Albemarle County Planning Commission
November 13, 2018

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, November 13, 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, Pam Riley, Vice Chair; Daphne Spain; Bruce Dotson, Jennie More and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative. Karen Firehock and Julian Bivins were absent.

Other officials present were Tim Padalino, Principal Planner; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director of Community Development/Director of Planning; Rachael Falkenstein, Principal Planner; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission and Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

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

The meeting moved to the next 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 on to the next agenda item.

Public Hearing Item.

CPA-2018-00004 Rio29 Small Area Plan - The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on November 13, 2018 at 6:00 PM in the Auditorium of the County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia, to consider proposed amendments to the Land Use Plan section of the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan and Places29 Master Plan by replacing portions of the existing profiles of Neighborhood 1, Neighborhood 2, consisting of an approximately 1/2 mile radius from the Rio Road and Route 29 intersection. The Small Area Plan establishes new land use policies, guidelines, recommendations, goals and strategies for future development within the Plan area. The Plan would establish the following for the Rio29 Plan area: a vision for the development and redevelopment of the area and supporting recommendations; place types with form and use recommendations; a plan for the transportation network and its integration with the place types; a plan for open space, trails and natural resource protection and enhancement, a plan for implementation and supporting community facilities and infrastructure. A copy of the full text of the Rio29 Small Area Plan is available online and on file in the office of the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors and in the Department of Community Development, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.
(Rachel Falkenstein)

Rachel Falkenstein, Principal Planner, provided a quick, high level overview of the plan. She said her remarks would be relatively short even though it is a long plan, but certainly can answer any questions or hear any feedback you have.

Purpose of the Public Hearing

CPA-2018-04 Rio29 Small Area Plan
- Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) to amend the Land Use Plan section of the Comprehensive Plan and the Places29 Master Plan for the area around the Rio Road and Route 29 intersection.
- The Rio29 Small Area Plan establishes a vision for the development and redevelopment of the area and supporting recommendations.

Rio29 Plan Area
- Rio29 Plan boundary is measured as a ½ mile radius from the Rio Road and Route 29 intersection
- Areas of single family residential not included in Rio29 Plan area
- Total area 391 acres

Ms. Falkenstein said she was going to go through each of the plan concepts in a little more detail, but this gives you the overall vision for the Rio29 area. She said it is a long-range vision developed in cooperation with staff, citizens, public officials and stakeholders over a two-year planning process. Ms. Falkenstein said she is going to talk in a little bit of detail about each of these concepts as shown in the PowerPoint presentation.

The first concept of the plan details is **connectivity**.
Vision: Transform Rio29 into a multimodal hub with a connected network of complete streets that are designed for all users. The connectivity chapter assigns a street typology for each street with the standards and recommendations about enhancing the pedestrian environment and alternative modes of transportation.

The second concept of the plan details is **character**.
Vision: Transform Rio29 into a vibrant and diverse mixed-use community with interesting character and a human-scaled built environment. The character chapter identifies place types, a focus on the built form and use; it makes recommendations on how to activate streets within Rio29.

The third concept is **conservation**.
Vision: Transform Rio29 into a place enhanced through conservation with a network of sustainable and usable public spaces that enrich community, preserve and enhance natural resources. The conservation chapter focuses on creating connections to green features and establishing public places to enhance the community. It provides recommendations for areas for parks and plazas and trails.

The last chapter of the plan focuses on **implementation**. The implementation chapter is really a road map to achieving the vision she just discussed, and it includes recommendations for transformative projects that are shown on the map. It also includes recommendations for updates to policy and zoning, pursuing partnerships and incentives and engaging the community.

Ms. Falkenstein said the revisions to the Places29 Master Plan would be a small paragraph of text just summarizing the plan and hyperlinking to it. She said that will be in the introduction chapter of the Places29 Master Plan and then we have updated the maps to show the Rio29 Small Area Plan boundary and that will also hyperlink to the plan

document. She said the document itself would be within the appendix of the Comprehensive Plan in the Places29 Masterplan. She said that concludes my remarks tonight and there is a motion on the screen with the resolution in Attachment C of the staff report. If there were any questions, she would be happy to answer them.

Mr. Keller invited questions for staff. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing for public comment and that Vice-Chair Riley will take it from here.

Vice-Chair Riley read the guidelines for the public hearing and asked the first person signed up to come forward and speak.

Sean Tubbs, with Piedmont Environmental Council and a resident of the City, said he was once briefly a resident of Albemarle County and lived in this general area. He said when he was a reporter and was covering the development of the Places29 Master Plan that a lot has happened since then that has led us to this moment. Mr. Tubbs said that he supports this opportunity plan and looks forward to seeing how it will guide future development in the creation of a new place, a new place that he certainly saw the vision of back in the past. He said this plan states the vision strongly and provides a series of possible ways that we can get there and there is a lot to like. He said a few weeks ago, he met a friend at the Northside Library, and after the meeting went for a walk and cut through the woods to get through to Berkmar. He noted this is on the section that is marked as the square in the conservation chapter of the document. He said as we walked he could imagine the future of this location and what might be there in the future if we can truly get everyone to come to the table to do their part to make sure this all becomes a reality. He said it is going to take a lot of work, but he can say there is a lot in here for the community to get excited about.

Mr. Tubbs said the entire area is 391 acres and 124 acres is currently parking that is not the most productive use of land. He said we are encouraged that this plan does not hide that reality of the early 21st century and that things are going to be a little bit different in the future. He said we are hopeful that the property owners will come to the table and see this as a starting point for the conversation and not be too deterred by the lines on the map that depict roadways that could be there in the future. He said it just suggests a grid network that is going to be necessary for some of the connectivity. He said it is clear because the car-oriented superblocks are a deterrent to the walkability that we certainly want. He said if done correctly the property owners would be able to see that their bottom line is added to as well as the county's. He said that we are here to help boost the economic development of the county. He said that it is clear from the comments received that people care about bike and transit, green space, place making and he is looking forward to seeing in particular how the character chapter is going to translate into a comprehensive rezoning to something form-based. He said speaking from somebody who works in Charlottesville as well the entire region is looking to see an example of what this form-based code might be, and this is the chance to make that happen. He said that successful implementation could entice me to once again live in Albemarle because this is an exciting place and time so he just wants to support this and looks forward to hearing what other people have to say.

Travis Petrolia, with the Southern Environmental Law Center, said that first he would like to thank county staff for all their hard work in getting this small area plan to this point. He said this has been a big effort and we have appreciated the chance to serve on the Steering Committee for this process as well as the many public input opportunities that have been provided along the way. He said while it takes many things to realize the vision of a land use plan like this that we see in this small area plan an important step for encouraging and

facilitating the type of development and redevelopment that is key to advancing both the county's growth management strategy and its economic development goals. He said among other things this plan recognizes that in order to achieve the county's growth management goals our development areas need to be places that residents want to be. He said that we need to provide greater opportunities to make them not only more vibrant and interesting but also more accessible, connected and livable. He said speaking of livability, we appreciate the plan's acknowledgement of the environmental challenges this area faces today.

Mr. Petrolia said surface-parking covers nearly 40% of the Rio29 area compared to just 16% for tree canopy and few trips can be made in this area without a car. Along these lines, we support the plan's recommendations to make this area more pedestrian, bicycle and transit friendly as well as create additional parks, trails and green spaces, increased tree canopy and encourage low impact development. The one part of the plan that could be strengthened in this respect is in the performance measures that will be used to access the county's progress in this area. While we understand that the proposed metrics and indicators still need to be flushed out that it strikes us as odd that the key outcome under conservation is focused solely on providing amenity spaces some of which may have little or no relation to the environmental protection. As these conservation measures are developed further it is important to ensure that the additional indicators related to natural resources and sustainable design are made a primary focus of this ongoing review. He said but again in closing they would like to restate our appreciation for the work that has gone into developing this plan as well as our support for its incorporation into the Comprehensive Plan.

Neil Williamson, with the Free Enterprise Forum, said as he looks at this aspirational plan first and foremost he is reminded as a property rights advocate that you do not own any of the land, well you own a little bit. He said but, what are you willing to do to bring this forward. He said he sees about a hundred million dollars in infrastructure spending and that does not include something that is mentioned multiple times in the staff report of a concept of a shared parking deck. He said there is a lot of parking in this area and maybe you want to convert some of it but believe it or not people are going to drive to get to the place that you make, and they are going to need to put their car some place. He appreciated the significant changes that this plan has gone through based on public input and neighbor input as well. He said there was a conversation about interconnected trails and there was a recognition that the neighborhoods did not really want those trails interconnected but they are not precluded from sometime in the future being interconnected. In addition, he was trying to get comfortable with the idea of lines going through existing buildings. He said staff has done a good job saying that these are conceptual, and they are not really going through these buildings although when he looks at the map they are, but that is okay. He said the key question becomes one of not what the Planning Commission is willing to do because you can plan all you want. He said in the past many committees talked about the concurrency of infrastructure driving this process forward. He said if we want to see the change imagined in this small area plan that has been envisioned that he firmly believes the county needs to step up and be a partner.

Nancy Hunt, Chair of the Rio29 CAC, said she was speaking for myself with eight years of planning background in Arlington County and some involvement in the Colonial Pike Form-Base Code. She said you have an email from me that makes several points, but she would just like to emphasize the last point which is as we go forward when we change zoning processes we are also perhaps giving more density and value to what the property owners

currently hold. She said my last point in my email was to encourage the county and the Board of Supervisors to calculate carefully any additional information such as revenue bond financing, tax breaks and so forth that developers will ask for because developers will always ask for more. She said we really need to understand what the return is to the county before we give developers a lot of additional support besides implementing the Form-Base Code. Having said that, she had enjoyed working with Rachel and this is a very impressive plan perhaps not perfect, but it is a pretty big undertaking and she has her fingers crossed and will be working with the CAC to make this all come through.

Ms. Riley asked if anyone else would like to speak on this topic.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Keller closed the public hearing to bring it back for comment, discussion and action.

Mr. Dotson asked if there was a proposal from the Chair as to how we go through this, and Mr. Keller replied that he did not have a plan but asked to start at one end of the dais and go through the set of feelings that you have for each one.

Mr. Dotson said we have heard in the public hearing very positive things about this work and he would like to add my positive thoughts about this work that it was an amazingly complicated set of interrelated issues. He said the way that this has been evaluated, analyzed and now presented in a very clear combination of graphics and text in a consistent organization really does make a great deal of differences as we go through it. He said that staff with Rachael in the lead has done a great job on this.

Mr. Dotson said he had one question, and it is not a disagreement, that is with the Urban Core designation along Rio Road, which in a sense is a little bit of a misnomer since it is really an Urban Corridor rather than sort of a Node Core. He said but leaving that aside, it is hard to picture exactly how a road like that can be a pedestrian friendly street level active street and have the cross section that is depicted in the plan. He said when pedestrian activity is going to happen he thinks it will be more on the interior of what he will call the precincts of each of the four quadrants. He said that there is going to be less traffic, more sidewalk cafes and activity like that so he has a little trouble picturing a street as busy as Rio Road being this sort of comfortable urban active area. He said that it almost seems like that 29 is a Corridor, Rio is a Corridor, and the neighborhood feel happens on the interior of the four quadrants. He said the one example that he could think of was Brick's Restaurant on 29; he does not know what the traffic count is; but, it is steady traffic all day long and the restaurant sits back a little distance and there is an outdoor eating area along the front. He pointed out that he had sat there before and despite the noise of the traffic, he could carry on a conversation but wonders if you could repeat that throughout the length of Rio Road. He said that it works in that particular location so that is more a question and a hope because when he looks at the cross sections a lot of space is being allowed for kind of a pedestrian activity zone and he was not sure it will work.

Mr. Dotson said that was probably his single biggest question and supposed the answer comes that let's try it and see how it works to find out since this is going to be a learning experience. He said in a few weeks we will see a rezoning that is taking place on West Rio Road and he will be interested to hear the staff report and have a discussion exactly how that property fits into this as perhaps the first puzzle piece and he will be looking for consistency. He said that those were comments on connectivity and character combined and he has some other ones on implementation.

Ms. More said she had some comments on connectivity and agreed with Bruce that the nature of that intersection as it exists now is inherently not pedestrian friendly. She said there are ways that we could address that issue but would imagine that in the quadrants you may experience more of that pedestrian activity and less of the area with all four quadrants. She suggested that they need to make sure there are sticking points that make people want to hang around a street. She said the recommendation of the plan was for complete streets that are designed to be safe and comfortable for pedestrians and the plan recommends uses and designs that will encourage more pedestrians along the streets and would imagine that within the interior of a quadrant and not along 29 or whatever pedestrian underpasses or overpasses there might be.

Ms. More said the other comment is about potentially pedestrian accesses. She said there was overall feedback as to select one quadrant to focus on and then use that as a case study and staff felt like the concept was too far along in planning and there is flexibility with that. Ms. More said she agreed that you needed to move forward with this bigger vision but in my mind realistically that may be what happens, it may be that through the process of self-selection and things that change with properties that one quadrant may come forward and start to actualize some of what you are showing here and then hopefully that creates a snowball effect where other people see that successful and the County Code incentive other property owners will see that. She said that is more likely how this could evolve since it does not have to be all at once and very likely may be that one place goes and then it sort of unravels. She commented that we should not be opposed to that it all has to happen at once because that is not realistic.

Ms. More commented about parking that it just says the plan also recommends that parking standards be reexamined and structured parking be encouraged. She said to Neil Williamson's point, she did not know that structured parking needs to be encouraged since it is going to have to happen at some point in a plan like this and so thinks that is where the county might need to consider what part the county might play in something like that. She said the worst thing that can happen in something like this that is super dense is to have it under parked because there will always be people who will drive there, and parking is always going to be an issue. She said there should be a huge focus on how we are going to manage that and how that is going to be spread out over time as the vision actualizes itself.

Ms. Riley said she wants to thank the staff for work that has gone into this and thinks it is an inspiring vision and agreed with many statements that previous commissioners have said as well as some of the speakers. She said in looking at the amount of public investments that will need to go into this place and to try to think about what we want to prioritize she thinks that structured parking is very important. She pointed out that she was glad that in our previous feedback you have placed more emphasis on prioritizing transit above some other projects. She said that Form- Base is very forward thinking and potentially a big change in our culture as well as transit-oriented development and so in order for this to be a transit-oriented development plan she thinks in the implementation end we really do need to think hard and long about prioritizing that as some of the initial investment.

Ms. Spain said the issue of where the development with the communities will take place whether in all the quadrants or one at a time is similar to an issue we have with the Pantops CAC in can Pantops be made one single community when Route 250 East is going right

through the middle of it. She pointed out there have been requests for plans to do some sort of pedestrian walkway or bridge and she was sure it was not going to happen anytime soon. However, she does not think that means that Pantops should not be handled as a complete place and that yes, there can be a sense of community among people in different places. She said that is how she was thinking about this plan in that it is all four quadrants and they may not have connectivity over Route 29 particularly but that does not mean they cannot all be treated as the place that it is and should be treated as that place. Ms. Spain said she was pleased to see, as Commissioner Riley was that transit was prioritized and we talked about that before along with the preservation of the mountain views. She said they have been working on this for two years and she did not think there would much discussion tonight because we have had input at every point and would assume this is about as finished as it can get. She said staff has done a very good job with the size of the project so she would be voting in favor of it going forward as a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Mr. Carrazana said he was new to this body but what he had studied of the plan it is not a perfect plan, but it is encouraging both from a development standpoint and what it can bring to the community. He echoed his colleagues' concern on connectivity and that buffer on 29 and if that really is something that would be pedestrian friendly and offered another example, Burns Grill where he has sat outdoors, and it makes use of that buffer space. He said however most of Stonefield is internalized and it moves away from 29 for the most part and he thinks there are some lessons learned there on how that can be successful. He said there is a lack of green space in Stonefield and they are trying to remedy that in some degree and how it connects then to Costco. He said that there were some lessons learned there that we could apply to these other developments.

Mr. Carrazana said that from an implementation standpoint he would like to see a phased prioritized approach with what are some things that we can begin to think about. He said that structured parking was brought to the table and that he thinks that is something that needs to be addressed if that should be one of the first moves that we should be thinking about. He asked what some of the priority moves would be and as a form of implementation would offer that there should be some more conversation and discussions on what are some of the first moves we should be thinking about.

Mr. Keller said he had communications from both Commissioners Bivins and Firehock and they have asked me to pass on their positive views towards this. He said that both have met individually with staff and they feel that the comments that they have made for the most part have been incorporated in this last shorter timeframe and very much appreciates that. He said again to reiterate those concerns that we have been hearing along the dais of connectivity that those are ones that really have been expressed by them and he shares those views as well. He said that we are all unanimous and that is a significant challenge and you knew that when you began this process, but he thinks that there is still thought that there could be maybe some more creativity as this begins to develop as we have heard as we are starting to see those first pieces come in.

Mr. Keller said in terms of the parking garages it is interesting to think about places in our greater community where we have seen the positive aspects of those and so without getting into how they happen he thinks that for many years we got the small decks at the corner and the plan for the Downtown Mall included not just parking garages but store fronts on the lower levels to make them pedestrian friendly. He said the University in what they have done in terms of the hospital have put in the large group parking area as well on

Ivy Road. He said that we all have seen that if we really want to have the kind of density that we are talking about that this is going to be an important step.

Mr. Keller said speaking for myself he was trying to translate from the other two commissioners who unfortunately can't be here this evening that the connectivity issues is the one piece but overall the sense of how this has moved and how we have seen this grow that we have been involved that there has been a significant amount of transparency we believe in the community in the way this has been shared in the many groups. He asked Rachel to hit on some of those community groups and areas that you have meet with over the course of the 2 ½ years and the number of groups that have been involved. He said it was just as one last opportunity for us to think about what a major undertaking this has been and how much community involvement there has been.

Ms. Falkenstein said that she did not have exact numbers but would say we have had dozens of meetings with different groups, citizens, stakeholders and property owners. She said we tried to do some focused conversations with different folks and tried to get a focus group with younger people, with business leaders, and with finance professionals to talk about some of the financing hurdles that we would have to get through. She said throughout the whole process we have done multiple ways for community members to get involved with on-line surveys, social media, community meetings, PTO meetings, went out to soccer games and talked to parents and so we tried as creatively as we could to reach the community in different ways rather than just through traditional community meetings, which we did have. She said it had been over 2½ years and started in April 2016 with the kickoff.

Mr. Keller asked to go back to Commissioner Dotson and talk about implementation a bit more.

Mr. Dotson said on the topic of information he had a question to lead off with and then a couple of suggestions. He said the question is at the last meeting we were talking about economic development and in my mind economic development is part of community building and place making – how will economic development fit into the implementation of this plan – will there be a very active role or is this largely a community development thing and economic development is dealing with more major industries – how would that happen?

Ms. Falkenstein replied that she thinks they would play an active role in the implementation, a big thing we called for is partnerships and she knows it is something the county is looking at as a whole. She said it is how we can start to enter some of these public/private partnerships. She said a parking garage is something that has come up time and time again – is there a partnership opportunity for a public/private project maybe that involved structured parking. She said so they will play a very important role and they have been part of the discussion of the drafting of the plan; they have blessed the implementation chapter as we have it written, and they will certainly be involved as we move forward.

Mr. Gast-Bray said that he would just like to add that as part of this process that we have an opportunity zone on one of the quadrants and that was very much enacted in partnership with Economic Development and they certainly are the lead on that. He said also it was part of the work that the Commission and Board of Supervisors blessed by having the expedited process that was not just for business but was for us to learn by dealing with the potential development to kind of figure out how this works in practice and

what kind of obstacles might be there. He said parking came up a lot in that particular mix because we were able to do things like take advantage of the topography and given the topography we might be able to put in deck parking because it is the only thing you can really do under the frontage of the building when that applies. He said we wanted to be flexible enough to do that. He said another opportunity that came in with talking with potential developers is building to be able to put in decked parking but not requiring it up front because obviously we have tons of parking right now but putting in footers, etc. in the development to be able to go up if they need to and to design it into the mix for instance with something that we came up with in partnership by talking with potential developers and seeing what would be enticing to them to do X, Y and Z. He said this is still a learning process as we go forward and it is needed to be flexible because we do not know what the future is going to be and one thing we are seeing is that change is happening faster and faster all the time. He said the more we try to tie something down the more we are probably obviating ourselves, so he thinks that this plan has been very thoughtful at opening opportunities. He said the invitation that you mentioned Commissioner Dotson is very much how do we get what we all want, and he thinks there has been a strong movement forward on that and considers that one of the best forms of economic development that he knows.

Mr. Dotson said he had three other points – one is that projects like this need a champion and a consistent champion and he does not know whether it would be Rachael or somebody else but the same person that is out there talking to existing businesses and solving problems. He said it needs to be the same person that is talking to new businesses, residential developers, VDOT and kind of a consistent yearning to and commitment to this plan over the years. He said it is important to have a champion and not parcel it out to different departments – it needs to be a person to do that. He said that is a suggestion in terms of implementation.

Mr. Dotson said a second suggestion has to do with momentum and this has already been addressed by transformative projects, those that happen in the first five years, but he is thinking even at a smaller scale that maybe we challenge ourselves to every quarter complete something and publicize it. He said we could approve something either a study, a RFP, a development project, a plan or whatever it is and then publicize that so that people can say things are happening here. He said in a three-month period people will not forget about it whereas in a five-year period people can forget. He said that is a way at a more micro-level to get some momentum going.

Mr. Dotson said the last comment or suggestion is maybe consider creating an advisory board of people who are not from this community but who have experience from elsewhere. Mr. Dotson said he was thinking of groups like the Urban Land Institute with people in finance, people who have worked with developers who can say to us sort of truth or ground testing that this is a great idea you have but it is too soon for X, but Y could be a great thing to do right now. He said that he had seen how it has worked in other communities and maybe create this kind of advisory board of people who have done this sort of thing to help us learn because this will be a learning process. He said those are my three thoughts and suggestions about implementation.

Ms. More said to add on to what Bruce said that she likes the idea of keeping momentum around the plan but was reluctant to do studies just for the sake of doing studies, so we can have it in the paper that we did another study. She said if there is an opportunity or there is a need to do that then we should do that and create momentum around that since this is a vision and it is subject to change. She said we are drawing lines through buildings and

know that maybe is not where that line is but as opportunities present themselves she thinks that is very much appropriate to continue to further study and look at those in a more detailed way as we start to have something that becomes a little more concrete and is not as much of a vision. However, she would avoid without some sort of trigger or anchor to kick this off doing too many studies without momentum behind those.

Ms. Riley said she thought those were all interesting considerations and the key question is being are we going to dedicate some additional resources and/or staffing to the implementation and she does not personally think she should weigh in on that, but it is the right question.

Mr. Keller said it was time for us to do a bit of a wrap-up and consider a motion. He said it would seem with the discussions about the economic development at our last meeting that maybe these are things that you will be taking jointly to the Supervisors, but he thinks that the thoughts that are here about where that integration of the County Economic Plan and each of these area plans that are calling for work forces, places for people to work, live and move back and forth to recreate are really important. He said that he would hope that we would be getting a sense in this next step of how that is going to begin to integrate and not just with the projects that come to us in the regular manner but actually searching for projects to add into this. He said because he was reiterated by both of my colleagues who communicated with me and it is a concern of mine to reiterate in the connectivity the pedestrian level, the human scale level and when we think about the infrastructure that could be added and priorities for that in how that is going to evolve. He said just as we have had the recent announcement of the new park on 29 North and creative ways of trying to fund that through crowd sourcing - are there parts of this that could be thought about in creative manners to bring forward pieces of it that would, as we have heard from everyone here including staff, that would spark the imagination of the public and the private sector for their involvement. He said that next piece of this moving forward is important, and we will be interested to hear back from you after this stage has completed the process through the Supervisors. He asked if someone was prepared to make a motion.

Mr. Dotson made a motion that the Planning Commission adopt Attachment C Resolution to approve Rio29 Small Area Plan, CPA-2018-4 and forward this to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

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

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

Mr. Keller said thanks to all of staff and the community members who have been involved with this and have gotten us to this point.

Mr. Dotson asked do we know what date this will go to the Board.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that it would go to the Board on December 12.

The meeting moved to the next item.

Work Session.

CPA-2018-00006 Birdwood Mansion and Grounds
This work session focused on potential amendments to portions of the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan that directly relate to the Birdwood property, including the "Future Land Use" section and the "Other Areas of Importance" subsection. This Comp Plan Amendment process follows the recent completion of the Birdwood Area B Study, which was formally endorsed by the Planning and Coordination Council (PACC) on September 20, 2018. (Tim Padalino)

Mr. Padalino stated that this is a Comprehensive Plan work session, and prior to addressing the CPA language, he would touch on a few background documents. He said that the Birdwood property is owned by the UVA Foundation, and all of the recent projects have been studied with a larger Birdwood Master Plan the Foundation completed in 2018 – which became the basis of an Area B study, as the portion of the County owned by the foundation is in that area and is subject to joint planning among the County, City and University.

Mr. Padalino said that four of the five main projects or uses contained in the Area B study were either built or under construction today, because they were found to be consistent with the vision presented in the master plan as it currently exists. He cited the connector road as an example, stating that it has been approved and constructed and in permanent use; the UVA indoor golf was also approved and constructed and opened in October 2018. He stated that the Birdwood Golf Course renovation and short course addition have been approved under the previous zoning and were under construction. He added that the UVA tennis facility had a special use permit granted, and a site plan and water protection ordinance plan were currently under review.

Mr. Padalino noted that those projects were the majority of what was contained in the Birdwood Master Plan and subsequently in the Area B study, with the one remaining use from that study being the proposed rehab and reuse of the Birdwood Mansion and surrounding grounds – for special events and for hospitality services. He said that because of that, the proposed use was not considered to be consistent with the language that currently exists in the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan, and therefore amendments to the land use section as well as the "Other Areas of Importance" subsection would need to be amended before the proposed use would be found to be consistent with the recommendations in the plan.

Mr. Padalino stated that the Birdwood property is more than 540 acres of the development area, referencing it on a map and comprised the southern and western edge of the development area. He noted the excerpts of the Birdwood Master Plan that became the Area B study, which went through PACC Tech and was endorsed by that body. He noted that PACC is the Planning and Coordination Council, the three-party collaboration among the County, City, and University. He emphasized that his point at this meeting was not to go through the Area B Study in detail but to focus on the Birdwood Mansion and grounds, because the use was not covered in the master plans.

Mr. Padalino said that on page 44, the master plan identifies the Birdwood property as an "Other Area of Importance" and provides future land use designations for this large property, including institutional – which covers the majority of the 544-acre property, and some areas in the rear portion of the property designated as Parks and Green Systems.

He pointed out that there is one paragraph in the master plan that led to a lot of ambiguity

between different users of the document: “In the future, this large property may serve a more intensive function than it does presently. Possible considerations include but are not limited to: a mixed-use area near the entrance and residential uses for other parts of the property not designated as a part of the parks community and systems. Before further development of the property occurs, an amendment to the plan will be needed.”

Mr. Padalino stated that this led to a lack of clarity, especially “this property **may** serve a more intensive function,” as there was a lot of good faith misunderstanding about what that meant. He said that as a result, a CPA is presented to the Commission that proposes to amend that section to resolve the ambiguity and update the vision for this “Other Area of Importance” to capture the main concepts contained in the PACC--endorsed Area B Study.

Mr. Padalino said that there were a few things the proposed language would accomplish, but he wanted to clarify what it would not do. He explained that the CPA would not change the Institutional land use or the Parks and Green Systems land use. He noted that it would provide an updated summary of continued uses, would reorganize some of the information and provide additional details, and it would introduce the concept of reusing the historic mansion for events and hospitality purposes – although it would contain qualifying language about the necessity of historic preservation and context-sensitive design.

Mr. Padalino added that the language as proposed would also maintain a placeholder section for longer range future uses and development – and would provide clarity by distinguishing between the Foundation’s near-future plans, which are contained in the PACC-endorsed Area B Study, and the longer-range future plans that are currently unknown or unformed. He said that he was trying to use the existing language as much as possible, and it was included in Attachment B as tracked changes. He stated that it was also important to reserve the possibility of additional future uses, given the size of the parcel and location within the development areas.

Mr. Padalino stated that the concept of reusing the Birdwood Mansion for events is not only being evaluated as part of this CPA process, the County had actually received a permit application to pursue the use in the form of a zoning map amendment. He emphasized that this application is the product of a lot of close coordination between UVA Foundation staff and consultants and Community Development staff. He said that considering their proposed uses, County staff indicated that the best thing they could do would be to apply for a ZMA with proposed proffers as submitted. He noted that he did not want to go into detail on those because they were separate reviews, although there is significant overlap.

Mr. Padalino said that project-specific details for the mansion reuse project would be evaluated and reviewed in detail during that separate ZMA review process and during subsequent reviews by the site review committee, ARB, and others. He stated that the priority focus for this CPA work session is generally to consider whether reuse of the historic Birdwood Mansion should be incorporated into the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plans, and specifically to evaluate the draft language provided as attachments B and E.

Mr. Keller asked UVA Foundation representatives to speak next, but asked Commissioners if they first had questions.

Ms. Spain asked what the earth-moving was at the edge of the property.

Mr. Padalino responded that it was most likely the renovation of the golf course, and most of

the holes would be remodeled or relocated to provide an overall smaller golf course.

Ms. Valerie Long of Williams Mullen law firm, representing the UVA Foundation, addressed the Commission and said that UVA Foundation President Tim Rose and Project Planner Elise Cruz were also present. She stated that they appreciated the collaborative nature of the proposal and were generally comfortable with it, especially Mr. Padalino's differentiation between current and future uses, as this contemplates new uses in the future.

Ms. Long stated that there was reference in Mr. Padalino's text regarding pedestrian and bicycle connection to neighborhoods, and while the applicant supported this in concept, they wanted to make it clear that they did not have unilateral ability to force pedestrian or bicycle connections into neighborhoods that have already been developed. She added that they would work with Mr. Padalino on that text, which had originally said "considered." She noted that there is a new connector road that includes pedestrian and bicycle connections between the golf course area and the Boar's Head Sports Club, Ednam Village, and Ednam Forest.

Ms. Long offered to answer questions.

Ms. Riley commented that in the existing land uses draft of the changed language, the text refers to "Ivy Mountain Muscular-Skeletal Center, Formerly the Kluge Children's Rehabilitation Center," and she asked for clarification.

Ms. Long responded that she had not been directly involved with that, but it was essentially the redevelopment of that for other institutional uses by the University. She noted that at the PACC Tech meetings in which she had participated, there were proposals to those committees that had referenced the proposed projects.

Mr. Tim Rose stated that the Kluge University Center that is part of that parcel is a much broader complex under the proposal, which also includes redevelopment of the UVA Police Station and will include a hotel center – all of which falls under this proposal.

Ms. More commented that Commissioners had walked the property and staff pointed out the location of the mansion and surrounding property and structures, as well as the existing gardens, and she asked Mr. Padalino if he had a slide that showed where that is on the property and how it relates to the proposal.

Mr. Padalino responded that his slide was just an excerpt from the master plan, so it was small scale, and he pointed out the vicinity of the mansion which encompasses about 14 acres total on the National Historic Register. He said that this was identified as the Birdwood Mansion and Grounds site, as distinct from the surrounding golf course, driving range, and future short course.

Ms. More said that she would like to see something like what they saw before, and she noted that in two places on page 3 it talks about Highway Commercial – which was described as encompassing the historic site and implies adjacency to Route 250. She stated that she would like to understand why that is a recommendation, as it seems that the mansion site would be an island among the commercial development. Ms. More said that the proposal also references long-range uses with increased intensity and possibly a mixed-use area with institutional, athletic, hospitality, residential, etc. – and she wanted to know if this was the area by the entrance to the historic property.

Mr. Padalino responded that it referred to Birdwood Drive and the historic entrance was closed, except for use by residents who live on the rental properties there. He explained that what is now Boar's Head Drive, which was formerly Golf Course Drive, was used by almost everyone who accessed the Birdwood Golf Course or the Boar's Head Sports Club. He stated that he did not know if the Foundation's plan was to continue use of the rental properties, but the long-range future and potential uses did not contemplate the how or where, but just entertained the possibility of a whole suite of future uses.

Mr. Padalino emphasized that all the known Foundation plans are incorporated in the Birdwood Master Plan and subsequently the Area B Study, which are also typically reflected in the neighborhood master plans. Mr. Padalino said that he was able to keep that with some modifications but clarifying that there were some near-future proposals that have received PACC endorsement, which was the main emphasis of the CPA drafted.

Ms. More asked about the Highway Commercial encompassing the property and what that would mean for the mansion property that fronts Route 250 – and she would like to see the overlay that showed the entire historic property, as there were some specific features intended to be preserved. She expressed concern about the possibility of commercial development between the road and the mansion and asked why this was proposed.

Mr. Padalino responded that when County staff coordinated plans with the UVA Foundation, they looked at all the different possible permitting paths, based on what the Foundation indicated they were interested in potentially doing – ranging from another SP to rezoning the entire property to changing the Comp Plan designation. He stated that the process started in October, but they have been engaged for more than a year in terms of intended uses for the mansion. He said that they have looked at it from different perspectives, but a ZMA for a certain portion of the property seemed to be the most sensible approach to pursue the proposal, based on what the Foundation said it wanted to do.

Mr. Padalino pointed out that there were challenges in using a structure presently considered a single-family dwelling for hospitality and overnight stays or for events – because one was primarily a residential use and one was a commercial use – so there was not really a good special use permit that could be applied for to accomplish a different mix of uses. He said that because of this, Highway Commercial seemed to make the most sense – and the Foundation had made extensive proffers and had struck out uses that would typically be allowed in HC.

Mr. Padalino also noted that the proffers almost identically mirror what the Boar's Head facility had proffered a decade ago, with both properties having similar uses. Mr. Padalino emphasized that it would make sense from an operational standpoint for the properties to have similar zoning, and it would make it clear to neighbors what they were going to do and not going to do.

Mr. Dotson said that he was satisfied that UVA had adequate interaction with the neighborhoods around the property and assumed that those conversations would continue. He stated that when this was before the Commission as a specific project, he had concerns about comments made about redoing traffic flows and redefining intersections on Route 250. Mr. Dotson said that his concerns related to traffic impact and UVA's participation in the costs for those and asked if this related to that in any way.

Mr. Padalino replied that the CPA technically did not address those items, but it was just one aspect of an overall proposal that also included a ZMA application – which was just received in

late October. He stated that in the pre-application conference, they discussed having this application be constructed in a way that mirrors the existing conditions or proffers such as intersection improvements and financial obligations for surrounding uses such as the Boar's Head and cross-reference them in the ZMA, so they would not nullify the work done to date. He stated that typically you would want to look at transportation impacts during the CPA process, but in this instance, they were relying on the previous zoning approval.

Mr. Dotson also suggested that the names of facilities be made more specific, as not everyone in the public was as familiar with UVA as the Commission and staff might be, and perhaps there could be more explanation provided in the text. He pointed out that the beginning text refers to UVA/Birdwood, but he wasn't sure if that meant just the UVA Foundation and suggested that it be wordsmithed.

Ms. Spain asked if under existing conditions reflected in Attachment A, pages 3 and 4, the Ragged Mountain Natural Area and southwestern portion designated Parks and Green System would all be left intact in terms of land use, or if it would be affected by the CPA.

Mr. Padalino responded that none of that would change, and it would align with what PACC had endorsed and not be altered in any way.

Ms. Spain stated that on page 4 the text refers to a "critical escape for humans," and she felt that perhaps "refuge" might be a better language choice.

Mr. Padalino said that the language may have just been excerpted from the Ragged Mountain Biodiversity document.

Mr. Keller commented that the UVA Foundation had done a cultural landscape study of the area, and there were stale national register nominations that had emerged prior to certain technologies and philosophies had evolved. He stated that it might be worthwhile for UVA to consider updating the State Landmark and National Historic designations so that they considered elements identified in the cultural landscape study to complement the historic structures, which were called out in the earlier nominations prior to cultural landscape elements. He said that this also related to Ms. More's points regarding the entrance from Route 250, and this would reiterate what UVA had found in its studies and help the public better understand their approach. He added that this would also be a helpful template for other historic properties, many of which were designated in the 1970s.

Mr. Keller asked if staff needed a more specific response or just general feedback.

Mr. Padalino stated that this input had been very helpful, and staff did not necessarily need any formal action at this point. He said that staff would be working to firm up the schedule for the Board's work session, currently scheduled for January 16, 2019, and there would be a hearing for the ZMA on December 10, 2018.

Mr. Keller thanked staff and the Foundation for their work and their cooperative process, stating that the connector road and squash courts were a good example of collaboration between Birdwood and the Boar's Head.

Next Steps:
Staff to schedule work session with Board of Supervisors (tentatively January 16, 2019) and then public hearing with each body. The community meeting is scheduled tentatively on

Monday, December 20, 2018. Staff will work with the applicant to address issues identified by the Commission.

The meeting moved to the next item.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – November 7, 2018.

Mr. Gast-Bray reviewed the actions taken on November 7, 2018.

Committee Reports

Mr. Keller invited committee reports.

Commissioner Keller reported:
- Attended Rivanna River Flyover thanks to Rivanna Conservation Alliance and we are working to have those images available.

Commissioner Dotson announced upcoming meetings:
- CIP Oversight 101 to be held on Friday, 11/15/18 at 10 a.m. in room 241.
- November 20 and November 28, 2018, the Oversight Committee will have its two annual meetings to give its input on the CIP before it goes back to County Executive to move forward to the BOS.

Commissioner Riley reported:
- Attended Focus Group for the Affordable Housing Needs Assessment with Tim Keller with consultant, Anita Morrison from PES and Ron White. It should be completed and shared with the various jurisdictions by the end of December with a set of brief recommendations to each county and the city following in first quarter.

With no further committee reports, the meeting moved to the next item.

Old Business.

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

New Business.

Mr. Keller invited new business.

a. **Fontaine Master Plan (Luis Carrazana)**
Presentation on Fontaine Master Plan for informational purposes.

Mr. Carrazana reported that this had been presented to PAC-TEC and the Master Planning Council and said that it was hard to focus on just one part of UVA because their plans were all interconnected. He said that he would provide a brief overview of current activities that his office was involved in, with North Grounds and the Emmett/Ivy Corridor having a master plan done years ago that was still active. He stated that there are construction and infill activities around McCormick, with Brandon Avenue having several projects under construction; the West Complex and Hospital Drive area is a future area of consideration, but it is very much tied to the Fontaine Master Plan.

Mr. Carrazana stated that there were a lot of activities proposed to be moved from one area of

the University to another, and along with the area plans, Fontaine engages in integrated space plans – looking at the program of each area. He said that they look at the schools needs and priorities, along with program direction, and try to pair them with their space needs. He stated that they were in the process of doing a comprehensive academic space plan, which takes all of these into account and brings them together – considering where there are duplications and synergies, particularly in research and classrooms. He noted that if they were to take all the plans and all the required classrooms, they would be building about 300,000 square feet of classrooms – but they really only need about 50,000 square feet of new classrooms if they avoid duplication.

Mr. Carrazana said that the Fontaine parcel was purchased by the UVA Foundation in 1994, and UVA recently acquired the last parcels there; between 1994 and 2018, there had been a process in which UVA was purchasing buildings and land parcels on which to build. He said that the initial building was constructed in 1995 and was just renovated from an office use to clinics, so now the urology and cardiology clinics are located at 500 Ray C. Hunt Drive. He reported that there is currently 875,000 gross square feet in the park, which was envisioned to increase to just over 1 million in the park – with a build capacity in the park of 1.4 million gross square feet, looking into the future and not having a long-term timeline.

Mr. Carrazana stated that Fontaine forms a triangle with the health system to the east and the Ivy Mountain development to the north, including the muscular-skeletal center – which is currently housed primarily in Fontaine. He said that this was also in proximity to science and engineering, about a mile from that quad, with good bike access that would still benefit from improvements, along with enhanced transit.

Mr. Carrazana said that there are two recent efforts that have fed into the Fontaine Master Plan – the engineering and the health system integrated space plans, with components of both of those studies incorporated to accommodate clinicians, students and researchers, as well as patients. He stated that enhancing patient access and experience is a predominant concern with the space plans, as some of the facilities such as West Complex were quite dated and challenging to navigate. He noted that they were looking to actively take the clinics out of that complex. He said that there were currently about a 500,000 annual outpatient visits, not counting ER or inpatient visits – with less than 200,000 currently at Fontaine – so they were looking to flip that ratio.

Mr. Carrazana reported that the vision for the infrastructure includes making the facilities patient friendly and hosting transformational research innovation community, which incorporates the idea of moving measures from the research labs into active patient care practices. He said that one way to achieve this was to put clinicians and researchers in close proximity, and Fontaine provided a great opportunity for that. He said that one of the physical challenges with Fontaine was just getting there, and there has not been great bus traffic there, with two busses now planning to go to Fontaine in 15-minute incremental pickups that will take riders anywhere on the grounds. He said that the last physical driver was an active role for the clinical and research aspects of the West Complex.

Mr. Carrazana stated that the advantages of Fontaine improvements include proximity to campus, easy accessibility, plenty of surface parking, opportunities for clear wayfinding – which was a challenge now on central grounds, and a pleasant aesthetic situation with mountain views and greenspace. He added that Fontaine currently houses one of the University's largest research cores, with tens of millions of research equipment that cannot be easily duplicated. He said that the footprint offered great flexibility, being flat for the most part and able to house

large-footprint, multidisciplinary buildings that combine both clinics and research. He said that there were also opportunities for public-private partnerships and initiatives, with some limitations in the case of state-funded buildings that may not apply at Fontaine.

Mr. Carrazana presented a map showing Fontaine and its proximity to Route 29. He reported that the near-term development includes construction of a 1,260-car parking structure as an initial project, which provides necessary parking. He said that these improvements would also include a roundabout that would afford visitors with increased time to make a decision as to where to go next. He stated that they were also looking to create two neighborhoods – a clinic neighborhood and a research neighborhood – which would also help with wayfinding. He stated that there would also be some new amenities.

Mr. Carrazana pointed out the location of the current Fontaine traffic entry, with visitors having to make a decision about whether to turn right or left – but upon arrival, the backs of the buildings were viewed, and they were not clearly marked. He presented a simulation of the parking garage and its location within the park. He said that they would demolish the building at 545 Ray C. Hunt Drive that currently housed orthopedics, which would be moving to Ivy Mountain. He noted that it is the smallest building in Fontaine, and it would require major rehabilitation to remain useful.

Mr. Carrazana said that the redevelopment will allow extension of the road and creation of a roundabout, as well as establishment of amenities and open spaces. He stated that the research park and building were the first developments in the timeline, with the School of Medicine being the anchor tenant, and Curry School, Engineering, and Arts & Sciences also collaborating in the building, along with the UVA Brain Institute. He stated that this would combine with RROC, which was just to the southwest, and Snyder – which would be part of a doubling to almost 100,000 square feet of contiguous research core, making it one of the largest research cores in the Mid-Atlantic.

Mr. Carrazana stated that the clinical neighborhood would be a phased development of 120,000-150,000 square feet in two buildings that would connect, with greenspaces for staff, wayfinding, etc. He said that the amenities building would be located at the end of the green street and would have conference rooms, a bus stop, and food service for clinicians, patients, staff and researchers.

Mr. Carrazana said that transportation and connectivity were the keys to unlocking Fontaine, with improvements for busses, as well as bike and pedestrian amenities. He pointed out a Smart Scale project that was underway with the City, noting the location of the County line, and he stated that UVA intends to extend where City busses stop so they go to the end of Fontaine. He noted that there are currently no sidewalks that go into the park.

Mr. Carrazana explained that the bus service currently includes an inner and outer loop that end just shy of Fontaine, and he pointed their current locations out and the proposed extensions. He explained that the bus will come in and do a turnaround, with a bus stop at the entrance, and he said it adds 2.5 minutes to the route but would provide a 15-minute headway to any location on grounds. He noted that there is currently a small hospital shuttle that comes into the park, which would move from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes. He pointed out the Health South building and the 415 Ray C. Hunt Drive clinics, noting that the lawn would be gone – with a street put in and storm water detention along the perimeter.

Mr. Carrazana presented a rendering of the first phase for the near term, and he pointed out

the clinical and research neighborhoods. He stated that the earlier buildout was just over 1 million square feet, with the future buildout at 1.4 million square feet net – with a lot of buildings coming out because of their age and the potential cost of repurposing them, with most having very small footprints and land values sometimes exceeding the value of the buildings. He stated that there were more parking garages needed beyond the initial large one, so there was an additional one to the east and a third one to the southwest.

Mr. Carrazana said that there would be a transitional neighborhood for either clinical or research, with another extension of the clinical neighborhood toward 500 Ray C. Hunt Drive, which would also provide an opportunity for another research building. He explained that the last piece was another amenity building, which was envisioned to have frontage on Fontaine and could possibly have retail and maybe food amenities, as well as classrooms. He noted a proposed bike/ped bridge that would cross over Fontaine.

Ms. Riley asked what the timeline was on the near term.

Mr. Carrazana responded that it was 5-7 years, with the parking garage considered a near term for inclusion in the Fontaine six-year capital plan – which means it would happen in the next two years.

Ms. Spain asked if there were plans to have golf carts or shuttles that could take patients from the structured parking to buildings for appointments.

Mr. Carrazana commented that patients prefer surface parking and like to park close to the front door, so all of Fontaine's clinic buildings have associated surface parking – so a surface lot would remain, with a parking structure next to it. He stated that they were accommodating it well in the near term, but in the long term, they would likely have people park in garages.

Ms. Spain asked where Northridge fit into all of this.

Mr. Carrazana responded that it was not completely built out and it was possible to expand to the north, with some opportunities for parking structures there as well – but they did not have a specific vision to do that in the foreseeable future. He added that they would continue to use both Northridge clinics for clinical purposes. He stated that there was a shuttle that currently went just from the hospital property up to Northridge and back, but they could see it connecting to Fontaine for stops and then down to the hospital.

Mr. Dotson asked if he could talk about the elements and the mix of variables, such as accommodating more patients, new special patients, more space needed for existing special cases, market competition, and shrinking federal dollars.

Mr. Carrazana responded that the health system integrated space plan identifies the need and the market direction as a population-based model. He stated that this UVA could not continue to function as a community hospital, as there was already a community hospital at Martha Jefferson. He said that it was difficult for UVA to function with the recharge and reimbursement rates from Medicare and Medicaid as a community hospital, so they would need to move to tertiary quaternary care model – which has much higher levels of acuity. He stated that the goal is for the UVA hospital to move in the tertiary quaternary direction and shift outpatient patients into the community for care, using clinics. He said that the way to achieve this was through partnerships, with some of those already forged.

Mr. Carrazana stated that as Central Virginia grows, that would mean more patients – and UVA believes it can gain market share in some areas. He said that there was tremendous growth in the area of transplants, with the muscular-skeletal center combining all orthopedic specialties. He said that there were probably some areas they did not need to grow. He stated that the three categories of care were on grounds, near grounds, and off grounds.

Mr. Dotson asked what role federal funding played in this.

Mr. Carrazana responded that that affected clinics but also research credits, which were increasingly competitive. He said that the healthcare reimbursement continued to be a challenge, although Medicaid expansion in Virginia helps in terms of reimbursements for UVA. He added that if they are just seeing a patient for a simple case, the UVA model was very expensive because of the number of people involved as a teaching hospital. Mr. Carrazana said that federal grants would continue to be competitive, and P3 initiatives would become increasingly important.

Ms. More asked about the timeline of 5-7 years for the short-term phase.

Mr. Carrazana responded that the two large buildings – the research building and clinical building – were within the five-year timeframe, and there were some amenities that would need to be prepared to enable the projects. He said that the 5-7 years includes bringing the clinical building online.

Ms. More asked about the stepdown when patients were ready to be discharged, as proper follow-up care reduces the likelihood of readmission.

Mr. Carrazana replied that when someone is in a stepdown situation, no one is making any money – so the need to expand those beds, which UVA has assessed and believes it can accomplish. He said that this would allow them to expand some of their observation units, and it was the reimbursable model that was pushing doctors to get patients out sooner. He stated that the question was who the caregivers would be upon discharge, as is the case sometimes with elderly patients, which was an issue for all facilities. He said that Health South did perform some of that function currently.

Ms. More stated that the stepdown system reduces chance of rehospitalization, and perhaps adjustments could be made to accommodate patient discharges.

Mr. Carrazana agreed that it was important to get the proper resources in place at home, and there were also issues with extended hospital stays.

Mr. Keller asked if there was significant more acreage in the greater Fontaine Park area on the road leading to the Department of Forestry.

Mr. Carrazana responded that there is more land, but they try to keep the development within the areas that are not in the woodlands, which have fairly steep terrain. He said that having the natural buffer would be advantageous, with the Rivanna Trail running directly behind Fontaine. He clarified that UVA did not own the land leading to the Department of Forestry, as the state owns that.

Mr. Keller said that he was hearing a lot of buzz about a $29/month Medicare plan in the community, and asked for details – as this seemed like a magnanimous service.

Mr. Carrazana responded that population-care is about numbers, with potential advantages and disadvantages, and this was a way to try to attract volume. He said that this did not work well for tertiary quaternary care, but it could work well for primary care and could be a benefit for the patient – although they lose a deeper service.

Mr. Keller commented that it seems they are preparing for a larger population base here, but on the other hand there is decentralization of the system, citing an example of going to Zions Crossroads for an MRI. He noted that there would be interns from here working at the NOVA hospital system and mentioned that some technology advances would have people getting in-home basic medical services. Mr. Keller stated that this discussion indicates that there is much more to this than land use.

Mr. Carrazana said that UVA Health visits their Wise campus every year, and in four days, that clinic sees over 10,000 people – which may be their only doctor visit for an entire year – and those patients come from all over the region, not just Virginia, for cardiology, dental care, etc.

There was no formal action taken on this item.

Chair Keller announced:

- The next meeting will be on Tuesday, November 20, 2018 in the Auditorium at 6:00 p.m.
- There will be no meeting on Tuesday, November 27, 2018.

Hearing 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

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:26 p.m. to the Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday, November 20, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. in 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: 2-5-2019
Initials: sct