Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes December 17, 2019

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, December 17, 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; Daphne Spain; Jennie More; Julian Bivins, Vice-Chair; Bruce Dotson; Pam Riley; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: Karen Firehock.

Other officials present were Jodie Filardo, Community Development Director; David Benish, Planning Director; Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission; Cameron Langille; Mariah Gleason; Roger Johnson; J.T. Newberry; 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 asked if there were any matters from the public not listed for public hearing on the agenda that anyone would like to speak to.

Mr. Sean Tubbs (Piedmont Environmental Council) said he didn't know if any of the Commissioners would not be there in a couple weeks. He said because he was not a reporter at that moment, he hadn't kept best track of who is where. He said that for those Commissioners who might be leaving or staying on that he wanted to thank them for their service. He said over the years, he had a chance to watch the Commission as a reporter and now, as an advocate.

Mr. Tubbs thanked the Commission for helping to fulfill Albemarle County Planning Commission's task of promoting the orderly development of the County. He said it takes long meetings and, at times, impassioned arguments, as well as a lot of patience.

Mr. Tubbs said that in doing some research for the Broadway Blueprint work session, he came across the minutes from the October 2016 joint City-County Planning Commission meeting. He said Mr. Peter Thompson of The Center (formerly The Senior Center) came to talk at that time about the relocation of that organization to Belvedere. He said this was now something that is four months away, and that Mr. Thompson has a concern. He said he wouldn't talk about that that evening because in the future, the Commission would be hearing a lot from him and others about the need to make sure that the City and County are working together better in the implementation of infrastructure that fulfills the Comprehensive Plan goals.

Mr. Tubbs said on that point, one of the Comprehensive Plan goals that's been in both jurisdictions" Comprehensive Plans for years is the goal of reducing single-occupant vehicles. He said this was something that, according to the American Community Survey data from the

Census, really hasn't happened, but that there was a group of people and many pieces where they can get those things moving together.

Mr. Tubbs asked the Commissioners to mark their calendars for January 22, as the Center for Civic Innovations would be holding a forum to have people talk about what their obstacles are for why they continue to remain in a vehicle. He said this is something that he has personally been doing to try to make himself break the habit of driving, and that he wants to hear from others. He said there must be respect for what people do, and the idea is to reduce the numbers, not replace the system completely.

Mr. Tubbs pointed out an email that his colleague from PVCC, Mr. Peter Krebs, had sent the Commission regarding the Hyland Park amendment, specifically the proffer amendment. He said it may be in the Commissioners' email boxes and that Mr. Krebs could explain it much better than he could regarding their position about the Class A trails versus the Class B trails. He recommended taking a look at this and consider what that means.

Mr. Keller informed Mr. Tubbs that he would have an opportunity to speak to that at that point.

Mr. Tubbs said he was not sure he could speak in the detail Mr. Krebs did, and so he would refer the Commission to the letter.

Consent Agenda

There were no consent agenda items.

Public Hearing Items

ZMA201900011 2231 Seminole Lane

Mr. Cameron Langille, Senior Planner with the Planning Division of the Albemarle County Department of Community Development, presented. He said the rezoning request sought out to change the zoning of one property from CO Commercial Office to the (HC) Highway Commercial Zoning District.

Mr. Langille said the property in question has a physical address of 2231 Seminole Lane and is located on the east side of Route 29. He presented an image, noting that the property is directly across 29 from where Walmart is located. He explained that Seminole Lane was represented by a small stub street, which comes off of Route 29 and goes in slightly in front of the property. He said the other road across 29 is Hilton Heights Road.

Mr. Langille said that further east to the subject property is the Carrsbrook subdivision and that to the north, there are different commercial properties, such as a gas station and a couple restaurants. He said the property immediately south was undeveloped at that time.

Mr. Langille presented a zoomed-in image, indicating to where Seminole Lane comes off Route 29, noting there is a stop light. He said currently, there is a 2.5-story structure on the property that was built in the 1970s. He said historically, the structure has been used for office space and that he did not believe there was currently a tenant in it.

Mr. Langille said the property is adjacent to the Carrsbrook subdivision, but that the topography was interesting. He said the property sits approximately 30 feet below where the residential lots in Carrsbrook are located, so when one is in Carrsbrook, one cannot see the property unless they get right up to the property line and look down that slope.

Mr. Langille presented a Google Street View of what the property looks like. He said in the 2.5-story structure, there is a basement in one area, noting that it was difficult to see.

Mr. Langille said the existing zoning is CO Commercial Office. He said by right, there is a variety of administrative office rights, accessory uses, and facilities that are allowed in the CO District. He explained that the image presented showed that everything that surrounds the property (except for the Carrsbrook subdivision) is currently zoned (HC). He said the reason the property was zoned CO was because when the County adopted the ordinance in 1980, an office user was there, so it made sense to make the zoning match up with what the existing use was. He reiterated that everything else that is along Route 29 north, west, and south of the parcel is zoned (HC).

Mr. Langille said that in terms of overlay zoning districts, the property is in the Entrance Corridor, the Airport Impact Overlay District, and at the rear of the property (or eastern edge), there are managed steep slopes. He said this was the area where he explained how the grade differentiates the site from Carrsbrook.

Mr. Langille presented an image from the Places29 Master Plan that shows the future land use recommendations. He noted it calls out two types of future land uses on the property. He said approximately one-tenth of an acre is Commercial Mixed Use and that the rest of the property is designated for Office, Flex, R&D, and Light Industrial uses.

Mr. Langille said the Commercial Mixed-Use designation is meant to apply to areas that have already been developed, or have been approved for commercial uses and shopping areas. He said uses include retail, automobile, commercial service, and some office types. He said that secondary uses in the Commercial Mixed-Use designation do include things that would be classified as Office, Flex, R&D, and Light Industrial.

Mr. Langille said the staff report includes a lengthy summary of all the different types of uses that can be classified under Office, Flex, R&D, and Light Industrial. He said the aim of this designation is to apply to an area where there will be a range of employment-generating uses, and then non-retail commercial areas of Route 29.

Mr. Langille let the Commission know he could answer any questions about the specific uses outlined in the staff report, after the presentation. He said in summary, the (HC) Zoning District is the closest zoning district to Office, R&D, Flex, and Light Industrial that one can get without actually going to the Light Industrial Zoning District.

Mr. Langille said with the application, there would not be a proffered development plan, but that the applicant did provide staff with a concept plan for how the property could be developed. He indicated on the plan to a building that is about 2,800 square feet and that parking could be put in on site on the sides of the building, as opposed to having it in the front (which is consistent with Neighborhood Model principles). He said the plan also shows the ability to have future interconnections with adjacent properties, particularly the one to the south that is currently undeveloped. He noted again that the concept plan was meant to demonstrate how the property could be developed.

Mr. Langille indicated to the top of the image representing the east side of the property, explaining that this is where the managed slopes are located and that, based on the proffer to not encroach into some of the slopes, one could see that it is possible to get a building on the site as well as all the other necessary improvements without disturbing the area much.

Mr. Langille presented another concept image that shows how grading would occur if the site was developed as the specific use, noting how it showed the limits of the disturbance.

Mr. Langille said staff recommends approval of the zoning request. He said the factors favorable include that the request is consistent with the land use recommendations of the Places29 Master Plan.

Mr. Langille referred to the staff report, noting that under Number 2, the language on the screen was different than what he had written originally. He said originally, there was one aspect of the application that was not consistent with the buildings and spaces of human scale Neighborhood Model principle. He said the applicant is proposing a proffer about the architectural elements that would be necessary on a future building.

Mr. Langille said in speaking with ARB staff, staff looked at this and didn't think it would allow them to require, at the site plan stage, that the building's front façade that faces Route 29 appears like the true front entrance. He said staff wanted it to have things like windows and doors, even if it was not the primary entrance, and so there could perhaps be faux windows to give the appearance so it was not a blank wall.

Mr. Langille said that in terms of the language in the draft proffer statement, he has been working with the applicant and that they came to an agreement that morning on some revised language that they feel meets the Neighborhood Model principle. He said therefore, the request is consistent with all the applicable Neighborhood Model principles, at this point.

Mr. Langille said another reason staff is recommending approval is that it includes proffers that will help create the interconnected transportation network both for vehicles and pedestrians. He said the applicant is including a proffer about making sidewalks connect out to the existing sidewalk, which will be converted into a larger multi-use path at some point. He noted that staff was potentially looking into a Smart Scale application for this.

Mr. Langille said he included the revised proffer language in the presentation for the Commission to read.

Mr. Dotson said he had two questions for staff. He asked if he was correct in assuming that this was north of the area that would be part of the form-based code, in the future.

Mr. Langille replied yes, noting that this property was not located within the Rio-29 Small Area Plan boundaries.

Mr. Dotson said there is a statement in the staff report that he had seen a couple times recently that uses the phrase, "When the original zoning ordinance was adopted in 1980." He said his understanding is that there was zoning prior to 1980 and in 1980, there was a comprehensive rezoning. He asked if the statement was accurate, or if it was making reference to the comprehensive rezoning.

Mr. Langille replied that the statement must be inaccurate. He said he meant to say, "When the current version of the zoning ordinance was adopted in 1980."

Mr. Benish added that it could very well be possible that the zoning was substantially consistent with the original rezoning, but that he believed staff was referring back to the 1980 rezoning.

Mr. Dotson said he asked because with some other projects, the question will come up of how long the zoning has been in place.

Mr. Keller added that the Commission has seen this coming up lately, several times, and so staff may want to address this in order to be consistent.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing.

Mr. Maynard Sipe, a land use attorney in Charlottesville, introduced himself, as well as the engineer for the project (Mr. Gathright) and the landowner (Mr. Garattia). He said they were available for questions.

Mr. Sipe said the rezoning was a simple request to, in a sense, remedy what was a spot zoning done in 1980, which was done in recognition of the existing use at that time. He said the applicant is simply looking for the opportunity to have more flexibility to develop the property consistently with all the other parcels around it that are zoned (HC).

Hearing no comments from members of the public, Mr. Keller invited the applicant to come forward again for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Dotson said he supported the request, and had one question. He asked when the proffers say, "The following uses will not be permitted," what the reasoning was behind those particular uses not being permitted. He said the uses do not strike him as obnoxious, loud, or generating problems and cited churches, cemeteries, and funeral homes as examples.

Mr. Sipe replied he came to the project after the initial discussion and application was filed. He said his understanding was that those were in response to some concerns from staff to limit the number of uses. He said the uses that are stricken are likely to be impractical for the property, anyway. He said he did not think the property was large enough to accommodate a funeral home or those kinds of uses. He said it would not be desirable for a cemetery. He said the proffer simply narrows down the field of uses to reasonable ones.

Ms. Riley said page 3 of the staff report refers to both the conceptual site layout plan and a conceptual grading plan. She said in terms of the grading plan, it has been offered for conceptual purposes only, but not proffered. She asked why this was.

Mr. Sipe replied that there is no ultimate use determined for the property at that time. He said this was something that was not commonly seen, but that it was a straight rezoning of the property and with no actual user, it was difficult to know the exact parameters of the design of the site at that time. He said the site plan, sketch plan, and grading plan were submitted simply to illustrate a typical use, or one type of use. He said the engineer has done a couple exercises like this to see what could fit on the property. He said the grading could change slightly, but would not likely change substantially.

Ms. Riley said she thought the language in the proffer was demonstrating that the applicant does not expect to have extensive disturbance to the areas of managed steep slopes in the rear, east side of the parcel. She asked if this was correct.

Mr. Sipe replied yes. He said there is a proffer that the applicant is restricting activity so that there will not be clearing or any disturbance, to the rear of the property next to Carrsbrook. He said this was done in recognition that the slopes are difficult there, and also to protect the neighbors.

Mr. Bivins asked to present the slide of blended land use, where there was a sliver of Light Industrial and Commercial Office. He asked if there was a reason this couldn't be pushed all out there in order to create one consistent land use on the particular parcel.

Mr. Langille replied that he was not entirely sure what exactly happened with that specific site but that he could say that many times, when they draw the layers for land uses, it's based on whatever the GIS layers have for the parcel boundaries at that time and that sometimes, this is not entirely accurate. He said there are properties elsewhere in the County where it is sometimes appropriate to have more than one future land use designation on them. He said many times, they will see properties that have some residential and some green space, and that he has seen mixed commercial on two different properties.

Mr. Bivins said this was true. He said he was puzzling over the driveway. He said the idea of having a Light Industrial driveway or road was something he wasn't sure would be helpful for VDOT or for looking down the road in the event something happens coming across with the connection onto Route 29.

Mr. Langille replied he didn't think so.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing.

Mr. Dotson asked if staff had proposed language for the recommendation.

Mr. Herrick asked if the motion included any sort of acknowledgment of the revised Proffer 3 as well.

Mr. Langille replied that this should be included, with the reasons listed in the staff report, and the revised proffer previously shown.

Mr. Herrick noted that page 8 of the staff report included a motion that included the proffer revisions.

Ms. More asked if this included the one that was just shown on the screen.

Mr. Herrick said he believed they could rephrase the motion suggested in the staff report to move to recommend approval of the ZMA, with the proffer revisions, including Proffer #3, as recommended by staff.

Mr. Dotson moved to recommend approval of ZMA201900011, with proffer revisions as recommended by staff, including as recommended that evening.

Ms. More seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6:0). (Ms. Firehock was absent.)

Mr. Keller thanked staff and the applicant, noting that the request would be moving on to the Board of Supervisors.

ZMA201900007 Hyland Park

Ms. Mariah Gleason, Senior Planning with the Planning Division of the Community Development department, presented.

Ms. Gleason said the subject parcels are located in the Fontana subdivision in the Pantops development area. She said this area lies just west of the upper Cascadia development. She indicated on a map to Cascadia and Route 250. She said this is the last phase of development for Fontana.

Ms. Gleason said the Zoning Map Amendment request is to amend proffers previously approved with ZMA2014-18 and ZMA2011-01 on 21 parcels covering 10.88 acres of the Fontana subdivision. She said this request is proposing revision to 9 of the 10 approved proffers. She said four of those are substantive changes, three are clerical changes, and two of them are requested to be removed because they have been satisfied.

Ms. Gleason presented an image of the current site, indicating that parcels are a mix of developed, developing, and undeveloped parcels. She said the parcel on the far left has a primitive trail on it and is not expected to be developed. She said there are 19 parcels in a cul-de-sac area that have been platted and graded, with one Certificate of Occupancy (CO) having been issued and 11 Building Permits having been issued there so far.

Ms. Gleason said development is underway, and that there is one parcel in a corner lot that is currently under review by staff for the platting of the final 15 lots in the rezoning amendment to culminate at 34 dwelling units that were approved with the rezoning plan in 2004.

Ms. Gleason said she would be touching base on the four substantive changes. She said they could also review the clerical changes and the omission if members of the Commission would like. She said the first substantive change was to Proffer #5, which the Commissioners may have received an email about. She said she provided the existing proffer language on the top and the proposed language on the bottom of the slide, with language changes represented in red.

Ms. Gleason said the items changing in that proffer amendment are to revise the language to include more generalized language to allow flexibility in where the final placement of the paths are; changing the construction type of the paths from Class A Type 1 (being an asphalt construction) to Class B Type 1 (being constructed of earth, mulch, or stone dust); and to change the timing of the installation from the ninth building permit to when 50% of the dwellings are complete.

Ms. Gleason presented a picture of the trails that will be affected by the revision, for reference. She said they are located on the corner lot that is yet to be developed and is currently being reviewed by staff. She said in terms of development standards, there were differences between the Class A Type 1 and the Class B Type 1. She said there is also a design element that informs the grading that is allowed, with one being a 20% grade allowed while the other having a 10% grade. She said thus, these are allowed to be slightly steeper with Class B than Class A would allow.

Ms. Gleason presented an image that came from the approved road plan. She said that while the road plans do not carry any weight on what the subdivision does, they were approved by Engineering.

Ms. Gleason said the revision to the sixth proffer addresses the cash proffers. She said the applicant is seeking a by-right use credit, which is relief from the obligation to pay proffers on development that would have been allowed on the property prior to the original rezoning. She said revisions to the proffer also remove the earmarking of the proffers to be used exclusively for improvements for schools, libraries, public safety, parks, and transportation as identified in the County's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). She said this language is being removed.

Ms. Gleason said the cash proffers are now codified under the State legislation, and so the statement was no longer needed. She said the revised proffer actually improves the language because the County, under State code, is no longer able to accept cash proffers to fund libraries.

Ms. Gleason said clerical edits were also proposed to change the terminology of "residential units" and "units" to "dwelling units," which is consistent with the clerical changes across the rest of the proffers.

Ms. Gleason said Proffer 9 addresses the architectural standards and is requesting to expand the number of allowed façade colors. She said the representative from Monticello has confirmed that this revision satisfies the Monticello Viewshed's concerns. She added that staff has no concerns with this proffer change. She said there were also clerical edits with this.

Ms. Gleason said Proffer 7 is the only proffer that staff and the applicant could not reach agreement on. She said the applicant is requesting that the escalation date of the proffer be revised to start on January 1, 2019 as opposed to the original start date of January 1, 2008. She noted that the start date will affect cash contributions associated with the cash proffers of Proffer 6, as well as the affordable housing proffers contributions of Proffer 3.

Ms. Gleason presented a chart of the similar proffer agreements that the County has considered up to that point. She noted what stood out was that the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have recommended denial in all of the previous requests that have been similar, in reducing cash proffers or changing the escalation date (to staff's knowledge).

Ms. Gleason said there had been one request in Avon Park in which the Board did approve the application request, but the request for the cash proffer reduction was removed per the Planning Commission's recommendation. She said with that request, however, the start date adjustment is visible in the final proffer statement, and the adjustment was not discussed by the Board nor mentioned in the staff report. She said that change was likely missed by staff and approved in the final proffer statement.

Ms. Gleason said that based on staff's evaluation, staff believes that based on the Board's previous denial of similar requests, the subdivision construction and proffer payments for the development have commenced, and by resetting the escalation date, the resulting proffer amounts for cash proffers and affordable housing proffers will be reduced. She said staff does not support the requested revisions to Proffer #7 and recommends that this request be omitted from the proposal prior to the Board's consideration. She concluded staff's presentation.

Ms. Spain asked Ms. Gleason if she had said that the grade on the paths would be 20% rather than 10%, or if it was the other way around.

Ms. Gleason replied that they would be allowed to be up to 20%.

Ms. Spain asked if this would still be ADA-compliant.

Ms. Gleason replied no.

Ms. Spain asked if 10% was ADA-compliant.

Mr. Benish replied that a 5% grade was ADA-compliant.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing to hear from the applicant.

Ms. Ashley Davies (Riverbend Development) thanked the Commission for their consideration of their request for a proffer amendment. She extended her gratitude to staff, noting they had been excellent to work with. She said Ms. Gleason covered the extent of what the applicant was asking from the Commission.

Ms. Davies said when she inherited the project a couple years before, it was simply one step in the long process that has been the very last phase of Fontana known as Fontana 4C. She said as Ms. Gleason mentioned, this request originally came into the County in 2004, and this was about the same time she was finishing graduate school and learning about essential nexus and proportionality, as they relate to the discussion.

Ms. Davies said there was one interesting thing about the applicant's request versus the other requests that have been considered in the past. She said staff mentioned that this was the same as the other requests, and that she disagreed with this point because in the research she has done on all the other cash proffer requests indicated that those requests were to make those proffers consistent with the CRIM (the County's fiscal impact model) and FIAC numbers (Fiscal Impact Assessment Committee). She said this was a very significant reduction in the cash proffers, versus the applicant's request, which is to simply reset the escalation date of the proffers.

Ms. Davies said this mainly has to do with the timing of the application. She explained that when the application came in in 2004, the applicant came forward with a $3,000 proffer per unit that was consistent with other proffers at that time. She said even up to just months before the project approval, there was still the $3,000 proffer in place, but in 2007, the County adopted the new proffer policy. She said the final approval of the project was in March of 2008, which was just after the passing of the new policy. She said that therefore, they were hit with the larger proffer numbers and interestingly, even at that time, the developer had suggested the by-right credit, which had been removed before the final approval.

Ms. Davies said that policies change and now, the applicant is grateful that the County has been approving the by-right credits. She said she also thinks their request is different in that with the March 2008 approval, this was right before the financial crisis of 2008 (or "Great Recession") hit, and so there were all these factors at play that were working against the development. She said the developer passed away a few years later, and her firm came to acquire the property.

Ms. Davies noted that the property already has the $17,500 in proffers per unit, which the applicant believes is reasonable and is 2-3 times the amount that would be required if they were looking at the FIAC numbers. She said it was more than fair that the applicant is addressing any impacts associated with the development. She said considering the fact that it did sit for several years, planning-wise, the County's big policy is protecting the rural areas and promoting development in the growth areas. She said the request makes a big difference to the applicant because every couple thousand dollars either has to be eaten or passed on to the buyers. She said the applicant thinks the proposal is fair.

Ms. Davies said regarding the trail system, most of the trails at Fontana were put in with the previous subdivision plats and rezonings. She said their trail just has a couple of very small sections that primarily tie into the trails of Hyland Ridge that are primitive trails. She said much of the area that had previously been shown in trails in the rezoning, through the applicant's redesign, is actually handled through streets and sidewalks to carry the pedestrians. She said the applicant feels that if they are connecting in with the primitive trails, this makes the most sense.

Ms. Davies said the reason behind the timing was that the trail was initially set with the rezoning. She said she assumed that the cul-de-sac piece was originally going to be done first as the first phase, but that the applicant has changed that, and so 15-20 years later, a lot of redesign had to be done. She said this was their Phase 2, and that there was no way they would be able to get those trails in by the ninth CO. She said the idea was that they would put all the infrastructure of Phase 2 in at the same time.

Ms. Davies offered to answer any questions about the request, reiterating that they had spent a lot of time with staff getting the application organized.

Mr. Mike Depoteto (605 Fontana Drive) said his property abuts the Hyland Park development. He said he actually purchased the original developer's home. He said he did not have much to say about the cash proffers, but if for some reason the Commission were to deny them, he would encourage them to consider offering some sort of a community beautification that would be a compromise for the developer.

Mr. Depoteto said as far as the paint color, as an abutter, he found it to be agreeable. He said regarding the trails, he would suggest that they do connect to all the primitive trails there, adding that they were very nicely done. He asked the Commission to consider that they be wide trails to be in conformity with the existing Hyland Ridge trails. He also asked the Commission to require that, if they are not going to require the Class A Type 1 (which he didn't think was appropriate in blending with the character of the community), they keep with the character of the community by having a combination of gravel and stone dust, when needed, and have a nice packing done of that to be in conformity with the rest of the development.

Mr. Depoteto said so far, the applicant is doing a great job in regard to building homes there, noting they are good quality homes and that it will be a nice development in the community.

Mr. Keller invited the applicant to come forward again.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarity on the correspondence around the paths. He said in his reading of the original proffers, it appeared that the paths were to be Class A, Type 1. He said later, in reading the staff report, what has been installed throughout the community is Class B. He said he was trying to reconcile the proffer for Class A with the fact that Class B was allowed. He asked what the County's sense was on this.

Ms. Gleason replied that the proffer statement was written for Fontana Phase 4C, and those were proffered with the construction type of Class A. She said the rest of the Fontana development has been that they were constructed to a Class B. She said this is cohesive and consistent with the rest of the pedestrian trails provided in the subdivision.

Mr. Bivins said this was interesting because he noticed that, in Ms. Elaine Echols' correspondence with the previous developer, there was some tension in the correspondence about the developer perhaps extending his interpretation of what took place at the Commission. He said that in any proffer among the documents shared with the Commission over the past week, there was an acquiescence to a Class B, except a noting that by tradition, Class Bs were constructed, when in fact the proffer looked to refer to Class A. He said he was trying to understand where a decision was made that Class B was deemed to be fine. He asked how to have input or impact on what type of Class B they would be willing to go with, since they are being asked to go with Class B.

Ms. Gleason replied she was not sure.

Mr. Benish said the proffers actually contain two proffers related to paths. He said one is to the 4C area, and one is to the other areas. He said the other area refers to an application plan that was actually sited as drafted by Mr. Glen Brooks, who was a County Engineer at the time. He said this plan actually differentiates between Class A and Class B. He said it met the requirements of the proffer through that plan, which is why other sections were built that were not Class A. He said these were approved over different times over different sections, with "C" being added later on.

Mr. Benish said that at the time, the Class C came in with a desire for those to be asphalt paths. He said what has happened since that time is that the County has road requirements that allow them to require sidewalks so now, there are sidewalks on the road where, when Fontana was originally approved, they could not get that. He said this is what he believed happened over time and which is why the Commission sees the older part of the development having a trail system. He said for better or worse, this is what was agreed to and could be something less than a Class A. He said the sections came in for asphalt and subsequently, the County was able to require sidewalks along the roads.

Mr. Benish said staff's position is that the trails now become a secondary set of trails and more recreationally oriented, now that there are sidewalks on the streets. He said they tie into the existing Class B trails. He explained that the map on the screen showed the sections that connect to what is the existing set of Class B trails. He acknowledged it was confusing.

Ms. More said her questions were along those lines, and that there were some comments from the community meeting that some residents expressed about the current trails needing maintenance. She said based on the map shown on the screen, they could see that the Class B, Type 2 is a higher-maintenance trail. She asked if there is a plan for maintaining the trails.

Ms. Davies replied that trails in general are a huge issue in the Fontana neighborhood. She said they have spoken to the board members and the group that manages the HOA about the trails that will be part of 4C which, compared to the rest of the trail network, make up very small sections of trails. She said the HOA group feels comfortable with that. She said Ms. More was correct in that the trails are currently a huge topic of debate within the neighborhood. She said that because they are on such steep slopes, they experience many erosion issues and do require a great deal of maintenance.

Ms. Davies said it is her understanding that there are some residents within the neighborhood that really value the trails and some who would rather not pay the huge maintenance cost every year. She said there may be more discussions with the County soon about what to do with the overall trail system in Fontana and if there are any partnership opportunities there.

Mr. Benish said the Pantops Master Plan identifies a couple of neighborhood connecting trails, one of which is nearby the area, but not involving the particular trails subject to the review.

Ms. Spain said another issue that came up at the community meeting is the issue of liability. She said when Mr. Dan Mahon spoke with residents about making the trails public, to interconnect down to the river, one of the concerns was who would be liable for it. She said Mr. Mahon told the CAC members that the County would then have responsibility for it, as well as for maintenance. She asked if this was correct.

Mr. Benish replied that if there are public access easements or a dedication, the County would. He said otherwise, if it is private property, it is the responsibility of the homeowners.

Ms. Spain noted that this was a "sticking point" and that there were some people who did not want the interconnectedness and did not want other people coming onto the paths other than immediate neighbors.

Mr. Benish said that these sections of trails were not seen as the ones that might be subject to that partnership. He said these sections were more of ending, connecting points to existing systems that connect to other private trails.

Ms. Gleason replied to Ms. Spain stating she thought this would be an ongoing discussion.

Ms. Spain replied she assumed so. She also asked if it was now preferable to have the trails be a more natural, permeable surface rather than impermeable. She said she assumed the asphalt would be something the County would not be something they would want to promote now, compared with ten years before.

Mr. Benish replied that it depends, and that the preference is for them not to be paved. He said with joggers, there is more wear and tear on hard surfaces. He said the maintenance could extend longer, depending on grades and where they are located, but that the costs for maintenance is much more expensive. He said there is much debate in flood plain areas whether it is better to replace the rock as opposed to having asphalt break off. He said he was not a trails expert, but that he knew the bias for those types of trails is more primitive, impervious, and softer to walk on.

Ms. Davies said the applicant did have Mr. Mahon out to the site, and that he walked all the existing trails to confirm they had been installed. She said they looked at the potential pathways of the new trails, and that Mr. Mahon agreed that that the primitive pathway was the way to go with those because of the connections they were making.

Mr. Keller said that it would be helpful for the Commission, in the future, to have that information in their packet. He said in making their decision, it would be helpful to have the trails person weigh in on the matter.

Mr. Dotson said one of his questions had to do with the map that was presented, and the extent of the trails that the Commission was being asked to make a decision about that evening. He said his understanding was that it was not about the whole development, but was about a fairly small increment. He said he imagined it was likely 2-4% of the total trail system in the neighborhood and made up a small portion of it.

Ms. Gleason replied that she had not measured it out, but that being on the site, the trail sections are less than a mile, and perhaps were between 0.25-0.5 mile.

Mr. Dotson said there appeared to be a portion along a street. He asked if this was an area where there is no sidewalk and, therefore, there is a trail.

Ms. Gleason replied yes. She presented a picture of the existing condition, noting that there are no sidewalks on that road presently. She said staff viewed primitive paths as a harmonious addition that would provide pedestrian facilities that are buffered and away from the street. She said staff's opinion on that was that it would actually be an improvement to services offered whereas, since this is a newer development, redevelopment is not expected to occur very soon.

Mr. Dotson asked Ms. Gleason to pull up the map again. He said with the other two trails, one is off a cul-de-sac, and that this trail is simply to connect the new development to an existing non-asphalt trail.

Ms. Gleason said this was correct.

Mr. Dotson asked if the piece at the bottom of the map falls under the same scenario in that it simply serves as a link to a non-asphalt trail.

Ms. Gleason replied this was correct.

Mr. Dotson said that as he was reading about Proffer #7, he read the language, "Annual adjustment of cash proffers," and thought that this may have to do with inflation or the like. He said it sounded it was an oblique way of saying to stick with the existing proffer, or go with the fiscal impact level of proffer. He asked if this was what it came down to.

Mr. Herrick replied that it comes down to what the initial start date is for the indexing. He said there is a comparative copy (Attachment 7) that shows a red line and the full proffers. He said the current wording is that it is adjusted annually based on the Marshall and Swift Building Cost Index, with a start date (for adjustment purposes) of January 1, 2008. He said the applicant is essentially requesting that the indexing date be moved up to January 1, 2019 and to allow those 11 years of increases in the Marshall and Swift Building Cost Index to be waved in terms of adjustment of the proffer amount.

Mr. Dotson said he would attempt to repeat this. He said the original proffer was about $17,000 and that this proffer escalates each year based on inflation.

Mr. Herrick replied that it is based on the Marshall and Swift Building Cost Index.

Mr. Dotson said what the applicant is requesting is that the clock not start in 2008, but start currently.

Mr. Herrick said this was correct, and that he noticed a slide that might address what this translates into in terms of actual values.

Mr. Dotson said the difference is that the request is saying, "Save us about $4,000 per unit. Let's make the $17,000 the 2019 number rather than $21,000 being the 2019 number."

Mr. Herrick said this was essentially correct.

Mr. Dotson said this was a new understanding for him.

Ms. Riley added that the applicant suggested that this request was different than the previous requests that have come before the Commission in the past to reduce the proffers, and that she had made her explanation clearly. She said this adjustment request for essentially the removal of the adjusted appreciation may be a different request, but that it still has the same effect of what previous requests have been before the Commission, which is to reduce the contribution. She said the numbers may be different but that, in principle, she would argue that it is fairly similar to previous requests for reductions in proffer amounts by applicants. She said she would love to hear if the staff sees it differently.

Mr. Benish said some of the requests for the modifications of the actual cash proffer have included this adjustment as well, but that it was just not as focused in as much. He said there has been action, at least on some, specifically about this as well. He said staff views it the same way as Ms. Riley.

Mr. Bivins asked if they could discuss Attachment 3 on page 4, regarding Proffer #7. He asked to push him to a place where the document is, vis-à-vis what is before the Commission, because he said he gets wound up when it says, "In no event shall any cash contribution amount be adjusted to a sum less than the amount initially established by these proffers." He said this reads to him like a contract, and that his role as a Commissioner is that this was a contract that was entered into between the Board of Supervisors and this particular applicant, and so he was not going to take it on himself to change it. He said he would push it to the Board and allow them to change it.

Mr. Bivins said when he sees language like this in Attachment 3, page 4, on the fourth line down, perhaps he is looking at a proffer that is not relevant to the request.

Ms. Gleason replied no, stating that Proffer #7 still holds true presently.

Mr. Bivins said that, given the reading of that, this doesn't provide him the liberty of changing it since the structure of the contract between the Board of Supervisors and the applicant (Mr. Nichols). He said this was the defining principle of it, in his interpretation.

Ms. Davies clarified that the applicant is not asking for a contribution that is less than the amount initially established by the proffers. She said they are asking for the same amount that was initially established by the proffers. She said this is her entire point that makes the applicant's request different than any of the others -- that they were looking to bring the proffers down to match the CRIM numbers that were established. She said the applicant is simply asking to honor the initial amounts that were requested and agreed upon in the proffers, and feels very sincerely that they more than address any of the impacts of the development.

Mr. Bivins said it would perhaps be helpful, at least for him, to have Ms. Gleason walk the Commission through her slide. He said that where he should say that the cash contribution isn't of value (and that for him, it is not the $17,500 or the $28,809) but that at some point, there was some large amount, and over how many years are they going to arrive at that amount. He said if they will get to $100,000 in two years, and this means they will make a $50,000 annual payment, he is fine with this -- unless they are saying that they are not going to do $100,000 but they only want to do $75,000, which he would not be okay with doing.

Ms. Davies said the clock will still be ticking, and there will still be room for escalation with the proffers in a way that would have been more similar to a project not being approved right before the biggest recession since the Great Depression. She said the line in the proffer statement is to say that the proffers can never be reduced, but they will likely escalate in the future. She said the purpose of that line is to say it will never go down below the $17,500 number, which was the contract.

Ms. Gleason said that to add to staff's evaluation of this, there is essentially one reduction with the approval of this, and that is in the by-right credit. She said once they allow the first nine residential units that would have been approved with the rezoning (with the by-right credit being consistent with decisions the Board has made previously), and once those are taken out of the mix, there are less cash contributions to be made, and there is a reduction (in that sense) of the total amount.

Ms. Gleason said the property is already being platted and developed, with one CO already issued. She said it is truly for the Planning Commission to decide whether this is consistent with previous actions, or if they are going to set a new precedent as far as an escalation point. She said this was something to consider and that it was up to the Commission.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing.

Mr. Keller addressed someone who was in the audience, stating that this was not the proper format, as the public had already had a chance to speak in the public hearing. He explained the public had a chance to speak after the applicant's first presentation and before her second one. He said he had to close the public hearing.

Mr. Keller said that the Commissioners had all been addressing the trails, sidewalks, and proffer escalation issue. He asked if they should address the trails first.

Ms. Spain said she didn't have any problems with the trails being Class B instead of Class A. She said the permeable surface is preferable to the asphalt and, as noted from the map, it is a fairly small amount of trail to connect with the other trails.

Ms. Riley agreed with Ms. Spain and supported staff's recommendation of the trails.

Mr. Keller said he did as well, in light of hearing that the trails person has weighed in. He reiterated that in the future, it would be helpful to have this documented.

Mr. Bivins said he supported it, but he was struggling with whether or not it should be Type 1 or Type 2 (high maintenance). He said the red line from the applicant has it as a Type 1 (primitive) as opposed to Type 2 (high). He deferred to staff to see if they are in concurrence with Class B, Type 1 (primitive), as there was little discussion on whether or not it was the primitive or high-maintenance. He said referring back to the correspondence, the was a request for a trail that had a bit more staying power to it, given the bike riders and activities that tend to disturb. He said this was his only concern. He said though he was fine with it, he wanted to know if it would be Type 1 or Type 2.

Ms. Gleason asked if Mr. Bivins could repeat his question regarding Type 1 and Type 2.

Mr. Bivins said in the red line from the applicant, they identify a desire to have a Class B, Type 1 primitive nature trail. He said in the discussion, the conversation about a primitive trail has been generic in type and not necessarily specific, given it's a term of art. He said he wondered whether or not staff had a recommendation about using the term "primitive" as a term of art (informative).

Ms. Gleason replied that during the discussion with the applicant, Parks and Recreation weighed in, and staff asked for the applicant to clarify what class they had wanted. She said that in previous revisions, the applicant had been asking for a primitive path, and staff nailed down (through revisions) that it would be Class B, Type 1 as the definition and standard to hold to.

Ms. Gleason said she likely was not clear in the staff report that Parks and Recreation had weighed in, and that it was brought to the applicant's attention that both classes of trail would still require maintenance, though not to the amount the asphalt would. She said since this is a secondary recreation trail and not a commuter access way, staff was fine with it being a cohesive development pattern.

Mr. Benish added that staff has standards for Class B.

Ms. More said Ms. Gleason's clarification somewhat confused her. She asked if the trail type will be what is already in the existing development, or if it would be more primitive.

Ms. Gleason replied that it would be the same, if not slightly more designed. She said it would have a higher performance standard, but perhaps it was a question of the maintenance that is currently there. She said in reviewing the existing trail, there was some differentiation on the width and how much gravel or stone dust was used in some areas, which speaks back to the comment raised about the concerns about the wear and tear on the paths and how they are currently being maintained. She said with the installation, it would look somewhat nicer than what is there currently, but that this may just be a maintenance issue.

Ms. More asked if it does address standards for the width, etc.

Ms. Gleason indicated yes.

Mr. Dotson said he was comfortable with the staff recommendation.

Mr. Keller said that the Commission had consensus on the trails that would help in making the official recommendation. He suggested moving on to the proffer escalation issue.

Mr. Bivins suggested first having some consideration of whether or not the Commission should allow the exclusion of the by-right units and bifurcate those two issues. He said it seemed that staff was recommending they were in support of the reduction of by-right, and that the Commission may have the ability to handle this.

Mr. Keller agreed that this was a good point.

Mr. Bivins said he would support a reduction in the amount, based on the by-right units which were there. He said he believed this was a reasonable solution and supported that modification.

Mr. Dotson said he was comfortable with this as well, and that it was consistent with a number of recent actions.

Ms. More agreed.

Mr. Keller agreed as well. He suggested moving on to the particular point about 2008 versus 2019.

Mr. Bivins said in 2008, someone came before the Commission and said they would develop, and everyone agreed, so they went forward with building. He said while he is sensitive to the fact that 2008 was a horrible year for everyone's portfolios, no one (except for those who went bankrupt, like Lehman and other bad actors) got out of their contracts. He said if someone wanted to get out of their contracts, there were ways to get out. He said 11 years later, he personally did not have a lot of empathy for the 2008 debacle. He asked why what happened in 2008 was being talked about in 2019, as this may be helpful in moving him towards a place where he would be more sensitive to it.

Mr. Bivins stated, however, that he wanted to declare upfront that he was not sensitive to abdicating 2008 to 2019.

Mr. Benish said staff agrees. He said the policy of the Board and decisions by the Board have been consistent in not changing the cash proffer amount. He said a number of those requests have also included a request for the same change. He said the applicant is not requesting a change in the cash proffer amount, but they are changing the timeframe for the adjustments. He said those had been part in parcel, and some of the other requests, such as Old Trail and Spring Hill, included the same change when they requested their cash proffer changes.

Mr. Benish said the Board has not agreed to a change to either the actual proffer amount, nor any of the operational inflation factors, accelerators, or components of that cash proffer even beyond the cash proffer amount. He said in order to be consistent with past actions, staff recommends keeping with this policy.

Ms. Spain, Ms. More, Mr. Keller, Mr. Bivins, Ms. Riley, and Mr. Dotson all agreed with the staff recommendation.

Ms. Spain moved to recommend denial of the proposed amendment to Proffer 7, and approval of the remainder of ZMA201900007 Hyland Park, both as recommended by staff for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Mr. Dotson seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (6:0). (Ms. Firehock was absent.)

Mr. Keller thanked staff and the applicant, informing them it would be moving on to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Benish to give him a reference point on the Monticello Viewshed. He asked if, at some point, Mr. Benish could direct him to some place where he might understand that position so that he has a fuller understanding of why Monticello has that ability to speak to those things.

Mr. Benish said he could do this later on under New Business, noting that during the Planning Commission's development of that Comprehensive Plan (which may have been prior to Mr. Bivins being on the Commission), there was an agreement as to how they approach Monticello's input into properties within the Monticello Viewshed that they essentially determine within their viewshed, and that the County encourages applicants, developers, and others to work directly with them. He said the staff becomes a sort of third party to ensure that communications take place and report their findings back.

Mr. Keller said Mr. Herrick could provide the specific point, but that it was advisory and not regulatory.

Mr. Benish added it was Comprehensive Plan-embedded and not ordinance-embedded.

Presentations

Broadway Blueprint

Mr. Benish said he would provide a quick introduction. He said the purpose of the presentation was to inform the Commission of the progress on the Broadway Blueprint Economic Development Revitalization Plan. He said feedback and comments from the Commissioners were certainly welcome, though no action was required by the Commission. He said this was primarily an informational item.

Mr. Benish said that as noted from the Interim Report, this is an Economic Development focus study. He said the Board directed staff to focus in on encouraging adaptive reuse, and leveraging of unique assets of the corridor, for business development. He said as an Economic Development plan, it is somewhat different than what the Commission traditionally sees in a land use plan. He said the plan focuses in on leveraging public and private investments in the Broadway Corridor, feeding off the County's commitment and the inertia from the Woolen Mills site redevelopment and WillowTree development.

Mr. Benish said that Community Development staff and other staff within the County have been involved in assisting and that the Transportation Planner, Zoning staff, and other Community Development leadership have been involved in providing input and comment to the Economic Development office as they go through the process.

Mr. Roger Johnson, Economic Development department, said he works to promote Albemarle County as a great place to do business and help try to create a sustainable community for the long-haul. He said part of the charge from the Board was to create the Broadway Blueprint. He said he would provide some history, and then Mr. J.T. Newberry would talk about where they are going as a board. He said they would then take the Commissioners' comments, encouraging them to make those as they are key stakeholders in the process.

Mr. Johnson said that as part of the development agreement with WillowTree, Economic Development agreed to study the area to make certain it would be a place for business and have compatible business neighbors. He said WillowTree was a competitive project and that the County was competing with a couple other large locations. He said one of WillowTree's concerns they expressed in the process was making sure they had a home where they felt comfortable and so, as part of the agreement, the County said they would take a look at the particular corridor to make sure it is consistent with the type of environment that WillowTree would like.

Mr. Johnson said it also corresponded with the adaptive reuse of Woolen Mills and, as a result, has catalyzed many things there.

Mr. Johnson said in August 2018, the Governor came and announced that WillowTree would be building a campus in Woolen Mills. He played a video of the event for the Commission.

Mr. Johnson said currently, there is roughly $12 million of private investment being put into the site. He said the County has leveraged $2 million of support from the State to keep WillowTree in the community. He said this particular space would have a brewery, restaurant, and event space that have been confirmed as tenants.

Mr. Johnson said the County is also working with JAUNT, WillowTree, and the developer to put a shuttle in the Broadway Corridor. He said part of the growth of WillowTree's employment base in this particular corridor creates transportation concerns, and so as part of the agreement, the County pledged $40,000 per year in partnership with the other two partners to create a shuttle that would connect them to the Downtown area. He said it would have connections to the Rivanna Trail and that other community assets were underway, including public parking and the like. He said there is also other development occurring in this particular corridor that Mr. Newberry would go into greater detail about.

Mr. Johnson presented a picture of the inside of the building, noting that it looked markedly different than before and that it was changing every day. He said WillowTree is planning to occupy the space in April of 2020. He said the developer is making great strides in turning the once-defunct mill into something that will be quite the community asset.

Mr. Johnson said WillowTree will occupy the space in April 2020 with roughly 275 employees, generating activity along the Broadway Corridor. He said organically, there has been interest from other developers, property owners, and the like in that particular community to focus on lifestyle and other amenities that are growing and happening right now, and that there have been other indications that this may continue. He said there has been interest from other related industries

to locate approximate to WillowTree and that there was also some excitement with what is going on with the study as it relates to the Rivanna River, as a portion of the particular study area will include the Rivanna River Corridor.

Mr. Newberry said he would spend the next 15 slides largely summarizing the information that was found in the draft Interim Report. He said at the end of those slides, there would be a discussion around what the Board of Supervisors had given staff feedback on (November 20), which included the Intention Statement and the focus areas for where the study will be going to in the future. He said staff was very interested in receiving the Commission's feedback on this. He said staff would also cover the next steps in more detail.

Mr. Newberry said the slide shows where staff has been and what they have been doing since about the middle of the 2019. He said on November 20, staff checked in with the Board of Supervisors and just earlier that evening, they checked in with the Economic Development Authority. He said they will be going to the 5th and Avon CAC at some point in the future and that he would have more to talk about with the planned public engagement going forward a little later. He said ultimately, staff hoped to get back to the Board of Supervisors sometime in Q2 of 2020.

Mr. Newberry said the Broadway Blueprint includes the 46.5 acres south of the railroad tracks, west of Woolen Mills, north of the water treatment plant, and east of Franklin Street. He said it included all the Light Industrial and C1 Zoning found along the Broadway Street Corridor.

Mr. Newberry presented the latest satellite picture of the corridor, noting it was from early- to mid-2018. He said it shows some of the grading that has occurred at the front of the corridor, at the corner of Franklin and Broadway.

Mr. Newberry presented a map, noting that though it was outdated, he likes using it because it has labels of some of the existing businesses and provides a direct overhead view of the corridor. He said this was a sort of peninsula of the County that extends out of the City. He said to the north is East Market Street, which is in the City in the Woolen Mills Historic District, and to the west is also Carlton Avenue, Carlton Views, and the mobile homes along Carlton that also exist in the City. He said this was unique and that there are some people who are unaware that Broadway Street is a part of the County.

Mr. Newberry said the remaining slides summarize the draft Interim Report. He said regarding the existing policy framework that applies to this area, staff was careful to note that this isn't a land use plan, per se, but is an Economic Development study. He said obviously, the land use provides an important context and framework for the study, going forward.

Mr. Newberry said the other slide showed some of the ongoing redevelopment along the corridor. He said as part of the public engagement done so far, staff has met with the existing businesses and property owners. He said some of the slide shows Festive Fair's expansion at the back of their warehouse. He said at the front of the corridor at Franklin and Broadway, where the grading has occurred, there is an approved final site plan for about 100,000 square feet of Flex space. He said the developer continues to make incremental steps to develop that site.

Mr. Newberry said Decipher Brewing is a brewery that has located along the corridor and opened in mid-2019. He said they have so far been successful in their progress there.

Mr. Newberry paused to show the existing Comprehensive Plan for the area. He said the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan describes the area as a "center," and so the majority of it is Office, Flex, R&D, Light Industrial. He said there is some community mixed use where the Woolen Mills Redevelopment project is happening. He indicated on the plan to the Residential designation is meant to recognize that there are existing residences there, but that the zoning map actually shows a disconnect and that those properties are zoned Light Industrial. He said the Woolen Mills site is zoned C1 and on the other side of the railroad tracks (along East Market Street), there are some higher-density residential properties that are currently single-family dwellings, but that they are R4 and R15.

Mr. Newberry said some of the other interesting parts about the existing conditions work staff has done to date is about the transportation network. He said one cannot get to the Broadway Corridor without travelling on City streets. He said as the County considers what the future may look like, some of the constraints are very visible and top of mind.

Mr. Newberry said staff did meet with both the ACSA and RWSA about the utilities to the area. He said they feel like the area is currently appropriately served in terms of utility capacity, but are more than willing to work with the County if there will be more heavy water or sewer users along the corridor, as the authorities feel that they could accommodate this through their Capital Planning process.

Mr. Newberry explained there is a great mix of businesses along the corridor with tech companies, manufacturing, and warehousing. He said Decipher Brewing is in the largest building on the corridor (1740). He presented some pictures of the brewery's equipment and space. He showed a picture of a recently installed sign from a welder who has a shop that she does her work out of in that space. He said the 1740 location has Class A Office at the front, then a nice mixture of artists, welders, and shipping businesses that are located there. He said Decipher installed some windows to open up natural light for its indoor seating area.

Mr. Newberry said across the street, in the old Yves Delorme building, there are a number of businesses going in there. He said this was sold last year. He presented a picture of a new sign that was recently put up and though there was some space available, a variety of businesses will be going in there much like a variety of businesses are located in 1740.

Mr. Newberry said the other property he wanted to specifically mention was the old Isotemp Research Building (indicating to letter "D" on the map). He said Sun Tribe Solar has a warehouse there and, as a part of the Tom Tom Festival, an international artist from Mexico worked with the community on the design there, noting that it is a bright spot on the corridor seen when traveling down.

Mr. Newberry said there has been a continued growth and momentum of redevelopment along the corridor. He said in meeting with the stakeholders there, staff heard that they recognize there is a momentum growing. He said the Woolen Mills site has been transformed radically, but that many other sites have seen some amount of activity, and so the existing businesses are recognizing that increased activity.

Mr. Newberry noted there is some concern around the demand because what was once deemed as a sleepy corridor that they found, and thought was located in the City, is now changing rapidly. He said gentrification and displacement is a concern, but that the stakeholders are also excited about the future and want to make sure that whatever new uses may be coming in would enhance and complement the existing character of the corridor.

Mr. Newberry said that as a part of the existing conditions research, staff also went to the Westwood community in Richmond and to Scott's Addition. He said they looked at the Harris Street Corridor and IX Art Park, trying to get a sense for how these types of areas that primarily have an industrial history grow and change, and what staff could learn from these other areas. He said as one might expect, as redevelopment occurs, there is a pressure for rents to rise, and that uses that used to comfortably fit there find it more difficult to be there.

Mr. Newberry said staff sees there is a lot of interest in those areas as tourist destinations and that governments can take a whole spectrum of approaches from doing nothing at all and letting the areas redevelop organically, or playing a bigger role in terms of making investments for public spaces, public programming, and the like.

Mr. Newberry said regarding precedents, staff looked at the LoSo area of Charlotte where there is public programming for things like yoga, festivals with outdoor eating areas, and transit available to help people get safely to and from those places. He said they could almost have put in pictures of events that Decipher Brewing is doing at 1740 now and not be able to tell the difference. He showed pictures of the interior of the LoSo area, noting they are the kinds of spaces that are largely in demand, with large windows, lots of space, high ceilings, and former industrial areas. He said staff saw a lot of opportunity in making those site visits with the existing Broadway Corridor, and that they wanted the Planning Commission's' feedback in this area.

Mr. Newberry said looking forward, staff has discussed a lot of the "what" that has been included in the study, but now, they want to look at the "how" as far as moving forward. He presented the intention statement, explaining that it aims to capture that. He said they want to leverage the public and private investment to encourage vitality, connectivity, and placemaking.

Mr. Newberry said diving deeper into those focus areas, page 12 of the draft Interim Report talks about specifically, within those focus areas, what they would be aiming to do. He said many of them were about Project ENABLE and talk about balancing new uses with existing uses, as well as addressing cost impacts for existing property owners and tenants. He said regarding connectivity, it talks about enhancements that would make sense in terms of pedestrians, bikes, and trails, as wells a vehicles, cars and trucks.

Mr. Newberry said in terms of placemaking, it was about what would make the most sense to enhance the sense of place. He said Mr. Johnson mentioned the Rivanna River Corridor study that the TJPDC is leading. He said part of the County's investment includes public parking there and a pedestrian bridge. He said staff feels that the pedestrian experience there will be important to keep in mind, going forward.

Mr. Newberry said forward, staff will be creating the plan for broader public engagement and hoped to get back to the Board of Supervisors again sometime in Q2 of 2020.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing.

Mr. Sean Tubbs (Piedmont Environmental Council) stated that PEC is not opposed to the idea whatsoever. He said if handled right, the project could put jobs right in the place where they want them -- right next to where people live. He said if done poorly, there could be a transportation mess that worsens relations between Albemarle and Charlottesville. He urged the Commission that planning, and coordination happen as early as possible, beginning now, given the long time it takes to get transportation projects addressed and built in the community, and that this was something the Commission was very much aware of.

Mr. Tubbs said he was very glad to hear about the shuttle, which would be set up from JAUNT. He said he was very hopeful that this works, and hopeful that it could perhaps park and be in good places, which would take coordination with the City's parking forces, for instance. He said those are the little things that might be necessary to make sure this is smoothed out.

Mr. Tubbs said the draft report in front of the Commission promotes this as a desirable place for business and lays out a very effective case for the location. He said Decipher Brewery is a fantastic place, but is difficult to get to on transit.

Mr. Tubbs said the task of the Planning Commission is to promote the orderly development of Albemarle County and that, looking at its mission, it has been appointed to ensure that transportation systems are carefully planned, and that the growth of the community be consummate with the efficient and economical use of funds. He said this was where he was tying it back to the transportation issue, and how the County would pay for these things. He said economic development's public-private partnership was really good, but that they would need some public money for that.

Mr. Tubbs said that on two occasions in the past five years, the Commission has met with its counterparts in the City to discuss development on the County side in this general location, with Woolen Mills and the industrial park that is currently being cleared. He said this was fantastic. He said since then, the Board has signed an Economic Development Memorandum of Understanding. He read one bullet from this that states that the two jurisdictions are to, "identify and consider potential impacts on each other's jurisdiction and share information where appropriate." He argued that this was one of those places because there are specific transportation constraints that are identified in the document, some of which have been issues in the past (e.g. Franklin Road railroad bridge).

Mr. Tubbs said the City may actually have Community Development block grant money, and though he couldn't find this out, this would be the kind of thing that would be useful to know now instead of later.

Mr. Tubbs said Albemarle County also has 89 transportation priorities at the moment and the question was where the Broadway project would fit in there. He asked if they would be asking City taxpayers to pay for improvements. He said these were questions he was raising mostly because, as the public phase moves forward, he does not see in the document the City of Charlottesville being identified as a stakeholder. He asked the Commission what role the City would play, as well as the Economic Development Authority.

Mr. Tubbs said PEC is supportive of the overall use, but wants to make sure the project is done right.

Ms. Katie Chester (1812 East Market Street) said her home is just on the other side of the railroad tracks behind the Amtech building. She said throughout the presentation, she was hearing a lot about steps with public engagement, noting that the public didn't seem to include anything in the City. She said yet, there are repeated comments about how this is an odd peninsula that is in the City and one cannot get there without traveling in the City. She said she didn't hear staff focusing on how that aspect of it (that it's within the City) might inform the County's decision. She stressed that this was very important.

Ms. Chester said she has friends who live nearby IX Art Park, and with many of the concerts that happen there, it is as if they are in their backyards and house, and they have to keep all the windows closed. She said the subject area backs up to the residential area on the other side of the tracks, and that none of the residents knew about any of this. She said it was disappointing at the outset for staff to talk about all the business owners and property owners they are engaging and yet, if those happen to be on the City or on the other side of the tracks, those people are not being included and would very much like to be included and on board so that this is a wonderful thing for everybody and not just people in the County.

Ms. Chester said as a resident, one thing that comes to mind is sound, and an example where this has been a real problem is Belmont. She said there is music next to residential and when that's done well, it's wonderful and vibrant. She said when it's not done well, everyone is "pissy" and it's not fun to be there.

Ms. Chester encouraged the Commission to include in its thought process the fact that this is in the City that everyone shares. She said if it wasn't for the City and the people who live there, the place would still smell like a sewer. She said it was the City people who found the solution to get the sewer smell out of the area, and because of that (and the historic designation giving the tax credits), now everyone can be there. She asked if everyone could, however, play well together.

Jenny McCulskey (718 Franklin Street) said she was there on short notice and looked forward to engaging more with the project and showing up for more feedback sessions. She pointed out what she felt was a graphic frustration, expressing that when these sorts of reports are distributed, they can be misleading.

Ms. McCulskey said just in the past week, a very large site was clear cut that is not shown in the satellite photo. She said that as a newcomer to the neighborhood (who bought her home through the VHDA first-time homeowner program), she was motivated by the project and did her due diligence by looking at site maps. She said Mr. Kevin O'Brien (the developer developing the steep slope) was not aware that he owned a large portion in the flat section. She said this has been a very obtrusive clear cutting that has suddenly happened and really changed the character of the street.

Ms. McCulskey said that just as the City has been developing new residential homes on both ends of Franklin, one of the immediate things it is now very open all the way to the sewage treatment plant and Rivanna Trail, and there is going to be increased foot traffic. She said perhaps the plan, going forward, could reflect that the Light Industrial zoning extends all the way up to the wetland impoundment area in front of her house.

Ms. McCulskey said in doing some research, it seemed as though perhaps in the Light Industrial category, there are some cities and places that have added subcategories (e.g. Campus Light Industrial) that would regulate the ratio of trucks to employees, prioritizing businesses that will

have more employees than trucks. She said this could be an added value for the intentions for the area as presented that evening.

Ms. Spain complimented Mr. Newberry on his presentation. She said the speakers raised the same issue she was going to raise as far as the City's involvement in the project. She recalled meeting with the City Planning Commission some years ago and talking with the then-developer, and that she had thought the combined sentiment there was to work together. She said the transportation issue was just part of that, and what the residents have raised is another part. She asked Mr. Newberry to comment.

Mr. Johnson said he would answer this question. He said the County Executive Office has formally asked the City Manager's Office to participate in this particular project, and that the County was hopefully that they would.

Ms. Spain asked if there was a deadline or timeframe for this.

Mr. Johnson replied that he was not part of the composing of that particular memo, so he didn't know what the specific deadline was.

Ms. Spain said her other issue was the comment that with some newly-renovating areas, government should stay out of the action and let the areas develop organically. She said they will not be developed organically, but will be market driven. She said the most successful places that she read about are those in which there are public subsidies for those who otherwise couldn't remain there. She said artists are a typical category -- that they are the ones to revitalize an area, and then they get kicked out because they cannot afford the rent. She said it was more than just artists, however, and that if the County does not take an active role, there will be more gentrification and much higher rents, which would alter the character of what they are trying to achieve there.

Ms. Riley said it was a good presentation and that she has been very excited to see the Woolen Mills project develop. She said she was also very encouraged to hear that the County Executive's Office has reached out to the City. She asked if staff could talk more about in what matter the City has been invited to participate.

Ms. Riley said the questions raised by some of the speakers about transportation has been an ongoing concern for everyone. She asked staff to speak more directly to coordination with the City around transportation.

Ms. Riley said there is a lot of value to the two Planning Commissions meeting and to meet again. She said although they are not the governing bodies, this kind of peer-to-peer discussion and brainstorming would be helpful and should be encouraged in this situation.

Ms. Riley added she has been consistently been hearing that residents (particularly City residents) feel like they haven't been involved or heard. She said she was appreciative that staff would come to the 5th and Avon CAC. She pointed out that it is a County body, however, and the only time they ever had a Woolen Mills representative on it was Brian Roy himself. She said they didn't have any other Woolen Mills residents or business owners on that committee. She said it was great to continue to meet with the CAC, but that it is not an avenue for the property owners, stakeholders, or residents of the area.

Mr. Johnson said staff will meet with the Community Engagement office that month to put together what the public engagement plan will be. He said they did not have this yet and that it very well may include invitation to the City. He said everything Ms. Riley said made sense and that he suspected there would be an opportunity for people in the City to be engaged.

Mr. Johnson said relating to coordination with the City, to date, there had been very limited coordination. He said County staff has informed them that they are moving forward with the project and has invited them to be at the table, but at that point, there had not been any coordinated activity with the City.

Ms. Riley expanded to say, as a representative of the Scottsville District on the Commission for four years, she has seen a lot of County-sponsored projects come through. She said in the case of the Avon Street Corridor project, it didn't involve land use and was fairly limited around transportation, which very well may have been appropriate. She said Southwood was a different case in which it had it a whole different track, and that she wouldn't go into detail about it.

Ms. Riley said with the Broadway project, she thinks it is appropriate that it is led by the Economic Development department, but that she is concerned that a broader planning process is missing. She said this is a different question than coordination with the City because in the past, the County has received a request for a Small Area Plan. She said she has asked for a Small Area Plan for the County-owned land on Mill Creek.

Ms. Riley said those who live in the community that see a project that is County sponsored that lands in their backyards are constantly asking if they can get a fuller-scale planning process. She said another question is if there is the potential for a Small Area Plan for Broadway, or any other avenue for more comprehensive planning. She expressed appreciation for the Economic Development department's work, but that there has to be complementary work done with the Community Development department somehow.

Mr. Johnson said at that juncture, they have taken the direction of the Board to move forward with a plan that is intended to improve the economic vitality of the area and use the 46.5 acres of Light Industrial zoned land as planned. He said he didn't know that there would be land use changes to the plan or certain activities and if, in fact, this occurs, there would be engagement with the Commission, Planning department, and those aspects.

Mr. Johnson said they did not know what would happen, but that he understood Ms. Riley's point.

Mr. Benish said from a broader plan for Master Planning and updating Master Plans, Community Development is currently looking at a work program to propose to the Board of Supervisors what their priorities are for the work currently on their plate, when it will be completed, and then the next projects. He said they have not made a final recommendation yet and are still working on this internally. They said they are weighing the need to update some substantive components of the Comprehensive Plan before they go into further Master Planning.

Mr. Benish said alternatively, they are continuing on their track of incrementally updating Master Plans. He said the Places29 area and Southern areas are both areas that staff is trying to weigh. He said within those areas, there are Small Area Plan areas that have been discussed, and so they have a lot on their plate with relatively limited resources. He said this was not an excuse, but from a timeframe standpoint, they are still trying to weigh in on what it will take to get this done.

Mr. Benish said they do not have a definitive plan yet for the Commission, but hoped to propose something to the Board of Supervisors in March 2020 when they will be laying out how to step through continued Master Planning or some essential updates of the Comprehensive Plan that will help them do better Master Planning and incorporate environmental planning, housing changes, and other land use changes that may inform what they do in Master Plan areas.

Mr. Benish said they do not have a definitive plan for the Broadway area. He said they do hear and see a desire for everyone to get their Master Plan done next and are trying to work out the most effective way to do that. He said what comes out of the Broadway study may inform certain things that Community Development does in this area or others and as they work through the plan, some of the recommendations may play into how projects are prioritized.

Mr. Keller reiterated the points made by fellow Commissioners, noting that they succinctly hit on the areas that are nerve edges. He applauded the Economic Development side of the County (from Supervisors down) for at least developing this much of a plan. He said though there are stakeholders that would like to have more involvement, having a plan to move forward was a good beginning and it was good to begin the process the way that it was.

Mr. Keller said the point made in the letter to the Commission from Bill Emory and from the speaker is that as much as the people in the County would like to take the credit for the Woolen Mills project, that was a project that was destined to happen. He said everyone understood that because they have a dearth of these kinds of buildings that everyone wants to redevelop.

Mr. Keller said it would not have happened without getting the sewage stink out of the way. He said anyone who knows the area knows how bad it had smelled, and the City partners raising the issue about this for a number of years have allowed the project to become much more successful. He stressed the importance of considering the interface between the residential and the project, which was an example of more of the projects the County is hoping to see more of.

Mr. Keller echoed Mr. Tubbs' point of having a neighborhood where people can live and work, and walk to work, with the possibility to be able to involve people who have not had opportunities in the past and to figure out ways with partnerships and internships at the high school (or perhaps even elementary level) with the new centers they are talking about with the high schools. He said this needs to expand out and though he thinks it's wonderful they were beginning there, they really need to consider expanding out.

Mr. Keller addressed Ms. Jodie Filardo and the Community Development staff. He said they did have a fine tradition of the City and County Planning Commissions meeting once or twice a year and that they needed to get back to that. He said the Commissioners understand that there have been some difficulties within the City, noting that staff has reached out to the City and that they do not have answers yet. He said they can schedule those joint meetings, though. He said they had had a very successful one on this topic and on the Rivanna River last year and that his hope was that with the new Planning Director, they would get this, and that staff would be putting a couple dates on the calendar now for 2020.

Mr. Keller said in terms of Economic Development, one part he found interesting was their interaction with the property owners and businesses. He said he wondered if, in the next stage, whether they can make the distinction between business owners and property owners. He said that when they are not the same (and sometimes if even the same, but an older, longer-term business wondering about how they might transition), there are going to be a lot of changes. He

said to the degree that they can share it without sharing things that they have gained in confidence, it would be helpful to know whether there are businesses that are really interested in continuing in a new manner, or whether they are looking at a complete changeover of businesses in a generation or decade.

Mr. Keller pointed out that though everyone is excited about the possibility of what the shuttle might do and the partnerships that are being put together for that, in looking at several other communities where this has recently been tried, it seems that if it's three times a day (morning, midday to restaurants, and evening), it excludes a lot of people on the lower-income end of the scale and encourages more driving. He said people have other things to do, such as picking up their children from daycare. He encouraged staff to talk with the partners what the shuttle will be so that it truly provides alternatives for a full spectrum of potential workers and services the community (not just the businesses).

Mr. Carrazana said the connection with the City was obviously important at every level of planning. He said they are neighbors, but are also part of the network of transportation, which is tenuous, at best. He noted there are challenges with the road network. He said the point that was brought up about having a broader understanding of the physical reality, whether it's a Small Area Plan or a mini-Master Plan, is important even when developing the economic parts of it. He said this is akin to programming an area and considering what types of businesses may want to come in and what kind of infrastructure is needed.

Mr. Carrazana said it seemed to be an area that is ripe for quite a bit of development, and he was not sure that they could wrap their arms around exactly how much development could happen there if they look ten years out. He said this is what would begin to inform the transportation needs. He said considering this takes off, they need to determine the expected density and how this will drive parking and transportation requirements.

Mr. Carrazana said the economic programming pieces are the first steps, in many ways, but they do need to be married with a physical reality so that they can begin to understand how much development is appropriate in the area, what can be sustained with what they have today, and what improvements would need to be done in order to realize a broader vision.

Mr. Keller said Mr. Carrazana has done an outstanding presentation on Fontaine Avenue and the changes anticipated there. He said when staff goes to all other relevant places, they should check in with Mr. Carrazana and the architect at UVA about the plan because he imagines that, in terms of acreage, there are some similarities.

Mr. Carrazana asked what the acreage was for Broadway.

Mr. Newberry replied it was between 46-47 acres.

Mr. Carrazana said this project is somewhat larger than Fontaine.

Mr. Keller said they could see that there is definitely a major economic driver in what UVA is thinking about and it reiterates the point that Mr. Carrazana just made about bringing all the other pieces together.

Mr. Keller said he knew that Economic Development's colleagues in Planning were considering this with their Pantops planning, that there is a significant other workforce within walking and biking distance, if they have an alternative over the Rivanna River, from people who are coming in the greater Pantops neighborhood. He said it was not just Woolen Mills and Belmont, but depending on how the grades are dealt with, and/or how shuttles are dealt with, there is the potential for a much larger workforce there as well.

Mr. Bivins expressed his disappointment in the sentiment from some people in the technology community that they were under duress to be located in Central Virginia. He pointed out that in Charlottesville, they get decent meals, fresh air, fresh water, and big ideas.

Mr. Bivins said page 2 of the report talks about lifestyle options, but that one thing he was struck about with this phrase was that there was nothing about where to live. He said the County has basically pushed rents and that they would see some projects in the next year where rents for people for one bedroom are about $1,100 and that this is not close to this place.

Mr. Bivins said when they are talking about lifestyle options on page 2, they are talking about a tasting room, events space, etc. and that two bullets below that, they talk about Riverside Village. He pointed out that Riverside Village is on the other side of the river and that they don't have a connection to it. He said if they are looking at that as far as the extension of how to get people there, it is hard to get them to that place, and that they have seen lots of photographs about how people can't move at Pantops to get into the City. He suggested that until they figure this out, staff might want to consider that.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Newberry to go to the slide that shows the blown-up map of the Carlton Avenue Apartments, Rudy's, Kevin's Rug Place, and other things. He said what they are talking about there is that this happened by default, and those boundaries could have been drawn any number of ways. He said the people who live there happened to live there because that was one of the few places where they could get a place to live. He said they have already "let the genie out of the bottle" by putting WillowTree there and that with the hipster feel of the WillowTree opening, they have already radically changed the neighborhood.

Mr. Bivins said the area will never be the same. He said it was not a bad thing, but that he didn't want them pretending that they are going to do something in the neighborhood that is not going to impact all those individuals on Carlton Avenue, Franklin Street, and East Market Street, noting again that it was a radically different area.

Mr. Bivins said staff needs to consider how they think about what they bring to the area, through Economic Development and Community Development, and how to encourage people to come there. He said they have some funds where they could encourage housing to go there where "lifestyle" would also include residential. He asked that they not necessarily focus on another tasting room, but they focus on perhaps a way to get housing there and get a non-shuttle transportation network that does connect people on Franklin Street and Carlton Avenue and draw them into the peninsula. He said this is how to make the project win.

Mr. Bivins said he was one of the biggest fans of San Francisco, but that he could not deal with it because what they have done to the community through not being smart about how they let technology come in from the Valley to the city. He said he is fearful that by putting WillowTree in the area, it will attract many businesses that will turn the area into one that, ten years from now, the County will be wrestling with its success in a negative way and that they could displace many

people who have been there for generations. He said his concern is about how they do integrated development that considers placemaking, but not place exclusion.

Mr. Bivins said part of what is happening at IX Art Park is that it has created a universe of itself with some changes going outside of it, and it is wrestling about what those changes are going to feel like. He asked how they will sit with Friendship Court, which is similar to how Broadway will sit with people on Franklin Street and Carlton Avenue. He asked how to make sure that the place isn't littered with scooters, and that scooters have a way to move around there without being disruptive to the people who can't ride scooters.

Mr. Bivins said while he was glad for artists, he wondered how they will deal with someone who is currently getting a $10-per-square-foot commercial space right now when it will eventually come to $100 per square foot and, depending on the amenities, could eventually go to $1,000 per square foot. He also theorized a possible desire for UVA to create some space there across from Route 20.

Mr. Bivins said the area has all the right things to be able to do business, and then the question is about how to do that business in a way that doesn't push all the residents out of the area (much like Vinegar Hill, Dice Street, and 10th Street), as this would not be a success, but a continuation of displacement of people in the community.

Ms. More said Mr. Bivins' comments were amazing. She said Economic Development staff did a good job presenting and that she agreed with what the other Commissioners said. She said she understands that staff reached out to the City at the higher levels, but that every piece of what she heard in the presentation has a component where the City needs to have a voice in it, even if it is just about the shuttle parking and being on City roads. She said every piece has some interaction with the City and those who live around it.

Ms. More agreed with the comment about the CAC not being a place where City residents participate, and that staff should find an avenue to start hearing feedback from City residents before trying to get the two Planning Commissions together. She said they should find ways to pull in those more challenging components as early as possible in order to be more successful.

Mr. Dotson said his colleagues said things he agreed with, and that he would use some different words to cap it off. He addressed Mr. Bivins, telling him he moved to the area 42 years ago from the Bay area. He said he has lived in California in some beautiful cities, Colorado, and New York. He asked Mr. Bivins to take a few seconds to think of some great U.S. cities, noting that if they wrote down their answers, they would likely come up with some consistency between them. He said whatever is on that list, he would argue that cities are known for their best parts. He said all of the cities also have their less great areas, and so does Charlottesville, and that cities are still known for their best parts.

Mr. Dotson said the Broadway Corridor is becoming such an area in the community that when people think about Charlottesville, they will think about a number of great things. He said this is also a fragile place, agreeing with the other Commissioners. He said therefore, being a fragile place, it warrants measured steps. He said he was pleased that the work that has been done on the plan is a process of trying to identify some measured steps. He acknowledged the concerns with transportation constraints, gentrification as a consequence, detraction from livability, and that these are the reasons why measured steps need to be taken. He said change will take place, but that hopefully, it will be an area that people will think of that makes Charlottesville great.

Mr. Dotson asked about the JAUNT shuttle. He said "shuttle" implies to him that it has a start and end place and does not stop in between. He said it is not a route, but a way to import or export people. He said he would hope that the conversations about this end up making this more of a service so that the neighborhoods nearby (and less nearby) see it as the beginning of a new service that benefits them, rather than as a shuttle.

Mr. Dotson said regarding the two Executives in the County and City, when they say the "County" and the "City," this does not necessarily mean the Executives. He said it may involve other people in the organization and the residents as well. He said the two Executives could strike up a great relationship with no trickle-down, and so this was also his concern.

Mr. Dotson said the bottom line is that Broadway is a fragile place that needs measured steps in order to become one of the ways that people "know" Charlottesville.

Mr. Johnson thanked the Commission for its feedback, noting it would be helpful in informing the processes and the decisions that will come back before the County and perhaps the Commission as well, if there are land use implications.

Mr. Johnson said he wanted to make sure he would carry the message forward to the right groups of people who will receive the feedback in addition to Economic Development. He prefaced by saying these were his words and not necessarily the Commission's.

Mr. Johnson said they should get the residential community involved without regarding for political boundaries. He said for this to be effective, the City needs to be at the table and be a partner in the project in some way, shape, or form. He said what the project is doing is endorsed, but it needs to perhaps be broader in scope and scale, which includes some other Small Area Plan or broader planning initiative. He said he heard that the shuttle service should be more than just a service, but should be looked at more holistically.

Mr. Johnson said those were the themes that he heard. He said there were other individual comments that he wrote down. He asked if he missed anything major so that Economic Development would not misinterpret what they had heard. Hearing none, he thanked the Commission for its time.

Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

Mr. Bivins recalled Mr. Benish's mention of Community Development putting together a work plan for 2020. He asked if they would be bringing the plan to the Commission before going to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Benish replied yes. He said there is a tentative date and that it may appear on the tentative calendar provided to the Commissioners, prior to the Board presentation.

Mr. Keller asked if there was then an opportunity for modification from the Commission.

Mr. Benish replied yes.

Mr. Benish said he wanted thank Ms. Spain and Ms. Riley for all their work. He expressed he sincerely enjoyed working with them and that he would miss them.

Mr. Keller said it has been his honor and pleasure to serve the body with such a talented, well-qualified, and congenial group. He said it has been an amazing several years and it was because of everyone there. He said on behalf of his fellow Commissioners, he wanted to thank Mr. Benish and the entire Community Development, Planning, and Zoning staff.

Mr. Keller said it has been great to have Mr. Herrick, and that his counsel has been so important at many points.

Mr. Keller said Ms. Shaffer has been a great new addition. He said Ms. Sharon Taylor, who he recently saw, has fond memories of the Commission.

Mr. Keller said this would be his last time as Chair, regardless of whether or not he returns as a Commissioner. He said there were many qualified people who could move on as Chair.

Mr. Keller said that for those Commissioners who were returning, they would not have a meeting again until the second Tuesday in January.

Adjournment

At 8:27 p.m., the Commission adjourned to January 14, 2020 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: 01/14/2020
Initials: CSS