FINAL ACTIONS Planning Commission Meeting of October 16, 2018	
AGENDA ITEM/ACTION	**FOLLOW-UP ACTION**
1. **Call to Order**. • Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Keller. • PC members present were Ms. Spain, Ms. More, Chair Keller, Mr. Bivins, Vice-Chair Riley, Mr. Dotson, Ms. Firehock and Mr. Carrazana (UVA Rep). • Staff members present were Rachel Falkenstein, Andrew Gast-Bray, Sharon Taylor and Andy Herrick.	
2. **Other Matters Not on the Agenda from the Public** • None.	Clerk: No action required
3. **Consent Agenda** **Approval of Minutes**: January 30, 2018, February 6, 2018, February 13, 2018, June 26, 2018 and August 7, 2018 • **APPROVED,** by a vote of 7:0.	Clerk: Finalize minutes as noted in actions.
4. **Work Session**. **PROJECT: CCP-2018-00004 – River's Edge** MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 03200-00-00-005A0, 03200-00-00-005A1, 03200-00-00-022K1 LOCATION: 2256 Rivers Edge Lane PROPOSAL: Potentially rezone property to increase the number of units allowed by-right and to add commercial space. PETITION: Potentially rezone 37.74 acres from Rural Areas (RA), which allows agricultural, forestal, fishery, and residential uses at a density of 0.5 unit/acre in development lots, to a different district, which allows mixed use development. A maximum of 145 units is being considered, for a gross density of 3.8 units per acre and approximately 31,000 square feet of commercial/office. Proposed density of the project, based on the Master Plan (net density), is 8.37 units per acre. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Property is in the Places29-North Development Area. Master Plan shows uses as Urban Density Residential – residential (6.01 – 34 units/ acre) with supporting uses such as religious	Staff: Action Letter – Recommendation as noted in the actions.

	institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses; Neighborhood Density Residential – residential (3 – 6 units/acre) with supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools and other small-scale non-residential uses; and Privately Owned Open Space/Environmental Features – privately owned recreational amenities and open space; floodplains, steep slopes, wetlands, and other environmental features. (Rachel Falkenstein) • **HELD WORK SESSION.** Discussion held on whether proposal would be found in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan. The Commission gave feedback on staff's follow-up questions and conclusions as noted in **Attachment 1**. No formal action taken. (See Minutes for details).	
5.	**Committee Reports** Ms. Riley reported: • The Village of Rivanna CAC met and received an update on the Rivanna Village: about 85% of phase 1 infrastructure is complete and they plan to start phase 2 in four to six months. Three staff members presented the draft proposal to improve stream health in the development area. Mr. Bivins reported: • The Hydraulic CAC went on a tour of the Charlotte Humphries Park to appreciate what might make it more accessible and usable to the public.	
6.	**Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting –** October 10, 2018. Mr. Gast-Bray reviewed the actions taken on above date.	Staff: • No action required.
7.	**Old Business** • None	Staff: • No action required.
8.	**New Business** • Discussion held on the calculation of density. **Mr. Keller announced**: • ***THERE IS NO MEETING SCHEDULED FOR OCTOBER 23, 2018.*** • ***THE NEXT MEETING WILL BE ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2018.***	Staff: • None.
9.	**Items for follow-up** • **None**	

10.	Adjourn to October 30, 2018 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting at 6:00 p.m., Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. • The meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.	

Attachment 1 - PROJECT: CCP201800004 – River's Edge: Planning Commission Recommendations

Attachment 1 -

PROJECT: CCP-2018-00004 – River's Edge – Planning Commission Response

In a work session, the Planning Commission discussed and provided the following responses to staff's questions.

Q1: Can density from TMP 32-22K1 (Urban Density Residential) be applied to TMP32-5A1 (Neighborhood Density Residential), considering the separation caused by the river and other environmental resources.

Question 1: Staff believes transferring the density from TMP 32-22K1 to TMP 32-5A is not appropriate.

Question 1: The Planning Commission agreed with staff's recommendation.

Q2: Would Neighborhood Model District (NMD) be an appropriate zoning district for the proposed development or should the applicant seek separate zoning designations for the proposed commercial and residential pieces?

Question 2: Staff does not believe that NMD is an appropriate zoning district for the proposed development and recommends that the development of the property as proposed be considered with separate rezoning applications.

Question 2: The Planning Commission agreed with staff's recommendation.

Q3: Would neighborhood scale commercial use (i.e. veterinarian office, barber shop, yoga studio, etc.) in an area designated as urban density residential (specifically TMP 32-22K1) be found in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan?

Question 3: Staff agrees that the listed commercial uses could be appropriate on TMP 32-22K1 as secondary uses, with the appropriate design and scale.

Question 3: The Planning Commission agreed with staff's recommendation.

Q4 (Additional question from staff): What land should be available for development and calculating potential density? Is strict adherence to the area shown on the Master Plan as Open Space required or should the area available for development be calculated using more recent mapping technology that better depicts the environmental features (stream buffer, preserved slopes)?

Question 4: Staff recommends that more accurate GIS-data should be used to calculate the net density of the site.

Question 4: The Planning Commission was in general agreement with staff's recommendation that more accurate GIS-data should be used to calculate the net density of the site. (Ms. Firehock disagreed and suggested gross density be used for the calculation.)