**Albemarle County Planning Commission**
**August 14, 2018**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, August 14, 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, Jennie More, Daphne Spain, Karen Firehock, and Bruce Dotson. Luis Carrazana, UVA representative and Pam Riley, Vice-Chair were absent.

Other officials present were Dan Mahon, Parks and Recreation; Andy Reitelbach, Senior Planner; Cameron Langille, Senior Planner; Elaine Echols, Chief of Community Development; Bill Fritz, Manager of Special Projects; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission and Andy Herrick, Assistant 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, the meeting would move to the next item.

**Consent Agenda**

**Approval of** Minutes: May 1, 2018 and June 19, 2018

Mr. Keller asked if any Commissioner wanted to pull an item off the consent agenda for discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Dotson moved for approval of the consent agenda for the approval of the minutes for May 1, 2018 and June 19, 2018 and Ms. More seconded the motion.

The motion was passed by a vote of 6:0 (Riley absent).

The meeting moved to the next item.

**Regular Item**.

**CCP-2018-00002 Rio Mills Landing and Trailhead Park**
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rio
TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 045000000066B0
LOCATION: 20.4-acre parcel approximately 300 feet to the east of the intersection between Millers Cottage Lane and Rio Mills Road (Rt. 643). The parcel is bordered by Seminole Trail (Rt. 29) to the east, Rio Mills Road to the north, and bisected by Berkmar Drive.

PROPOSAL: County use of the parcel to establish a public park that will provide public access to the South Fork Rivanna River that will include a recreation area, walking trails, a boat launch, access to a trailhead and parking spaces.
ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots) and other uses including public uses.
ENTRANCE CORRIDOR (EC): Yes
OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): AIA - Airport Impact Area; FH - Flood Hazard Overlay District
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Area 1 – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources; and residential (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots).
(Cameron Langille)

Cameron Langille, Senior Planner, said that he had been managing the review of this Comprehensive Plan Compliance application CP-2018-00002 for the Rio Mills Boat Landing and Trailhead Park. The purpose of the review of this application is to establish that a proposed new public park that is located on a parcel in the Rural Areas of the county will be consistent with the goals and objectives of our Comprehensive Plan.

**PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW**

A Compliance with the Comprehensive Plan Review ("CCP Review" or "2232 Review," in reference to the Code of Virginia statute which necessitates this type of local review process), considers whether the general location, character, and extent of a proposed public facility are in substantial accord with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. It is reviewed by the Planning Commission, and the Commission's findings are forwarded to the Board of Supervisors for their information. No additional action is required of the Board. The Commission's action is only related to the appropriateness of the site for the proposed public use and is not an action or recommendation on whether the facility should be funded and/or constructed.

For this specific proposal the applicant is the Albemarle County Department of Parks & Recreation. In October 2017 the property owners of a parcel that is identified as tax map 45-66B approached staff with the Department of Parks and Recreation seeking to donate a 20.4-acre piece of land to the county in order to establish a new park along the South Fork of the Rivanna River. The Department of Parks and Recreation hired a consultant to conduct a site assessment study to determine the feasibility of creating a park on this specific property and their report concluded that it was feasible and that a new park with walking trails, a boat launch at the foot of the river and a public parking lot could be created there.

The property is in the Rural Areas of the county and it is located just to the west of Route 29 and it is bordered by Rio Mills Road to the north and has about 1,500 linear feet of property frontage along the South Fork Rivanna River. The outline of the property shown in purple on the screens is what we are looking at and you will notice that Berkmar Drive bisects the property into two separate pieces. Just for information the park is proposed to go on both sections of the property even if split by the roadway there. The land goes underneath the Berkmar Bridge and there is an opportunity to put some trails underneath there. This property is zoned RA, Rural Areas and is located within the Airport Impact Area Overlay, the Flood Hazard Overlay and the Entrance Corridor Overlay District. There are no structures on the property right now and it is covered mostly by dense vegetation. The properties to the northeast and west are undeveloped and located in the Rural Areas. The properties to the south across the river are in the Development Areas, specifically Neighborhood I of Places 29.

Mr. Langille noted this is the concept drawing that was included with the feasibility report that is in the packet of information that you received. Basically, this shows the property and all the features that are called out in those labels will be things provided within the park. A civil engineer has not been hired to a full actually site layout of this property and he mentioned earlier it does have the Flood Hazard Overlay District, which is the 100-year floodplain and there are also some areas of wetlands and so it has not bee hashed out yet exactly where everything will go because we need to abide by all of the regulations that pertain to the kind of development that can occur there but nevertheless this shows the general locations of walking trails, calls out fishing along the river bank and there will be a bike and pedestrian trailhead with a public parking lot with actual vehicle parking spaces. He said at the river will be a little boat launch that you can launch kayaks, canoes or other small water crafts.

Mr. Langille said the full staff analysis of this is in the staff report on pages 4 and 5. Staff is recommending approval of this CCP application. The proposal meets several objectives contained in chapter 11 of the Comprehensive Plan dealing with the Parks and Recreation, Greenways, Blueways and Green Systems. Staff has identified factors which are favorable to this proposal and feel strongly that this is consistent with our Comprehensive Plan:

**Factors Favorable:**

1. The proposed use would create new a new public park and provide active recreational amenities.
2. The proposed use would provide access points to greenways and blueways and help complete the greenway trail system.
3. The proposed park will improve the public health, safety, and welfare by providing a safe means of access to the river and will alleviate issues with trespassing.
4. The proposed use at this subject property does not appear to be contradictory with the Comprehensive Plan, and would support and advance goals, objectives, strategies, and other policies contained in the Plan.

Mr. Langille said that under objective 3 there is a specific strategy about increasing public awareness and providing educational opportunities along greenways and blue ways in the county. This specific property does have two known historical resources on it and they were mentioned briefly in the site feasibility report, but this map is from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and it shows the general locations of where those two items are. He pointed out the Native American lithic scatter; some pottery artifacts and things like and in the blue/green area is a site of an historic boat channel and lock – it has not been fully surveyed to identify exactly where that feature was on this property, but it is known to have existed going and looking at some historical maps. He said with this park there are two conditions that staff is recommending on the approval related to installation of signage along the walking trails near these features and we think that will really help accomplish that strategy in Objective 3 of the Comprehensive Plan related to providing educational opportunities within the park.

**Recommendation**: Staff recommends that the Commission find the location, character, and extent of the Rio Mills Boat Landing and Trailhead Park proposed public facility and public use to be in substantial accord with the County's Comprehensive Plan with conditions for the reasons identified as favorable factors in the staff report, as following.

1. During the site plan review process, a property survey shall be conducted by a licensed surveyor that identifies all existing historical artifacts and archaeological sites on the property. No grading activities may occur in areas featuring historical

artifacts or archaeological sites identified on the survey. No historical artifacts may be removed from the property during installation of the park improvements.

2. Educational signage shall be installed near all historical artifacts and archaeological sites located within the property in compliance with the Albemarle County Historic Preservation Committee requirements.

Mr. Langille said he would take any questions from the Commission.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Ms. Spain questioned on the drawing the boat launch side view shows steps going down and does that need to be ADA accessory or acceptable stairs.

Mr. Langille replied that Dan Mahon from Parks and Recreation was here to answer questions and that Building Inspections and Zoning are looking at the requirements for getting down to the boat launch form the parking lot.

Ms. Firehock asked is 100 percent of the site in the 100-year flood floodplain, and Mr. Langille replied yes, 100 percent of the site is in the 100-year floodplain and the purple color on the map is the regulatory floodway which is the part of the 100-year floodplain that is the most intense and the county zoning ordinance has some provisions that can allow for some public uses within the 100-year floodplain without having to do the special use permit process. Mr. Langille said this is another item that zoning staff is investigating at the moment and we don't think that parking areas, for example, could go within that regulatory floodway. He said as we get further along with the actual site design that is something the civil engineers will need to account for when they are choosing the location of the parking area.

Ms. Firehock noted that generally you should not put bio-swales in the 100-year floodplain because when you have a flood it drops the finest materials into the bio-swale thereby clogging it and you end up having to dig the whole thing out. She said in other words it ceases performance so would not recommend that as a method to reduce stormwater management in the 100-year floodway; but, that is a technical consideration that can be solved.

Mr. Langille noted that the parking outlined was a concept plan and he did not think the intention was to have that area entirely covered by parking.

Ms. Firehock said we talked about archaeological resources and was interested to know how we would be protecting it from disturbance and not be encouraging collectors to come and dig up things.

Mr. Keller invited Dan Mahon to address the Commission.

Dan Mahon, a Greenway/Blueway Planner with Albemarle County Parks and Recreation, said what you saw in the site plan and study that both the cost estimate and the structures that you saw we actually hired a consultant to put all of that together to have a rough idea of what we had with that site to create a campaign for a crowd funding project. He said we wanted to have a good sense of what the full build-out might be but it was done for the purpose of having something visual to set out there to sort of crowd funding campaign that we have never done for any of our park facilities before. He said there a lot of things in the plan that are not going to be there and other things that can be adapted – for instance, the parking as it is shown in the

floodway we can still satisfy that same amount of parking elsewhere. He said the historic resources is something that all our riparian parks and riparian greenways – this is an issue of concern all the way down the river. He said as you suggested we don't point to sites and we would not want to map the sites for people to see. He said we have been looking at putting kiosk up and some of the designs have been started regarding mapping out the cultural heritage in that area.

Mr. Mahon said that handicap access is required to be put in, but the challenge is the level of impact that will happen with putting wheelchair accessible facilities in. He said the difference in elevation from the top of the bank to the surface of the water is pretty high and it would mean really laying back to get a good grade in there pretty dramatic unless we do a switch back. He said there are a lot of creative design solutions for accomplishing that and something that we will pay attention. He said other than the launch site the site is really level and would imagine we could have a really nice accessible trail system built through there.

Mr. Mahone said the design you see shows a lot of amenities – again, we were trying to show the high end of what we would do there. He said the trail development and what amenities go in there will be much less – the idea is to have a walking trail, there are a lot of wetlands and maybe a board walk – but the idea is to bring people to learn about these places but not compromise them. He said that bank fishing will be a big part of this so having a trail along the river that is also accessible will be an important part.

Mr. Keller thanked Mr. Mahon and invited public comment. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing to bring the matter before the Planning Commission for action.

Mr. Keller thanked Mr. Mahon.

Mr. Bivins noted concern with the previous dumping done on the road and hoped there would be conversation about that and road access. He said my piece is around access so how do we get to these various lovely places and he was going to pause that for a second because he thinks there is a conversation that will take place about Biscuit Run later this month. He said there has been in Crozet a conversation about the park land that is on the books but has not been actually funded he did not believe and that has been a piece that is there. He said there has been a number of discussions even among us about as we look at some of the development that has taken place in the county that sometimes we are a bit cautious in the way we create green spaces that people can actually get to. He said as we start thinking about what that 29 Corridor looks like some of you sit on transportation committees that we are also thinking about is there another way to get there that does not require me getting in a car – can a young person get the bus pass which are available in the summer and actually get to these parks via buses. He said that is on on-going issue that he wants to bring to us and then there is the piece about whether or not existing parks are being forgotten and so there is a park that is near Albemarle High School called the Charlotte Humphries Park that has a large population around it but actually you might feel a little nervous walking into the woods because it looks like it is not accessible to people. He said while we are building out this inventory of preserved spaces he hopes that we can actually put before our Supervisors that money needs to be set aside so that they are useful and able to be used.

Mr. Dotson said those were useful comments and in regard to CCP-2018-00002 Rio Mills Boat Landing and Trailhead Park he moved that the Planning Commission find the location, character and extent of this public facility and public use thereof as proposed to be in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan with the conditions as outlined in the staff report.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion was approved by a vote of 6:0 (Riley absent).

Mr. Keller thanked the staff who presented the request.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

**Public Hearing Item.**

**SP-2018-00006 Little Explorers Discovery School (Crozet Baptist Church)**
MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: White Hall
TAX MAP/PARCEL: 056A1-01-00-08200
LOCATION: 5804 St. George Avenue
PROPOSAL: Preschool/After School program for up to 40 students
PETITION: Request for day care, childcare or nursery facility in accordance with Section 14.2.2.7 of the Zoning Ordinance on 2.25 acres. No residential use is proposed.
ZONING: R2 Residential which allows 2 dwelling units/acre and institutional and public uses.
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Neighborhood Density Residential which allows 3-6 units /acre; supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools and other small-scale non-residential uses in the Community of Crozet.
(Elaine Echols)

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

- This is a special use permit for a preschool and childcare facility with a preschool and afterschool program that is located at 5804 St. George Avenue in Crozet at the Crozet Baptist Church. The property is zoned R-2, Residential and that allows childcare facilities by special use permit. The Crozet Master Plan recommends this area for Neighborhood Density Residential, which also includes places of worship and childcare facilities.
- The preschool is proposed for a 40 children maximum enrollment with not more than 25 at any given time there. The hours of operation are 7:30 to 5 p.m. and you will notice in the recommended conditions we moved that to 5:30 p.m. just to give a little more room for working parents who need to pick their children up. The building at the rear and the side of the church is for indoor instruction and in the back yard is intended for outdoor play.
- This is in an existing neighborhood that is mostly residential. These are some photographs, they do not really include some sidewalks that exist on the south side of St. George Avenue, and she would show them one of those in just a minute. It is an interesting neighborhood the lots are fairly deep and the houses are setback fairly deeply. There are varieties of uses along here mostly residential, but a funeral home and another church is further up the street towards the west. The residents who came to the community meeting talked to us about some speeding problems that exist and there were signs they have put out to try to encourage people who drive on this road not to speed but to drive like your kids live here.
- There are some sidewalks on the south side of the road from Crozet Avenue up to the church. This sidewalk is across the street from the church into the parking lot. This neighborhood is also at the exterior of the Crozet Historic District, which is a National

Register Historic District and some of the people who have been in touch with you have noted the location in the Historic District.

- The back-yard play area is one of those places where we have had people question what is going on and how it is going on. Therefore, she went out and took some photographs. If you were looking from the church to the back yard she pointed out in the photo that this is what you would see - a picnic table and a dense screen. This is a side view of that same screen. There is a place that is near the western property line she believes you have heard from the adjoining property owner about that playset. There have been some concerns expressed by neighbors at the community meeting and she believes you have received some emails. Staff included some of the letters in our packets. The major concerns are that there is an addition of a business to a residential neighborhood; the use is going to increase traffic on a neighborhood street where there are already some speeding problems; noise from outdoor play; loss of privacy for this particular property owner and the property owner to the back is going to lose some enjoyment of their property.
- There is a large Oak tree that sits right on the property line. This is the fencing area establishing that playground equipment shown in a previous picture and the distance is maybe ten feet. Staff has heard comments from other residents in Crozet and not all the comments have been negative. There were people at the community meeting who expressed the importance for providing more childcare opportunities in Crozet. Other ones said that while it feels like this might be intrusive to the neighborhood in fact there are many churches that have pre-schools and childcare programs where you really do not even notice that they are there. Staff heard from other people asking why the operation could not be Monday through Friday instead of Tuesday through Friday. The applicant has talked to us about the possibility of making this a Monday through Friday for the afterschool program. At the community meeting the church expressed their desire to not have the pre-school open on Monday; they have their own program on Monday morning and so they were not making that available to the applicant. However, an afterschool program is being discussed.
- Regarding traffic, there is an interesting thing with the traffic counts on this road at this location. In 2000, there were 720 vehicle trips per day that were recorded in 2012, lower than that at 560 vehicle trips per day, speculation maybe there has been a change in activity related to the church, maybe in the funeral home or any number of things could be the reason for this – we don't know. There would be approximately three vehicular round trips during the peak hours 7 to 9 a.m.; they are proposed to be staggered and that is something the applicant offered at the very beginning. However, in reality that is how drop off occurs for early morning care. Not all parents who are dropping their children off work; not all children are staying for the whole day and sometimes there are just programs there that people want to take their children to; sometimes children don't show up so it is not something that is just everybody arrives at the same time.
- The question about the speeding is something that one of the neighbors in particular has been in touch with our transportation planner about and he has committed to work with the neighborhood on finding ways to reduce the speeding and make for a safer situation for the street itself.
- With regards to noise, the applicant indicated at the community meeting that there would only be one class on the playground at a time so it would not be as all 25 children would be outside playing on the playground at the same time so the noise should not be overwhelming. In addition, the full use of the backyard is proposed not just that area around the playset.
- The privacy and keeping children on site - the church is proposing a privacy fence and in conversations, they said the church had wanted to put up a privacy fence for a long time.

The neighbor next door is not too keen on a privacy fence; they want the church to move the playset. Staff was looking at the privacy aspect anticipating that the church would be putting up a fence and wanted them to consult the neighbors on height and materials before putting something up in hopes that between neighbors they could figure something out that would work well. Ms. Echols said she did not know if they can but we were trying to step back and talk about how the impacts might be mitigated.

- In terms of neighborhood character, there are some concerns by neighbors that the character of the neighborhood will be changed because of this use. Ms. Echols noted that many religious institutions operate preschools and there are already existing businesses in the neighborhood. She said whether there is going to be a change is a judgement call and the Commission along with the Board of Supervisors would be deciding whether the level of change being proposed is such that it would result in a change in character of this particular neighborhood.

**SUMMARY:**

Staff has identified factors which are favorable and unfavorable to this proposal:

**Factors favorable to this request include:**

1. The proposed use is consistent with the Crozet Master Plan in terms of land use.
2. The proposed use is located within the Development Areas and will help support new residential development in Crozet where is need for young working parents to have more opportunities for preschools and daycares.

**Factors unfavorable to this request include:**

1. The use will generate additional vehicular trips on St. George Avenue; however, a staggered drop off period will be used to better distribute traffic and reduce impacts with public school traffic.
2. Outdoor play by children will generate noise; however, the addition of a privacy fence and enlarged play area in the back yard of the church will help to attenuate impacts from the noise and a screen for the activity that might take place.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Based on the findings described in this staff report and factors identified as favorable, staff recommends approval of SP-2018-0006 Little Explorers Discovery School, with the conditions as outlined in the staff report.

Ms. Echols said if you have any questions, she would try to answer them.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff.

Mr. Dotson said you had a slide that showed the proximity of the play area to the property line and asked Ms. Echols to put that up again, so we can see exactly where it is located and if staff had said that the play area was as close as 10 feet.

Ms. Echols pointed out the property line and that the corner is about 10’ to the property line and the equipment is a little bit further. She said from a standpoint of the visibility of the use that the church wants to put a fence around the play area regardless of what happens because they want the children to be in this area and not outside of the play area if they are going to be playing on the equipment. She said there are members of the church who can speak to that but this is the proximity.

Mr. Dotson asked if the Oak tree is on the property line and if the playhouse was on the church property or on the abutting residential.

Ms. Echols responded that she did not know the answer to that question but was sure the church members can tell us.

Mr. Keller invited other questions. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward and present and then the public will speak, and Ms. Firehock will run that portion.

Christie Gillette, Director and future owner of Little Explorers Discovery School, said over the past two months or since we had our community meeting, we have had a lot of correspondence with the neighbors regarding their concerns. Ms. Gillette said she wanted to start by reiterating how much we really understand that and just in considering if she were to be a community member living in that neighborhood the idea of 40 cars backed up on my street, people speeding and 25 children outside screaming and running around chaotically also would scare me. Ms. Gillette said so we understand that and wants to explain how that is definitely not the image that we are going for with the school. Ms. Gillette said as Elaine said there are very limited options in Crozet and even more limited options for working families in terms of preschool and especially afterschool programs. She said the school would serve children 2 to 5 years old for the preschool program and 5 to 10 years old for the afterschool program. She said if approved we will use the children's wing and that is already set up with five classrooms already equipped to accommodate 20 or more children than our 40 allowable in our maximum enrollment. She said our goal is to blend in with the community by working together to limit those negative impacts and add positive and enriching educational opportunities for local families in Crozet and the surrounding area.

Ms. Gillette pointed out that her presentation lays out how we will address the traffic and the noise, and so that 40 students being our absolute maximum, which includes all the children all day long including the afterschool children. She said at 7:30 a.m. we are estimating that 5 to 10 children show up, and then 8:30 a.m. would be our regular drop off time for preschool and we are estimating 10 to 15 children at that point. She said that is when our learning day begins so that is when we would have structured routine rotating children outside in small groups of an estimate of 6 to 10 children between 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. She said 11:30 a.m. would be lunchtime so we would head back inside. She said at 12:00 p.m. 10 to 15 children would be dismissed, which would be our one-half day preschool children. She said between 11:30 a.m. and 2:30 p.m. the children are not outside at all. She said that 5 to 10 children would remain after the one-half day children are dismissed.

Ms. Gillette said at 11:30 a.m. the children come in for lunch, story time, quiet time and nap time and so there is a good chunk of the middle of the day where there is no noise whatsoever outside. She said at 2:30 p.m. the afterschool children would arrive with one trip on the road by bus. She said those children come and we have a maximum of 25 children but we are anticipating that outside there is only 8 to 10 children with the way we would rotate outside. She said at 3:00 p.m. the preschool ends for the day and so any children that are not staying for aftercare that the rest of the preschool children would be dismissed at 3:00 p.m. She said at 5:30 p.m. afterschool care and aftercare for the preschool concludes so all of the children would be gone. However, that would be between 2:30 p.m. when the afterschool children get there and 5:30 p.m. because parents are going to come when they get off work.

Ms. Gillette said in conclusion the maximum possible number of cars on the road would have to be at that 8:30 a.m. time and that would be 22 cars because 3 of the teachers already have children and that could end up being more as we hire more teachers. She said at 8:30 a.m. if no children are enrolled in before care nobody has siblings and nobody is carpooling there would be 22 cars on the road assuming we have maximized enrollment. She said to further address traffic, in addition to those staggered times the drop off, pick up line would be utilized, and you can see in the picture they can do a nice loop there and keep traffic moving. She pointed out the church's main parking lot area, which is the greatest distance from any of the surrounding neighbors. She said additionally we plan to provide parents with information upon enrollment just, so they are aware of the character of the St. George Avenue neighborhood and the speed limit with all of that information and if it becomes an issue as needed thereafter.

Ms. Gillette said to address the outside noise and the safety, again the children would be in smaller groups and the fence would be constructed with the privacy fence around the north and west boundary lines. She said the church has already taken steps to work with the neighbors on the details of this fence to ensure privacy and safety. She said to point out our curriculum it encourages the curiosity of nature and learning in the outdoors, so the teachers create that sense of learning and discovery versus just letting them go free and run chaotically that will facilitate a lot of our outdoor time. She said so hopefully that would also keep the noise down and keep the character of the neighborhood preserved. She said qualified trained staff will closely monitor children and the goal is to keep ratios under the legal limits as well so that will help with the noise and the safety.

Ms. Gillette said finally so our maximum number of 40 and she chose the number of 40 thinking she did not want to grow above 40 but if we are successful and actually get to that number 40 she would prefer to move to my own location and that is in number of years. Ms. Gillette said she would prefer to do that before maximizing that enrollment number. Ms. Gillette said the most important point is she has been a teacher for 7 years and had a degree in Special Education so was qualified to teach and business is a new endeavor for me so she did not want to start with 40 children and would like to start small. She said in conclusion 7 to 10 children playing and learning and 10 to 15 cars at one time looks a whole lot different from 25 screaming out of control children and a traffic jam of 40 cars and we prefer the former option.

Mr. Keller said we would hold the questions until after the public comment.

Ms. Firehock invited public comment.

David Collier, Pastor of Crozet Baptist Church, said he wanted to thank the Commissioners for considering this request and allowing me to speak today. He said that for over 100 years Crozet Baptist Church has been a positive presence in Western Albemarle County. He said during that time it has been one of our top priorities to serve our community and to share the love of God with our neighbors. He said we want to make Crozet a better place to live because we are also there. He said that most of our active membership in fact lives within a few miles of our facilities so we know the area. He said our members are involved in community conversations and in local projects and we keep our eyes open for opportunities to meet a need. He said we saw that even with all of the wonderful schools that are already present in Crozet there is still a need for preschool and afterschool care for children and families in our area. He said that is why we were excited when Ms. Gillette came to us with the idea of beginning a school in our building and that is why we voted unanimously as a congregation in our most recent business meeting to allow her to do that. He said that is why even though we will not have any ownership or direct participation in leadership in the school we are happy to

collaborate with her in this endeavor. He said we see this as one more opportunity to be a positive presence to serve the community and to share love with our neighbors and so urged you to give Christy and us a chance to meet this need. He thanked the Commission and offered to answer questions.

David Stoners said he was a resident of 6054 Rockfish Gap Turnpike, Greenwood, Virginia and was here speaking on behalf of Brian Richter and Martha Hodgkins the neighbors immediately to the west of the property. He said the Commission received an email from Brian and Martha; he is a good friend of theirs and was here speaking on their behalf since they were not able to attend the Planning Commission meeting. He said in the interest of time he was just going to read and paraphrase some brief excerpts from their note that as a way to try to illustrate and emphasize some of their concerns. He said that Elaine did a good job both here tonight and in the staff report summarizing the issues and some of their concerns and issues both pro and con as far as the proposal. He said again I paraphrase from their note to you, "We are writing you in response to the application for a Special Use Permit submitted by the Little Explorers Discovery School to establish a commercial pre-school operation on the Crozet Baptist Church property on St. George Avenue in Crozet. We and several neighbors are very concerned about the increased traffic that will result, as well as the impacts to our historic neighborhood. Additionally, as the only immediate neighbor to the church's backyard area, we have the most to lose from the siting of this pre-school operation, which would immediately impact our immediately adjacent quiet backyard. With reference to the Albemarle County Land Use Law Handbook (pages 12-10), we emphasize that there are three factors about this Special Use Permit that fail to meet Albemarle County's requirements. Again, I paraphrase. The proposed use would an adverse impact on roads or create a hazardous traffic situation. This greatly increased traffic on our quiet residential street will create a hazardous situation for children, pets, and other residents. Number two, the proposed use will have an adverse effect on the character of the neighborhood. The creation of a new and highly audible commercial business that will increase traffic on a short residential street is clearly not in keeping with the National Historic District designation of St. George Avenue and neighborhood. Thirdly, the proposed use will have an adverse impact on our abutting property. We have enjoyed the quiet use of our backyard and are concerned about the noise created by the preschool as well as an obvious need for a fence." Mr. Stoner said the one additional thing that he would add is from some correspondence between Mr. Richter and Mr. Collier: "Any reasonable resolution of this issue will necessarily require relocation of the playground to create a respective distance from our property line. The original placement of the playground site right up against our property line and built in 2010 without any consultation with us was frankly offensive. We are not interested in a large privacy fence and tall ugly fencing is not what we would like nor accept. We would like to discuss other fencing like picket possibly in conjunction with the relocation of the playground and vegetation with screening. One suggestion I would have is maybe amending condition 5 to require relocation of the playground further away from the line. Thank you very much."

Ms. Firehock invited further public comment. Hearing none, Mr. Keller invited the applicant to come back up.

Mr. Keller invited comment from Ms. Gillette.

Ms. Gillette replied that she did not have anything further to add.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Dotson said he had a question for the church. He said again on the question of the closeness to their property line we have heard a neighbor indicate the possibility of relocating the play area and he assumed that would pull it closer to the building and further from their property line. He asked do you have thoughts on that.

David Collier responded that we are and have already been in conversation with our neighbors and we really do want to make this good for all of us. He said that moving that playground because of the nature of being set in concrete and those sorts of things is an unreasonable expectation. He said also as we move closer to the church the land slopes down towards our church and that is the level spot in our backyard, so it would be very difficult for us to do that.

Mr. Dotson said the other question is about the tree house and is that on the church's property or the neighbor's property.

Mr. Collier said if he could give a brief history, a member of our church built it about 20 to 25 years ago for the son of our pastor who was living in the house in which the playground is the back yard. He said at the time the next-door neighbor was also a member of our church so we really did not have that issue or question. He said perhaps two-thirds to three-quarters is over on our side of the line and maybe a quarter over on the neighbor's side.

Mr. Dotson said the related question is if it is ever used and do children ever use it.

Mr. Collier responded that in fact he thinks that was a point of contingent and we did not mean for it to be, but it turned out to be. He said when we built the playground there was a ladder up to the tree fort and we removed the ladder for safety reasons since we did not want any children climbing up and being in the fort.

Mr. Gillette asked to add something about the playground in terms of the preschool. She said my son being almost two years old that he is too little to use the playground and she suspects he will be for a while so actually she did not anticipate us using it too much but maybe with the oldest of the preschool crew in the morning. Ms. Gillette said she foresees more of the afterschool program using that playground and then us bringing more toddler sized play structures to the other part of the play yard further away from those neighbors.

Ms. More said you kind of answered one of my first questions and that was when you talk about the type of play that you will have outside it sounds like it is not just a let them go on the playground and everyone sits backs and watch; that you will engaging in some interactive play which would occur elsewhere than the playground.

Ms. Gillette replied yes.

Ms. More said at the community meeting she had heard that there was a concern that the playground was actually encroaching on the property and can you clarify that it is not since it is my understanding that it is actually setback.

Ms. Echols responded that it is setback and thinks there is a feeling that it is right on the property line but it is not right on the property line and it is about 10 feet off the owners of the property next door. She said there has been a question about where that property boundary is and she walked it with the church. She said the neighbors also told me there was a survey done so that the county's property maps were not correct and that the next-door neighbor's

property line is right there next to the tree. She said there was a question about that and she would try to get the image from the staff report on line.

Ms. More said she had some thoughts and was very sensitive as you put it in the beginning to the change in the neighborhood, the noise of children playing does not really bother me but she lives with it all the time. However, she understands the concerns for the traffic and the things like this but what she heard in the community meeting was a great willingness on part to work with doing this sort of staggering is a very creative approach to disburse traffic so she really likes that. She said not only does it disperse the traffic but it hits a bunch of different needs that the community has that some other facilities don't offer and they just have the pick up and drop off at noon time. She said that is a creative solution that also is addressing a need that the community has. She suggested they explore the fencing because she had heard that there is a great desire on the part of the church and your organization to try to make that work the best for the neighbors and can understand why if they are talking about a picket fence and the church is imaging something taller if it would be possible to have on their property line something that is more in keeping with their vision to possibly plant screening that would give them that look and feel and not this tall stark fence with fence on the other parts of the property. She said that is something worth exploring that on that shared property line that might make that feel a little bit softer to them and not this tall big one colored fence and something more like what they are talking about but then putting the vegetation in for screening. She said that is an alternative because it sounds like moving the playground is costly and not an option so would be an option that you could explore. She asked if they are going to have something visible on St. George Avenue.

Ms. Gillette replied that she was told to hold off on that when she asked but does not know the details of what that entails.

Ms. More said my thought there was for traffic calming measures she feels that having people see a sign that there is a preschool there - my personal take on this particular neighborhood is that most of the people that speed through there are cutting through to get to somewhere else and those are the people that we need to have traffic calming measures to address. She said it sounds like the transportation planner is going to work with you and that is a great step for the neighborhood in general and as a whole. She said it is a popular cut through street and having the signage out there that there is a preschool and the children at play type of signs that other preschools put out at drop off and pick up might help alert drivers that don't live there that this is a use that is happening which is a trigger to slow down. She said any type of signage would be helpful in calming traffic.

Ms. Firehock said she had done a lot of work on park design and trying to direct kids where we do and don't want them and have used tactics such as prickly Holly bushes to keep them out of areas. She said that also helps with softening with sound as well as barriers so there is a lot that can be done with design to probably come up with something that is not making both sides feel like they are in a jail of some kind. She said one question is about the playground because she really wants to focus on that. Ms. Firehock said it is a great use; it is a church and if she was living next door would expect weddings, services and various things to be going on. However, she understands looking at Mr. Richter as the neighbor that he probably does a lot of work at home and so he is trying to think about his quiet to do his work. She said the question is to get to the playground appropriate for the toddlers/little kids or is that only going to be for the older kids.

Ms. Gillette replied that is not appropriate for the toddler age since it was pretty high and dangerous and so she really does not anticipate using it very much for the preschool.

Ms. Firehock said she was wondering if it would be possible to say something along the lines that you would not be using it before whatever that time that the afterschool kids show up. She said that would give at least give them some kind of notion but did not know what the time would be – from 8:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. it will be quiet so if he wanted to have a conference call with a client he would not have gigglers and screamers. She said no matter what you are doing or how you are guiding them there is always that child with a high pitch voice so she was really sympathetic to that. She said that a lot more work could be done to work on the sound absorption material, vegetation, fence style, design and then perhaps actually going ahead and limiting, it with a condition that we would consider saying that nobody will play on that playground until X hour and then maybe it is only an hour or two of the afternoons that somebody is out there giggling.

Ms. Gillette responded that made sense.

Ms. Spain agreed with the comments from my colleagues and she particularly agree with Commissioner More about the positive effects of a sign perhaps slowing down traffic. She said the speeding traffic is an issue independent of the school and if anything it could be a buffer and so would think from that standpoint that it would be to the advantage of the neighborhood. She said but living in a neighborhood with a speeding problem myself and having worked with the transportation planner and such that it requires constant vigilance so she did not take that into consideration when thinking about your application because that is an independent issue.

Mr. Bivins asked staff if this was a preschool program under the church would we be having this meeting today.

Ms. Elaine asked to defer the question to the county attorney.

Mr. Andy Herrick replied that it would still require a special use permit for a daycare since daycare is a separate use that is only allowed by a special use permit under the County Code.

Mr. Bivins asked if the house up the street from St. George occupied, and Mr. Collier replied yes.

Mr. Bivins asked does that house have children in it, and Mr. Collier replied that it does not but it could conceivably have children, yes.

Mr. Bivins said if we could go to the neighbor's property, there is a structure in the back and asked if that is your neighbor's office or is that structure used.

Mr. Collier replied that is a rental space over the garage.

Mr. Bivins said so that is an auxiliary use and so we are talking about the distance from the house that is on the road to the playground that is the issue here. He said in between there is a house that is occupied and presently they do not have children, but the next tenant could. He said the issue is not necessarily about the daycare but about how do we have an environment that somebody could work from home regardless of whether or not you have four kids or a family with numerous kids outside throughout the day since they could possibly be homeschooled. He said so that is the piece he is trying to work through and he thinks they are

being very generous because of the fact of putting a fence in and doing that particularly when the playground is here but the structure is at the front of the house and that it is limited time. Mr. Bivins said he was struggling about how much of a nuisance that we really have here, but he understands that someone's lifestyle may be changed and understands that particularly having worked at home myself, but the church has ongoing activities such as funerals, weddings, Sunday School and Bible School.

Mr. Herrick pointed out the religious use of the church does not require a special use permit since it really is an assembly and all the events for funerals, weddings, religious services and so forth are already by right uses in this zone; it is just the establishment of a daycare that would require a special use permit.

Mr. Keller said the Commissioner was making the point that all of those uses are by right and they could be making noise in their own way without needing a special use permit.

Mr. Herrick said he thought the concern was that there might be a need for additional permission to do the things that a church is already allowed to do.

Mr. Keller invited additional questions for the applicant or church. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing to bring it back for discussion and action.

Mr. Bivins said he would hope that given that we have the spirit of this congregation and he thinks the spirit of the person who is leasing the space that the one thing that they are going to want to do is to make this a win/win for everyone. He said, as we know in small communities if people are uncomfortable then they do not go to places and he thinks it may be that the church has to enclose the playground anyhow. He said that might be part of the licensing and the insurance requirements and so there is a piece of that which may have to happen as a result of having this activity there – but he would hope we would let them work this out in a cooperation as opposed to us being too prescriptive.

Ms. More agreed and what she hears is a willingness to work on coming up with the best solution within reason and that being too specific is not necessary. She said there were some points in staff's report that are very important that these are community facilities and services that are trying to accommodate the changing needs of our community as it grows and staff notes in the Crozet Master Plan they anticipate daycare centers and preschools will be located within these designated areas. She said this area has a designation of 3 to 6 residential units and fortunately, for them it is a very quiet one mostly single-family detached homes. Ms. More said that is a very quiet street and she was sensitive to any traffic impacts but finds what is proposed here to be very minimal and in all the scenarios she has seen this is something that she would think is very doable and actually could create some traffic calming measures for those. She said as staff pointed out the speeding may be an issue that is already happening in this neighborhood and this could help the county and this group and the neighbors work together to come up with solutions that needed to be achieved in any cause.

Mr. Firehock said she had already made comments and would lean more to what she suggested earlier to condition this that they have not used the older kid playset during the morning. Ms. Firehock said she understood it was a church but it was a different thing to have daycare going on all day, but it might add comfort even though in practical reality it would not happen anyway.

Ms. Spain said she was pleased to know that the church is willing to work with the applicant on this and thinks this is the third request we have heard from a church to include daycare facilities. She said in the Pantops area that Broadus Baptist Church has done this. She said we are as a society we are increasingly dependent on churches and other civil institutions to in a way substantivize these services that are very important not just for a quality of life but for economic being for families and on record wanted to say she appreciates the work that the church is doing.

Mr. Keller said he agreed with his colleagues all around except for the restriction on that play equipment in the morning. However, he agreed with Ms. Firehock's point that vegetation can be a sound absorption mechanism and that would fit in with the historic neighborhood. He said that as a designer he would encourage the church to think about the type of fencing if it does need to require fencing and that it is appropriate for an institutional setting. He said that is primarily not wood, but that a painted picket fence could conceivably fit in but by nature it is more of an open metal sort of fencing that would separate the children and not have them be able to go into an area where they could be hurt, runaway or whatever. He said that the vegetation really needs to serve as the visual buffer, but the fence scale be more the way the neighbor had proposed. He said of course that takes us away from one of my particular concerns in our society where people put fences up backwards and put the nice side in instead of out. He said historically it was meant to be that there the finished side was out. He said if the church elects to do a wood fence that it should be solid and would hope if you do that you put the proper side towards the neighbor and the proper side towards you. He said that otherwise all the points made about the traffic is really outside the preview of this applicant and the special use permit issues. He said we really want to see the kinds of facilities the churches are providing through the afterschool, daycare and those sorts of things and we applaud the institutions that are doing that. Mr. Keller said that because it was a special use and that special use is changing what will run with that land into the future we have a responsibility to think about that seriously and that is why we have taken as much time as a group on that discussion.

Ms. Echols suggested that it seems like most of you would be interested in something as a condition for the fence and was wondering if this might satisfy everyone and that is for number five, "After consultation with abutting property owners on materials and height but prior to beginning operation of the preschool or the extended care afterschool program the owner shall construct and maintain a fence which may be a vegetated screen along the western and northern property lines."

Mr. Dotson said that he did not want to get into the details other than he thinks that the spirit of the vegetation was not to substitute for a fence but in conjunction with a fence in order to maintain sort of the greenery and he was not sure the wording you gave us accomplished that.

Mr. Keller agreed.

Ms. More asked are we saying leave it as it is.

Ms. Echols said she was worried about leaving the word "privacy" in there.

Mr. Herrick suggested the deletion of the word "privacy".

Ms. Echols asked if that would work for you, but it does not get vegetation in but it does leave open that possibility certainly.

Mr. Keller asked Ms. Echols to restate the condition.

Ms. Echols said it is what is written there in number 5 and it would be to basically take out the words, “to maintain a fence” and would be to, “Construct and maintain a fence along the western and northern property lines.”

Mr. Dotson asked might it include at the beginning after consultation with abutting property owners on material, height and plantings.

Mr. Keller said that he thinks that does it.

Mr. Bivins said that is in consultation, but the consulting does not become a no, so at some point if the neighbor feels that they are hearing what they desire to hear that does not stop the process from going forward.

Mr. Dotson said that was a good point.

Ms. Firehock pointed out that it says after consultation, it does not say after approval.

Mr. Bivins replied that he understands but just wants to be clear that is what we are agreeing to.

Mr. Keller said we are hoping the neighbors can work it out since that is out of our realm. Mr. Keller asked if we are ready to go back to a motion.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of SP-2018-00006 Little Explorers Discovery School with the conditions outlined in the staff report with changes in #5 to read after consultation with abutting property owners on materials, height and plantings prior to beginning operation of the preschool or extended care after school program, the owner of the property shall construct and maintain a fence along the western and northern property lines.

Mr. Dotson noted one other minor point in condition #3 the staff indicated instead of 5:00 p.m. it should say 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Dotson seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion.

Ms. More asked if the 5:30 p.m. change would be captured.

Mr. Herrick asked Ms. More if she agreed with the friendly amendment.

Ms. More replied absolutely.

Mr. Herrick asked the Commission to vote on the friendly amendment.

Mr. Keller asked if that vote needed to be recorded or can we just do that amongst ourselves.

Mr. Herrick replied as long as the friendly amendment is agreed to what you would be voting on is the motion as amended.

Mr. Keller asked for a motion to accept the friendly amendment.

Ms. More moved to accept the friendly amendment.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission unanimously accepted the friendly amendment by 6:0 (Riley absent).

Mr. Keller asked if there was any further discussion. Hearing none, he asked Ms. Taylor if she had the 5:30 p.m. change and to call the roll.

The motion was approved by a vote of 6:0 (Riley absent).

Mr. Keller thanked the applicants and neighbors and the church for providing the facility, the applicant for providing this service and to the neighbor for offering some thoughtful areas for discussion because we hear a lot of these and these are things that we will be taking forward to other similar kinds of discussion as well. He said we wish you all well in reaching a conclusion that is positive.

Ms. Echols said she failed to introduce a new planner in our office, Andy Reitelbach and he will be assisting David Benish in taking this to the Board of Supervisors.

The Commission welcomed Andy Reitelbach.

The meeting moved to the next item.

**The Planning Commission recessed at 7:41 pm and the meeting reconvened at 7:47 p.m.**

Mr. Keller called the meeting back to order at 7:47 p.m.

**Presentation.**

**Cell Tower Update**
(Bill Fritz)

Bill Fritz presented an update on the current state of wireless facilities. He said for the last two years he has worked with the General Assembly – one year was with a sub-committee of the House and one year was with a sub-committee of the Senate on some wireless regulations as the representative for VACO in the localities. In 2017, there was a set of regulations adopted on small cells only and in 2018 there was regulations adopted on all types of facilities; he provided for you some information on what a small cell is and we have none in Albemarle County right now and it is unlikely that we will be getting any in the immediate future.

He said it set up two processes – one is for small cells for an administrative process - the new 2018 legislation added that new structures could be built for right up to 50' tall to accommodate small cell facilities and co-locations of small cells on existing structures. He said the way the law is written effectively except for in Historic Districts or in Entrance Corridor Districts where there are regulations written into the Zoning Ordinance there is effectively no way to deny these for a locality like Albemarle County. He said there are some where if you have ordinance that requires all utilities to be underground when you have a plan to do that you can prohibit new construction – but we don't have anything like that.

Mr. Fritz said small cell facilities can go up, and that is the long and short of it. He said the other types of facilities, and that could be small cell facilities, micro-, macro-, pico-, distributed antenna systems, and the like – we got some new regulations there. He said a lot of them don't affect us – some may affect us – we need to figure out what to do. He said one of the weird ones is a provision if we deny and we know there are modifications that would make it approvable we have to say what those modifications are. He said obviously the localities were very troubled with that language. He said some additional language was added above and beyond what the Telecommunications Act does that limits our ability to consider the business decision of the applicant; that has never been an issue for Albemarle County but now it is something that we have to not do. He said one thing that was added as the locality representatives we adamantly opposed, we can't require the applicant to provide alternative information to justify the need for the project that there are no other alternatives. He said that could potentially make the review of some applications difficult – we are going to have to work with it and it has only been on the books since July, so we have not had to test it yet. He said that is for all facilities – we can't require the applicant to submit information to justify the need for the project, so we typically have not done that, but our approach has been the treetop facilities. He said the Board has been moving more and more towards saying we want to see the coverage maps and we have never required those to be submitted and now we cannot require those to be submitted. He said if the applicant says no we can't give them to us, we can't base our decision on that and they are under no obligation to give us any of that information. He said the mere fact they are before you is justification that they need the facility in the eyes of the General Assembly.

Mr. Keller asked does that affect the balloon tests also.

Mr. Fritz replied no it does not because there you are talking about visibility and a clause was added in the law that says that we may not impose unreasonable requirements relating to kinds of materials arranging screening or landscaping. He noted that what an unreasonable provision is would be anybody's guess, and we argued against that also and did not win. Mr. Fritz said an interesting one that we may have to struggle with we may not impose a setback or fall zone that is larger than that imposed on other types of similar structures including utility poles. He said the localities opposed that because trying to say what is a similar structure and utility poles obviously have no setbacks – and everyone is trying to figure out how to interpret this. He said that some believe this essentially prohibits us from imposing any type of setback unless you can really tie it to other ones – we believe we could at least impose the same setbacks that you do for any structure.

Mr. Fritz said that he was not going to go through all the things we have to do and may not do since he gave them that list and we can talk about it however you want to. He said another interesting thing is there was a bill introduced just about a month ago into the United States Congress – Streamlining the rapid evolution and modernization of leading edge infrastructure necessary to enhance small cell deployment Act. He said looking at that it does not appear to do anything beyond what the State Code already does so he thinks that would be a somewhat meaningless bill except it does have a strange clause in it that if we don't act on it within a certain period of time or if we make decisions based on – we require the applicant to submit some information that we are not allowed to submit and the applicant refuses to do it that the application is deemed approved, which sets up an interesting issue of the federal government deeming approved things within the locality. He said it went in June 28th and there has been no movement on it. He said as a member of the NACO, National Association of Counties Telecommunications and Technology Steering Committee and we discuss legislation once a month about how things are going across the country in a once a month conference call and he

is sure this will come up in next week's phone call. He said if anything new comes up that he will let the Commission know. He said we have been anticipating this being introduced and in fact it was. He said we think we are up to date with all the FCC action – there are some things going on out there that are sort of under the radar where the FCC is thinking about making decisions. He said the really big thing that is going on with the FCC is that standards are finally seemed to be established for 5G – what the technology is going to be and how it is going to be used and companies are starting to build and design to manufacture the equipment that will be necessary to make the use of 5G – the chip makers have started producing the chips, the phone manufacturers are figuring out how they are going to incorporate it and so it is starting to gel. He said the really big thing that is going on is making more spectrum available – that is the thing where the industry is screaming at the top of their lungs. He said listening to testimony recently at the Senate and the take away from that was how little the industry was asking for Congress to enact any legislation to reduce restrictions or regulations on the telecommunications industry – they were screaming that we need more band width and more spectrum.

Mr. Fritz said that First Net is a telecommunications system for first responders and there will be a public version and it is called First Net. He said AT&T got that contract, it is a federal program and Virginia was the first state to opt in and sign an agreement with AT&T. He said since then every state has signed with AT&T. He said that AT&T will be building out the system and that spectrum will be available to AT&T customers when not in use. He said it is primarily being looked at of providing some broadband services also. He said there has been a recent uptick of applications – 2016 was a quiet year but in 2017 and 2018 we are seeing an uptick in applications both coverage and capacity.

Mr. Fritz said that is the current state of affairs – the industry went to the General Assembly and asked for legislation – they essentially got everything they were asking for and we don't think they will be coming back to the General Assemble because there is not much for them to come back to ask for. He said that is where we are technology wide and the Board of Supervisors is going to be meeting on September 12th and deciding whether to revisit the ordinance or policy and so he is waiting to hear what the Board directs me to do.

Mr. Keller thanked Mr. Fritz for coming back within a couple months of the Planning Commission's request.

The meeting moved to the next item.

**Committee Reports**

Mr. Keller invited committee reports. Hearing none, the meeting moved to the next item.

**Old Business**

Mr. Keller invited old business.

**a. <u>Albemarle County Planning Commission Rules and Procedures 2018</u>**
Discussion held on progress of appointed committee to find ways to improve process of Bruce Dotson and Karen Firehock in consultation with Mr. Blair and the senior staff with a report back to the Commission.

The Planning Commission discussed the Albemarle County Planning Commission Rules and Procedures 2018 and the role of the Recording Secretary or the corresponding secretary with staff. Mr. Herrick explained staff's recommended language and that notice was given at last week's meeting which would make this right for consideration tonight. The Planning Commission took the following action:

Mr. Dotson moved to amend the Planning Commission 2018 rules of procedure to insert item #6 as reflected on the screen and subsequently to renumber the following items.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion passed by a vote of 6:0 (Riley absent) to amend the Planning Commission Rules and Procedure to insert item #6 as reflected on the screen and to renumber the subsequent paragraphs.

- Discussion of roles and job of response to emails to Planning Commission – possible standard electronic response.

**New Business**

Mr. Keller invited new business.

- Ms. Echols reviewed items underway and coming up in the future.
- Mr. Bivins brought up issues of park accessibility, which the Commission decided to discuss later.
- The next meeting will be on Tuesday, August 21, 2018 in Auditorium at 6:00 p.m.

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

**Items for follow-up**

Mr. Keller invited items for follow-up. Hearing none, the meeting moved to adjournment.

**Adjournment**

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m. to the Tuesday, August 21, 2018 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting at 6:00 p.m., 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 |