Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL MINUTES September 24, 2019

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 24, 2019, 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, Vice-Chair; Daphne Spain; Karen Firehock; Pam Riley; Jennie More; Bruce Dotson; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Other officials present were Jodie Filardo, Director of Community Development; Amelia McCulley, Deputy Director of Community Development; Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission; Andrew Knuppel; Rachel Falkenstein; and Andy Herrick.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

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

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

Mr. Keller invited comment from the public on other matters not listed on the agenda.

Mr. Sean Tubbs, Piedmont Environmental Council, noted that that day was the first day of the official launch of the School of Data Science at the University of Virginia. He said it was a major addition to the institution and one of the biggest drivers of growth in the community. He said that according to UVA Today, there will be at least 10 endowed chairs, as well as a number of faculty and students. He said the question is to what effect this will have on the community's population.

Mr. Tubbs said that as he has been monitoring land use issues for over a decade in the community, the forum for those questions to be asked has traditionally been the Planning and Coordination Council, or PAC. He said many of the commissioners may have attended the PAC or PAC Tech meetings that have been held. He noted that the PAC hadn't met since March, and two meetings were cancelled earlier that year. He said he understood that there was a meeting planned for October, but there is no official listing of it. He said usually, they meet in November instead of October, and he was curious as to the change.

Mr. Tubbs said there is also a Master Planning Committee that is not open to the public and not subject to the same meeting rules that the PAC is. He said as a reporter, he got good stories and was able to assist the community by covering that meeting on the important matter of regional growth and how to deal with it.

Mr. Tubbs said that in June, a member of the City Planning Commission (who sits on the Master Planning Committee) had reported that over the next 7-10 years, UVA is expecting a 15% growth. He said he was alerted by this number and said it would be consistent with growth trends over the years. He said that when he looked at the forecasts that UVA had submitted to the State Council of Higher Education, he found out it projects flat enrollment growth for undergraduates. He asked how this could be possible when there is a new school and general attrition in the community.

Mr. Tubbs explained that this is why he brought up PAC, as he hoped that this public body continues to exist into the future. He said that as questions are asked, there are big issues. He said the three-party agreement was a major landmark decision back in 1986 and offered a tradition where the three communities work together. He said he would like to know what the future of the PAC is.

Consent Agenda

There was no consent agenda.

Public Hearing Items

CCP201900002 ECC Monopole at COB 5th Street

Mr. Andrew Knuppel, Community Development, presented. He explained that this was a review for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan to establish a public use microwave radio communications facility supporting operations of the Charlottesville-UVA-Albemarle County Emergency Communications Center (ECC) in accordance with Section 15-2 22-32 of the Code of Virginia.

Mr. Knuppel said the purpose of the review was to consider whether the overall location, character, and extent of the facility were in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan. He said the scope of the review and action by the Planning Commission was limited to the appropriateness on the site for the proposed use, and the commission's finding would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors, but that no additional action was required from them.

Mr. Knuppel said the Charlottesville-UVA-Albemarle County ECC operates a regional radio system supporting public safety. He said use of the current system dates to the late 1990s and early 2000s, and that over the past year, they have been undergoing a series of system upgrades to co-locations and other replacements to help improve the network, providing better coverage for reliability and redundancy for the existing system. He said the County Office Building at 5th Street (COB5) is home to police and fire rescue services for Albemarle County and also serves as the ECC's backup dispatch and equipment facility, which covers the enhanced 911 system as well as computer systems supporting the system.

Mr. Knuppel said that as part of the upgrade to the system, the ECC proposes to establish a microwave radio communications facility supporting that COB5 backup dispatch and equipment facility.

Mr. Knuppel said that COB5 is an institutional use in Neighborhood V of the Comprehensive Plan, covered in the Southern Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan. He said it is on slightly over 13.36 acres between 5th Street and Stagecoach Road and indicated to the location on a map. He noted it is located on an Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Knuppel said the monopole would be a 123-foot-tall monopole with microwave dishes mounted at about 67 feet and 120 feet above ground level. He said it would be located within the rear vehicle equipment storage lot that is currently accessed from Stagecoach Road. He said the ground equipment associated with the project would be located behind the building and would not be visible from the 5th Street Entrance Corridor. He said part of the reasoning for siting out this location was that the dispatch facility requires continuous communications with the overall system.

Mr. Knuppel said in reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, there were two main chapters that were applicable to the project – mainly, the "Historic, Cultural, and Scenic Resources" chapter, and the "Community Facilities" chapter of the plan. He said the goal of the Historic, Cultural, and Scenic Resources is, "Albemarle's historic, cultural, and scenic resources will be preserved, and attractive Entrance Corridors will welcome visitors and residents to, and within, the county." He said there were a couple of objectives that touched on the goal, including Monticello's viewshed and the visual quality and integrity of the roadways and Entrance Corridors.

Mr. Knuppel said that as part of the review process for the project, staff requested a balloon test to be done. He noted that they brought the project to the Architectural Review Board (ARB) for an advisory review as well.

Mr. Knuppel said the balloon test was held on July 30, 2019 at the site. He presented a view from the current storage lot, noting there would be a gate and that the monopole would be located in the back. He presented another view from the driveway of COB5 in order to provide an idea of the scale compared to the height of the current building. He presented another view of northbound on 5th Street near the Old Lynchburg Road intersection and its intersection with Stagecoach Road and indicated to the driveway of COB5 looking north. He presented what he called a typical view from the west side of 5th Street looking towards the building, with 5th Street and Wahoo Way facing south towards the building, with the new 5th Street Place development further up and with I-64 becoming closer.

Mr. Knuppel said the monopole would also be visible from the I-64 Entrance Corridor and presented a view from the eastbound travel lane, facing south towards the building. He showed a similar view from the westbound lane.

Mr. Knuppel said staff brought the application to the ARB for their advisory input on the proposal, noting they had no objection to the ground equipment as it would not be visible from the Entrance Corridor. He said the ARB did determine that the proposed location would likely have negative visual impacts on the 5th Street and I-64 Entrance Corridors and recommended that the monopole be a shade of light gray to help minimize the impacts (in contrast to the typical Java Brown that is typically seen with treetop towers).

Mr. Knuppel noted that the Entrance Corridor legislation in the Albemarle County Code states, "Where the public health or safety and any requirement of this section 30.6 or any term or condition of a certificate of appropriateness conflict, the public health or safety shall prevail." He said this circumstance would not require a certificate of appropriateness for the tower itself, and the ground equipment will not be visible. He explained he was providing context as to how the Entrance Corridor regulations are weighed against public health and safety considerations.

Mr. Knuppel said that the other major component with the review was the Community Facilities chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. He said there were a number of strategies related to the Community Facilities objective that were relevant. He summarized that the proposal provides for the co-location of a new public use of an emergency service need at an existing public facility, and that COB5 was the home of the police and fire rescue services for Albemarle County as well as the dispatch facility. He said the proposal would allow the building to function as a primary dispatch facility in the case of a critical event that impacts the current facility at Ivy Road and to provide redundancy for that location. He said the function as a backup facility necessities the link and prevents the relocation of the facility at a different site.

Mr. Knuppel noted that Strategy 1g mentioned that government facilities should conform to county regulations, standards, and policies and would not conform to the Entrance Corridor design guidelines, as discussed earlier.

Mr. Knuppel said Objective 6 in the Community Facilities states, "To continue to operate an ECC that coordinates emergency communications within the region in an expedient and professional matter." He said Objective 6a further expands upon that, stating that a community member in the proposed facility would directly support the operations of the ECC and provide redundancy for the existing dispatch center for emergency calls.

Mr. Knuppel said the factors favorable in the staff report included that the proposed use would support the ECC, addressing its prioritized emergency needs and health and safety concerns as identified in the Comprehensive Plan. He said the co-location of the facility at an existing public safety facility was also a favorable factor. He noted that staff let Monticello know that they were conducting the balloon test and that they had no concerns about the design of the facility. He said it would not have a negative visual impact on the Monticello viewshed.

Mr. Knuppel said the factor unfavorable was that the location and design of the facility is expected to have a negative visual impact on the Entrance Corridor as it is inconsistent with the guidelines. He said it does serve a prioritized public safety purpose.

Mr. Knuppel stated that staff recommended the commission find the facility to be in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Keller addressed the public, noting that the proposal was an odd one because, in effect, Albemarle County is the applicant, but they have people who will speak for the proposal besides staff. He asked if there were questions for staff before the presentation was made.

Mr. Dotson said his understanding was that with the finding of consistency, the action of the commission is the final commission and is shared with the Board of Supervisors only for informational purposes. He asked if the final decision on the proposal would be made that evening by the commission.

Mr. Knuppel said this was correct and that the County Attorney could weigh in otherwise. He said the Board of Supervisors could overturn the decision with a majority vote, and that the applicant could also appeal the finding of the commission.

Mr. Herrick said this was correct. He explained that the Board of Supervisors could overrule the commission, but if the Board chose not to, the commission would have the final say if it approves of the use.

Mr. Keller asked if this meant that the item would typically go on the consent agenda.

Mr. Herrick said it would be placed on the consent agenda for informational purposes and if pulled from there, the Board could consider it.

Ms. Riley said that in the staff report, under "Purpose of Review," it states that the commission's review should be related to the appropriateness of the site for the proposed public use. She said it then goes on to say that it is not an action or recommendation whether the facilities should be funded or constructed. She asked if the commission's decision was limited to the appropriateness

of the site for the proposed public use, in terms of the review.

Mr. Knuppel said that the language mostly reflected the fact that they are publicly-funded facilities that were coming to the commission. He said that similarly to how the commission has some input in the CIP process, the proposal was focused on consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and location, siting, etc.

Mr. Gabe Elias, ECC Systems Manager, said he works at the Charlottesville-UVA-Albemarle County ECC. He said ECC is the 911 call-taking entity for the county as well the city and university. He said they also dispatch police, fire, and EMS for all three jurisdictions. He said that importantly, ECC is the steward of the Regional Land Mobile Radio System, which serves public safety and public service.

Mr. Elias said the P25 project (named after the technology standard being used) is to upgrade that radio system, as indicated in the staff report. He said the system serves nearly 3,000 users, with over half of those users belonging to Albemarle County, both through general government and the School Division. He said the system was cut over to in 2006, with the project having been born in the late 1990s.

Mr. Elias said he would like to put the tower into larger context, note a couple of pieces of the public process, and address one of the public concerns contained in the commissioners' packet which relates both to the ECC's work and to the project. He explained that the P25 project will upgrade and replace the aging infrastructure and that it was important to improve coverage around the county and the city for responders. He said they also want to improve the reliability and the redundancy, and that COB5 was a core component. He said the proposed 123-foot monopole was a key piece of the connectivity network that connects the towers together and connects the primary and backup dispatch centers together. He said it was critical to be co-located with the backup dispatch center.

Mr. Elias brought up the partnership with Albemarle County Public Schools, noting that it was not shown on the construction drawing because the site wasn't fully designed yet. He said the ECC has partnered with the county schools to support their wireless broadband network project, which provides broadband data services to their constituency as well as to public safety.

Mr. Elias said it was also important to highlight that while the county is the ECC's fiscal agent, ECC is a public body. He said ECC believes, just as the county does, that these public projects should not be exempt from public process. He said he wanted to highlight for members of the public the steps ECC has taken so far. He said they took input from the 5th and Avon Community Advisory Council on July 18, as well as conducting a balloon test on July 30. He said this input was provided for the staff report. He said on September 31, they then went to the ARB, which made the recommendation about the gray color.

Mr. Elias said that the final piece was, if they were approved, the ECC intends to begin construction in the fall of 2019. He said in a perfect world, this would take 30-40 days, or perhaps longer, to construct the actual tower and foundation. He said as separate mobilization later on, they would come back and put antennas on that tower as well as the rest of their towers.

Mr. Elias offered to answer questions to both the commission and the public. He noted that in one of the attachments of correspondence, there was a concern from a local resident about the noise and the glycol ice storage tank removal project. He said the ECC would own this and that part of

the project was clearing out the ice storage tanks. He said after reading the concern, he committed to work with Community Development to develop whatever the best method is to reach out to the local community there. He said they would not overwhelm them with emails, but that they would let them know when to expect large trucks or loud noises and construction, if the proposal is approved.

Mr. Bivins asked if Mr. Elias could give the commission a sense of what the pushpins on slide 2 represented.

Mr. Elias replied that the pushpins on the map were the tower sites for the project and were a representation of the larger system that was being upgraded and built. He said his hope was that this would place COB5 in a larger context. He said there were existing towers at several mountains and would be adding some lease sites at other mountains.

Mr. Bivins referred to the slide, asking about the difference between the aqua and green pins. He noted a green pin on Buck's Elbow and an aqua pin at Heard Mountain.

Mr. Elias replied that the green pins were existing mountaintop sites in the system and some of the microwave relay sites. He said the aqua pins represent the expansion of the system. He said in terms of improving coverage and reliability, these locations address those.

Mr. Bivins asked if those existed already.

Mr. Elias replied that the sites exist. He said that the sites new to the ECC system will be leased sites, so that the ECC would be co-locating on commercial sites. He said the existing tower sites were the green pins, and the proposed sites were new places for the ECC. He said the non-existing site would be COB5 because it was the proposal to build there.

Ms. Firehock asked if this meant that the ECC would again come before the commission for all the aqua-colored pinned sites.

Mr. Elias replied no, explaining that those were co-locations and existing wireless towers on which they would place additional vertical and ground equipment. He said construction would not take place for those. He said the only other construction would be the already in-process replacement tower at Buck's Elbow. He said the ECC has already come to the Board of Supervisors and were also engaged in a more federal, historical review for Peter's Mountain in order to expand a tower. He noted that COB5 would be a new tower.

Mr. Bivins asked if the COB5 tower were approved, if the ECC's dishes would be the only ones on the tower or, at some point in time, if there would be commercial dishes on the pole.

Mr. Elias replied that he did not expect commercial dishes there. He said the public schools would have a cellular array for the private broadband there. He said Mr. Bivins' question was an apt one and had also been asked at the 5th and Avon CAC meeting. He said he did not intend to co-locate anything on the pole, but that he worked for an organization that works for a public body that could overrule him.

Mr. Elias said that one thing that addresses this in the staff report is that there is a limit to any tower to what it can hold. He said a monopole in particular doesn't present one with many options to expand it, and so it has been designed with enough capacity to do what the ECC needs as well

as to add the schools. He said they could not sell off the capacity because if an upgrade was needed in the future, they may need that capacity later.

Ms. Spain asked Mr. Elias to define "enhanced 911."

Mr. Elias replied that it is the current 911 technology that the county currently uses. He said the original 911 was simply a way to call a three-digit number and get that call routed to the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP). He said enhanced 911 came along somewhat later and includes not only the dialer's phone number, but their location. He said including the location was not a new enhancement but has been happening for a while.

Mr. Dotson said the commission had some experience in dealing with cell towers, but virtually no experience with dealing with microwave technology. He asked Mr. Elias to briefly describe the differences with microwaves. He also asked for the rationale behind the large separation between the two antennas (120 feet, and 67 feet) and the function of the two different antennas.

Mr. Elias described "microwave" as a wireless connectivity technology that could be thought of as wireless fiber. He said fiber has many advantages in terms of carrying a great amount of data, but it is also fairly easy to cut fiber. He said that by using the wireless fiber technology, or microwave backhaul, they could bring back the remote connections to some central point (in this case, the dispatch center and core network).

Mr. Elias said microwave is a point-to-point link, and the large circular dishes one can see that are usually 3, 6, or 8-12 feet are used to focus the signal at a distant point and transmit it straight to that point. He said looking at the larger picture, microwave is used to run the signal around to each site in a ring that is redundant in case, for instance, if a path is lost because an antenna is damaged, or a tree grows into the path. He said on commercial towers, one often sees small dishes that are used there for backhaul. He said microwave is a very common wireless backhaul mechanism to take data, voice, and information from a remote radio site and bring it back to a core switching center. He said the core function of the microwave technology was to replace the fiber in a more robust and reliable way.

Mr. Elias addressed the question of the separated antennas. He said that with any microwave tower design, it is ideal to work with the minimum height that one can get away with, for many reasons. He noted that it is very expensive to build tall towers, and tall towers are often also unsightly. He said the design should make the tower high enough to accomplish the goal and allow for some period of growth (e.g. 15-25 years) of statistically predicted tree growth or urban growth.

Mr. Elias said the separation indicates the destination paths, and that the destination paths for the project are downtown and on Buck's Elbow. He said to get to Downtown Charlottesville and to Buck's Elbow (west of Crozet), the towers are wildly different heights, with Buck's Elbow's tower being about 3,000 feet high, and with downtown's being much lower. He said the idea was that the dishes point straight at each other, with room for growth so that trees can grow up and not get into the path. He said they have had the experience of having trees grow up into the path and interruption at work.

Mr. Dotson said he was not sure why the towers were designed to be 120 feet and 67 feet. He said it seemed as if they would both be 120 feet.

Mr. Elias replied this was not necessarily true. He said that a hard antenna is on the tower, and the more loading it presents to wind, the more robust steel and perhaps the thicker the tower has to be. He said the towers are designed as a system and determination is made as to what needs to be accomplished, allowing for some growth or redundancy later if the systems are possible swapped out.

Mr. Elias said if both dishes were put at the top, they would be increasing the wind load on the tower, resulting in more stress on it in big storms. He said that if the destination site can point straight to the tower, and the tower is designed higher, it then has to be angled as opposed to being level. He noted that some of the antennas are 6 feet in diameter and heavy, so the more standard level position those are designed at, the easier it is to construct, sustain, and recover, with fewer variables to consider.

Mr. Dotson asked if the function of the 120-foot antenna and the 67-foot antenna the same, and if it was simply a straight line to different locations.

Mr. Elias replied yes. He said the way the networks are designed for redundancy is that they want to create redundant paths to and from any point. He said each of the dishes performs the same function, which is to bring in the remote signals and send them around the network and out to other towers. He said the dishes are doing exactly the same thing and are simply pointing in different directions. He said that on a good day, the data is coming in one direction and going out the other.

Mr. Elias presented an example of having to take down one of the antennas, or lighting strikes it, making it inoperable. He said the network is constructed in such a way so that no site actually loses connectivity. He said that each site has an east-west entrance, similar to what is done with fiber if one was building a facility served by fiber or copper infrastructure. He said in a fallback scenario, data can be looped to another antenna so that the network continues to function until the repair is made.

Mr. Dotson said he was asking, in part, to understand the engineering of the tower, but since visibility was related to height and 67 feet was good enough for some functions, he wanted to understand why both antennas couldn't be 67 feet tall.

Mr. Elias explained that at 67 feet, one of the destination sites could be reached, but the only way back to the other site is to go to the top of it, and that it goes back to the entire network design. He said that just as the pole and foundation are designed, zooming out, the entire ring is a system and feasible paths must be considered, which not only involves trees and construction, but elevation. He said microwaves cannot be fired through a mountain. He indicated on the map to the aqua and green colored pushpins, explaining that for all those sites, two paths are sent out from each one. He said optimizing this results in a design that requires the tower to be higher.

Ms. Riley said she had a related question to the visibility concern and to the concern not only from the neighbors, but by the ARB, about visibility along the I-64 Entrance Corridor. She asked if any other sites were considered and if so, where were they and what was the rationale behind choosing the selected site over others.

Mr. Elias replied that the reason the pole has to be located at COB5 as opposed to placing the tower elsewhere was that COB5 serves as the backup 911 center and backup core equipment housing site, noting it was a partnership between the ECC and Albemarle County, who is a major

stakeholder. He said the radio system being built has redundant key components so that they could lose either facility and continue to keep the radio system functioning. He said without those core components, that is when police, fire, EMS, school buses, service authorities, airport employees, jails, and all partners within the 2,300-3,000 users cannot communicate.

Mr. Elias said the functionality is split into two locations, and COB5 was the natural location for the equipment because the backup 911 center is already located there, and it is natural to have the dispatch center for the radio system co-located with the core equipment. He added that the ECC's backup data systems are also located at COB5. He said this has been a long-running partnership with the county with COB5, and to move the tower elsewhere would then, in turn, require the ECC to still construct a tower at COB5 the signals back in order to avoid relying entirely on fiber, which could be cut.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing.

Mr. Sean Tubbs, representative of Piedmont Environmental Council (PEC) and resident of the City of Charlottesville, addressed the commission. He said the important question was to whether or not the tower is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that PEC feels the tower is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and urged the commission to recommend this to the Board of Supervisors accordingly.

Mr. Tubbs said that overall, PEC urged the commission to consider the project in the context of the county's overall policy about towers and the wireless policy in terms of how it evolves overtime. He said Albemarle County adopted a policy in 2002 that sought to limit the visibility of such towers. He said this was a policy that had overwhelming support from the community over the years and has helped preserve the viewshed. He said it was a policy which has served the county well over that time.

Mr. Tubbs said that over the years, the county has begun to see that support somewhat waning. He said he was aware that the provision in the county (30.6.9) that states that public safety interests must be waived above other interests. He reflected back on this provision, stating that according to the documentation, there was a good explanation provided, but that according to the documentation submitted to the commission, the PEC was not sure that the ECC had gone far enough to justify the location in writing.

Mr. Tubbs expressed it was important to see that it was part of other things involved with the expansion idea. He said it was part of a larger overall effort, noting that with the Peter's Mountain tower, for instance, the Board of Supervisors opted not to proceed with the Special Use Permit to amend a previous approval that set conditions that are not being met at present time. He said PEC feels that this would be a positive thing to do, and when viewed in connection with the project, it was important to keep this in mind.

Mr. Tubbs said that in September 2018, the Board of Supervisors approved a tower at Western Albemarle, which went against the recommendation from the Planning Commission at that time. He said the notion at that time was that it was not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He said that in the case of the proposal, the tower would likely go forward regardless, but as a matter of process at present time, it was not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tubbs brought up a final question for the commission to consider, which involved the idea of the provision of the broadband facilities for the public school system. He asked if this perhaps

triggered the need for a Special Use Permit as opposed to a CCP.

Mr. Neil Williamson (Free Enterprise Forum) addressed the commission. He expressed his appreciation for Mr. Tubbs' comments and the many questions the Planning Commission had raised about the tower. He said many of the questions, because of the manner in which the ordinance is written, are not germane, noting the location and the color (which would be gray because of recommendations from the ARB). He said the balloon test was laughable if it was a private sector tower.

Mr. Williamson said he had no problem with the location and understood the need, but that he had an issue with the double standard. He said when considering public safety, cell towers and propagation maps are considered. He noted there was a map shown with pinpoints and understood that microwaves cannot transmit through mountains. He said cell phone companies have expressed many of the same reasons as to why they need to place their towers in certain locations, but that they would be told that they need to be placed somewhere outside of the Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Williamson said the question was not about visibility, but about public safety. Regardless, he said he had to ask if he was on I-64 broken down (or worse, his daughter was), this was her public safety, and the cell tower that is approved or denied is also about public safety.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing and brought the meeting back to discussion and action.

Mr. Bivins asked if Mr. Elias could speak to the two emails from the neighbors, with one being about the care and non-condition of the property behind her and how this has been resolved. He asked if Mr. Elias could also provide more information about the community meeting that took place.

Mr. Elias replied that he had two emails with him, and that one email discussed the tower in regard to the perception of the level of condition and maintenance of the COB5 facility. He said he forwarded this email to Facilities and Environmental Services (FES) so that they are aware of the issues, as it deals with maintenance of the site along the neighbor's property line. He said in regard to the community meeting, there were a couple of adjoining property owners who raised some concerns about visibility from their private properties and if there would be other wireless facilities co-located there. He said there were questions about light and noise emissions and if it would have to be lit for FAA regulations (which it would not) and if it would interfere with other signals or frequencies (which it would not).

Mr. Elias said there had also been comments about the tank removal and vehicle traffic from the Stagecoach Road entrance to the facility. He added that another neighbor called him a couple weeks prior who was opposed to the visibility of the tower.

Mr. Dotson asked in terms of other towers (which wouldn't necessarily serve the same function) what the tallest tower was that had been allowed or approved by the county.

Mr. Elias replied that he did not have the answer but could look into it and get back with him.

Ms. More said she was curious about the existing Buck's Elbow tower, which had come before the commission previously because it needed improvements. She said she couldn't recall if the tower went up in height in order to do this.

Mr. Elias replied that Ms. More was correct. He said the Buck's Elbow tower was a replacement tower and did increase in height.

Ms. More asked if this was done in order to better serve the ECC.

Mr. Elias replied yes, noting that the tower itself was very old and full. He said that even the transition would not have been supported on the current tower. He said the ECC was having trouble maintaining it and still was. He said this was both a safety concern and growth concern for the system to project the coverage out.

Ms. More asked what the tower was full of.

Mr. Elias replied that the tower has several public sector co-locations and includes a private co-location that the ECC inherited from Albemarle County. He referred to the original project that began in the 1990s and went forward into the early 2000s, noting that the site was an Albemarle County site that was using the public safety system and that they had a co-location which has been grandfathered in.

Ms. More asked if it was with the county.

Mr. Elias replied that the ECC manages the tower, but it is a county-owned structure and leases with Albemarle County directly.

Ms. More asked for clarification about the visibility, as it seemed as if with what the ECC was trying to achieve, concealment elements may actually interfere with the signal. She asked for explanation as to why other sites that may not be as visible would not work. She asked if this was due to possibly having another site, but then the COB5 building would still need something smaller on it in order to achieve the same transmission.

Mr. Elias replied that the reason for the site being located there was because it must be close to the equipment to run the cables down from the antennas into the core equipment. He said the effort is to avoid dependence on fiber optics, which get cut, and maintain the single-network performance all the way through. He said to put it elsewhere, it would still have to reach COB5 one way or another, and that this would drive up costs and complexity. He added that there would still be roughly similar height requirements so instead of the tower being located at COB5, they would then have to acquire the land to place it elsewhere while still having the height and still constructing something at COB5 to attain this.

Ms. Riley asked what would have to be the height of the monopole if it was just receiving, acknowledging that it would be a more expensive proposition.

Mr. Elias replied that he was unsure. He said he would have to have people from L3 Harris (the system vendor) look into this, which would involve reengineering the network as it presently stands.

Ms. Spain said a comparable issue came up with a cell tower at Albemarle High School, which was in the Entrance Corridor. She said there was a debate at the time among the Planning Commissioners as to whether to preserve the Entrance Corridor visual guidelines and/or enable a broadband distribution. She said her feeling has always been that when parts of the

Comprehensive Plan may conflict with each other, the public service does take priority, as Mr. Knuppel pointed out in the staff report. She said she would be prone to approve the proposal in the same way she did with the Albemarle High School cell phone tower.

Ms. Firehock said she agreed with Ms. Spain, but commented that in that case, there were claims made that it would be useful to have better cell coverage, but it wasn't quite to the level of the current argument made for public safety. She said, in other words, this was the county's own Emergency Response System asking the commission to make their system work, where in the other case, it was to improve cell coverage to be helpful.

Ms. More asked if she was talking about Western Albemarle, Albemarle High, or both.

Ms. Spain replied it was Albemarle High School, noting that it was the educational section of the Comprehensive Plan that was being considered.

Ms. Firehock added that there were a few letters expressing that it would be positive, but it wasn't to the same degree of needing the coverage as a lynchpin in the county's system and ability to communicate and respond.

Ms. More recalled Mr. Tubbs' question about the broadband aspect with the school. She said she assumed that staff reviewed this and that it didn't trigger a need for a Special Use Permit.

Mr. Knuppel replied that the school's broadband proposal was not included with the proposal, so it was not reviewed, but was acknowledged in the staff report that it was mentioned. He said at this point, it would be subject to the other regulations and Telecommunications Act that would cover some of the co-location facilities. He said he was not sure whether or not it would require a Special Use Permit, but that it would simply be a co-location on the tower. He said he would confirm this and what would be required.

Ms. Riley said the proposal was located in this district and that she was prepared to make a motion. She recognized that the ARB's letter reflects her concerns about the visibility of the location. She said she did agree with fellow commissioners in their statements about public purpose and the public safety need outweighing the inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan in terms of visibility and location in the Entrance Corridor.

Mr. Keller said that in the private sector, the commission is advised as to whether those poles will come down at some point when the technology has moved on to another phase that doesn't require poles. He asked what the county's policy was on this.

Mr. Knuppel said that regarding the county's policy for county-owned facilities and a sunset clause, he was not sure he was prepared to answer the question.

Mr. Herrick said he wasn't sure if this question was actually before the commission, but it was simply about whether a location of a tower of this height is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He said he did not know if this question was in the lines of a Special Use Permit where there could be some limiting conditions on it.

Mr. Keller recalled a time when the county wasn't bringing its own items before the Planning Commission and expressed that this has been a great move forward over the past several years where items have continued to come to the commission. He said he realized this was a

requirement, and that everyone was operating in a positive spirit, which is what his question was about. He said it was more to be part of the record for staff to reflect upon in terms of the future, as the technology becomes outdated, and what would be the responsibilities of the applying or owning party.

Ms. Riley moved to find the location, character, and extent of the Regional P25 Radio Infrastructure Project, public facility, and public use thereof, as proposed, to be in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan for the factors identified in the staff report.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion, which was carried by a vote of 7:0.

Mr. Keller announced there would be a five-minute break.

Work Session

2019 Growth Management Report

Mr. Knuppel said this first take on the 2019 Growth Management Report followed in the footsteps of the annual report that the commission previously saw in February and March of 2019. He said that the last time the commission saw staff's capacity analysis for the residential buildout of the development areas was about two years ago. He expressed staff's excitement for bringing forth a new format to the report and looked forward to having a positive discussion with the commission about it.

Mr. Knuppel said the presentation would include a section about tying the report back to the Comprehensive Plan, as well as to why the analysis is done and the intent of the report. He said he would provide an overview of the report's contents and recent trends (which was a new addition to the capacity analysis that year). He said the presentation would cover the revised model and changes made to the methodology to determine how to address changing needs and market conditions and how to better leverage the data and capacity staff has in-house. He said he would also present findings and implications in the report and hold an opportunity for questions, comments, and discussion.

Mr. Knuppel noted that the presentation was for informational purposes and that there was no action required by the Planning Commission that evening. He said that since the analysis was complete, staff wanted to be sure the report was put before the commission for its review and consideration.

Mr. Knuppel reviewed the reason why the report and capacity analysis is done every two years. He listed a couple objectives and strategies from the Development Areas chapter of the Comprehensive Plan, which focus on how the county uses its development area land efficiently. He said Objective 4 states that the county wants to use development area efficiently to prevent premature expansion of dwelling areas. He said one strategy the county undertakes to implement this objective includes monitoring building activity (including building activity reports put out by the Geographic Data Services division every quarter, Certificates of Occupancy, building permit issuance, and development dashboard and tracking system the county has been trying to implement and further build out) to understand how development happens in the county and the implications of it.

Mr. Knuppel said the other strategy the county uses is to update the capacity analysis every two years to ensure the county has adequate residential land to meet new housing needs. He said he

would discuss the methodology of this, explaining that the report is to provide better context to the capacity analysis and what has been happening, as well as to provide the analysis of what is left and the implications of it.

Mr. Knuppel said the staff tried to expand the report that year, noting that two years prior, it was simply a table containing a few buildout scenarios and what the theoretical buildout of each development area would look like. He said staff wanted to make sure they provided more context in the report that year, understanding some of the recent movement around the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, which was the housing study that Ms. Pethia was taking on. He said there was good data in this report and presented some questions for staff as they look at building trends, what types of housing is being built, and where.

Mr. Knuppel said staff looked at a 10-year analysis based on Certificate of Occupancy information, unit type, mix, and location. He said staff added some information as to what is in the pipeline, and the development dashboard that was rolled out earlier that year ensures they have a better handle of what is currently in the pipeline and what the nearly 9,000 units that were approved in the county would look like. He said it includes the residential capacity analysis, which looks at the county's developable land area within the development areas, greenfield and potential infill sites, and different buildout scenarios under the zoning ordinance and Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Knuppel said the report ends with profiles of each development area to understand what has been happening (e.g. in Neighborhood I or II) over the past 10 years, what is currently approved in the pipeline, what theoretical buildout would look like, and where the remaining land in the area would be.

Mr. Knuppel said there would be a new presenter. He said Mr. Joseph Snitzer was a third-year Mathematics and Statistics undergraduate student at UVA and was the county's intern that summer, bringing with him a fantastic skillset for data analysis, visualization, and GIS. He said Mr. Snitzer played an instrumental role in helping staff have the capacity to undertake a model, as well as helping staff understand current trends and build the new model.

Mr. Snitzer reviewed recent trends from the Growth Management Report. He presented a map showing Certificates of Occupancy issued throughout the county, with a hot spots map applied to it to show areas of high concentration over the past 10 years. He indicated to the highest concentration being in areas such as Pantops, Crozet, and Neighborhoods II and V. He said that more specific trends are analyzed in the development area profiles in the report.

In order to demonstrate current activity and the general trends between the development areas and rural areas, Mr. Snitzer presented a map that showed single-family detached building permit activity from 2018. He said up until the Great Recession, it was a roughly 50-50 balance in terms of permit activity between the two areas, but after the recession, the development area witnessed a much more severe decrease in activity. He said that ever since 2009, the development areas have seen greater degrees of activity relative to the rural areas.

Mr. Snitzer addressed the range of different dwelling units throughout the county, presenting a chart of the types of dwelling units that were built, by corridor, from 2009 to 2018. He said the majority of the dwelling unit type that has been built during this time period was single-family detached, with sporadic instances of multi-family housing units appearing. He said the second most frequent type throughout this period was the single-family attached/townhouse dwelling unit type. He said the only instances in which single-family detached housing reached less than 50%

of the dwelling unit types that were built in a given corridor were instances in which there was a large increase in multi-family units being built.

Mr. Snitzer said that in terms of general trends, the single-family detached type being the predominant unit type was a fairly consistent aspect of all the corridors. He said the multi-family types were very difficult to project based on the time it takes to construct them, the scale to which units are added, and the infrequency with which they are actually developed in the county.

Mr. Snitzer explained that one key consideration in revamping the capacity analysis model (the main aspect of the Growth Management Report) was to improve time effectiveness both in terms of making the analysis quicker to do and allowing it to happen more frequently. He said another consideration was to reduce human error by automating the process and ensuring that there is as little human interaction with the data itself from start to finish. He said a third consideration was ways to bring in data the county already has in order to improve the capacity analysis and make it more rigorous. He said specific methodological changes were made (e.g. revising the infill and redevelopment filter).

Mr. Snitzer presented the model used in the capacity analysis methodology, noting there were two main steps. He said the first step was geospatial, done in RGIS. He said the second step was to use the R programming language. He said the first component filters out land that is believed to potentially take on new growth in the future, and the second part is assigning how many units are expected on those filtered-out lands. He said the model takes in many data sets that the county already had and has a user interface that allows for assumptions to be changed, allowing for different iterations to be made based on different parameters inputted by the user.

Mr. Snitzer presented the result of the analysis. He presented a map of the projection based on the Comprehensive Plan buildout scenario, noting that it only showed residential units. He explained the color scheme, noting that yellow referred to single-family residential units identified by the capacity analysis methodology, pink referred to multi-family attached/townhouse development, and blue representing already-approved developments.

Mr. Snitzer said there were three different buildout scenarios the model handles: Current Zoning - Gross Density, Current Zoning - Net Density (with the difference having to do with the environmental constraints being considered), and the Comprehensive Plan's future land use buildout scenario. He said the summary tables provided show the buildout units calculation, explaining that it is calculated by the current units in addition to the approved pipeline units, as well as the area potential from the capacity analysis. He added that there is a low and high estimate for each of the values.

Mr. Snitzer said in terms of how this is compared to expected population growth estimate, the Weldon Cooper Center's 2040 projections are used in order to predict the expected number of dwelling units needed. He said the way to calculate that is by looking at population growth and the difference between what is expected in 2040 and current population, divided by the average people per unit in order to arrive at the number of units expected for the net population growth. He said this value was found in the Projected Additional Units Needed column on the table.

Mr. Snitzer said the last two columns in the table show the difference between the estimated additional units based on the buildout analysis minus the expected additional units needed to show whether there are enough potential developments to take on the additional population rise.

Mr. Knuppel said that the new model was a big step forward for staff in terms of reducing human error in the process. He noted there are many spreadsheets and tabs and that two years prior, there was a great deal of hand-sorted information. He said he would talk about the trends involved with the model, adding that the new model does a much better job of using the data currently available. He said staff looked at what other localities were doing, with a focus on the Oregon Metropolitan and Portland area which has a famous growth management policy. He said comparisons were made to this and other localities to ensure that the model has a solid method and background.

Mr. Knuppel emphasized how helpful Mr. Snitzer was, noting he was back in school and that they hoped he would return to help with other GIS work tied into the Rio-29 form-based code and some viewshed analysis.

Mr. Knuppel said the goal was to consider the implications on the full development area. He said staff was looking at the potential units that could be built under the current zoning and Comprehensive Plan, the gross density scenario that is currently in the zoning ordinance, and undevelopable environmentally constrained features from the density calculations and from the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that in the methodology, areas under easement were removed. He said the ultimate calculation was what is currently built, what is in the pipeline, and what could potentially happen to vacant greenfield and infill sites.

Mr. Knuppel said staff looked at some filters to determine if a parcel that already has a house on it could support a couple more units. He noted this would not happen with every house because not every piece of property could support it, but that staff considered the ones where infill could reasonably happen.

Mr. Knuppel said staff used a variety of sources, noting that they do not perform population projections in-house, but that these are obtained from the Weldon Cooper Center, adding that they do a good job (usually better than the Census Bureau) of predicting what could happen in Albemarle County. He said staff takes a 20-year look at the data, which was consistent with what other localities do, and that they plan on a 20-year Comprehensive Planning horizon and therefore use the 2040 projections from the Weldon Cooper Center.

Mr. Knuppel said estimates are used internally about how many people the dwelling units could theoretically report because the density calculation is created in terms of housing units per acre, not people per acre. He acknowledged that it wasn't a perfect translation, but that once staff obtains the 2020 census, they would have the first complete count and will have a better idea of the multipliers and assumptions that are inputted into the model.

Mr. Keller expressed that the commissioners likely had questions as well as delight in seeing the data, as it was something they wanted for a long time. He said they were pleased with the work Mr. Knuppel and staff did on the dashboard. He asked if Mr. Knuppel wanted the commissioners to ask questions slide by slide that were related to those areas, or if he would like to go all the way through it first and then take questions before the public hearing.

Mr. Knuppel replied that they could go all the way through the presentation, as there was a lot of material in the report and that he wanted to make sure there was understanding of the assumptions that he would review.

Mr. Knuppel noted the caveats with the data, noting that the model was more automated that

year. He said they performed an "eyeball" test, reviewing every parcel that came back as redevelopable and removed the ones that obviously should not be (e.g. cemeteries), as well as where GIS shows a sliver of a parcel. He said this test should ensure that everything in the report is consistent with what could actually happen.

Mr. Knuppel noted that with all this said, the model does likely overestimate capacity because it looks at a larger pool of redevelopment candidate parcels, which include parcels that have under a $25,000 improvement value (meaning there isn't a substantially improved structure on the parcel), and areas that have no improvement value. He said staff made a change, recalling that in the past, they removed an entire acre and that a parcel had to be over two acres. He said that they are seeing more and more that with smaller sites in the development areas and this is not feasible – that they will tear the house down or add in the incremental difference. He said removing one acre didn't seem to make sense with what was actually happening on the ground.

Mr. Knuppel said this also added more uncertainty for areas that had a mix of zoning designations and Comprehensive Plan designations. He said this, in and of itself, will cause an increase over the 2017 results.

Mr. Knuppel reminded the commission that they are using tax information more heavily this time and that this could result in a few more parcels. He said staff arrived at a point where the data was mostly consistent with past results, explaining that they went back through the spreadsheets and checked to see what made sense to ensure they were on the right track. He said the model is different than what was used two years before, and year-to-year comparability was difficult. He said the hope was because they have the new model, they could use it as a better way, moving forward.

Mr. Knuppel said parameters included the improvement value of the site, and overall land value per acre for commercial sites. He said with the Rio29 Small Area Plan and the most recent Pantops Master Plan, these could be places where they could start to see redevelopment in the future and that staff was planning for this. He noted that many of those sites weren't included in the analysis and didn't make it through the filter, so staff did not feel it was appropriate to add them due to maintaining consistency. He said staff was planning ahead, however, for what else could come.

Mr. Knuppel noted that the pipeline projects don't always build out to full potential. He said, for example, Old Trail Village was approved for 2,200 dwelling units for the whole project and since then, they have lowered their minimum requirement to 1,000 and that it has been heard that they are not expecting to build out to a full 2,200. He said that staff doesn't necessarily know what it will look like until every piece of land in the rezoning has been site planned and subdivided. He said that as staff was able, they made caveats were there were changes to the pipeline. He mentioned Cascadia and Avinity, noting they have two parcels left but it was basically done, but that there was uncertainty as far as the 8,443 units that were in the pipeline on July 1 about when they will develop and to what extent.

Mr. Knuppel said that in past analyses, staff has removed properties owned by UVA Foundation. He noted that properties owned by the University proper are exempted because of their Tax Exempt status. He said the Foundation, for instance, was an institutional landowner and that the county also owns substantial amounts of institutional land that would not be picked up otherwise and was not planned for a program yet. He said the institutional properties would not have been counted, but the Foundation does own a significant amount of land that is designated for future

residential uses in the Comprehensive Plan, and so one of the scenarios towards the end of the report did take this out and consider it because it was not known what the plan was and that other institutional priorities could shape how the land is used.

Mr. Knuppel said that the biggest caveat was that development that is market driven depends on property owner willingness. He said even though the county may have a lot of land that is theoretically available, it doesn't mean that it will be owner developed or the improvements will be in place for that property to develop. He said this was always important caveat in that they may have the land, but the challenges to seeing it meet the county's expected need overtime should be considered.

Mr. Knuppel reiterated that the model was better than what staff had before. He said in terms of findings, some of the scenarios that emerged from the model were under Gross Density Zoning, Net Density Zoning, and Comprehensive Plan. He said in looking at development area profiles, there were some conflicts evident between the minimum that might be doable under a Gross Density Zoning calculation versus under the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that this was partly due to the Comprehensive Plan calling out greenway corridors and parks and green systems to be preserved.

Mr. Knuppel said the conflicts were a consideration when drawing land use maps in the Master Plans or when possibly updating the zoning ordinance in the future. He said this was relevant in terms of the ability for capacity, as well as creating predictability in the process with the community in the Master Planning efforts. He said, for instance, in the Pantops Master Plan, it is zoned one way but is shown as another, and consideration had to be made for how to balance this and ensure the county has a plan that is ultimately workable and achievable. He acknowledged that this could frustrate the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan and when a property develops by-right.

Mr. Knuppel said the big question of the report was the expected need with the caveats mentioned. He said with a hypothetical buildout of the county's development and what is in the pipeline, everything in the pipeline builds out and in theory, there will be enough room to accommodate the growing population in 2040, per the Weldon Cooper Center.

Mr. Knuppel again noted that some of the units don't always build out, that institutional landowners sometimes have other priorities, and that there was potential overestimation in the model, resulting in predictions that were less clear. He said this was not a non-answer, but that the factors should be considered. He reiterated that many factors have changed with the new model and that the commission needed to be aware of this as they think about what it looks like to develop on the low end of the Comprehensive Plan, in a higher density of range, and so on.

Mr. Knuppel said this was the first time that staff mapped and visualized the data with the new model and that this was done in a much more effective way. He said the information would hopefully be effective when integrating into Master Planning and other land use and zoning efforts moving forward.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing.

Mr. Morgan Butler (Southern Environmental Law Center) addressed the commission. He thanked staff for their thorough analysis and well-written report. He said one of the key questions the report explores is to whether the existing growth areas have enough capacity to accommodate the

county's projected growth over the next 20 years.

Mr. Butler said in looking at the data and, specifically, the key summary table on the slide (also at the bottom of page 13 of the report), the first column of the table shows the three different growth scenarios evaluated. He said if his understanding was correct, the first two scenarios (Zoning Gross and Zoning Net) both assume that all buildout of vacant and underused growth area parcels will go forward, by right, under the current zoning of those parcels and that no further rezonings will occur. He said the difference between those two scenarios is that the first, Zoning Gross, calculates by-right buildout based on a growth density calculation, which is how the zoning ordinance currently regulates density today.

Mr. Butler said the second scenario, Zoning Net, calculates by-right buildout based on a net density calculation, which is more restrictive than the current zoning allows. He said, as such, that the Zoning Net scenario not only assumes an entirely by-right buildout, but that the by-right buildout occurs pursuant to a net density allowance that is more restrictive than what the current zoning ordinance allows. He said the Zoning Net scenario strikes the SELC as an overly-restrictive scenario for a capacity analysis.

Mr. Butler said that, still looking at the left-most column of the table, the third scenario analyzed (Comprehensive Plan) uses density ranges from the Comprehensive Plan's land use designations. He said this scenario assumes all vacant and underused growth area parcels are rezoned and developed within the range of residential densities called for in the Comprehensive Plan. He said as SELC sees it, the most reasonable capacity scenario falls somewhere between the Zoning Gross and the Comprehensive Plan scenarios. He said a share of development will occur by-right, but some parcels (hopefully a healthy majority) will be rezoned and developed in line with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Butler said that focusing on those two scenarios, and looking at the last two sets of columns in the table, it was clear that the current growth areas have more than enough capacity to handle all of the county's projected growth over the next 20 years, even at the low end of the estimated capacity ranges and even adjusting the final numbers downward to account for staff's caveats about the pipeline uncertainty and the UVA Foundation land. He said this is actually what has been done in the last two columns.

Mr. Butler said that what this demonstrates to SELC is that the county needs to be focusing on how they can fund and provide better services and infrastructure within the existing growth areas as opposed to expanding the area over which those things must be provided. He said it demonstrates that a focus must be kept on how to ensure that new development facilitates transit service and other ways of getting around to help reduce traffic impacts. He said it demonstrates that a focus must be kept on how to provide truly affordable housing in the growth areas where there is access to necessary services and public transportation.

Mr. Butler said that, in short, the county needs to keep its efforts and resources focused on establishing the growth areas it has promised rather than expanding its promises.

Mr. Neil Williamson (Free Enterprise Forum) said he appreciated many of Mr. Butler's comments and couldn't agree more that the county should keep the promises it made back to the "land use lurk" and other promises. He said any of those promises would be good in funding the infrastructure in the development area.

Mr. Williamson continued that, with this being said, he and Mr. Butler chose to read from different parts of page 13 of the report. He said that when he read the top of page 13, he read the line that says, "Removing 1,000 units from the current pipeline, accounting for Old Trail and Stonefield alone, the UVA Foundation's residentially-designated holdings from the potential capacity pool reveals the low ends of density ranges may not be sufficient to accommodate new residential growth."

Mr. Williamson said earlier that day, he shared with the commission a blog post that talked about Harry Truman, who famously looked for a one-handed economist because he wanted someone who didn't say, "on the other hand." He said the report has a number of "the other hands."

Mr. Williamson commended staff, noting that it was a very objective report, but the problem was that the Zoning Text Amendments that Mr. Butler referred to are approved by a subjective group called the Board of Supervisors and are recommended by the Planning Commission. He said as of late, the Planning Commission has been approving projects that have density in the hard edge that have been part of the design of New Urbanism for 20 years. He said that now, what they were hearing was the tapered edge and that it wasn't that the growth area was growing, but that it was actually shrinking because in the adjacent neighborhoods that are adjacent to the single-family homes that were built 4 years before, those residents state objections against having townhomes build next to them.

Mr. Williamson said there was no way to put into GIS the subjectivity of "not in my backyard." He said that Mr. Butler's comments about funding infrastructure were critically important, and that the concept of rezonings at present time continue to be challenging. He said he didn't believe the county would see a multitude of rezonings, but that they would see a balance of some rezonings and some properties going by-right.

Mr. Williamson said the words in the report about not having capacity were concerning words. He said later in the report, it talks about environmental impacts of residents living outside the area and commuting into work. He commended staff for the great first step and the information about ArcGIS, expressing that they were headed in the right direction. He also commended the Planning Commission for nudging staff in that direction.

Mr. Sean Tubbs (Piedmont Environmental Council) said that PEC's reading of the report concluded that the county has enough capacity to accommodate additional residential demand in the areas for the foreseeable future. He said that what the county really needed was a continued financial and moral commitment to fulfill the Comprehensive Plan and provide the services and amenities it will take to make the urban neighborhoods a desirable place to live. He said he could see much positive movement from the county on that.

Mr. Tubbs said he would focus mostly on transportation, which PEC takes to include new bike-ped infrastructure as well as the enhanced transit system that was under development. He said those amenities serve the county's climate goals, economic development goals, and Comprehensive Plan goals. He said as recently heard in the 999 Rio Road discussion, there were concerns with traffic and with the county's roads not being up to capacity. He said there was a sense that the infrastructure hasn't been provided, and that perhaps this was true up until 2013-2014, when the John Warner Parkway came online, which gave the county a multi-modal trail which was a new amenity that did not exist prior to many of the homes being built in that area.

Mr. Tubbs said the parkway was what makes the urban residential density in the Comprehensive

Plan that was called for at both 999 Rio Road, as well as the Wetzel Property, possible. He said up north, with the Hollymead neighborhood and the density that is both in the pipeline and under construction, there was the Berkmar Drive extension which, with its multi-modal trail, also makes the density possible.

Mr. Tubbs expressed that he didn't believe the projects were flukes or "one-offs." He said Albemarle County has in place a resourceful transportation planner and an accomplished assistant who have been able to capitalize on the momentum of the can-do spirit of the Route 29 Solutions project. He said there were a tremendous amount of possibilities, and that he had hope and confidence that everyone could work together to continue to fulfill the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tubbs said that as he read through the report, it was great to look at the neighborhoods, and that he was aware of the projects underway in Neighborhood V, such as the potential of the pedestrian connection to Azalea Park in the city. He said all over the county, there were projects underway and in the planning process, with a spirt that improvements were happening. He said the projects demonstrate that the county has a planning staff that has come a long way in being able to prepare and keep up with growth. He said staff was capable of conducting its Master Plans in house, which wasn't the case in the past and was exciting.

Mr. Tubbs mentioned the Regional Transit Partnership, noting there were many possibilities to address the concerns they have been calling for (for up to 40 years in the Comprehensive Plan). He expressed hope that this could be done, but noted he had a concern that if the county expands the growth area prematurely, this would all come crashing to a halt without the incentive to build much of the density they will see, for instance, in the Rio29 Small Area Plan.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing and brought the meeting back to discussion.

Ms. More acknowledged that the subject likely needed to be approached by topic, or commissioner to commissioner. She said, however, that she wanted to take the opportunity to discuss Old Trail and the 1,000-unit number that was presented by staff and Mr. Williamson. She asked about page 29 of the report and the chart for Old Trail and for confirmation that the units remaining were 1,816. She clarified that the 1,000 number was pulled back to the minimum number. She said the applicant was approved for 2,200 units. She asked if the 1,816 number was not counting the 196 apartments that were being built.

Mr. Knuppel replied that Ms. More was correct. He explained that the numbers account for the units that have Certificates of Occupancy as of July 1, 2019.

Ms. More asked, at the time the data was collected for Old Trail, if there were 384 units.

Mr. Knuppel replied this was correct and that this was staff's best estimate.

Ms. More responded that this number was low, and respectfully so. She said that, to this point, almost 200 apartments were currently being built and that they weren't being counted because they were in the pipeline and had not received their COs yet.

Ms. More offered history on Old Trail, noting that there was a part of Crozet that would not forget it, but that sometimes the commissioners do. She prefaced that she was not a part of it, but there was a time where David Wyatt was the supervisor who represented White Hall, and when Old Trail was to be rezoned (and the rezoning was presented to the community), Mr. Wyatt voted to

double the size of what Old Trail is today, at maximum full buildout.

Ms. More said that when the community is told that Old Trail may come in low, this was actually the number that the community, at that time, participated in and believed would be the full buildout. She said when staff approaches the community, they should remember that there was a major trust issue with what happened there and that there was another series of votes prior to 2008 that increased what Crozet's maximum buildout would be. She again expressed that staff's numbers were low and that it was known there would be some large numbers to add on to it, and that the 1,000 was pulled back and was more in keeping with what the community originally thought would be approved prior to 2008.

Mr. Knuppel said Ms. More's point was well taken and that staff was trying to ensure that in their first step bringing the information out to the public, the information is brought to the Planning Commission first. He said the point would be to figure out how to best bring the information to the CACs and other groups. Mr. Knuppel said that the buildout of Old Trail did not include the residences and The Lodge at Old Trail, noting that those do not count towards the density.

Ms. More asked if Creekside was being counted.

Mr. Knuppel replied that the numbers did not include Creekside.

Ms. More noted that most of Creekside was by-right.

Mr. Knuppel replied she was correct and that the numbers only look at what was captured under the original rezoning. He noted that the pipeline projects on the individual dwelling area profiles are marked down where staff was able. He said with Old Trail as an exception (where there were unknowns as to where the buildouts would happen), where there was a rezoning that did not come in under an approved maximum, staff tried to knock it down where they could. He said the numbers reflected the full theoretical 2,200 units.

Ms. More acknowledged that it was a challenge for both staff and for herself as a commissioner to track growth at Old Trail because it was a massive rezoning that comes through in bits and pieces, and therefore has the ability to change form (such as with the unexpected apartments, which were not a component that the community originally predicted, but was needed).

Mr. Keller asked Mr. Knuppel to let the commission know what he would hope to receive from the commission in terms of commentary. He asked him if he wanted to organize how the commissioners should respond to him.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that staff did not necessarily expect any outcomes but wanted to hear the commission's feedback. She said if the commission observed any red flags or had concerns with the language of the messaging, it would be helpful information. She said staff planned to bring it out to the individual communities, most likely through the CACs. She said if the commission had any thoughts or advice on how to do that, staff would be open to it.

Mr. Keller asked if the information had been presented to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Falkenstein replied no.

Mr. Keller asked staff to consider holding a joint Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors

meeting about the topic.

Ms. Riley said she had a procedural recommendation. She said perhaps initially, the commission could discuss the methodology as well as the structure of the report.

Ms. Riley expressed that it seemed as though the cutoff for the projects that were included in the pipeline was July 1, 2019. She asked if this was correct.

Mr. Knuppel replied yes.

Ms. Riley asked how often staff expected the report to be produced in the future.

Mr. Knuppel replied that the report took a significant amount of time to produce, mostly due to staff's hope to include the residential capacity analysis with it. He said the Comprehensive Plan calls for this analysis every two years, and that doing it any sooner than that two years would require some consideration with the work and staff capacity at that time. He said the work was planned for earlier in the year to do the project that summer. He said staff's hope was that in improving the process and model, they could start to run the report more often, or potentially with a Master Plan, they could run it with new assumptions. He expressed that there was not a firm date of when the report would be done again, outside of the two-year update.

Ms. Riley expressed her appreciation for the work that went into the reporting as well as the quality of the report. She said that in terms of the methodology, she had questions about the assumption around the multiplier. She said she understood that they were not generating unknown population numbers, but that they were taking it from Weldon Cooper. She noted that the multiplier of how many people per unit has major implications. She asked for more explanation about this, acknowledging that it was based on the census and that she assumed it was based on national averages in terms of the multiplier by unit type. She said she wondered if they might have a deviation from the average, as the cost of housing goes up and more people are becoming packed into smaller units, such as townhomes.

Ms. Riley said this was a question that came to mind as she was considering the numbers the county ultimately may need. She said if they are putting more people in homes, it might be less, but that it has implications in terms of affordable housing strategies.

Mr. Knuppel replied that the multipliers staff used in the calculations came from the same ones that were used in 2017 and were drafted from the American Community Survey from a five-year sample. He noted that he was not a part of creating the multipliers, but that staff looked at the numbers county-wide (not national averages) and that he believed it was based on using the census tracks (which most closely approximate the development areas) and on information about unit types and population to come up with the estimates.

Mr. Knuppel said staff would have a better opportunity with the 2020 census (with defined population centers and census-designated places) to have a complete count in 2020. He explained that census-designated places are a Census Bureau geography that has a named community with a center. He said, for example, the county had Crozet, Hollymead, Piney Mountain, Pantops, and were requesting to add Rio-29 as a CDP for 2019. He said for those specific areas, staff may have better luck at approximating who actually lives in the neighborhoods and areas and have the complete count.

Mr. Knuppel said that depending on the housing mix and type, staff uses a 2.54 multiplier overall for the long-run, as they do not know the exact mix of housing that is built over time. He said staff typically expects this in the population estimates. He said they did provide that they use a lower multiplier for more dense, multi-family developments than they would for a single-family home, which they would expect to have a larger population size. He said staff was considering the changing household sizes, moving forward.

Mr. Keller recommended to continue the discussion on methodology and hear from each commissioner.

Ms. Firehock said she didn't have a comment on methodology but expressed that all models are wrong, with some being less wrong than others. She said she hoped that staff's model was "less wrong."

Ms. More said she wanted to understand the idea behind not removing the 1-acre home site, as Mr. Knuppel had explained. She said the report explained that this would have been previously removed and that the trend was not to do this because it was more likely that the house would be torn down so that the full site could be used. She said she understood this, but that she wanted to know how this trend could be reconciled with the fact that the county has older, established neighborhoods in not only Crozet, but in other areas of the county. She said infill is discussed and there is language in the Master Plans about keeping the size, scale, and character of the neighborhoods. She asked how this could be reconciled with the trend, which involves tearing down historic homes.

Ms. More said with Crozet's character and small-town feel, some of that is pulled from those neighborhoods that are prone to have this happen. She said, for example, that rather than simply putting another house on a parcel in an R-2 development, a historic home could be torn down so that 6 units could be put in because a developer takes the parcel and neighboring ones.

Ms. More said she was unsure what the answer could be from staff, and that she thought the methodology was logical, but that it worried her in terms of the sensitive areas that make who the county is. She asked how staff reconciles this reality with some of the goals the county has in keeping the neighborhoods that are prone to infill to still possess some character and unique quality.

Mr. Knuppel replied that Ms. More's question was an interesting one. He noted that the area profiles were broken down into tables as far as vacant spaces on the sites versus infill parcels. He said there was a way to determine what the impacts would be from infilling properties. He said for the infill scenarios, staff did remove one unit for the houses already there and assumed that building would occur behind the house or on a subdivided lot. He said that building a new house on the lot does happen sometimes, and that there isn't always a great way to estimate this, but that their numbers were more in line with what was actually happening. He acknowledged the challenges present for how to reconcile an ordinance in the Comprehensive Plan that focuses on density ranges rather than character or scale.

Mr. Knuppel said there were more appropriate ways that staff could explore to measure growth or how to accommodate the growing population with development rights than tearing down a house, especially ones with historic or special value to the county. He said perhaps adaptive reuse could be more appropriate to help preserve the houses. He said he heard Ms. More's concern and that staff took into consideration how much was coming from infill and where it will

have an impact on communities, especially with the more urbanized, built-out neighborhoods and from where growth would come.

Mr. Dotson asked how staff performed quality assurance or quality control on the report, noting Ms. Falkenstein's mention of the report being a draft. He asked how staff went about troubleshooting the model and ensuring that it was strong.

Mr. Knuppel replied that staff built, broke, and rebuilt the model several times to make it work. He said that they QA'ed or QC'ed what the accounted parcels were, for example, noting that redevelopment and infill scenarios were tricky as far as how to figure out and calibrate them to match past results. He said it more closely matched to pick up half the development area as infill. He said staff compared to past scenarios what was done and ensured that the numbers were keeping more in line as far as what seemed redevelopable and what did not. He said this also involved changing out filters to arrive at how much density were needed on an infill site for it to make sense.

Mr. Dotson said he asked his question, in part, because the blog that Mr. Williamson mentioned cites a few things which have his math disagreeing with the math in the report. He asked if staff had tested the model and if they were confident that their numbers were correct. He suggested that perhaps a conversation between Mr. Knuppel and Mr. Williamson would resolve the difference.

Mr. Knuppel replied that he had seen Mr. Williamson's blog post that morning. He said the report was not a perfect document and that one of the numbers in it was a typo. He added that the other information about the pipeline was the best that staff had available as far as what was in the development tracking system, noting that projects do change as they go from the initial site plan to the final site plan and through revisions. He said that, for example, when pipeline projects come in, he enters the plan into the system, and that typos do sometimes happen, usually to a smaller magnitude of 1-2 units. He said he was fairly confident about the data in the report, caveating again that it was not perfect, and also noting the caveats in the graphs that indicated that the data was entered by hand.

Ms. Spain offered her appreciation for the work done on the report, adding that numbering the pages was a big help. She asked for explanation about a table, expressing her confusion about the model components that include retail, service, and commercial. She referred to page 46. She asked if she was correct in understanding that those components were used to calculate the value of the land, as well as for the purpose of the table.

Mr. Knuppel replied that for Table 1, staff explored the potential of using it in the future as a way to predict commercial buildout. He said they ended up not including this information in the report, as they did not have time to run the model, for example, for what was the theoretical square footage of office use that could be on the site. He said in conjunction with the Economic Development office that summer, they set up the framework for the model to be able to do this in the future. He said the table included example numbers they looked at based on a sample of developments in Pantops, for example. He said they did not end up using the different use types in the report.

Mr. Knuppel explained that in the future, staff would like to be able to predict what the commercial buildout of the county would look like to accommodate retail, services, office users, etc. He said the mixes for residential were the same as the ones staff used two years before and that this was

consistent with what was done. He said they did not vet the other mixes, or low and high ranges, for gross floor area per acre. He said they did look at this as a way that other localities (such as the Oregon Metro) predict their commercial counts.

Ms. Spain asked for the difference between the land use being identified in the first table, versus zoning in the second table.

Mr. Knuppel replied that the land use was the Comprehensive Plan land use, and that staff assumed that they wanted a mix of uses in the development areas and what this would potentially be on a site. He explained that the second table looked at a similar situation but what the output would look like. He said this was the current zoning and the potential acreage of the parcel and, using the multipliers, how many units could be supported in it.

Mr. Bivins thanked Mr. Knuppel for the format, explaining that it made the report much easier to read and to stay with his presentation. He expressed that he often gets annoyed at reports that do not have page numbers. He said he was not annoyed as he read the document. He explained that part of what Mr. Knuppel was doing was telling a story, and he wants to keep people with them as he tells the story. He suggested that Mr. Knuppel consider more consistent labeling. He said colors were assigned to housing types on page 7, and on the first screen in the presentation, the colors were changed as well as the order. He explained that assigning the colors sets the parameters of how one reads the report, and then it becomes confusing because the colors and orders changed.

Mr. Keller added that there was a caption that said, "Rural on Development," and then one that said, "Development on Rural."

Mr. Bivins said that the moment someone becomes suspicious or confused, they have been lost in the storytelling. He said he had another suggestion, explaining that it was offensive that Pantops had its own Neighborhood III, but Pantops was bracketed or put into parentheses. He said that either all the neighborhoods are treated the same, because numbering the neighborhoods but then not naming them all suggests that some are not worthy of being named. He said that neighborhoods (Jack Jouett in particular) will wonder why Pantops got called out as a specific neighborhood and everyone else is numbered 1-7. He said either they are named, or not named, and they are only named when going to Crozet, Hollymead, Piney Mountain, and the Village of Rivanna.

Mr. Bivins referred to the first paragraph on page 6 of the report that stated, "...where additional demand and competition for housing driven by University of Virginia students, retirees, and second home buyers also exerts upward pressure on sales prices and rents." He said this was an interesting hypothesis, as the university sent what is flat enrollment expectations to staff, and that he could say from his experience at UVA that they are already doing a reduction in certain staff. He said UVA was not growing their staff as hoped and that there would be flat enrollment, so the demand for that types of housing will probably be standard.

Mr. Keller interjected and suggested that since the topic was about demographics, they should talk about why. He said the reason was because the GenX population that was up, much like the Boomers, was experiencing lower trends of birth rates and therefore, all the colleges around the country were assessing this.

Mr. Bivins agreed. He said in addition to this, how people gather households was also being

researched. He expressed that he is often annoyed with houses being referred to as "single-family" as opposed to "households" because "family" has a different connotation in 2019 than it did in the 1950s. He said that keeping in mind the idea of what retirees and the over-55 community looks like, the data in the report suggests that the county will be out of luck because they wouldn't be coming to Albemarle, but to Greene County where they are building over-55 communities. He noted this was the case if this demographic was going to be driving the demand for housing type.

Mr. Bivins considered second home buyers, asking what this demographic looked like. He asked staff, as they build out the report, to research what second homeowners buy from the tax records because those records either go to an LLC with an address not in Charlottesville, or to an LLC in itself, or they go to some place other than 22901 or 22903. He said this was a hypothesis where it could be determined what the second homeowner's demographic looked like. He added that if there is ever data obtained on Airbnb, staff can also look at some of the second homeowner situations, adding that he believed that staff was on the right path with looking at this demographic.

Mr. Bivins continued that the housing that will be driven in the county will not be done so by the students, but by retirees/over-55 and the second homeowners. He suggested that because of this, the 2.54 multiplier is probably something that staff will want to adjust, because looking at the data and who is sitting in houses, 2.54 was likely not accurate because they were considering a different kind of household. He said that staff gets to tell the story, but they should do so in a way in which he would not argue with their assumptions because they are theirs.

Mr. Bivins said if staff's statement about the three demographics having an impact on sales and rents was true, the market will respond to that. He said in looking at the bubbles and hot points, he could not see anyone responding to those housing types. He asked how this would be reconciled.

Recalling Ms. Riley's earlier question, Mr. Bivins suggested that staff own the results from the 2020 Census. He said the report was dealing with old data, and that some things in Weldon Cooper's population predictions model should be discussed. He said the 2020 Census would actually be staff's baseline for the next model, and as they drive a set of equations or approaches, staff will be in a perfect situation to test them off of as close to actual data as they will have in the next two years, which would be when staff will be running the report again. He said this would enable staff to own their methodology and assumptions and be able to explain the assumptions and carry them through the narrative. He explained that this would prevent situations in which the commission would question the data.

Ms. Spain said she was sympathetic with Mr. Bivins' concerns about language that indicates families rather than households. She explained, however, that Mr. Knuppel was trying to follow census definitions of families and households. She said this standardization was needed to compare with other reports over time.

Mr. Bivins urged staff not to disregard the results from their last methodology. He said this was a model that was thought to be good enough at the time, and so the results from that become a baseline or benchmark for staff to see how their model compares. He suggested pushing the new model over the same data period to see how it performs in order to validate it. He also suggested looking at the variances and how the model could be improved upon.

Mr. Keller asked staff if they have worked with Steve Allshouse in setting the up the process and in considering the data sets, he was working with during the time when the Fiscal Impact

Committee was reviewing impact costs.

Mr. Knuppel replied no, and that staff had mostly kept the same general methodology they have used internally in terms of the data sets.

Mr. Keller encouraged Mr. Knuppel to at least collaborate with Mr. Allshouse during the next iteration of the report to begin building towards what will happen in two years. He said the one and two years will be important, as they will begin to have the new census information, noting that there would likely be surprises in what they learn from that.

Mr. Keller continued that it seemed to him to be components of impact that were very much part of growth management. He said that since staff is delving into the tax arena, he had a feeling that there were things that could be extrapolated from this. He said that county-wide, the relationship between the residential taxes being paid and its relationship to the commercial and industrial taxes being paid could, in effect, become the carrying capacity of residential units. He said this was a major figure that people were concerned with that resulted from Mr. Allshouse's work, which gave the carrying capacity of a household, which was a different formula than having the multiplier of 2.43 because it was closer to 4.

Mr. Keller said that the point was that, given the taxes coming in in all other categories annually, the residential units the county has must make up the difference, which is why the county raises real estate taxes because it is such a significant portion of the county's annual income. He noted that Economic Development staff were present and asked if the county was bringing in the commercial and industrial in order to hold the property taxes for the individual houses at the same level.

Mr. Keller pointed out that these things were all interconnected in the question of growth and looking at it on a through-time basis, they must determine if a lower assessment house will begin to carry a higher or lower percentage of its tax responsibility for the county. He said the subject then begins to relate to policy in a significant manner because there are groups and individuals who say that increasing the number of housing is actually going to be cost effective, while others will disagree. He said one way to measure this is to look at where the county is on the tax spectrum per typical, average family.

Mr. Keller brought forth the subject of ownership versus renters, noting that it was a subject that was under much consideration. He said discussions going on in a number of cities (where they have the capacity to do so) to consider the equation of renter-to-owner ratios in condominiums, explaining that there was a movement to buy out the condo owners and reestablish the properties to rentals. He said this was a part of the housing that is beyond affordable housing but comes back to capacity as it comes back to tax rates and to what rental and housing costs will be at every point along the price spectrum, from lowest to highest.

Mr. Keller said that the components he mentioned build upon what he believes to be a strong and well-presented information set. He expressed hope that staff would continue to flesh out the data.

Mr. Keller said that regarding infrastructure, it was known that neighborhoods that have failed infrastructure are less popular places to live, except to those who cannot afford to live anywhere else. He said ultimately, a component that would look at the infrastructure needs (going back to the CIP and CNA) would be interesting to have, as the projections were geospatially located. He said it would be interesting to consider many of the things that Mr. Dotson has been bringing up

and getting to those. He acknowledged it was 2-4 years out, but that this would add to the information and fits within growth management.

Mr. Keller said that if the county begins to see more rural subdivisions, consideration should be made as to how they will take these into account and if they should be thought about differently. He explained that if there is still a higher density in the rural areas in those subdivisions, they are in some ways a subset of the county's growth management in the rural areas. He said even if this was not official policy, the question would be if they should become part of the official policy.

Ms. Firehock asked if staff was able to see a trend in the data (e.g., what percentage of the Comprehensive Plan designated units are being built). She asked if it was possible to draw an overall conclusion (e.g., only 70% of the high end possible units of the recommended Comprehensive Plan are being built).

Mr. Knuppel replied that at this point, staff would not be able to, but that since they had a spatial dimension, it could possibly be approached as a case study. He said they have information from two years before and that for projects that haven't been proposed yet, there are vacant parcels they could analyze to determine how they are supposed to be built out. He said over time, it would be a better way to see what the actual yield is from the land.

Ms. Firehock responded that this would be helpful because it would assist the commission to ask questions. She said if the commission believes they need to hit a certain number, they can figure out why they would not be, noting that different areas would produce different answers.

Ms. Firehock recalled Supervisor Dill's comparison between Manhattan and Albemarle County in one of their work sessions years before in which he talked about being able to fit Albemarle's growth area into Manhattan. She said Manhattan is 22.82 square miles and has 1.62 million people. She said Albemarle's growth areas are 35 square miles and have, at the high projection, 171,706 people. She clarified that she was not suggesting that the county's growth areas turn into Manhattan, but that she wanted to know how the numbers relate to needs for schools. She said staff could also look at it from the standpoint of their mathematics of open parcels. She said if housing continues to be put in, then they need land for more school. She said land then needs to be subtracted in order to build the new schools.

Ms. Firehock brought up transportation needs, noting that Charlottesville was experiencing many problems with this and density is being placed on many roads that used to be only two lanes wide, with some having originally be designed for horses. She also mentioned parks and green systems. She asked staff when they looked at open lands, if they removed parks and green systems from the calculation of available open space that a house could be grown on.

Mr. Knuppel replied that they did take out existing parks and recreation facilities. He said the Comprehensive Plan land use maps are the only ones that show the park needs, which did not count towards the density calculation.

Ms. Firehock said this was good and revisited her question about people needing to attend school, go shopping, and use the greenways. She said she was interested in the report and grateful for the data, but she still wanted the county itself to take the data and project out what this would mean for facilities, if they actually realize the density from the high ends of their Comprehensive Plan. She said another question would be as to what this would cost. She expressed appreciation for the earlier comment about modeling the NIMBY factor, as she has heard many members of

the public in past meetings speak at the podium about their concerns dealing with density, and yet they speak from a very community that has that density.

Ms. Firehock expressed that she was not against development, but that she was trying to say that there was a pushback the county was seeing across the growth areas as people want quality of life and do not want to be "jammed in like sardines." She said that the data was absent of the social dimension of what it means for the county. She acknowledged that the information was simply data and that staff has created a path for discussion and thought. She stated that she wanted to see the information be used to paint the picture of the future reality and what this would actually mean for the county financially and physically. She said the county could then decide if this was the future they want.

Ms. Firehock said there were many numbers on the Comprehensive Plan maps that members of the public have raised objections to, expressing that those numbers would be good in another neighborhood, but not in their own.

Ms. More agreed and said she understood the purpose of the report but pointed out that she found the word "infrastructure" to only be mentioned in it a couple times. She said she wanted to see what Ms. Firehock suggested, with the report being used to tell the county where it is going and how they will pay for it all. She said this gets back to infrastructure and that it may serve staff well to acknowledge it in the report in some way. She said the commission often hears across all the localities that the public is unhappy with infrastructure.

Ms. More referenced page 10, which discussed where the county would grow next. She said when she reads this, she thinks of expansion, and that other people do believe the area should expand. She cautioned staff, however, to be careful with how this is presented to the community as far as the need to expand. She said Crozet and other areas were nervous about expansion, and if this was what the county wants to imply, if staff is considering if the public in those areas want to expand. She asked what this would look like – whether they mean creating another Crozet elsewhere, or pushing on the boundaries.

Ms. More referenced the second paragraph on page 28, which discussed the discrepancies that exist between by-right development and the Crozet Master Plan land use designation, and how stream buffers and flood plain areas "reduce capacity under the net density calculation. Additional areas designated as Open Space in the Master Plan contribute to discrepancies between zoning and Comprehensive Plan scenarios." She asked why this information was in the Crozet section and not in other places in the report, as this is how density is calculated, whether it is by right or rezoning.

Mr. Knuppel replied that the commentary on the difference in land use designations was because staff had heard a few times from property owners in Crozet about an entire property being designated as green space, for example. He said staff observed a number of these in Crozet and were being sensitive to the considerations. He said it was mostly seen on the Route 250 fringe in part of the development area where there is a large amount of R-1 or R-2 zoning, with many parcels being shown solely as green space in the plan.

Mr. Knuppel said staff felt it was important to acknowledge that, where they are designating the areas entirely, they are setting up a discrepancy. He said staff wrestled with this with Pantops, noting that the parcels on the corner of State Farm Boulevard and Peter Jefferson Parkway are shown as parks in the original plan, and conversation was needed about what could happen and

what was realistic. He said this was not to say that preserving the scenic buffer and corridor was not important. He said that when there is a zoning ordinance that does not match the Comprehensive Plan, there was uncertainty involved.

Ms. More pointed out that this was what staff wants to be careful not to send a message that those things are not important. She said that Crozet has been told before that they are not producing the numbers that they need to, and that the implication in the paragraph she referenced was driving at this. She also pointed out that there were properties that were believed would come in higher that have gone by-right and, in exchange for that, there are by-right R-6 properties that come in quite dense. She said she did not know if this was ever part of the ultimate buildout calculation, to offset those that came in lower versus the ones that come in higher.

Ms. More said page 29 addresses the other side of Crozet and that the Pleasant Green plan is by-right and will be over 200 units, noting that staff did not yet have this information. She said she would be careful about the paragraph referenced, as it may hit a nerve with some Crozetians that they are not producing units.

Ms. More said that before 2008, the Board of Supervisors voted to approve over 4,000 units to Crozet. She said looking at the history of Crozet and understanding why it sometimes hits a nerve with citizens when there is an implication that they are not producing the units they should be, there was the Development Area Initiative Project with the final report dated August 20, 1999. She said in Volume 3, consultants were brought in to do the calculations and that for Crozet, low, high, and maximum populations were considered. She said the consultants recommended that for Crozet, the maximum ideal population would be 12,198. She said this was the number presented to the community in the first Master Plan, and thus Crozetians will often bring up this number.

Ms. More said that when this went to the Board for a vote, what came through was 18,000, and sometimes 22,000 is even mentioned, which was the absolute max that came out of the report that was done for that project. She explained that this was why the 18,000 number existed in the plan now but at the time of Master Planning, the community was told differently. She explained that when Master Planning is done now, there are people who no longer show up because they were told 12,000 and what went into the plan was 18,000. She said there was a huge violation of trust that happened back then that, as a community, the county needs to rebuild and get people to reengage, letting them know that the county is listening.

Ms. More expressed that she needed to say this because many times, there is an idea that when the community pushes back to have things be less dense (particularly around the 250 corridor), the community is somehow failing to meet an obligation that the community didn't agree to. She urged staff that as they approach the community with the report to consider that the paragraph reads that the numbers weren't coming in as high as the county would expect.

Ms. More said when then considering the current population, Crozet is at 8,370 and the Master Plan predicted them at 12,000 by the year 2030. She added that there was the 18,000 number that was then put in, and thus there was an edge with the community to work with as staff goes through its Master Plan review because of how the other plans were handled.

Ms. More said that overall, staff did a great job of capturing many numbers, expressing hope that the county would be able to use the report to move forward with things county-wide, as well as in hot spots such as Rio where there are known infrastructure issues. She said she hoped that the

county doesn't look at the documents on their own, but to consider ways to mesh them together to have a plan that makes sense.

Ms. Riley said that staff listed on page 6 reasons why it is difficult to establish trends for multi-family housing construction. She said she was not questioning the reasons but wondered whether or not that difficulty might be overcome in the next rendition of the report. She said it was important to be able to track this and asked if this could be improved on in the next version of the report.

Mr. Knuppel replied that there are peak corridors where a project comes online and because of the scale of the projects, it has been difficult for staff to say that there is a strong multi-family trend. He said if staff looked at a longer time period, they may be able to see a trend. He said moving forward, they look at Certificate of Occupancy information, noting that there were currently many apartment multi-family complexes under construction. He said there aren't many projects and that when there are, they are more like a peak event or surge of new units coming online, explaining that it makes it difficult (even with the quarterly CO reports) to see a trend because it is very heavily influenced by one building and 50 units coming online. He said in the future, he hoped that staff could find a better way to analyze this.

Ms. Riley said it was important data for the commission to have, and that particularly, it was known from the Regional Housing Study that there was a growing demand for rental housing. She said the report does a terrific job of particularly outlining the ownership units and associated trends, but that multi-family needed to be better understood.

Ms. Riley said staff did a great job of providing data around density, as it was not just a matter of how many units in any given area, but how the density is being distributed throughout the county. She said this gets back to how it links to CIP and equitable distributions of CIP funds. She said she didn't know if the report was intended to cover all those kinds of questions, but that the question was as to how the report links to the identification of CIP needs and prioritization (particularly given transportation and school needs). She asked as to where the county was determining whether or not there was equitable distribution of the CIP funds to support the data that is shown in the report, that the increased density is in the urban ring around Charlottesville.

Mr. Bivins said that the report asks, "How will we grow?" He suggested that the report instead read, "How may we grow?" He said this softens the headline in a way that people may not find as stark.

Mr. Dotson recalled that Mr. Bivins had described the report as a "story." He disagreed, stating that it was a picture. He said the saying was that "a picture is worth a thousand words," but disagreed with this. He said that a good picture will generate 10,000 words, and that the commission had just proven it. He said it was important to keep in mind the purpose of the report, which was to look at rates of development and to conduct a capacity analysis. He said it was a wonderful report and was the best they had ever had, and though it generates many questions, the report could not address all of those.

Mr. Dotson said to him, the key question was to whether or not the county has enough land. He said that when he moved to the area in 1978, he tried to meet with other planners and what he kept hearing was that Charlottesville was built out, landlocked, and done. He noted that it was not built out and not done.

Mr. Dotson said that as they consider the question of not having enough land (even if the county

was built out), there are good and bad consequences. He said one of the good consequences is that there is enough pressure to stimulate redevelopment. He said if there is adequate land for a continuation of the past, redevelopment will not take place. He said if there is a degree of buildout, there is increased density as another way to get around the issue. He said there would also be increased transit usage, and there could also be a more sustainable community. He said perhaps there was not quite enough land, but perhaps some good consequences would result from it.

Mr. Dotson said that not having enough land could also have some negative consequences such as gentrification, the price of land increasing (which would increase both housing and business costs), and the loss of feel and character. He said that for him, the things that he cited as positive consequences were part of the Comprehensive Plan goals as far as encouraging more density, transit, redevelopment, and a more sustainable pattern. He said gentrification, land prices, and loss of feel are things to try to mitigate as a consequence of this. He said he was not convinced that if the county just barely had enough land, that this was a problem. He said it could actually be a blessing to achieving some of the goals.

Mr. Dotson said the report stated that it was provided for information and that no action was required. He disagreed with this, explaining that it would be useful to the commission to make some findings based on the report and to forward those findings to the Board of Supervisors. He said this did not mean that the Board couldn't see the report before the commission makes some findings. He said he was picturing a one-page document that would present the commission's findings about the report, noting that this could not be done that evening. He concluded that the report needed to be brought back for another work session so that the commission could work on the findings.

Mr. Keller asked Ms. Falkenstein if this could work in the schedule.

Ms. Falkenstein replied yes, saying that they could find some time in October and if not then, definitely in November.

Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Dotson if "findings" could include recommendations on how to use the data in county planning.

Mr. Dotson replied yes, as long as the subject is not exhausted.

Ms. Firehock agreed.

Ms. Spain agreed with Mr. Dotson's thoughts that the commission was asking the report to bear much weight that was not possible, from staff's standpoint. She added that the "story" was included on page 5, in the first graph that shows the increase in residential construction activity in the development area. She said a couple years before, this much evidence did not exist, and so this strengthens the goal and was the whole point of having the growth boundaries. She said it dips slightly for 2018, but that this may even out when the 2019 figures are available. She said this was a big item and something that should be in headlines. She said if the commission prepares a findings report for the Board, they should emphasize this, and it should be one of the main points.

Mr. Carrazana said staff deserves credit for all the work, noting that the county sometimes receives help from the Engineering school and from other data experts. He said the report demonstrates a lot of thought and great work. He said staff has the building blocks and they are

showing data analysis in a way they did not have before. He pointed out that this was just the beginning and that he would hate for it to end by simply cleaning it up two years from then.

Mr. Carrazana disagreed with some of the commissioners, stating that this was a matter of looking at much more than land capacity. He said the report could do this and that it was a good goal to have data that analyzes capacity to determine if there is enough land to meet growth projections. He reiterated a previous comment that projections are always wrong, and it was a matter of how wrong they are, noting that he spent a career confirming this.

Mr. Carrazana said it has also been said that the word "infrastructure" was not nearly said enough in the report. He said that in terms of infrastructure, this related to transit and schools. He asked how the report would inform the CIP, acknowledging that perhaps it was putting a lot on the document, but pointing out that it was a base document with data and should be used to inform all those areas.

Mr. Carrazana asked how the report aligned with the School Board report that was produced a few months before. He asked if it was consistent or if there were variances and, if so, why.

Mr. Carrazana said he liked the fact that the report consisted of building blocks that drilled down to neighborhoods. He said this was powerful in beginning to understand the neighborhoods, noting that staff was able to do and answer many questions from the commissioners, who have spent a great deal of time in those neighborhoods. He suggested that staff continue to develop the base knowledge of those areas, which would only make for a better document. He suggested they talk to the commissioners, the people and developers in those neighborhoods in order to come up with a better model that would trickle not only to the entirety of the county, but that it would also layer with other components, such as transit.

Mr. Carrazana proposed that the areas that are not desirable are not always the ones that are failing in infrastructure. He said that, in fact, very desirable areas begin to fail in infrastructure because the infrastructure is not keeping up with the growth, adding that there were many examples of this in the county. He said layering the infrastructure with the growth, determining the potential, considering what is in the pipeline, and what is needed would results in a recommendations piece. He said the report could end with some kind of trend that could lead to actionable steps, which would be the CIP and where the county is spending its money and energy.

Mr. Carrazana said he believed the report had a lot of potential and that staff was only scratching the surface. He said if only land capacity is considered, the county was missing the mark.

Ms. Spain pointed out that the commission was creating many expectations and clarified that they did not expect Mr. Knuppel to do all of this, but that they were simply discussing and figuring out how they could turn the report into something useful for the Board.

Ms. More thanked staff for the work they did. She acknowledged that the commission was asking a lot from the report, agreeing that they should be and recognizing that this potentially puts a great amount of work onto Mr. Knuppel. She said perhaps this was a message that the commission sends to the Board in what Mr. Dotson suggested, cautioning that they should be careful about how to approach this and how it would be advertised. She said it was an action item, and if the commission was to make recommendations, consideration should be made as to how they will ensure they are being clear with the public.

Ms. More said that the commission has asked a lot from the report, but if it will be taken to the different CACs and community, they will ask many questions as well. She said therefore, perhaps the commission's comments will be helpful as staff moves forward into the community, even though those comments address items that the report perhaps did not intend to provide at its current level.

Ms. Firehock said she was excited to think about the county institutionalizing the methodology so that, as they develop more figures in the coming years, they can begin to look back at how accurate their assumptions were. She said those assumptions could be tweaked if needed, transforming the report into a more predictive tool. She acknowledged that recessions can happen, but that the report could become a useful set of data for future projection planning, more so than it was at present time as staff did not have enough years of data to be able to make a significant conclusion.

Mr. Bivins suggested that if staff was looking to have a work session with the Board of Supervisors, the Hollymead page of the report would be an area they could have a discussion on. He said with the impact of what will happen at Brook Hill, at North Point, and what could happen at Hollymead, the county could possibly place 4,000 households of various types there. He said the question was to what this would mean, noting that it wasn't a place like Jack Jouett or Rio East, which he typically looks to as the community's urban center, but was stretching it up Route 29. He said that if the Board of Supervisors is trying to get ahead of this in a thoughtful way, the report could give the Board an opportunity to think about how to prepare for the impacts.

Mr. Bivins continued that there were many people in this area and if the proposals are built out to even half of what is being suggested there, it could have negative impacts. He indicated that the UVA Foundation's properties there were not in the mix.

Mr. Carrazana agreed.

Mr. Bivins said that the Foundation has been discussing turning some of its park into mixed-use parks. He addressed Mr. Keller, suggesting that perhaps the commission has a lab on this topic.

Mr. Keller said there was another piece that hadn't been discussed, which was doing away with R-1. He said this could be 2-4 years out and that changes to the zoning in Charlottesville have been observed.

Mr. Keller thanked Ms. Jodie Filardo and Ms. Amelia McCulley for attending the meeting, as well as for giving the report more form and going further with it. He said it was great to have leaders of Community Development present to hear about the work done as well as the discussion the commissioners had about it.

Committee Reports

Mr. Keller said he attended the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) meeting. He said there was a desire to go out into the greater Charlottesville-Albemarle area with a series of meetings, and that there were interesting members who know a great deal about what is being considered for transportation in the future. He said there was some thought about having a presentation about this due to the issue of the county and the city both having their transportation processes, and where the CTAC should be involved in public information that isn't in conflict with other things that are officially in the pipeline.

Ms. More said the Crozet community had their kickoff for the Master Plan. She said 120 people signed in and they ran out of space for sign-ins, so potentially 150 people attended. She said she hoped they would continue to come. She thanked staff, saying that the meeting was well-received, and she heard only positive comments about it. She said one person there had only moved to Crozet a week prior. She said she liked staff's approach to having pop-up coffee talk meetings at alternate times for people who cannot attend the evening meetings. She said it was a creative way to engage people in the process.

Ms. More said at the Crozet CAC meeting, they were going to review what was captured at the Master Planning meeting. She said there was a storm, and the library lost power and therefore, the meeting was canceled.

Ms. Spain said the Places29 North CAC met the Thursday prior, with two issues on the agenda. She said UVA and Encompass Health were proposing to relocate the UVA Rehab Hospital from Fontaine Park to the UVA Research Park, which would be a 2,000-square-foot, 70-bed facility. She said a fair number of members of the community showed up to ask about construction noise, traffic, etc. She said it was an issue similar to the one that evening to propose consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Spain said the other issue had to deal with amending the code of development for the Hollymead Town Center in Area C to allow for an increase in non-residential square footage for Block 1. She said with the Hollymead development, there are numerous parcels, blocks, letters and numbers and each time an amendment request comes forward, it's typically a different parcel or block. She said there were actually no community members there to talk about that issue – that the ones who attended were there to discuss the rehab center, noting that those comments were mainly positive.

Ms. Spain said the Pantops CAC met the evenings before, and that one of the first things the new chair did was update and finalize committee membership, which was an important thing to do on a regular basis, as there were people leaving and coming on board. She said she wasn't sure how many of the commissioners worked with their respective chairs to sort this out, noting that if a position goes vacant and there are other people who want to be members of the CAC, it was important to recruit them into any vacant spots.

Ms. Spain said there was an update on the Free Bridge zoning violations. She said an individual parked his numerous vehicles all along Free Bridge Road near Darden Towe Park, and that he has been warned and given a stern talking-to, all to no avail. She said the county was actually taking him to court. She said this seldom happens because it is a complicated process and the county had to go through many steps before coming to this point. She said it has been going on for two years, if not longer, and no compliance was intended. She said this would likely take another year to work through.

Mr. Herrick noted that these typically take several months to address.

Ms. Riley said the 5th and Avon CAC met the Thursday before, and they spent 1.5 hours on review of the Avon Street Corridor Study, which would next come before the Planning Commission before going to the Board of Supervisors. She said at that time, Kevin McDermott shared with the CAC that even though it would be adopted by the Board, it wouldn't actually be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. She said she was not exactly clear on what the status of the corridor plan

would be.

Ms. Riley said a second item was a report from Mr. McDermott and from Margaret Maliszewski on the Entrance Corridor status update for Avon Street. She said there were also a number of other road segments that would potentially be part of a county submission to the state for redesignating those segments as Entrance Corridors. She said there was a great deal of discussion about pros and cons to this, given that they just had a corridor study done on Avon Street. She said the CAC asked that Mr. McDermott provide them with a one-page report on pros and cons and that it will be discussed again, with the CAC voting on whether or not they want to be included in an application for redesignation.

Ms. Riley said lastly, there was an update from the Royal Fern development, noting that it would be coming before the Planning Commission on October 8. She said the applicant felt it would be useful to come back and provide some additional comments on transportation impacts and potential proffers.

Ms. Spain said she needed to add to her report, as it involved Mr. McDermott. She said he has obtained funds from VDOT to improve the Route 250/Route 20 intersection and did so by persistently talking to VDOT about what scraps might be left over after they funded the Hampton Roads project, which was a big-ticket item. She said he continued to ask until VDOT said yes. She said the improvement will also include a pedestrian crossing at the intersection, which the CAC has been lobbying for years.

Ms. Spain said there was much to thank Mr. McDermott for and that it was clear he does a lot of work behind the scenes that the commission doesn't see. She said when the commission becomes aggravated with Smart Scale problems, he seems to know his away around some of those.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

Mr. Bivins asked that the commission receive a report with an update on the county's wireless plan. He recalled that Mr. Bill Fritz indicated that something was in the works. He asked if it was too much trouble for Mr. Fritz to provide a full presentation, if he could provide a memo explaining to the commission what he was doing. He said he had a feeling that with the 5G technology, Albemarle would be one of the last places that gets it because of the county's topography. He said there has been some movement with the co-ops of what they are doing with broadband, and it would be helpful for the commission and for the public to be fully briefed as opposed to casually briefed.

Mr. Keller asked Ms. Falkenstein if she could pass this request on.

Ms. Falkenstein replied yes.

Adjournment

At 8:55 p.m., the Commission adjourned to October 8, 2019 Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m., Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

David Benish, Interim Director of Planning

(Recorded by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards, and transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 11/05/2019
Initials: CSS