Albemarle County Planning Commission
March 6, 2018

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, March 6, 2018, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Julian Bivins, Daphne Spain; Pam Riley, Vice-Chair, Bruce Dotson and Bill Palmer, UVA representative. Commissioners absent were Karen Firehock and Jennie More.

Other officials present were Cameron Langille, Senior Planner; J.T. Newberry, Senior Planner; David Benish, Chief of Planning; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director of Community Development/Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission 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.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

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.
Hearing none, Mr. Keller said the meeting would move on to the public hearings.

Public Hearing Items

SP-2017-00016 Caliber Collision
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville
TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 07700-00-00-011F0
LOCATION: West side of Avon Street Extended (Route 742) approximately 300 feet north of the intersection of 5th Street Station Parkway and Avon Street Extended (Route 742).
PROPOSAL: Proposed body shop in a new building of approximately 18,700, which includes approximately 2,200 sq. ft. of office space. The body shop and associated improvements are proposed within the approximately 2.41 acre portion of the property zoned HC Highway Commercial. PETITION: Body shop in the HC Zoning District on a 4.382-acre parcel under Section 24.2.2.17 of the Zoning Ordinance. No dwellings proposed.
ZONING: HC Highway Commercial which allows commercial and service; residential by special use permit (15 units/ acre); and RA Rural Area - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots
OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): Entrance Corridor, Airport Impact Area, Flood Hazard Overlay District, Steep Slopes - Preserved
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Industrial which allows manufacturing, storage, distribution, office and commercial activities related to industrial use and research and development; and Parks and Green Systems which allows parks, playgrounds, play fields, greenways, trails, paths, recreational facilities and equipment, plazas, outdoor sitting areas, natural areas, preservation of stream buffers, floodplains and

steep slopes adjacent to rivers and streams in Neighborhood 4 of the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan.
(Cameron Langille)

Cameron Langille, Senior Planner with the Department of Community Development said he was the lead planner on this special use permit for SP-2017-00016 Caliber Collision. Mr. Langille summarized the request in a PowerPoint presentation.

This application is on tax map/parcel 77-11F and is located on the west side of Avon Street extended approximately 300 feet north of the intersection between Fifth Street Station Parkway and Avon Street Extended. The parcel is highlighted on the slide, measures 4.382 acres and is completely undeveloped. There has never been a site plan or special use permit application submitted to the county for this property before. The rear property boundary follows the Moore's Creek centerline. The parcel is actually split-zoned - the 2.41 acres closest to Avon Street Extended is zoned HC, Highway Commercial and the rear 1.972 acres is zoned Rural Areas.

The Overlay District Map shows the Overlay Districts that are on this property. It is in the Airport Impact Overlay District as well as the Flood Hazard Overlay District and it does have Preserved Steep Slopes. The steep slopes are in green and the Flood Hazard District is the stripped blue at the rear of the property. As shown in the slides, those environmental features overlay districts are entirely located within the Rural Areas portion of the property; they are not in the Highway Commercial area.

This property is located in Neighborhood IV of the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Development area. The land use called for on tax map/parcel 77-11F has two different classifications. The area shown in green are parks and green systems that actually coincides with where preserved steep slopes as well as the Flood Hazard Overlay Districts are located. He noted that there is a Water Protection Ordinance stream buffer on the property, which is located entirely within that Parks and Green Systems portion. The area shown in purple is industrial.

To get into the specifics of the proposal the applicants are looking to do a body shop in the portion of the property that is zoned Highway Commercial. There are no improvements proposed in the Rural Area portion of the property. Under our Zoning Ordinance, body shops are special uses and are not permitted by right in the Highway Commercial District and so they are looking to do a single-story building that measures 18,635 square feet. About 2,200 square feet of that will be office space and the remainder of the building will be used for shop floor. The applicant will be doing a parking lot as shown in the conceptual drawing. It is going to have 81 total spaces; but 56 of those parking spaces will be for employees and customers.

In terms of utilities, they will be connecting to Albemarle County Service Authority public water lines that are located along Avon Street Extended. The nearest public sewer lines are actually located in the Willoughby Subdivision, which is located behind this property across Moore's Creek. Because of that, the applicant wants to do a private septic system under the parking lot. The Virginia Department of Health has reviewed that and they have said that it is feasible to do a septic system underneath the parking lot that will be entirely within the Highway Commercial zoned portion of the property. Mr. Langille said when it comes time for a final site plan later, they will need to get a construction permit from the Virginia of Health and he just wanted to make that known that it has been evaluated at this point in the process.

In terms of other improvements that we are looking at with this special use permit, in the right-of-way of Avon Street Extended there is actually no sidewalks along this property frontage. The applicant is proposing to construct new sidewalks within the right-of-way to connect to the existing system that is located south of the property. It kind of ends just north of the intersection of the Fifth Street Station Parkway.

In the conceptual site plan that is tied to this special use permit application, Mr. Langille pointed out that the building at its closest point is located approximately 11' from the proposed right-of-way line. It will be within our maximum 30' front setback so it meets all of our setback standards. He pointed out the other improvements that will be done, which includes the location of the driveway that will be situated overtop of an existing 50' shared driveway easement that is for the benefit of the Avon Motors property just to the north as well as the Caliper Collision property. They will be doing some parking on this side of the building as well as some parking in other areas for customers. Behind the building is where they will have their vehicle storage spaces. There is some employee parking area in the center area of the parking lot.

Mr. Langille pointed out the conceptual grading plan that is associated with the application. They are going to be doing a stormwater device in this area and the septic system drainfields are located in this area. He called out in the drawing that the zoning ordinance actually requires properties that are adjacent to residential or rural area zoning districts to maintain a 20' no disturbance buffer. With this application, he pointed out in the 20' measurement line is the zoning district boundary line. Therefore, there will be no improvements or no grading located in the no disturbance buffer and if they were looking to do that they would have to get a special exception, but they have managed to fit everything outside of that buffer.

Mr. Langille said the applicant also included a conceptual landscaping plan with their application and he pointed out the area where the applicant will be installing new landscaping. The applicant is not going to be doing anything in the rural area portion of the property where those preserved steep slopes and the floodplain area is located since it is all up front. They do have some street trees here, which species are medium and large shade trees that meet the requirements of our site plan ordinance. There are also some trees within the parking lot and at the rear of the property; they are going to do a line of shrubs to provide an additional screening measure. Mr. Langille pointed out that was brought as something the residents of Willoughby wanted to see when the community meeting was held for this special use permit application. On the conceptual site plan, they were proposing to do a fence back there as well so this is going to be a combined constructed screen with landscaping measures as well.

Staff recommends approval of the special use permit with several conditions that are included in the staff report. Staff feels that this application meets pretty much all of the Neighborhood Model principles contained in the Comprehensive Plan. We do not think that it poses any substantial detriment to adjacent lots and it will be similar in character to the existing uses in the surrounding area that are in the Highway Commercial zoning district. The other properties near this site are all zoned Light Industry and they are similar in nature of warehousing and distribution type of uses. He noted that a body shop is not substantially different from that type of use. The one aspect of this application that we do not feel entirely meets the Neighborhood Model principle of pedestrian orientation relates to the architectural renderings that we have looked at for the new building.

In a slide traveling north along Avon Street Extended Mr. Langille pointed out where the building will be located and what it will look like if you were traveling north along Avon Street Extended. He pointed out

the intersection with the Fifth Street Station Parkway and Avon Street and the location of the building. He pointed out the renderings and the side of the building that will face Avon Street Extended. If you notice, there are not a lot of windows included along this building face. It has a very large massing just kind of a monolithic looking wall. With the pedestrian orientation principle, we are looking for applications to make it more inviting for pedestrians walking along the street. We also think that architectural detailing is necessary just so that it provides a more comforting experience. Staff recommends one condition that recommends more fenestration or additional architectural details along this building wall. The applicant wants to speak with the Planning Commission about that recommendation from staff and he will leave that up to them once the floor is open for public comment.

Mr. Langille said the conditions recommended are in the staff report and he was not going to read all of them. However, the one related to that building wall is sub letter b) which states Additional fenestration or architectural features shall be added along the left elevation south façade to provide pedestrian orientation to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or his/her designee. Mr. Langille said staff recommends approval of the application with conditions and that he will take questions from the Commission.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Ms. Spain asked is a commercial enterprise required to have a septic tank pumped out every five years since that is the recommendation for residences. She asked is there any type of requirement for commercial businesses.

Mr. Langille replied that he was not sure; however, he could look into that and get back to her. He said all of the requirements for that are State Code regulations, which are handled by the Health Department. When the site plan comes in for this, we will forward a copy of the Virginia Department of Health and they will look at that. He noted there is a construction permit for that and then have requirements for ongoing maintenance. He said he was not sure exactly what the timing was for doing that.

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

Rusty Coan, with Cross Development, 4336 Marsh Ridge Road, Carlton, Texas 75010, said they were under contract to purchase this 4.38-acre property for Caliber Collision. To give some history of Caliber Collision since they are not in the community he pointed out Caliber has over 520 stores in 17 states with 38 locations in Virginia alone. He said Harrisonburg and Culpeper are the closest. He said they do about 1.4 billion dollars annually in revenue and they are an industry leader from an insurance standpoint. As far as uses in the building, we are strictly an auto body and a paint repair shop. He said that we would not be doing any transmission work, engine work, tires or things like that.

Mr. Coan said Cameron spoke to the site plan and explained we have about an 18,600 square foot building and two doors on the backside of the building to enter cars. In working with the Architectural Review Board in early November of last year that the building does have some projections to it - there are two columns there and the middle piece comes away from the wall along with the left side where we added a bump out and bump up to match the door area on the right. He pointed out they also have another column similar to the two that will be in the middle right under it, which is the one you will see from the Fifth Street Station signal. He said we have some landscaping in front and submitted the

Architectural Review Board with two options on that landscaping with one meeting the regular spacing and one grouping three to five trees together. Mr. Coan said we are happy to install either one of those. He pointed out the engineer was here, Freeman Kaufman, who can answer questions on the site plan or storm drainage and he would be happy to answer questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions from the Commission.

Mr. Dotson asked how liquids from radiators, transmissions or other damaged things from cars are handled in whether they would be hooked to the system or septic system and related to that how floor drains are handled in the work bays.

Mr. Coan replied typically cars will come into the shop in a U-shaped fashion and go to tech bays there. Again, if a car is damaged enough to have engine trouble and things like that we are probably not working on it at this shop; however, we do have a detail bay and storage area that are outside which will be screened by the fencing. The detail bay will have its separate drain and oil/water separator that will tie into the septic system and Todd can speak to how that will operate. He pointed out they have hired somebody locally to design that and to the question on maintenance whatever that requirement is we will maintain it based on that.

Todd Burnette, with Freeman and Kaufman, said to answer your question that upstream of the actual septic system we will have a sand/oil separator. He said all drainage inside the building goes through the septic that goes into a sand/oil separator that is separate from the septic system upstream of it. Therefore, if there is antifreeze or whatever collected there it is cleaned out on a different basis than your typical septic system.

Mr. Bivins asked the applicant to speak to the additional windows or as they are set on the sidewalk since he did not hear him speak to that.

Mr. Coan replied that he did not other than he had gone through the Architectural Review Board and we were able to make some extensions from the face and so it is not just one big massive building since there are some bump outs and bump ups as well. He said that middle section, the stone columns there, are probably about a third of that building. He said you really could not see into that with the landscape in front of them, however, where that building changes colors from the tan to the dark there are two stone columns that stick out a foot, which is very similar to what is in Fifth Street Station in the Dick's. He said the two stone columns and those will bump out from that face about 1' X 4' wide and the top has some cornice on it that will stick up higher than the existing building there. It will be the same on both ends and where the doors are for the office. He said the whole face along Avon Street is a shop. Again, if we need to add windows it will be full windows. He said you will not really see in there and the doors will be in the back. He pointed out they do have a screened fence around the whole thing and as Cameron said about the community meeting that we added some landscaping in the back at the request of the neighbors.

Mr. Bivins said in staff's recommendation about additional fenestration or architectural features he asked are you saying you will use architectural features.

Mr. Coan replied that he was saying that we went through the Architectural Review Board added some of those bump outs, again, very similar to the Fifth Street Station at Dick's. He said we can definitely add them if we need to; however, as people are driving up and down the road he did not think that they are

facing that. He asked if there are any direction on the number and location. He pointed out that was a struggle with the Architectural Review Board that the Code did not really spell out you had to do X amount of things but that was like a list of options. Again, he pointed out what we had there is what we settled on in early November.

Ms. Spain said the narrative talks about a proposed 23 employees and is that based on other locations and is there a supply of mechanics that can do the work.

Mr. Coan replied yes, based on this size building we will probably have 20 to 25 employees and a lot of them would be a tech in the back and Caliber spends in the neighborhood of ten to twelve million dollars a year on training alone. He noted that they have 10,800 employees across the country and as new things come out, they are on the forefront of training those folks.

Ms. Riley said just a follow-up on the question about the fenestration – this is an evolving corridor for pedestrian use and she is glad to see that there are sidewalks provided; but you had mentioned that if there was to be some windows that they would be full windows. She asked have you done this at other locations since she would be interested in seeing something besides just additional columns in terms of pedestrian view.

Mr. Coan replied that in their 500 locations he was sure they have a few of those. He noted the west end on the plan has the full windows; the right side is where our entry door is and the windows in the bottom elevation are all office windows. He pointed out those windows will be real and you can see in there again on the left hand side of that large face along Avon; it is a full window. He pointed out the office door and that there is a full window there as well.

Ms. Riley said at the community meeting the neighbors in the Willoughby Neighborhood expressed an interest in knowing more about the lighting to make sure there would not be lighting at nighttime or lighting that would shine into those homes. She asked Mr. Coan to talk a little bit about the outdoor lighting and related to that he said there was a detail bay in the rear and she asked would all of the work take place within the building; there is no detail work outdoors.

Mr. Coan replied that all of the body and repair work painting would all be enclosed in that building; but actually, the paint booth is a separate structure permitted through DEQ as well. It will have its own fire sprinkler system and ventilation in kind of an enclosed box that you drive in. The detail is like a wash down areas as a service that we provide before we bring your car back around. He said that is directly behind the building, and again will be covered and behind the screened fence. It will have its own drain and sand/oil separator. As far as the lighting, Mr. Coan pointed out they will meet the Code. He said they have added a 6' fence in the back along with shrubs. He said they have completed a lighting plan and asked staff if that was correct.

Mr. Langille replied that there was no lighting plan included with this special use permit.

Mr. Coan suggested that they may have submitted it with the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Langille noted the zoning ordinance has some requirements for using full cut off fixtures and basically maintaining a low foot-candle measurement along the property lines and then where that zoning district boundary is between the Highway Commercial and Rural Area portion it can't exceed a certain measurement. He said that will be part of the site plan review process.

Mr. Coan said we are okay following that as well and again, the back part is where we will have cars and our employees will be moving them in and out, as they are awaiting for parts throughout a week. He said for part of Caliber's insurance we do have to keep those secure and so we will have to have enough light to keep those secure but will definitely meet the ordinance.

Mr. Dotson questioned the fenestration since he mentioned the ARB and some time ago, you were before the ARB.

Mr. Coan replied yes, it was November 6 of last year.

Mr. Dotson said that was for a preliminary, and Mr. Coan replied that it was for a conceptual elevation review, and again that is what we landed on there with them. He pointed out we went through there twice and a lot of it centered on that left hand side elevation where we added another bump out and the full windows on that side.

Mr. Dotson asked if this request was recommended for approval and then approved, would this have to go back to the Architectural Review Board again or have they completed that process.

Ms. Echols suggested that Mr. Blair could enlighten the Commission on the ARB.

Mr. Blair said this would not have to go back to the Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Coan said he thought it had to go back to the ARB, and Mr. Blair replied no, not currently.

Mr. Keller invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited the applicant back up for questions. He said he would jump in on the fenestration and asked if there is an opportunity for natural lighting to come into those bays and would there be some benefit because of color tones to have an area with natural light.

Mr. Coan replied possibly and that there will be three or four cars per tech bays along that whole wall. He said if you would not see cars when working on them because those would be up higher.

Mr. Keller said when someone is thinking about this neighborhood model and adjacencies it is not necessarily about a pure kind of aesthetic because part of the interest for this business conceivably could be that people walking back and forth might be interested in what they are seeing. He asked Mr. Coan to relay these type of questions to corporate in cases like this when you are in a more urbanizing environment where with new residential development there will be a lot more pedestrian foot traffic. So that leads to the rationale why designers and planners are interested in breaking up that façade other than the first part he said many are going to be stopped at a traffic light and backed up as they are coming off I-64 before they go into Fifth Street Station. Therefore, he thinks there is going to be a lot of interest from both the automobile passengers and pedestrians. He said it is quite important that there be fenestration, but in the ideal, he would encourage them to think about the benefits to the business for people to be able to see the activity inside. He said we all know that in an industrial building it could have an industrial treatment with a wire mesh over for security inside but that one can see through.

Ms. Spain agreed with Mr. Keller, but two other options occurs to me. She said when she sees a vast expansive wall as if that she thinks mural would be a great place for one or more. She asked staff would a mural count in the Neighborhood Model as street level detail and interest.

Ms. Echols replied that one of the points of the windows or the detailing is to help the pedestrian understand how tall the building is next to them. Therefore, if there was some kind of an illustration on that wall that helps to create a pedestrian understanding of height she thinks that would be fine. The Commission knows in historic preservation it is common for painting to take place on buildings without having to change the façade of those buildings and so that could be a possibility as well.

Ms. Spain said she still agrees that windows would be the best. However, the other option of bio filtered wall or plants on twine or the equivalent of twine going up the side of wall creates a great deal of interest and it helps offset all of the concrete that is there in the building and the building roof.

Mr. Coan asked if she is suggesting that in lieu of some of the landscaping that is there.

Ms. Spain replied that if he decided to bunch some of the trees rather than spreading them out evenly the way they are illustrated here, then you could have the trees closer to the street and the plants growing up part of the wall. She suggested it be something that makes sense from a design standpoint and for the health of the streets, too. However, the buildings that are covered with vines, flowers and such to change with the seasons she thinks are very effective in creating interest and offsetting some of the downside of concrete.

Mr. Coan asked if they start changing what the ARB approved, then they would have to go back.

Mr. Blair replied no, sir, the conditions can be changed as part of the special use permit.

Ms. Echols said the Planning Commission is recommending conditions to the Board of Supervisors so the Planning Commission could recommend modifications of these conditions that would provide for greater flexibility.

Mr. Blair agreed.

Mr. Coan said if we went to the ARB previously and were set up for that conceptual approval and getting new things where do we start/stop with that.

Mr. Keller referred the question to our county attorney.

Mr. Blair said there would be no further ARB review on this because this will be handled through the special use permit conditions.

Mr. Keller said the Commission's recommendation would be advisory to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Blair said typically he thinks the Commission would once there is consensus on the conditions at least give the applicant an opportunity to address that voluntarily.

Mr. Keller agreed the applicant still has a chance if they need to and invited other questions for the applicant. There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed and the matter before the Commission for discussion and action.

Mr. Dotson noted an observation that the majority of our discussion has been about the visual treatment of the wall along the public right-of-way because of the fact that this is in an Entrance Corridor location, which simply shows me the importance of Entrance Corridor designations.

Mr. Keller asked does anyone want to speak to the septic or are we satisfied with the septic under the asphalt because that is under a state review.

Ms. Riley said other than what Commissioner Spain suggested in terms of alternative methods to fenestration for visual interest and helping the pedestrian understand the scale of the building, that she thinks there is consensus on additional fenestration as a preferred method of dealing with this.

Mr. Bivins agreed and he wondered if there is a way to modify subsection b that would take into consideration Commissioner Spain's suggestion of consideration about being more creative in the proposed landscape solution. He said the sun exposure at the bump out would be an appropriate or optimal place to have the suggested trellising system and was not sure how to modify subsection b to include that kind of flexibility.

Mr. Keller suggested that staff might have thoughts on that.

Ms. Echols suggested perhaps to add between fenestration and/or architectural features you might say wall plantings so additional fenestration, wall plantings, or architectural features. She asked would that cover it.

Mr. Keller pointed out that he would like to see whether other commissioners support my proposal for real windows. He asked that to be in the list then and be the first that the ideal would be that the building would be true to itself, represent what was going on in the inside, which then would begin to answer that fenestration and respond to the Neighborhood Model because it would be true interest for people to see. However, he was comfortable with everything proposed thus far except for a mural and he would be happy to have a discussion with Ms. Spain at another time about murals. Mr. Keller said a mural would not work in this situation; but, thinks the proposal of vegetation on the building would. He noted there are maintenance issues that are another discussion just as there are with murals. Mr. Keller said but, that could be said for the plantings as well, and if Ms. Firehock were here she would be telling us about that.

Mr. Dotson said he could sympathize with the applicant wanting direction in what to do and he was not sure it helps him enough to say priority to additional fenestration perhaps in combination then with wall plantings and architectural features. He did not think we have the ability sitting here tonight since we don't know what happens on the inside of the building; we don't know to what extent – is it one window, five windows, and he did not see how we can resolve that tonight. However, he could see saying give priority to fenestration and then let the applicant in discussion with the staff come up with a plan to take to the Board.

Mr. Keller said he was comfortable with that and asked Ms. Echols to suggest how we would modify that one condition so that we could then make a motion with that included.

Ms. Echols asked Mr. Dotson if he was saying that priority be given to additional fenestration.

Mr. Dotson replied yes, it was priority to additional fenestration in combination with wall plantings and architectural features and so it was not one or any of the others but a priority in rather a pecking order.

Mr. Keller said parenthetically it would be nice if the fenestration would be functional if possible and then that would allow the option for the faux if necessary.

Mr. Dotson said he would guess he would take faux fenestration as an architectural feature.

Mr. Keller agreed.

Ms. Echols reiterated that it would say priority should be given to providing additional fenestration in a combination of wall plantings, architectural features and fenestration along this particular elevation.

Mr. Keller noted that all the Commissioners were nodding their heads and asked for a motion.

Ms. Riley moved to recommend approval of SP-2017-00016 Caliper Collision with the changes recommended by staff and conditions outlined in the staff report, as amended for condition b, subdivision b.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. There being none, the roll was called.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5:0 (More, Firehock absent).

Mr. Keller thanked the applicant and said this request for SP-2017-00016 Caliber Collision is moving forward to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval.

The meeting moved to the next item on the agenda.

SP-2017-00030 Willow River Veterinary Services
PROJECT: SP201700030
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville
TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 07700-00-00-04700
LOCATION: 32 Mill Creek Drive
PROPOSAL: Utilize up to 2,900 square feet within the Southside Shopping Center to operate a full service companion animal hospital. No outdoor activity is proposed.
PETITION: Permit a veterinary office and hospital under Section 25.2.2.5 of the Zoning Ordinance on a 5.99-acre parcel. No dwelling units proposed.
OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): Entrance Corridor (EC), Airport Impact Area (AIA), Steep Slopes (Managed)
ZONING: PD-SC Planned Development Shopping Center – shopping centers, retail sales and service uses; residential by special use permit (15 units/acre).
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Community Mixed Use – residential (up to 34 units/acre), community scale retail, service and office uses, places of worship, schools, public and institutional uses in Neighborhood 4 of the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan.

(JT Newberry)

Mr. Newberry summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. This is for an approximately 2,900 square foot veterinary office and hospital within the existing Southside Shopping Center down Avon Street Extended. Attachment C has the applicant's concept plan which focuses on this edge of the shopping center. Attachment C shows a different entry and exit points, one at the front and one at the rear of this space of the shopping center. The next slide shows the Comprehensive Plan for the area. He noted the shopping center is designated for Community Mixed Use, the residential area across the street, Mill Creek Village, is designated for Neighborhood Density Residential; adjacent on the other side is an institutional designation; the county owns parcel 48 immediately adjacent to the Food Lion and then Urban Density Residential is on the other side of Calvary Baptist Church.

The next slide shows the zoning map. Mr. Newberry noted an error in the staff report that the zoning for the shopping center is Planned Development-Shopping Center (PD-SC), the Calvary Baptist Church is zoned R-1 and the Mill Creek Village is zoned PUD. Part of the staff report analyzed the special exception requests, which talked about being within 200' of any residential lot line. He incorrectly associated that with the PUD across the street, Mill Creek Village, but it is actually Calvary Baptist Church. So the staff report notes that the entrance would be about 150' or so away from the nearest residential lot line, but it is actually closer to 50' with Calvary Baptist Church being zoned R-1. Mr. Newberry noted that does not change staff's analysis or recommendation on the special exception request but he did want to bring that to the Planning Commission's attention and that will be a part of staff's transmittal to the Board of Supervisors.

Staff found two favorable factors for this request.

1. This special use permit is in conformity with the Comprehensive Plan and relevant supplementary regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. This special use permit is for a small portion of a larger commercial retail center/shopping center and there are no adverse impacts expected on nearby or adjacent parcels.

Staff did not identify any unfavorable factors to this application.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends approval of the special exception request subject to the following condition:

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit information to the satisfaction of the County Engineer and the Zoning Administrator (or their designees) that demonstrate the sound attenuation qualities of the construction materials used in the renovation of the clinic can reasonably meet the fifty-five (55) decibel sound limit in Section 5.1.11(b).

Staff recommends approval of the special use permit request subject to the following conditions:

1. Development and use of the veterinary service shall be in general accord with the concept plan titled "Willow River Veterinary Services (Mill Creek)" and marked "received" on December 18, 2017, by the Department of Community Development. To be in general accord with this concept plan, the proposed use shall reflect the following major elements essential to the design of the site:
    - Location of more than one entrance and exit for animals visiting the clinic
    - No outdoor exercise areas or runs
2. The hours of operation for the clinic shall not begin earlier than 7:00 a.m. and shall not end later

than 8:00 p.m., each day, Monday through Saturday. There shall be no hours of operation on Sunday.

3. No overnight boarding use, other than for those animals under medical care shall take place at the veterinary clinic.

Mr. Newberry noted on the slide that he outlined some clarifications that are not present in the staff report and with help from the County Attorney's Office staff felt like this clarified some ambiguity that may be read into the existing conditions. He said we also added a third one just to make it clear that there is no request for overnight boarding in any commercial way. This exact condition has worked well with a previous veterinary clinic that allows some flexibility for animals that are under medical care that may need overnight boarding. The condition for the special exception relates to the construction materials that will be used to renovate the area within Southside Shopping Center. Mr. Newberry said he has been working closely with the applicant and they have been working with their contractors to use some new materials and different construction methods to make sure that they will be meeting this portion of the supplemental regulations. The next slide has staff's recommended actions. Staff recommends approval with the conditions of the special use permit request and the special exception. Therefore, with that he offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff. Hearing none, Mr. Keller opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward.

Brad DiCarlo, DVM, said he was going to be starting Willow River Veterinary Services and did not have anything further to present. He said he would entertain any questions or concerns.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Bivins said he was pleased to see the piece about overnights for dogs who have life-saving surgery because that was one piece he was very concerned about that what happens if you have a client whose animal is at this point and you could not send it home or to one of the emergency vets to overnight. So he is feeling a bit better about that.

Dr. DiCarlo said it certainly is important to clarify it because there are situations that arise where we are working with elderly and handicap and they are unable to arrange transport in the afternoon ambulance services are not available for our pets. Therefore, there are situations if we have to make contingencies if people cannot come by at close of business, then generally it is the vet who must attend. He said we would come back and check at the middle of the night several times to make sure if an animal is critical. We are also lucky that in the area we have two emergency hospitals that have arisen in the last eight years so we always try to have overnight situations observed by veterinarians and licensed medical practitioners. It is never the ideal situation to have them in the hospital, but to clarify that seemed important. He said we are also working with obtaining a lease that was agreeable with the lease agent, and that was important to them as well.

Mr. Keller invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited the applicant to come back up and invited any follow-up with the owner.

Ms. Spain said she was impressed with the green glue idea because she did not know that such a product existed and wondered if some of the apartment buildings around here should not be using this. She asked if this was a relatively a new product.

Dr. DiCarlo said that he would have to defer because he has been using Martin Horn as the architectural firm that has been helping with that. He said he was a small animal veterinary practitioner and so he certainly has a limited understanding of how to use materials. But, as far as he has been made aware there are specific architectural materials that are developed for sound encapsulation purposes and the idea between sound proofing in general is to create an air space but then also have baffling material such that you create sound traps so that things cannot escape into the environment. He said if you have a solid surface and sound hits one side it will be transmitted to the other and he believed that is where the green glue is involved. He said it is essentially a porous foam material, as he understands it.

Mr. Keller thanked Dr. DiCarlo.

Mr. Newberry pointed out their web site has some great videos if anyone wants to see the application-taking place and hear more.

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

Ms. Riley pointed out at the community meeting there were no real concerns expressed which was stated in the staff report and she thinks there was general enthusiasm for having a service of this type available.

Mr. Keller invited questions. Hearing none, Mr. Keller asked if there was a motion.

Ms. Riley moved to recommend approval of SP-2017-00030 Willow River Veterinary Services Mill Creek and the associated special exceptions subject to the conditions recommended by staff.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5:0. (More, Firehock absent).

Mr. Keller said SP-2017-00030 Willow River Veterinary Services Mill Creek would move forward to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation for approval for a final decision.

The meeting moved to the next item on the agenda.

SP-2017-00028 Woodard Dock
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rio
TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 04500-00-00-01000
LOCATION: 1775 Earlysville Road
PROPOSAL: Floating boat dock
PETITION: Water related uses such as boat docks and canoe liveries under section 30.3.11 of the Zoning Ordinance on a 9.49-acre parcel. No new dwelling units proposed.
ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots). FH Flood Hazard – Overlay to provide safety and protection from flooding. Water related uses such as boat docks and canoe liveries (30.3.11).

OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): Entrance Corridor, Flood Hazard Overlay District
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)
(David Benish)

Mr. Benish summarized the staff report in a PowerPoint presentation. This is a proposal to construct a low profile floating dock on the South Fork Rivanna River Reservoir that is about 168 square feet in size. He pointed out the proposed design as attached to the staff report has been approved by the manager of the reservoir, the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority and there also was no objection from the city who own the reservoir. This site is located across the street from the Ivy Creek Natural Area along Earlysville Road near the Twin Bridges at Earlysville Road and Woodlands Road just to the east. He pointed out the city boundary and the approximate location for the dock and noted the old roadbed would be the access down through the site. He said the dock does meet the standards for the Service Authority for installation; it is a floating dock and there is no earth disturbance required other than several 6' X 6' posts to anchor it to the shore line and otherwise it is floating in the reservoir. He pointed out no stairs or decking are proposed. As in the applicant's description, there is an old roadbed, driveway that is serving as access from the house down to the dock so no clearing is necessary to get access.

Mr. Benish said the findings from staff is that there is no direct impact to the water supply or neighboring properties, no impact to floodplain levels, and again it has met the standards of the city and the Service Authority for construction. He noted staff found no unfavorable factors. Staff provided three standard recommendations in the staff report that limits lighting, the removal of materials other than dead and dying materials, and identifies the plan for the dock as the design to be installed at this location. He said staff recommends approval with some suggested motions and would be happy to answer questions.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Mr. Dotson asked if the condition about no lighting within 25' of the reservoir is something we have used in all the other actions.

Mr. Benish replied yes, we have used these standard conditions in previous approvals including the dock just up the river and the lighting is just a general limitation for excessive lighting on the dock.

Ms. Spain asked would the dock be visible from the Earlysville Road Bridge.

Mr. Benish replied yes, more than likely since with the speeds on the roads you probably could see it during this time of the year. He noted coming north and south you might be able to see it through the abutments since it 22 feet in length and it is right on the level of the river.

Ms. Spain asked if there is a guideline about what colors it could not be and if it is going to be a natural wood color.

Mr. Benish replied that he thinks the applicant would prefer natural wood; however, the applicant could actually speak to this because there are certain types of wood that have to be used that will affect its coloring. He noted that it would certainly age and weather over time and he thinks they discourage painting.

Ms. Spain said so there would be no lime green; and Mr. Benish replied no.

Mr. Keller asked if the dock would be a floating dock that adjusts to the water level.

Mr. Benish replied yes, the only thing anchored would be right along the shoreline. He noted as shown in the picture they have identified two 6' X 6' posts, however, there might be posts underneath but that is the only place where there is connection to the ground. He said otherwise, it is floating on the water.

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

Keith Woodard said his wife Patricia is here tonight and this dock is part of my retirement plan. He explained that he has retired and moved back to Charlottesville after a number of years away and building our home on this property. He said the dock would be at the end of the old road that used to come down to Hydraulic Road when it was down where the reservoir is. He said we would not be using any lime or pink colors. He said there would not be any grass since that is one thing he has sworn off since he loves leaves and the wooded area. He noted there would be no lighting or electrical on the dock itself and it will be in the dark as we do now when we go out on the reservoir. He said it is low profile and he has a son that has a single scull boat and he plans when he finishes the house taking up some rowing himself to stay in shape. He said this request is for our family that includes our youngest son who has moved back to help build a house and live here to carry on his business, my older son who teaches at one of the local schools, and wife who works with foster care folks in Charlottesville. Mr. Woodward said that this is our dream to have our granddaughters and sons all on the property.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Bivins asked if he could describe on his deck plan what treated pine wood frame and composite deck would be.

Mr. Woodard replied that a composite is like a Trex deck that comes in many shapes and colors, but he wants a deck that will hold up. He noted it would be low profile because with a schull you want it down within a few inches of the water.

Mr. Keller invited public comment. Hearing none, he invited further questions for the applicant. There being none, Mr. Keller closed the public hearing to bring it back for discussion and action.

Mr. Dotson moved to recommend approval of SP-2017-00028 Woodard Dock subject to the conditions as recommended by staff.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

The motion was approved by a vote of 5:0. (Firehock, More absent).

Mr. Keller said this request would move on to the Board of Supervisors.

The meeting moved to the next item.

Committee Reports

Mr. Keller invited committee reports.

Daphne Spain reported:
- Places29 North CAC met on February 8 and served as a community meeting for the Hollymead Town Center proposal to expand the amount of commercial space in the Hollymead Town Center.

Julian Bivins reported:
- Meeting on March 8 at 6 p.m. at Charlottesville High School to discuss the Hydraulic/Rt. 29/US 250 potential intersection being discussed by Places29.
- Places29 Hydraulic CAC met and comment was heard on the Roslyn Farm special events permit.

Tim Keller reported:
- Rivanna River Corridor Planning Steering Committee met and reviewed plans for the river involving Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) and discussed tie-ins with the Pantops Master Plan Update.

Pam Riley reported:
- Fifth and Avon Street CAC met on February 15 and received staff reports on the Avon Street Corridor Study and the Cale Cross Walk. The next meeting is on March 15 from 6 to 8 pm at Southwood and Habitat will be presenting their application for phase 1 of their rezoning.
- Village of Rivanna met on February 12 and received an update on phase 1 of Rivanna Village from Tim Culpeper who is from Robertson Development.
- CTACH – Unable to attend January 17 meeting where transit rider report discussed – next meeting March 21. An invitation extended to a joint work session tomorrow night with City PC and CAT along with City appointed boards and commissions at 5:30 p.m. at the Carver Rec Center and will be focusing on transit ridership.

Bruce Dotson reported:
- School Division Long Range Planning Advisory Committee met last week and meeting on a two-week schedule. There was a very quick report on the strategy that the School Board has taken in terms of addressing high school expansions which is a centered based approach.

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Dotson if he would like to speak to the Board of Supervisors meeting tomorrow and the report from the committee that we were on and you sent an email to Bill Fritz.

Mr. Dotson replied yes, he forwarded from Bill Fritz an email to each of the Commissioners with the recommendation and the fact as Chair Keller indicates that item will be reported to the Board of Supervisors tomorrow.

The meeting moved to the next item.

Old Business

Mr. Keller invited old business. Hearing none, the meeting moved to new business.

New Business

Mr. Keller invited new business.

Mr. Gast-Bray pointed out an old/new business item, the tentative schedule most recent update.

Mr. Keller pointed out that first monthly meeting was held with the chairs and co-chairs of the Supervisors and Planning Commission and another one with the Planning Director. He asked Andrew to hit three or four points of the items that will be coming to us, the more global type and not the individual projects over the rest of this calendar year.

Mr. Gast-Bray said we are looking to follow up with the school, for instance, on the report that the school of the future the Planning Commission was interested in and trying to get that arranged to have presented to the Commission. He said that apart from the traditional business of the updates for the Planning Commission, we would be looking at the updates of the master plans as they are coming forward. Obviously, Rio 29 is continuing to move forward, Pantops, and Avon Street will probably be coming forward to you in some form or update during the course of the year. There is also affordable housing, transportation and green infrastructure and of course, the ZTA's although they are more detailed and he did not know which ones are going to be coming through at any specific time.

Mr. Keller invited questions.

Mr. Bivins said at our joint session with the Supervisors and the School Board Supervisor Daphne asked whether there was an inventory of land that could possibly be considered for work force housing that was owned by the county. It was interesting to notice at the special use permit for the veterinary that the county owns the piece of property that is right next door to that, which is right next door to Monticello High School, which is right down the street from Cale, and right around the corner from Walton. He asked how one would get the inventory of land so we could actually talk about it.

Mr. Gast-Bray explained that at this point he does not have anything to report on that, however, there is a list that could possibly be created.

Mr. Benish noted there had been a couple of inventories that have been done either internally or externally for the Board because when the great depression hit we did an inventory of land to determine which ones might be saleable. He said that staff would look back and see if there is something available that does not take a lot of new work.

There being no further new business, the meeting moved to items for follow-up.

Item for follow-up.

Follow-up on the addition of an Entrance Corridor
(Andrew Gast-Bray/David Benish)

Mr. Gast-Bray said at the last Commission meeting Commissioner Dotson suggested the addition of an Entrance Corridor from its current end on Rio Road from the railroad track until it turns at McIntire and inquired as to what the possibility is to have that section of Rio Road introduced as an Entrance Corridor. He said that was supported by the Planning Commission and so staff has a brief follow-up on that request.

Mr. Benish said Margaret Maliszewski, ARB Planner, was not able to be here. He said in looking at your proposal that if the request is to extend the Entrance Corridor from the railroad on Rio Road to the railroad at the city limits that from a practical standpoint the properties that are impacted or that might benefit are about five properties. He pointed out that two of those properties are the City Church and Covenant Church and both are developed. He said right now the City Church is under review for them to tear it down and rebuild as a larger church. He said there is CATECH, which is in two parcels, is an older building and might be subject to some redevelopment in the future. He said the biggest property that is a greenfield site subject to development is the Wetzel, which is zoned R-4, and known as two sites with the main house on a separate parcel and the larger tract of about 26 acres. He noted there was about a 2-acre parcel on the corner of Belvedere and Rio Road, and it too is zoned R-4, and we have a development proposal under review for that for either townhouse or single-family and it has not been approved yet. He said around the bend are the Dunloras and so those properties are nearly developed or approved and some of those are single-family attached which are not subject to EC Corridor requirements. So the observation past Wetzel is most of the property is city owned part of the linear park and then you get to Charlottesville High School (CHS) and the football and softball field are located in the county but are the CHS fields, and then you get to the city limits. He said most of the area that would benefit from that review is in this area and most of those properties recently have been developed or subject to reviews that are underway right now. Certainly, they would be a long term benefit if those properties redevelop, CATECH, whatever happens to that in the future and someday the churches would develop and the ARB review would benefit those new buildings, but you have a lot of new development and residential.

Mr. Benish said in the short term what we see as the benefit is primarily to the Wetzel property and long term it is to those five properties that he just went through. He said it is unclear how quickly we could get through the EC review to extend Rio Road, it is a new request so we would have to prioritize that, get input from the Board and so there is an unknown timeline. He pointed out that anything that requires a site plan is subject to ARB review but single-family detached development typically does not so it is not subject to it and conceivable the Wetzel property could come in as single-family detached and it is more likely that it will be subject to a rezoning to maximum the density on the property. The property is zoned R-4 and you can use density bonus to get up to R-6, six units per acre and so there is some by right potential without going through a rezoning. He said the last point is if Wetzel comes in, as a rezone property there was a question about whether we could address aesthetics under a legislative act or a rezoning since it is not likely that we could review and approve or deny based on aesthetic or architectural review. He said there is a limited ability in a rezoning request to address that issue. He said we can probably address form in density but little architectural or aesthetics that the ARB addresses we probably could not address in a rezoning. He said we might be able to address it a little bit more if there was a special use permit for some reason associated. Mr. Benish said staff does not know what the timeframe is to be able to get to this would be.

Mr. Dotson said this was anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 5, Strategy 8f specifically calls out extending the Entrance Corridor. It calls out extending some other but he is not familiar with those others to know if they are under equivalent possible development pressure as this but he does know that this is. He said it is in the Comprehensive Plan, development interest and activity are at a buzz right now, and tonight we have seen how important it is to have an Entrance Corridor designation. He suggest that we proceed to adopt a resolution of intent and after discussion, he has a couple of comments to make about a draft resolution that he thinks the county attorney has for us.

Mr. Keller invited discussion. He said that he thought the Commission had discussed this quite

thoroughly before that lead to this point and was supportive.

Ms. Riley agreed with that but also was mindful that there were other extensions of Entrance Corridors that were recommended for study as well and thinks if staff knew what they were we could at least hear what they were.

Mr. Benish noted that he not recall which other ones and did not know which priority was going to put on whether to bring the ones that we have to rescind back in as a priority over adding new areas.

Mr. Blair said Chair Keller and Ms. Riley had asked about the other roads and in the Comprehensive Plan Strategy 8f mentions John Warner Parkway, Route 614 (Sugar Hollow Road), Route 692/712 (Plank Road and Route 810 (Browns Gap Turnpike) as possible additions to the Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Dotson said he thought the John Warner was unique amongst those in carrying roughly 20,000 vehicles per day.

Mr. Keller asked if there was a motion.

Mr. Dotson moved that the Planning Commission forward the Resolution of Intent to the Board of Supervisors with the two modifications that in the second whereas referred to Chapter 5 Strategy 8f add phrase, "to ensure that the visual integrity of this road is not diminished" and add an additional, "whereas development interest and activity in the corridor makes this consideration timely."

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0. (More, Firehock absent).

Mr. Keller said the resolution of intent would move on to the Board of Supervisors.

The meeting moved to adjournment.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:42 p.m. to the next meeting on March 20, 2018 meeting at 7:00 p.m. at the COB-McIntire, Auditorium, Second Floor, 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: 7-17-2018
Initials: sct