thematic units and field trips, sports program, and focus on community service. She said that students leave Field School with an understanding that it is their responsibility to take care of their school, community, and the world – and this property would help reinforce those values. Ms. Buckett stated that the school's curriculum includes thematic units focused on wildlife, astronomy, and Shenandoah National Park, and students learn a great deal about their local community in class, as well as on field trips. She said they do an annual spirit walk that highlights local history, and they take students hiking every year. Ms. Buckett stated that in English, they read books that promote deep thinking about the relationship to nature – books by Jack London, Gary Paulson, and Carl Hiaasen that inspire students to want to conserve the land around them. She stated that in their sports program, students run cross-country on trails around the school, and they have also developed a mountain biking program that has done a lot of trail building and maintenance around the current land. Ms. Buckett said that they would seek to build low-impact structures on the Barracks Road property that would leave ample space for trails and fields, and plenty of buffer for the neighbors – and the neighborhood would benefit from an increase in trails nearby. Ms. Buckett stated that students understand that they must take responsibility for making the community and the environment a better place, doing jobs around the building every day and planting a garden that the chef uses to cook healthy, local meals. She said that 8th graders initiate their own service projects, and have focused on issues such as homelessness, helping at the SPCA, and chopping firewood for low-income community members. Ms. Buckett added that building a school that is close to nature and town reinforces their mission of creating young men of character and accomplishment who care about conservation and appreciate their responsibility towards the community.

Mr. Will Jackson, an 8th grade student and member of student council at Field School, addressed the Commission and spoke in support of the request. Mr. Jackson said that he really enjoys the school, which has provided him with a lot of great experiences – both academically and social. He stated that the school has a great physical education program, allowing students to take part in a wide variety of sports, and a great academic program. He stated that the school hosts "Spirit Walk," an event where Field School students dress up as both little known and prominent local historical figures, and looks forward to reenacting the history of the Hessian soldiers who were held near there.

Ms. Jessica Simmons, resident of Colthurst Farm since 1978, addressed the Commission and stated that she could not imagine a more benign or superior use for this particular parcel. She stated that when the Field School first expressed interest in the parcel, they engaged surrounding communities. She said that they have held three meetings, and neighbors have been a part of every enhancement they want to make to the land. Ms. Simmons stated that residents of the area, and Colthurst in particular, would much rather see the school than a by-right development that would allow one house per two acres. She noted that the Field School has promised not to have any lighting and has promised to put in a buffer, which would ameliorate any noise or disturbance to the adjacent communities. Ms. Simmons said that the school would make Barracks Road safer by having an ingress and egress, and for residents of that area, it puts the idea of a bypass to bed "forever and always." She asked who could argue with listening to children having a phenomenal experience in the morning and afternoons, and asked the Commission to support the recommendation.

Mr. Saunders Midyette, resident of Albemarle County and a resident of Colthurst Farm since 1992, spoke in favor of the request and said that he and his wife, Shirley, agree with the County planning staff in its report recommendation to approve the school permit request. Mr. Midyette said that they have attended several community meetings in which Mr. Barnett and teachers were very receptive to feedback regarding plans to relocate the school near Colthurst. He stated that their responsiveness is reflected in school planning points, including preservation 2/3 of the site and the pond, thereby preserving most of the favorable environmental features of the parcels; no outdoor lighting and no amplified sound systems for sporting fields; provision of turn exit lanes in both directions at the school entrance off of Barracks Road; and availability of bus service to and from the school, reducing impact to traffic. Mr. Midyette said that Colthurst Farm residents are pleased to have St. David's Anglican Church at the entrance to the neighborhood and looks forward to having the Field School adjoin it. He stated that he and his wife ask that the Board approve the special use permit subject to conditions as cited.

Mr. Greg Jurick addressed the Commission and said that he owns the property behind the Field School and is opposed to the proposal because he did not want to see it or the additional traffic. He asked staff to show the critical slopes layout and for clarification of the area of the slopes.

Ms. Falkenstein clarified that the slopes are the slopes shown in the front.

Mr. Jurick said there is a large swale that goes through the site, and when the previous owner connected Barracks Road to his site, he may have created critical slopes to the right and left of his entrance, but the other slopes were already there.

Ms. Falkenstein pointed out the slopes associated with the dam.

Mr. Jurick responded that the other slopes were not created when the previous owner came in and did the fill site.

Ms. Falkenstein stated that she relied on the County engineer and applicant to make that assessment.

Mr. Jurick asked if the County engineer visited the site and looked at that.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that she was not sure, but the applicant did an analysis that is attached to the staff report.

Mr. Jurick said that he did not see anything about how he analyzed the slope.

Ms. Firehock stated that the applicant's engineer could address that when he speaks again.

Mr. Jurick asked if there was room to make a left-turn lane coming in and if there was room on the right-hand side to do that – or if all of Barracks Road would shift to accommodate it.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that the applicant would have to widen it onto their site, and the applicant would do that analysis.

Mr. Jurick asked if a traffic study had been done, and if VDOT would put some tubes out to measure traffic at that time.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that the County did not require a traffic study because of the size of the use, and the County applicant can request traffic counts – but it would be up to VDOT.

Mr. Gary Schultheist addressed the Commission and stated that he is adjacent to the Free Union Country Day School, where his children attended – including his son prior to attending the Field School. He stated that the Free Union school goes up to 5th grade, and the amount of traffic that comes through Free Union Road is probably greater than the amount of traffic that the Field School would produce on Barracks Road. Mr. Schultheist said that there is no impact of the Free Union Road drivers in either direction when the school lets in and lets out, and he knows this because he drives by it every day. He stated that being a neighbor to the Free Union school is a wonderful thing, and they are a good neighbor even when they have events.

Mr. Bill Marrow with St. David's Church spoke in support of the request and stated that the church's current services are Sundays with a Wednesday evening bible study, and they do not anticipate any activity that might add to the traffic load on Barracks at any time during the week when the Field School operated – so he did not foresee any problems with compounding of traffic.

Mr. Steve Bolton, parent of an 8th grade student at Field School, spoke in support of the school and stated that the combination of academics, extracurricular activities, and outdoor experiences have all been extremely valuable for his son. He stated that this is most likely a high-valued use for the property, considering that it could be subdivided and sold off as individual homes, which would create a very different situation and would compound any kind of traffic issues. Mr. Bolton said that currently, many of the children ride the bus – but there are also many carpools, so 150 kids in the future would likely be served by carpools. He contrasted this with a use of housing, which would have daily, single-use occupant vehicle trips throughout the day. Mr. Bolton stated that the students were going to be good stewards and community members, and he encouraged the Commission to support the application. He asked Field School students to stand.

Mr. Percy Montague addressed the Commission and stated that although the Field School would own the pond, they have proffered to leave a buffer that would block the pond view from neighbors. Mr. Montague stated that he lived in Ivy Farms for 31 years and drove up and down that road several times a day, and the traffic is moderate at most hours and the site distance is outstanding. He said that he feels this is the perfect site for the Field School and encourages the Commission's positive action on their application.

Mr. Dennis Rooker stated that he is representing the Field School and said there are a lot of good reasons for approving the application, with the best ones being in the staff report. He said that staff's conclusions on the various factors that should be considered in the Comp Plan when

evaluating an application like this – with the first being that the proposed special use permit would not be a substantial detriment to adjacent lots. Mr. Rooker stated that staff points out that since there is no proposed lighting of the sports field and no amplified sounds, staff expects noise impacts to be limited and confined to daytime use only. He said that nearby residents may be affected by increased traffic on Barracks Road, but with the addition of turn lanes to the site, overall impacts to the traffic on Barracks Road are expected to be minimal. Mr. Rooker stated that staff concludes that the character of the district would not be changed by the proposed special use, and states that the proposed school use would be more intense than neighboring uses but is not expected to impact the other rural area uses in a significant way since the applicant is proposing to buffer and screen use from all adjacent properties, using existing vegetation and supplemental vegetation. He said that staff concludes that the special use permit will be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the comprehensive plan, with one stated purpose of the zoning ordinance being to facilitate the provision of school services – and even though the proposed school is a private facility, it would provide an additional school option for County residents. Mr. Rooker stated that staff also points out that the proposed school would only use a portion – approximately 8 acres of a 25-acre site – and the remainder of the site would be preserved, which is in harmony with the right uses of the property in the district and would limit overall disturbance of only a portion of the site most suited to development. He said that staff also analyzes traffic and points out that the effects on traffic would be minimal, with full student capacity generating 372 daily traffic trips. Mr. Rooker noted that the school only has about 80 students today, so the goal to get to 150 is a long-term goal, and this would be one of the smallest schools in the County – with St. Anne's having 900 students, Charlottesville Catholic School having 600 students, and only the Waldorf School being close to the small size of Field School. He said that staff concludes that the plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan, pointing out that defined development on the site will limit the area of land disturbance to only a portion of the site and will help to protect natural resources in areas not designated for development – such as existing woods; areas of critical slopes; and the pond, stream and water protection ordinance buffer. Mr. Rooker noted that the critical slopes comprise just .85 acres of the site, and the majority of that is manmade. He said that he walked the site when it was a fill site, and there was rebar all over, so this application would turn it into something the previous owner never imagined. Mr. Rooker stated that every factor aligns with something that should be approved, and he would ask that they do so.

Ms. Firehock asked to hear from Mr. Shimp again regarding engineering questions.

Mr. Shimp stated that it is the engineers' opinion is that the area was all disturbed and the County has a history of prior violations on the site, so they feel they have reached a pretty accurate assessment of the disturbance of the slopes.

Ms. Firehock asked if the idea is to return some of the slope to a more natural gradient because they were made overly steep with the prior use.

Mr. Shimp confirmed this, stating that those were put in without regard to what the design standards were for construction that they would have to follow for construction of the school site.

Mr. Keller asked him to address the third parcel, as there were three parcels becoming one with an outparcel – the school parcel and an out parcel.

Mr. Shimp explained that it was actually two parcels becoming two, stating that each side – the left and right – were part of the same parcel. He said that the middle was a separate parcel taken

by the state for the bypass, and this proposal would shift that lot to the right and have the 25-acre residue be the Field School on the left.

Mr. Keller asked how many development rights were on the smaller piece.

Mr. Shimp responded that it has one development right that it will use; it is a six-acre parcel with one development right for one house.

Ms. More asked for clarification to the public comment that any easement used to create turn lane left so that would come from the school's property.

Mr. Shimp confirmed that the left and right turn lanes would come onto the school's side, with all improvements built on their side of the road

Ms. More commented that they were not talking about widening an entire stretch of road – just creating a lane for deceleration.

Mr. Shimp confirmed that this is correct.

Mr. Palmer asked who is responsible for maintaining the dam.

Mr. Shimp responded that it is the property owner's responsibility.

Ms. Spain asked if the applicant owns the site now, or if the purchase of the land depends on the outcome of the Board of Supervisors' decision.

Mr. Barnett responded that the school does not own it now and it is owned by someone in the community, so if this is approved, that owner would take advantage of tax opportunities and donate it to the Field School. He reminded the Commission that he had made a request regarding increasing the number of people on campus.

Ms. More asked if he felt that allowing 300 persons was enough, given that there are 150 students.

Mr. Barnett responded that he counts at every event, and they probably wouldn't go over 250 – so 300 gives some room to not go over.

Ms. More asked about graduation.

Mr. Barnett responded that they have a mother's visiting day and a father's visiting day.

Ms. More replied that she trusts the number but was just thinking about the number of parents and grandparents.

Mr. Barnett responded that the school does a few public events such as Spirit Walk, but that happens over two nights and a lot of time, so people don't come at the same time.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing and brought it back for discussion and action.

Mr. Lafferty asked is there any problem going to 300.

Mr. Keller replied it would not if it stays school related.

Ms. Spain commented that since they have just been dealing with the winery and breweries and such and requiring them to have a traffic management plan for events with over 200 people, and asked if that would that apply to these events as well.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that it would not apply because this is accessory to the school use, but if the Commission wishes for that to be part of the condition, it could be.

Mr. Keller noted that this was a very good point to be consistent, and they might consider that.

Mr. Lafferty said he was ready to make a motion.

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

MOTION: Mr. Lafferty recommends approval of SP-2015-24 Field School of Charlottesville with the conditions outlined in the staff report, with the exception that condition #4 is not to exceed 300 people instead of 200 people.

Mr. Keller asked if he wanted to include the traffic management plan, and Mr. Lafferty replied that he did not want the traffic management plan.

Mr. Blair noted there was one point of clarification.

Ms. Firehock noted that he only asked for four times.

Mr. Blair pointed out that he thinks the 300 limit is for 4 events per year, and the other 8 would be for 200.

Ms. Firehock clarified that 4 of the 12 events would be up to the 300 limit.

Mr. Blair agreed.

Mr. Lafferty amended the motion that 4 of the 12 meetings will be for 300 students, and the rest would be 200 students.

Mr. Keller noted it was 300 individuals and not students.

Mr. Lafferty agreed and amended the motion for 300 persons.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion.

Ms. Firehock asked to make a brief comment, stating that she often asks a lot of questions, but the reason she did not ask a lot of questions this time was because this was a very well put together and detailed proposal, with much of the due diligence done. She also commended the applicant for the obvious efforts to include the community, and said that although not all of the members of the audience were happy this evening, she would commend the applicant for making the effort to reach out and try to make this a suitable development for the rural area.

Mr. Keller asked for a roll call.

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

Mr. Keller thanked everyone and pointed out SP-2015-24 Field School of Charlottesville would be going forward to the Board of Supervisors. He said that the Commission is an advisory body, and the Board would be making the final decision.

Mr. Rooker asked if there should be an action on the critical slopes.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that the Board of Supervisors would take action on the critical slopes.

The meeting moved to the next item.

SP-2016-00021 Tommy Shull's Wrecker and Repair
PROJECT: SP201600021 Shull's Wrecker and Repair
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 09000-00-00-035Q0
LOCATION: 1815 Avon Street
PROPOSAL: To permit automotive repair in conjunction with existing towing and body shop uses
PETITION: General commercial use under Section 26.2(a) of the Zoning Ordinance (via Section 24.2.1(2) "Automobile, truck repair shops")
ZONING: LI – Light Industry – industrial, office, and limited commercial uses (no residential use)
OVERLAYS: Entrance Corridor, Steep Slopes (Managed)
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial – professional office, commercial; research and development, design, development of prototypes, engineering; light manufacturing, fabrication, distribution if with a non-industrial use in Neighborhood 4 of the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan
(JT Newberry)

Mr. J.T. Newberry summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation, referencing an area map of the property on Avon Street Extended. He said that the map shows the comprehensive plan designation of the area, stating that the Lake Renovia subdivision borders the property on the west, and to the north is the edge of the Avinity residential development. Mr. Newberry reported that this request is to permit commercial auto repair, which the ordinance calls an "automobile/truck repair shop," that would be conducted in conjunction with an existing body shop and towing use that is operating on the site currently. He pointed out that Attachment C in the staff report is the conceptual plan, which would also likely serve as the site plan amendment for the site – with the previous site plan dating from 1973, for a certified welding shop. Mr. Newberry said that the applicant has delineated some different parking areas for towed vehicles, employee parking, customer parking, company vehicles.

Mr. Newberry reported that factors for consideration of adding auto repair to the existing body shop and towing use include that the requested use is compatible and supportive of the other existing industrial uses on the property. He said that staff's recommended conditions are fairly standard: in general accord with the concept plan as shown in Attachment C, limited hours of operation Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Mr. Newberry stated that staff recommends approval of SP 2016-00021 with the conditions included in the staff report.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Ms. Spain noted a typographical issue on page 5 of the staff report; letter F, stating that it should say, “there are no expansion plans associated with this proposal.”

Mr. Newberry confirmed that this is correct.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing and invited comment from the applicant.

Mr. Clint Shifflet of the Timmons Group addressed the Commission and stated that he represents the applicant, Tommy Shull. He stated that Mr. Newberry’s summary did a good job of explaining what the applicant was proposing and why. Mr. Shifflet said that there is no new infrastructure proposed onsite, and they were simply using the building already onsite – with no new impervious area proposed – so this was just a request to add the repair use to the existing facility. He offered to answer questions.

Ms. Firehock said that the applicant said in the future, he might pave the lot to make it more stable, and asked if they would be required to have a storm water management plan for paving such a small area.

Mr. Shifflet responded that he did not think so, and the new regulations actually consider gravel area as impervious surface, so paving that would be the same.

Mr. Dotson said that condition #2 says 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and he asked if he felt that was adequate because someone needing to be at work at 8 a.m. would need to drop a vehicle off earlier, and similarly in terms of picking up a vehicle after 5 p.m.

Mr. Tommy Shull stated that he is the owner of the facility, they have a nighttime drop box for drop-offs before hours, and if they are picking it up after hours, they can pay by credit card over the phone and pick up their vehicle after hours.

Mr. Keller said that the Commission is trying to help him at this point in suggesting that he ask for a little more time so he would not have to come back again. He stated that if Mr. Shull could see a benefit to being open earlier or later, this is his opportunity to do that – and it would not necessarily affect the application.

Mr. Shull responded that he would ask for 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Mr. Keller invited public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Planning Commission for discussion and action.

Ms. Riley said she had attended the community meeting and she thinks that in general people were feeling that Mr. Shull had been a very good neighbor in the past, and that there is not going to be a lot of new impact in the neighborhood. She stated that one person expressed slight concern about noise, but Ms. Riley felt that he allayed her fears that there is not going to be a lot of new activity. Ms. Riley added that she thinks there is general support in the community for it.

Ms. Firehock added that this was another very well prepared application and she did not have to come up with lots of questions, which she appreciated.

Mr. Newberry noted that this was true with the exception of the typo.

Mr. Dotson said that whoever makes the motion, he would hope they would incorporate opening at 7:30 a.m., which does not require it to open at 7:30 a.m., and closing at 5:30 p.m., which does not mean that it has to stay open beyond 5:00 p.m.

Ms. Spain pointed out that the applicant asked for 7 a.m. to 6 p.m.

Mr. Dotson noted his comment was 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Keller asked if there was a motion.

MOTION: Ms. Riley moved to recommend approval of SP 2016-00021 Tommy Shull's Wrecker and Repair with the conditions included in the staff report; but, with a change under recommendations #2 for the hours of operation to begin no earlier than 7 a.m. and end no later than 6 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Mr. Lafferty seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited discussion over the hours, because Mr. Dotson has suggested one set of hours and Ms. Riley another.

Mr. Dotson said that he was fine with the recommended hours.

Mr. Keller asked for a roll call.

The motion was approved unanimously by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller said that SP-2016-00021 Tommy Shull's Wrecker and Repair would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval.

Other Public Comments.

Mr. Keller invited other public comments.

Mr. Greg Jurick readdressed the Commission and asked if they were satisfied that the engineer had done a critical slopes analysis, as the County engineer had said had been done on the previous Field School application. He pointed out that Dennis Rooker had commented that he saw some rebar sticking out of the ground, and the Commission did not even ask any questions.

Mr. Lafferty commented that there was rebar on the site until the County asked him to clean it up.

Mr. Jurick stated that it was on the opposite side of the site. He asked if any of the Commissioners had visited the site, and raised concern that they saw 40-year old trees sticking out of a slope and say that was made five years ago.

Ms. Firehock responded that they don't have a long enough history of that site.

Mr. Jurick said that the engineer [Justin Shimp] shrugged his shoulders and said, "Yeah, I walked around," and the report clearly states that the critical slopes were created when they put the entrance in – but when they asked him, he said, "Well maybe it was made when they built Barracks Road."

Ms. Firehock said she had not seen his detailed report, but they can certainly ask that the County engineer take a careful look at it – but they are not sitting here with an engineering report in front of them.

Mr. Jurick pointed out they did not even ask him for one; the County says there is one, but the Commission did not ask for one.

Ms. Firehock responded that at a certain point, the Commission does trust our staff to do their due diligence review. She added that she also knows it is the Commission's job to oversee their work, so they would certainly make that request.

Mr. Jurick thanked Ms. Firehock.

Mr. Keller invited further comment.

Mr. Neil Williamson of the Free Enterprise Forum read "An Albemarle Planning Christmas," a poem that he had written. (Attachment 2 – Available with the written minutes in the Clerk's office).

There being no further comments, the meeting moved to old business.

Old Business

Mr. Keller invited old business.

Mr. Lafferty noted that he forgot to mention under committee reports that he had visited the Regent School, and they had a nice presentation that was similar to the Field School's. He stated that the school had bought a bigger bus to handle traffic problems, as the dog leg going out of the school site making people go west seems to be working although they have to do a U-turn somewhere to get back into town. Mr. Lafferty said that the delay with the larger bus is they want somebody with a commercial driver's license; but it was a good meeting and he expected that they would bring an application forward.

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

New Business

Mr. Keller invited new business.

Ms. More said she was wondering because she knew there was a meeting with the chairs of CACs, with the topic of that discussion being the community meetings among other things. She said that the Commission has expressed interest previously in hearing about that and what sort of progress is made and what decisions are made that might affect CACs since Commissioners advise and are liaisons to those groups. Ms. More asked if there was a plan to bring the Commission some information that was gathered from that joint chair session.

Mr. Gast-Bray replied that there was, and he thought there were some recommendations out of that. He said that he would bring that to the next meeting and make that clear, but his recollection was they had the opportunity to separate the events in order to avoid the situation with the proffer legislation. Mr. Gast-Bray stated that many of them said that once they understood the nature of what they can and can't do, they were comfortable with taking a stronger role and making sure that they were compliant with the new rules and how to avoid any misdeeds when it came to

dealing with things that might be construed incorrectly in the nature of the new legislation. He said that there were two strategies: to separate them entirely, or to do it at the CAC meetings in the proper venue to make sure that there were no misperceptions that could result from the restrictions due to the proffer legislation.

Ms. More thanked Mr. Gast-Bray.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the joint meeting would start at 6 p.m. on December 21.

Mr. Blair noted the Board of Supervisors website lists the meeting as starting at 6 p.m.

Mr. Keller pointed out on December 21, the Commission would be asked to evaluate and take action; then the Supervisors would hear the discussion and have their session pursuant to the Commission's recommendation as handed to them.

Mr. Lafferty asked if the meeting will be in the auditorium, and Mr. Keller replied yes.

Mr. Dotson asked if they will have a normal staff report a number of days ahead of that meeting.

Mr. Keller replied that this was his understanding.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out the computer went down this afternoon.

Mr. Gast-Bray replied that staff had been struggling with that.

Mr. Dotson said he had one thing to think about regarding our January organizational meeting and suggested reviewing the Commission's starting time at 6 p.m. and perhaps changing it to 7 p.m. or 4 p.m.

Mr. Keller said that Mr. Blair had been working on updating the bylaws.

Mr. Blair suggested that the bylaws themselves don't address a meeting time, and the Commission had reached consensus on a meeting time. He suggested that at the annual meeting in January, the Commission could review and take action on the planning schedule and the time at which they wanted to start their meetings.

Mr. Keller said that there have been discussions about other approaches to Commissions as taken throughout the Commonwealth, so there may be some merit in talking about some of those – such as the selection process for chair and vice chair, because the current bylaws for the County have no mechanism for a nominating committee, but the City does. Mr. Keller stated that many commissions advertise a field trip day with staff and then don't have it – and it would be one day a month, advertised to the public that it might happen. He said that they have discussed being onsite with the applicant for complex applications such as Brookhill or Adelaide, and there is also the option of a pre-meeting – which is still public but offers the opportunity for commissioners to meet with the applicant and staff and talk through some of the details of a project. Mr. Keller stated that cites and urbanizing counties use this approach, and perhaps Mr. Gast-Bray has some new ideas and direction. He said that the challenge is finding the right forum, perhaps a special meeting, to discuss some of these things.

Mr. Dotson said that if there is anything they want to discuss immediately in terms of chair selection procedures, they should discuss that first if they wanted to implement it in the next year.

Mr. Gast-Bray suggested that they consider a “parking lot” or “wish list” for issues that arose that were not germane to that particular application but should be discussed at a later time.

Mr. Lafferty asked Mr. Keller to jot down an email and circulate it, then the Commissioners could add individually and come up with master list.

Mr. Keller asked about the first meeting of the New Year.

Mr. Gast-Bray clarified that it would be the joint meeting with the BOS on January 18, 2017.

Mr. Blair stated that the Commission needed to have an annual meeting per their bylaws, and suggested having one earlier in January – perhaps on January 17 – particularly if they want to discuss their meeting format, and at that time they could elect the chair and vice-chair.

Mr. Keller mentioned that Mr. Blair chairs that meeting until a chair and vice-chair are elected.

Mr. Lafferty asked why they wouldn’t do it on the 10th and 17th to hash it out.

Ms. Firehock said she would not be in town on January10.

Ms. Riley said that these were organizational topics, and she would prefer to have just one meeting.

Mr. Lafferty responded that if they change the way the chair and vice-chair are selected, they would need to do that before the election.

Ms. Riley stated that they could always make the change for next year.

Ms. Firehock said that currently there is no method.

Mr. Keller emphasized that they should hear from Mr. Blair as to how they ended up with the current process.

Mr. Blair explained that there are different approaches, and the method in a body like this is that the planning director opens the floor for nominations – and anyone may be nominated for chair or vice-chair, and there is a vote to determine the chair. He said they could also have a nominating committee of Commissioners that would typically meet in October or November of the previous year to come up with a list of candidates – and this does not preclude nominations from the floor as well. He said that the practical difference is that, if the Commission felt they needed to talk about who was nominated, they would start the process earlier to talk about who should be nominated for chair or vice-chair. He said that without that approach, they would just take nominations from the floor at their annual meeting in January.

Mr. Keller said that in the discussion of bylaws, he had brought these things forward to Mr. Blair because it is good due diligence to do so. He said that Mr. Blair had said that technically no more than two people would be on the committee, and he does not care about a particular approach.

Mr. Blair stated that it is a seven-member body, so they would probably have two members to nominate the chair and vice chair. He said that supervisors from other localities could not decide which two members would serve on the nominating committee.

Mr. Dotson said they could all be nominated but would have the ability to decline and vote on those left standing.

Ms. Spain commented that she did not think they needed to have a committee, as the current method was acceptable – and they were too small a group to have a committee.

Mr. Lafferty said that in the past, they have had committees – not appointed by Commissioners but who met by themselves – so if they are going to have a committee, he would like it to be formalized so they nominate two people or just take everything from the floor.

Ms. Firehock said she was not necessarily advocating having a committee, and having a more formalized process that provided more transparency. She stated that with relatively new commissioners, she wanted to have a process that was transparent, rather than the perception that people talked on the side and picked a chair and vice-chair.

Mr. Lafferty said that he agreed.

Ms. Firehock emphasized that they are not the Board of Supervisors and are not as political, in her opinion.

Mr. Dotson asked if there is anything in their bylaws that says the current chair remains chair until a new one is selected.

Mr. Blair responded that the bylaws state that the chair and vice-chair would be elected for one-year terms, and either or both may be elected for one or more.

Mr. Keller noted that Charlottesville also limits theirs to two one-year terms.

Mr. Dotson said that it doesn't sound like they have any option other than to select a chair and vice-chair at their first meeting in January, unless they are talking about choosing for the following year.

Ms. Firehock stated that she thought that staff could run a meeting for one meeting if there was no chair.

Mr. Lafferty said there was nothing in the bylaws for that.

Ms. Firehock asked how they could run a meeting for part of it.

Mr. Keller said that it was in the bylaws to do that until the vote.

Mr. Dotson said they could change their bylaws in the first meeting for this purpose.

Mr. Lafferty said they could temporarily suspend the bylaws in terms of having to elect a chair at that first meeting.

Ms. Firehock stated that she had made a change to the bylaws that the Commission passed, which said the Commission could not suspend their rules during a meeting – but could only alter them for a following meeting – in an effort to get around the midnight vote that the Board of Supervisors had taken.

Mr. Keller asked Commissioners if they would be there on the week of December 20.

Ms. Riley responded that she would not be here on December 20, and said that it would be helpful for them to decide if they are interested in a nominating committee – and even though she felt it would be excessive for this size group, she would go along with the majority.

Ms. Firehock clarified that she was not saying they had to have a committee, but was just relaying that it worked quite smoothly for Charlottesville, and suggested that they could just send out an email asking if someone would be willing to be chair or vice-chair.

Mr. Dotson suggested that prior to the first meeting of the year, Commissioners could let Mr. Keller know whether or not they are interested.

Ms. Spain said they could do that right now.

Mr. Blair said that if anybody is interested, they can announce right now, if the Commission would like to know who the candidates are.

Ms. Firehock said she thought that would be the most transparent way rather than having emails on the side, as she was all about the transparency.

Mr. Dotson said there were three possible answers: definitely no, maybe if persuaded, and yes for sure.

Ms. Firehock suggested the response of no, yes, or willing – which is like a maybe.

Mr. Blair suggested they start with chair or vice-chair.

Mr. Keller polled who was interested in serving as chair.

Mr. Dotson stated no.

Ms. More stated no.

Ms. Riley stated no.

Ms. Spain stated no.

Mr. Lafferty stated no.

Ms. Firehock stated no.

Mr. Keller stated that he would be for this one upcoming year.

Mr. Keller polled for the vice-chair.

Mr. Dotson stated no.

Ms. More stated willing.

Ms. Riley stated no.

Ms. Firehock stated willing.

Mr. Keller stated no.

Ms. Spain stated no.

Mr. Lafferty stated he was willing.

Mr. Keller said that the planning director would run the first meeting with this slate of nominees; however, if somebody else decides that they wish to be added, they should all have that right to be added on that day. Mr. Keller said he was going to send an email out with a few items and ask for Commission response. He commented that because he thought it was effective to talk about the topics they would like for special meetings and willingness to lead those special meetings, he was going to ask for both bylaw sort of structural changes as well as general ideas. He believed that thy have a pressing resource issue for things like affordable housing, and asked if the joint meeting with the City is going to deal with the housing.

Mr. Gast-Bray replied that he believed that was one of the presentations.

Mr. Keller noted that this would be a kick off for that.

Ms. Riley said that she and Ms. Firehock had met with Ron White, Bill Letteri and Rebecca Ragsdale – and they were under the impression that the City and County staff had looked at the memorandum of understanding on affordable housing and had produced sort of a matrix of some potential areas of cooperation. Ms. Riley said she thought it would be really good for the Planning Commission to get a copy of that as soon as it is available.

Mr. Dotson asked for clarification that the January 17 would be their first meeting of 2017, with no applications but just organizational matters such as bylaws and topics for the future.

Mr. Keller noted that Mr. Blair would have some housekeeping items related to the bylaws, as well as matters of interest for the Commission going forward and special interest topic areas for organized educational sessions.

Mr. Blair stated that one of the items discussed was the situation of two deferrals, because the bylaws currently state that meetings can only be canceled due to weather, so they wanted to make the deferral situation an option as well.

Mr. Blair confirmed for Mr. Dotson that as long as they do the regular public notice of January 17, that's all that would be required.

Mr. Lafferty asked if they could do a closed session.

Mr. Blair responded that it would depend on the topic.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that it must be related to personnel and money.

Mr. Blair offered to speak with Mr. Lafferty after this meeting.

The Commission confirmed that there would be a quorum for the next meeting.

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m. to the Tuesday, December 21, 2016 meeting at 6:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Room 241, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

Andrew Gast-Bray, Secretary

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

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