Albemarle County Planning Commission
September 26, 2017

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 26, 2017, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room #241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Pam Riley; Jennie More; Bruce Dotson; Daphne Spain and Bill Palmer, University of Virginia Representative. Absent was Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair and Mac Lafferty.

Other officials present were Elaine Echols, Chief of Planning - Long Range; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director of CDD/Director of Planning; Stephanie Banton, Community Development Assistant II and John Blair, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

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

From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda

Mr. Keller invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda. There being none, the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Consent Agenda

Approval of Minutes: July 25, 2017

Mr. Keller asked if a Commissioner would like to pull an item from the consent agenda for discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Dotson moved, Ms. More seconded to approve the consent agenda as presented.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0 (Firehock, Lafferty Absent),

The meeting moved to the next item.

Public Hearing Item

ZMA-2016-00022 2511 Avinty Drive (Moss)
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 090000000035L0
LOCATION: 2511 Avinity Dr., approx. 70 feet south of the intersection with Avon St. Ext.
PROPOSAL: Rezone property to allow for apartments
PETITION: Request for 0.9 acres to be rezoned from R1 Residential zoning district, which allows residential uses at a density of 1 unit per acre to PRD Planned Residential District which allows residential use (3 – 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses. A maximum of 24 multifamily units is proposed for a density of 26 units/acre.
OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): ENTRANCE CORRIDOR

PROFFERS: No
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Urban Density Residential – residential (6.01-34 units/acre); supporting uses such as places of worship, schools, public and institutional uses, neighborhood scale commercial, office, and service uses in Neighborhood 4 of the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods.
POTENTIALLY IN MONTICELLO VIEWSHED: Yes
(Elaine Echols)

Ms. Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the staff report for ZMA-2016-00022 2511 Avinity. This is a request for 24 units in a potentially new development along Avon Street Extended, but access is proposed from Avinity Drive. The property is located south of Cale Elementary School and south of the Avinity Development. The property is zoned R-1 and the Comprehensive Plan recommends it for Urban Density Residential Development. Currently there is a single-family house on the property, which is adjacent to Avinity. She noted the application plan is in the packet and the first page shows the context of the proposed development in relation to the property surrounding it. The proposal is for two-12-unit apartment buildings and a courtyard area for access from the parking lot. There is an emergency access way that the Fire Department has said is adequate from the end of the parking lot over the (southwest) corner of the development.

Ms. Echols said staff spent a lot of time with the applicant on this particular project and identified the following factors, which are favorable to this rezoning request:

1. Proposed density is in keeping with the recommended density for Urban Density Residential as shown on the Master Plan.
2. Relegated parking is provided, in keeping with the Neighborhood Model.
3. Affordable housing may be provided with the development.

Staff has identified the following factors, which are unfavorable to this request:

1. Feasibility to accomplish the rezoning has not been established: the applicant has not demonstrated permission to use Avinity Drive for access to the development.
2. Offsite easements will be required in order to accomplish the development. The ability to obtain these easements has not been demonstrated.
3. It appears that ARB requirements for landscaping and street trees cannot be met with the proposed development. Buildings, parking, and a courtyard are shown to cover almost the entire site and there is little flexibility to modify the plan and retain the courtyard should site changes be needed.
4. Insufficient information has been provided to justify why a PRD of less than 3 acres should be approved, given the fact that it does not share any features, other than potential access, with the adjoining PRD.
5. No information other than setbacks and building height has been provided to ensure architectural compatibility with the adjoining development.
6. Affordable housing information is not sufficiently detailed to ensure that the project will truly provide 20% affordable units.
7. No provision is made for connecting to the property to the south of this parcel.

RECOMMENDATION

Due to the number of outstanding issues, staff cannot recommend approval of this rezoning or the requested special exception to reduce the minimum acreage for a PRD.

Ms. Echols said to do a development of this type, the only other zoning district that might be available would be a Neighborhood Model District, which has some more requirements than the PRD has. She said therefore, technically a special exception could be approved by the Board of Supervisors to allow for less than 3 acres and staff thinks it is hard to justify that right now given the lack of a relationship to this other property. She said if there were not a relationship we would want to know that everything could actually be done as it is shown on this particular plan. However, that is not to say that you could not recommend that a special exception be approved in this particular case only to say there are a lot of things that are going on at this site that make it difficult to make recommendation for approval for the reduction of less than 3 acres.

Ms. Echols said staff does not have any information other than these setbacks and the building height of three stories that tell us whether there is going to be compatibility with this adjoining development. There is the piece of this which is that the Architectural Review Board will be reviewing it and if the Planning Commission and Board think that is sufficient that they will ensure compatibility on the Entrance Corridor then that could be a factor that the Planning Commission decides is not an outstanding issue. However, because we have had a lot of concerns by the adjoining property owners in Avinity to understand what this is going to look and feel like we felt it was important to ask for some kind of elevations or better information on architectural features, massing and scale that could ensure that it would be compatible with the adjoining property.

Ms. Echols said in the staff report it says that affordable housing information had not been provided; however, since that time we have provided some information to the applicant on how affordability could be addressed on this application plan. She said that would be through the provision of a rental rate agreement, which occurs with density bonuses. In our standard residential districts using conventional zoning you can get a bonus for providing affordable housing and there is specific language that helps make that happen. Therefore, staff does not think this is an outstanding issue if the applicant is willing to provide that language on the plan.

Ms. Echols said there is another outstanding issue that is there is no vehicular connection to the south so when this property redevelops we don't know how it might relate to this property. However, it might be possible that a connection extends down here (east) and the situation might be easily remedied. There is no pedestrian connection right now and it is something that could be resolved, and she would be happy to answer any questions. She said if the Planning Commission choses to recommend approval of this zoning map amendment you could move to recommend approval of this or you might choose to recommend approval with changes. Then the applicant would be on the hook to decide whether he wanted to make those changes before it went to the Board of Supervisors and you would need to articulate what those changes are. If you should choose to recommend denial of the zoning map amendment we have given you the seven factors that are unfavorable to the request although it would only be six if the applicant is willing to provide the statement about rental rate agreements on his application plan.

Mr. Keller invited questions from Commissioners.

Ms. Spain asked has there been any update from the applicant about access to Avinity Drive, and Ms. Echols replied that she had not received any.

Ms. Spain questioned why there were so many unfavorable factors unresolved, and Ms. Echols replied that the applicant had requested the hearing.

Mr. Dotson asked what the density is of the adjacent Avinity development; the staff report indicates that this would be 26 units to the acre.

Ms. Echols replied that she thinks it is 13 or 14 units.

Mr. Dotson said the land that is along Avinity Drive that is not a part of this property he takes it is reserved open space within the Avinity Development and landscaping area, and Ms. Echols replied yes.

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

Justin Shimp said he was the engineer for this project and representative for the owner tonight. He said there was a question about the unfavorable and the access is an issue that we have been working through steadily trying to resolve and are close. He said the reason for the problem ties back to things that were done with the original rezoning of Avinity so he thought that was worthwhile to bring up so we can understand why it is an issue and so it won't happen again.

Mr. Shimp presented a PowerPoint presentation to give a context of the scale of this development. He said we had a neighborhood meeting early on in the process and we heard that the parking was a big concern. Originally, we had a plan that was under parked with 40 parking spaces but given the neighbors experience with the lack of parking here and there is not a lot of other off-site parking opportunities we increased that and decreased our units from all two-bedroom to eight one-bedrooms. He said we have a reduced demand for parking and an increased parking supply from where we started with, and he feels like we have addressed that issue.

Mr. Shimp said the other factor that was identified as unfavorable in the staff report is why a PRD, and as you all know there has been changes to proffer regulations and things like this. He said one of the fundamental things he looks for in opportunities for development is working to provide some extra density in some affordable housing opportunities since he thinks it is lacking around here and it is difficult to do and actually implement. He said this site made sense for that and we had some email correspondence with staff and what we were told is that if we wanted to create this Planned District with an affordable housing opportunity the PRD was the only way to really do that. He said that is the reason that we did it since he would just assume not to have an additional hoop to jump through but to achieve that goal we needed a way to tie ourselves down to it and that seemed to be the best way to do it. He said that was the origin of the PRD. He said our adjacent property is zoned PRD and the zoning map would look consistent, but that is really why is to provide that opportunity.

Mr. Shimp said the street tree requirement may be stemming from an older plan and was not as clear so he has done some surveys as shown on the slide and we have 23 feet from the power line to the face of our building. He said that was plenty for landscaping and he thinks at the time the ARB reviewed this we had different survey information and it was not as clear. He said it was an important question to ask and he came to the ARB back in March and was told to make sure it was addressed and so we have researched it and adjusted it from there.

Mr. Shimp said similarly the question about scale of development, again, we went to the ARB and staff recommended that we present elevations and things like that at this time. He said we asked the ARB if you need to see this and they said no. He said if you look at their approval

from their meeting they said we have jurisdiction over this area and whatever you do is going to have to meet our guidelines so bring that forward when you are ready. He said that is why we proceeded with this. He said for comparison our building is 82' long and the first block of townhouses across the street is 88' long; they are four-stories with a rooftop deck on three that sites 10' to 12' above the road. He said our building is three-stories and a roof and is really a very similar scale. So again, we felt like with a restriction of three-stories that we met the scale and why you don't have other details.

Mr. Shimp said the easement one is an interesting one and apologized that you can't read it well. He said the plat from 2000 shows a 50' right-of-way for a 50' private road that was directly to the north of the site. He said the 1963 language granted us a 50' road for all purposes to serve our site. He said during the public hearing there was some discussion about a private road request as part of the rezoning for Avinity because it has private roads; there was discussion of maintaining ingress/egress to adjacent properties and then a maintenance agreement to do so, which was what the typical practice would be. He said where this got sideways in the approved application plan you can see the existing conditions that text there says "access easement to be provided to adjoining property." He said when we did our research about how we shall connect this to anything it made sense to go where there was supposed to be an access easement. However, what happened if you go out there you see a driveway that comes off Avinity Drive to this house, which apparently has no easement to use the road has an address of 2511 Avinity Drive so we are on it. He said when you establish a requirement for a shared easement when the plat is recorded there should have been a deed describing who can use it with conditions of that maybe maintenance agreements and things like that and somehow that slipped through the cracks here. He said the developer came in and developed 20 or 10 acres adjacent to a guy that owns 1 acre and even though a shared access road was shown, and they overlooked this easement issue. He said our former 50' road for all purposes is kind of gone and he feels the county has endorsed it, but he was sure it was not an intentional item. He said now here we are they are approved and have their construction, then we come back now and try to develop our property and we are fighting an issue that should have been settled the first time around. He said it was much more difficult to settle now and why this needs to be done upfront so to me it is a legal issue that the Planning Commission could say we should defer action on this or if it was to move forward recommend to the Board that it not be finally approved until it is resolved. He said that we are doing this because we are trying to illegally take someone's property and all of the zoning and planning information said you need to go this way with your road except those T's were not crossed and we don't actually have a recorded easement saying how. He said that was very frustrating to us that good planning dictates that connection be made, there were discussions of it, easements shown and a proffered plan showing it that does not exist. He said so that is the hold up on that.

Mr. Shimp said that this site can handle the density and as far as the amenities go not every apartment complex needs to have a swimming pool and there are lots of choices in this neighborhood if those are things that are important to you. He said but if you are looking for a place that is near the school that is more affordable here is an opportunity for you. He said the only issue that he sees that needs to be resolved is the access and he would ask the Commission to weigh in on this and he thinks this project can move forward with a condition that before the Board votes on this it should be resolved.

Mr. Keller invited public comment.

Paul McArtor, resident of 2012 Avinity Loop, said there are a number of concerns with this

project and staff did a great job of expressing most of them. So rather than rehash those he would like to touch on the ones that my neighbors and me feel most concerned with that is too much is trying to be put on .9 acres. He said when we look at that there is not enough common space, green space and they mentioned there is Cale Elementary but realistically what is going to happen are the tenants of this facility are going to use the common area and amenities of Avinity. He said that is going to add extra liability to us as residents having people coming over and using our amenities. He said going along with that is a private road that we are responsible for paying for, which is going to be extra wear and tear on that. He said at the neighborhood meeting this was brought up as a concern and to magnify that concern is that there is no track record of development by this owner who is planning to develop or doing any kind of property management on this scale which they are claiming to do. He said there is no reason to believe that tenants are going to be properly policed to keep them from using our amenities and again adding the extra stress on our neighborhood. He said because it is a small area and proper screening from the townhouses on the side would be needed since the plan is to put a dumpster and parking lot right next to this house. He said we still have a concern with parking that would impact the entire neighborhood.

Amory Mellen, resident of 2309 Avinity Court, said he just wanted to state concerns and was for proper and responsible development, but agreed with Ms. Spain that there are numerous unfavorable and more than what you would see pending a request from the Commission. He said the density was not in keeping with the adjacent development, double what you would find in Avinity and the acreage is less than a third of what is typically required. He said they are trying to squeeze this development into a spot where it does not fit. He agreed with Paul that he can't see how there would not be spill over from this into the Avinity community. He said the lack of common space for 24 units and if one-half of those units have dog owners they have to be walked somewhere. He said that there are also parking concerns and thinks that some of the unfavorable should be resolved including an agreement in place for the road maintenance that will be shared.

Travis Pietila, with the Southern Environmental Law Center, said although we appreciate the applicant's plan to build affordable units on site we can see a number of areas in which this project could be improved. He said we share many of staff's concerns with this PRD as currently proposed. He said first we share the concern that the applicant has provided few details on a number of key aspects – this includes how the affordable housing commitment will be achieved, - how storm water will be moved off the site, -how required street trees and landscaping will be accommodated and how the PRD open space commitment will be met. He said this level of information is more appropriate for a work session rather than a public hearing and it is far from clear the concept we see today will resemble the project that is eventually built if this rezoning is approved at this early stage. It could also set a bad precedent when it comes to the expectations of future applicants to recommend approval now with so many key features yet to be nailed down.

Mr. Pietila said we also have concerns with granting a special exception for the PRD concept being proposed. He said as staff has noted PRD's typically must be at least 3 acres in size and the minimum size is important since it gives room to accommodate the 25% open space requird of PRD's and allows more flexibility in design to protect the natural features of a site. He said there is not much room for that here and it is far from clear that the open spaces shown meet the criteria for these areas, which are primarily supposed to be maintained in a natural state. He said that PRD's are intended mainly for recreation, protection of sensitive areas or to provide a buffer between uses. He said understanding the neighbor's concerns, we also can't help but

note how much of this site is devoted to parking because if this PRD moves forward there may be an opportunity to address some of the issues noted. He said the applicant is proposing 48 parking spaces with 2 for each residential unit and as the applicant noted that is above the standards set in the ordinance for these multi-family units. In addition, the Board can waive or modify the standards in establishing a PRD. He said reduced parking here could allow greater room to accommodate open space, trees, landscaping and adequate stormwater facilities and enable this project to better meet the county's intent for PRD's. These components are particularly important as it appears that much of this site would drain towards Biscuit Run. Overall, we don't think this PRD should be recommended for approval tonight, but if this project does move forward we urge the applicant and the county to consider ways to reduce parking and preserve more natural areas on the site as well as to ensure that adequate commitments are put in place to make sure these and affordable housing measures are realized.

Glen McCluskey said he lived in Avinity and again he was not anti-development, but it just seems like we are trying to put ten pounds of potatoes in a five-pound bag. He said in looking at it he can't see how you could get a moving van in and out of that parking lot as well as heavy equipment moving in and out of that area without a lot of damage. He said if it is toned down a little bit that it would be better for everybody involved since it is a lot of infrastructure in a very small space, which is his objection to the way it is right now.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Keller invited applicant rebuttal.

Justin Shimp asked for a moment to respond to these things since he agreed that there was too much parking, but we are trying to balance out some competing concerns here. He said he would be happy to lose a few parking spaces and create a little more planting area. He pointed out that there are not streams here or natural features to preserve since it is all mowed lawn. He said we can put the affordable housing on the plan and the only thing he sees as a problem here is the access. He said the other items are subjective of what do you think needs to be done now versus later and how much faith do you have in the Architectural Review Board to make sure these buildings look right and is it really true that you can't build a parking lot 5' off a property line. He said you can build a parking lot at 5' or less.

Mr. Shimp noted that adjacent to the four blocks of townhouses is a wooden screening fence 6' to 8' high right on the property line and behind that is a 20' backyard somebody has. He said if that was good enough for them then is our 5' area not good enough for us. Again, perspectives here we do this all the time and if approve this plan he can build it and he asks the Commission to consider that in their deliberations.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Ms. Spain noted concerns about why the entrance did not come off Avon, the access easements and if he could reduce the number of units.

Ms. Riley said she attended the March 22nd community meeting and all of these issues were raised at that time including both the staff's and community's issues and she finds it hard to understand why these issues haven't been really addressed and it is coming before us this evening. She said that if the easement you at least tonight are publicly acknowledging could be resolved and it is with relatives of the applicant she did not understand why we don't have documentation necessary to prove that easement.

Mr. Shimp replied that he discussed it with staff for a time and it is not something that struck him as an urgent matter; this needs to be done for the Board meeting and really it is a site plan issue. He said that nothing on this plan guarantees us the right to build it since we have to comply with all of the ordinance requirements and if he needs an extra 2' of space he has to adjust the plan and may have to lose some square footage of building and lose a unit or two. He said from the work he has done he did not think it was necessary, but that is what you would do in that situation.

Ms. Riley said asking us for an exception to a PRD is a great concern to me and you can't show us that you will have 25% open space, so she was not seeing a justification for an exception especially since we have seen concerns from property owners at Avinity and you are not adding amenities on this site. She added that Cale Elementary School might be an available amenity after school but during school hours it is not going to be available.

Ms. More questioned whether there was enough room for planting trees, and Mr. Shimp said that it was 23' from the power line to the face of the building that would be adequate space for the required landscaping since we can plant the trees behind the sidewalk that can grow out over the sidewalk.

Ms. More said you are asking for a special exception for the PRD because it is less than 3 acres and asked do you believe that you are asking for a special exception for the 25% open space.

Mr. Shimp replied that we have had some disagreement with staff as to how that space is counted; however, if this moves forward if the zoning folks feel that is appropriate we will do that at the Board meeting. He said again where is the 25% - is it off of the forest or is it part of your amenity space and that is why he thinks the justification is for this lesser space in this particular instance. He said that is the justification we put forward to the Board.

Mr. Dotson asked have you talked to the Avinity Homeowner's Association about actually striking a deal where the residents here could use the open space pool and those facilities?

Mr. Shimp replied that it is a little tricky because the HOA does not exist in an official format that is still declaring control, and he met with a neighbor here last week to discuss some of these things. He said we are willing to do that, but he was not sure there is a willingness on their part to accept. He said he talked to the developer today and his position is to direct it to the HOA but they are not officially formed yet so he did not know if they can make a decision. He said we are open to those discussions.

Mr. Dotson said if that were to happen he would assume there would be an initial payment to buy into the capital facilities and then some monthly payment as a usage fee. He asked would that be his assumption if you could come to such a deal.

Mr. Shimp replied probably so, yes, but those numbers would have to be worked out for a user fee just like everybody else pays.

Mr. Dotson asked where the building would face, and Mr. Shimp replied there will be double-faced buildings with a door that basically fronts on all sides with doors on each side.

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

Mr. Dotson said when we have an Urban Density Residential that goes from a low density to a high density if somebody was looking for a bigger site 26 units to the acre is there a district other than PRD or Neighborhood Model that would allow that.

Ms. Echols replied no, it has to be a Planned District in order to do that because R-15 is the most dense district and with the density bonus you could get 20 units per acres.

Mr. Dotson said that is a consideration going PRD because there is no other way to go. He commented this is a miscellaneous problem parcel and is only .9 acre and all has all kinds of issues with some flexibility in order to encourage its infill or redevelopment is going to be necessary. He said we are going to find more and more of those in the future so we don't have much of a track record on that.

The Planning Commission discussed the following issues:

- Verification of the access (need something in writing)
- Improvements on the property line.
- Emergency access (need verification)
- Storm water management under the parking lot and where is it going to drain to.
- ARB requirements for landscaping and street trees. (Ms. Echols said if they have 23' it might not be an issue, but staff has not received anything in writing.)
- Approval of the PRD less than 3 acres. (Mr. Keller asked to discuss this further under new business and separate that out from this discussion.)
- Lack of information on setbacks and building height for the architectural compatibility.

Mr. Shimp asked for a deferral.

Ms. Riley moved to accept the applicant's request to defer ZMA-2016-00022 2511 Avinty Church for 90 days.

Ms. More seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. There being none, Mr. Keller asked for a roll call.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0. (Firehock and Lafferty absent) for deferral of ZMA-2016-00026 for 90 days.

Mr. Keller thanked the members of the community who came to speak, the applicant for a thoughtful presentation and hoped we can have a general dialogue beyond this in the future.

The Commission took a break at 7:18 p.m. and reconvened at 7:23 p.m.

Informational

2016 PC Annual Report

Presentation from staff of PC Annual Report. (Elaine Echols)

Ms. Echols and Andrew Knuppel, the newest planner and summer intern, presented the 2016 PC Annual Report in a PowerPoint presentation. (See Presentation). Ms. Echols said staff

wanted to give this information to the Commission and then we will come back for a discussion later.

The Planning Commission received the report and congratulated staff for a great job. No action was taken.

Committee Reports

Mr. Keller invited committee reports.

The following committee reports were given:

Daphne Spain reported:
- Places29 North CAC met last Thursday evening and Rebecca Ragsdale and David Fox gave a presentation of the actions revolving around the transient lodging regulations. Two major things emerged from the CAC: 1. Change from transient to short term, short-term tourist or temporary lodging. 2. Why is this coming up now and what the goals are – are they to enhance safety and the units to generate further tax revenue.
- The Pantops CAC met last night with a report given by Ms. Echols.
- The Rivanna River Corridor Committee met last night. The conference on water quality will be held Friday with the River Fest Event on Saturday.

Pam Riley reported:
- On September 18 the Village of Rivanna CAC met with a presentation and discussion on: Transient lodging and community input. Short update on improvements for restoration to a short section of the Rivanna trail as their NIFI project. In terms of leadership, Lynda White agreed to be the chair for the CAC until next November when her term expires at which point she might extend her leadership role.
-On September 20 Long Range Transportation Plan Work Session. The committee discussed feedback received from the public open house on the 2045 LRTP. Received staff updates on the I-64 Corridor Plan and the Regional Bike-Pedestrian Plan update.
-On September 21 the 5th and Avon Street CAC met with a presentation on the Cale Elementary School by Kevin McDermott; transient lodging briefing/discussion; and two community meetings on two potential applications – Charlottesville Music Institute Community Meeting – 1740 Broadway and the Calliber Collision (Auto Body Repair) Community Meeting – 1540 Avon Street Extended, adjacent to Avon Motors.

Jennie More reported:
- Crozet CAC met last week and discussed transient lodging. Joel DeNunzio, with VDOT, discussed transportation issues. She encouraged other groups to invite him to their CAC meeting.
- Historic Preservation Committee met yesterday. The majority of the meeting was spent talking about Rio Mills Road Bridge with a boat launch access underneath concerning a possible marker.

Ms. Spain noted that the Places29 North CAC had been discussing the marker and should be in touch with the Historic Preservation Committee.

Ms. Spain noted today something that came up with the Rivanna River Corridor group and that is the need for a cultural heritage trail as well and to include African Americans, Native

Americans, and one of the ideas was to have one of the presentations about the project at the Jefferson Center. Therefore, we could get a variety of people to provide their knowledge about how the river was part of live. She asked to amend her Pantops CAC report that Andrew Gast-Bray was there along with Ms. Echols.

Mr. Keller asked to make sure that the Central Virginia History Researchers are in the loop since they actually meet at the Jefferson School monthly and there is a significant interest in African American history that occurred. He said he had seen two presentations on the Hydraulic area there and this is a rich source of knowledge.

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

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – September 13, 2017

Andrew Gast-Bray reviewed actions taken by Board on September 13, 2017.

Old Business

Mr. Keller invited old business.

- Joint PC/School Board meeting on October 26 postponed.
- October 17 Joint EDA/BOS/PC meeting begins at 4 p.m. in Room 241 with regular meeting starting at 6:15 p.m.

The meeting moved to new business.

New Business

Mr. Keller invited new business.

- **No meeting on October 3, 2017.**
- **The next Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, October 10, 2017.**

The meeting moved to adjournment.

Adjournment

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 8:27 p.m. to the October 10, 2017 Planning Commission meeting at 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

_____

Andrew Gast-Bray, Secretary

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 3.19.19
Initials: SLB