

**Albemarle County Planning Commission  
FINAL Minutes November 24, 2020**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, November 24, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Julian Bivins, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Tim Keller; Rick Randolph; Daniel Bailey; Corey Clayborne; Jennie More; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: none.

Other officials present were Margaret Maliszewski, Planning Manager; Megan Nedostup; Kevin McDermott, Chief of Planning; Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum**

Mr. Bivins said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(14), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." He said opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting will be posted at [www.albemarle.org/community/county-calendar](http://www.albemarle.org/community/county-calendar) when available.

Mr. Rapp called the roll. All Commissioners noted their presence.

Ms. Firehock called the meeting to order and established a quorum.

**Consent Agenda**

There were no consent agenda items.

**Public Hearing**

**SP202000014 1680 Seminole Trail**

Ms. Margaret Maliszewski, Manager in the Planning Division of Community Development, said she would be presenting the request for a special use permit for outdoor sales, storage, and display of vehicles in the Entrance Corridor Overlay District.

Ms. Maliszewski said she would provide some basic information on the property that is under review, some details on the proposal itself, some general background on the outdoor display special use, and discussion of the ARB's role and action in the process.

Ms. Maliszewski said the special use is requested for the site that is currently occupied by the Hardee's fast-food restaurant, prominently located at the southwest corner of the intersection of Route 29 and Rio Road. She said the parcel in question is zoned Highway Commercial. She said motor vehicle sales is a permitted by-right use in the Highway Commercial Zoning District; and sales, storage, and display of vehicles is considered accessory to motor vehicle sales.

Ms. Maliszewski said the general motor vehicle sales use was not under consideration that evening, and that sales, storage, and display is the focus of the review.

Ms. Maliszewski said in the Entrance Corridor Overlay District, sales, storage, and display requires a special use permit. She said this site is bordered by two entrance corridors, as both Route 29 and Rio Road are designated entrance corridors in the County.

Ms. Maliszewski said the purpose of requiring a special use permit for this use is to allow for the review of potential negative visual impacts on the entrance corridor streets. She said the intent of the Entrance Corridor Overlay is to ensure quality development that is compatible with the County's important scenic, historic, architectural, and cultural resources. She said the County has Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines that have been adopted to help meet that intent.

Ms. Maliszewski said the ARB applied those guidelines to the review of this application in a meeting on September 8, 2020.

Ms. Maliszewski presented the applicant's concept plan. She said the proposal includes 34 display spaces that are distributed primarily along Rio Road, along Route 29, and adjacent to the south and west sides of the building. She presented an image that illustrated the display parking in tan or orange.

Ms. Maliszewski said to accommodate the display spaces adjacent to the building, the proposal includes the removal of the drive-thru structure on the south side of the building and the refrigeration unit on the west side of the building.

Ms. Maliszewski said the proposal also includes increased planting area along Route 29 and along Rio Road. She said the increased planting area would be created by reducing the width of the travelways on the north and east sides of the building. She said these increased planting areas would allow for significant amounts of new tree and shrub plantings that bring the site much closer to meeting the entrance corridor landscaping requirements.

Ms. Maliszewski said the proposal also includes the removal of nonconforming site lights and of a nonconforming freestanding sign, as well as consolidation of dumpsters on the site. She said it is also possible that a portion of the retaining wall that currently exists on Rio Road could be removed in connection with the increase in planting area.

Ms. Maliszewski said over the years, the ARB has established standard conditions for mitigating impacts of outdoor display of vehicles. She said one of these is the requirement that vehicles not be elevated anywhere onsite. She said another is the requirement that cars only be parked in striped parking spaces. She said these conditions help maintain an organized and orderly appearance onsite, and they are among the conditions the ARB has recommended for this request.

Ms. Maliszewski said the increased planting areas, added landscaping, removal of nonconforming features, and other planned improvements are all positive changes that increase consistency of the site with the Entrance Corridor Guidelines. She said the staff report does note that the proposed use is not consistent with many of the goals of the Rio29 Small Area Plan.

Ms. Maliszewski said given recent guidance from the County Attorney's Office, however, and the consideration that this proposal is strictly limited to determining whether the use is consistent with the Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines, factors unfavorable are eliminated, and staff's recommendation is revised to one of approval, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report.

Ms. Maliszewski said she had drafted motions available when the Planning Commission was ready for them and offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Clayborne asked for clarification on the reason for the change in removal of the unfavorable condition.

Mr. Andy Herrick (County Attorney's Office) replied that Ms. Maliszewski and staff had originally drafted the report to take into consideration consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. He said as Mr. Clayborne was probably aware, in almost all applications for special use permits, consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is a critical factor.

Mr. Herrick said that when taking a closer look at the conditions for this specific type of special use permit, however, the ordinance limits review to determining whether the outdoor storage display and/or sales is consistent with the applicable design guidelines. He said for better or worse, the specific provisions of this specific type of special use permit limit consideration only to that of the design guidelines, which the ARB has already addressed.

Mr. Bivins asked if they would be hearing from the applicant.

Mr. Rapp said he did not believe anyone representing the applicant was present.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was anyone from the public present who wished to speak. Hearing none, he brought the matter back to the Commission for discussion.

Mr. Bivins said he had a question, and asked staff to pull up the image of the plantings. He said based on his reading of the ARB's report, he would assume that this is to offer some visual buffer between the narrow strip that comes along the on-ramp back onto the bypass, then comes around Route 29. He asked Ms. Maliszewski if this was how she would interpret this.

Ms. Maliszewski asked Mr. Bivins if he could repeat his question.

Mr. Bivins said that around the spot where they see the increased planting area, he believed one of the rationales for that was to bring some visual transition as well as some isolation from the vehicles on the Route 29 side that take the on-ramp back onto the main part of Rt. 29 or, as one comes onto Rio Road there, to offer some buffer so that they are not right up against the commercial area as they are today.

Ms. Maliszewski explained that the existing condition is not consistent with the entrance corridor landscaping guidelines. She said the standard landscaping that is required along the entrance corridors is large shade trees planted at 2.5-inch caliper, 35 feet on center, interspersed ornamentals, and rows of shrubs. She said one could see from the photo on the screen that there is almost no landscaping along the corridors at this time, so increasing that planting area is a big step towards bringing the site up to what the guidelines are calling for.

Mr. Bivins asked if the plantings need to be in place before the applicant gets a permit (perhaps the certificate of occupancy (CO)).

Ms. Maliszewski replied that she believed it was, in fact, the CO and that the site would need to be in conformance. She said the applicant will need to do a site plan amendment so that the site is consistent with the approved site plan.

Mr. Bivins said before moving along, he understood there was an applicant for the project who was trying to access the meeting. He asked if the applicant was in the meeting yet.

Mr. Rapp replied that Ms. Schaffer noted that the applicant was in the public side of the meeting, ready to speak.

Mr. Bivins said that he could see the applicant but could not hear him.

Mr. Rapp said the public could hear the applicant, but the County staff and Commission could not.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was a way to correct this.

Mr. Rapp said he was working on the issue.

Mr. Bivins circled back to his earlier question to Ms. Maliszewski and apologized for interrupting her. He asked if the applicant would need to do the plantings and meet all the requirements from the ARB before they are able to open their business there.

Ms. Maliszewski replied yes.

Ms. Schaffer asked Mr. Rapp if he could hear her.

Mr. Rapp replied yes.

Ms. Schaffer said she had Mr. Scott Collins, the applicant, ready to speak when the Commission was ready. She apologized for having microphone issues.

Mr. Bivins asked to hear from the applicant.

Mr. Scott Collins (Collins Engineering) said he appreciated the opportunity to present the project to the Commission. He said Ms. Maliszewski did a great job with the staff report and highlighted what they were trying to do. He said the applicant was focused on making this site meet many of the entrance corridor requirements and landscaping requirements for the small area plan, even though the building does not quite [inaudible] calling for.

Mr. Collins said the applicant recognizes that this corner is a predominant corner of Albemarle County, with the two entrance corridors on two sides of the site, and so they focused on the site aspects they could control and looked at enhancing the landscaping along those two corridors to create a much better pedestrian zone along those corridors with the increase of greenspace, landscaping, and buffering from the site. He said this was his main point.

Mr. Collins added that this predominant corner is made up of five parcels, and the total acreage is about 4.6 acres. He said this site was 0.7 acres of it, and his client also owns another property two properties down, which is another 0.7 acres. He said the idea is that this is a good use, in the meantime, as things start to evolve in the County with the idea that ultimately, these two parcels could be combined with the other three properties in the future and that something could come that is more consistent with the small area plan.

Mr. Collins said for now, however, the applicant is focused on what they can control and do with the site in order to increase the landscaping aspect and buffering of the pedestrian corridor to enhance the site aspects. He said it would be difficult to develop this property on its own, given its size, and will be in a better place to be more consistent with the small area plan with the landscape buffering provided so far.

Mr. Collins said these were the main aspects he wanted to address, and that Ms. Maliszewski did a great job with the staff report. He offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Bivins said Mr. Collins mentioned his client owns property that is two properties down.

Mr. Collins said yes.

Mr. Bivins asked if this was Downtown Auto.

Mr. Collins replied yes and explained that what the applicant would like to do is move Downtown Auto to the subject site. He said the applicant has a pending lease to use that existing property two doors down as a new, different business in Albemarle County. He said this is not an auto dealership and is a use that is allowed in the Highway Commercial corridor.

Mr. Bivins said he may be wrong, but his recollection was that when Mr. Collin's client came before the Commission for a special use permit to use that particular property where their business is located now, there was screening that was supposed to be put in, as well as some striped parking areas to give a bit of an orderly context for the particular property where Downtown Auto moved to when they moved off of Preston Avenue. He said he comes to this area frequently and has not seen any of this put in place. He said perhaps he was not looking in the right place, but he has not seen any screening put in, nor any cars presented in an orderly manner on that lot.

Mr. Bivins said he was now somewhat cautiously nervous that the same actions will not take place on a more prominently positioned place in the entrance corridor. He said he was sure Mr. Collins had not come prepared to answer that question, but since he said his client was the person who owns the two lots farther down the road, he was asking this question. He asked how the Commission will know that this will be better than what it is right now.

Mr. Collins replied his understanding is that his client had his business downtown in the City of Charlottesville, and he obtained this property and special use permit about a year and a half ago with the intent to move there, but it was too small, so he had not moved over there yet. He said it was about 6 months ago his client found out that within a matter of 60 days, he had to vacate his site in the City of Charlottesville. He said his client had to move his business over to the new site rather quickly, in the midst of COVID-19, and so he has been scrambling. He said the site is small, and so his client had to work through many issues on the site.

Mr. Collins said he met with his client about 6 weeks ago on the site, and his understanding was that his client was working on getting the landscaping installed. He said he believed his client had to have conversations with the County about it, and they were working through some aspects and getting the landscape in.

Mr. Collins said the subject site gives his client much more room so that he can maneuver and function correctly, which is the reason for the move.

Mr. Bivins said basically, Mr. Collins was saying that this was like going into a house and realizing that they did not have enough closet space, which was why they wanted to move up to the corner.

Mr. Collins said this was a great analogy.

Mr. Bivins asked if there were other questions for the applicant. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak.

Ms. Schaffer said there was no one with their hand raised at that time.

Mr. Bivins brought the matter back to the Commission for additional questions and discussion. He asked Ms. Maliszewski if she had a sense that conversations between the applicant and staff had taken place.

Ms. Maliszewski replied that she had multiple conversations with the business owner about landscaping that was required. She said she had not been out to the study the site, and so she did not know what the current condition was.

Mr. Bivins said he could share that as of that day, there was nothing going on except lots of cars there.

Mr. Keller said he had a question for both Ms. Maliszewski and Mr. Herrick and that it was, in many ways, more for the public than for the Commission. He asked when they have a special use permit like this and it is approved, what could then happen on the site with a different leaser without it having to come back to the County.

Mr. Herrick replied that as Mr. Keller was probably aware, special use permits run with the land. He said if the special use permit were to be issued in this case, future owners and occupants of this property would have to comply with the terms of the special use permit issued. He said this would survive even a transfer of ownership.

Mr. Keller asked if this would limit it to outdoor storage and would not allow for a multistory closed storage building.

Mr. Herrick replied that the owner would still have all the permitted by-right uses that exist under Highway Commercial. He said in addition, they would have the ability to have outdoor storage and display subject to the conditions of the special use permit.

Mr. Clayborne said he had a follow-up question that did not pertain to this specific proposal. He asked in light of what Mr. Keller just said, what tools would eventually be put in place so that they can achieve the vision of the form-based code and small area plan. He asked if the special use permit runs the life of the property, how they will ever get to a three-story to six-story building and see it to fruition, from a policy and procedural standpoint.

Mr. Herrick replied that the form-based code is still in development and is an optional overlay, meaning property owners have the option of opting into the form-based code. He said owners that choose not to will continue to have the by-right uses of the Highway Commercial Zoning District. He said perhaps Mr. Rapp had something to add, but the form-based code would eventually be an optional overlay.

Mr. Rapp said Mr. Clayborne raised a point that was initially a thought that staff had as they looked into this. He said this would certainly make implementing the Rio29 Small Area Plan vision more difficult, and if they continue this, they eventually need to find a way to support that plan. He said as it was pointed out earlier, they have an ordinance that restricts the way they can evaluate some of these proposals. He said it will take some work on the ordinance as a whole to hopefully square some of this up and promote the type of development they want in this area, if they want to see it come to fruition.

Ms. Firehock said she did note staff's comments to that effect, that it was not quite in keeping with the vision espoused in the form-based code currently under development. She said she did want to point out a couple of things about the way she looked at this.

Ms. Firehock said first, nothing that the applicant was proposing to do would structurally alter the site such that a future building could not be constructed. She said it is currently a fast-food chain restaurant and is attractive as it could be as such. She said she thinks the landscaping will dramatically improve it, and that while one could debate whether this is the ultimate, highest, and best use of this premier corner parcel, from the applicant's standpoint, it gives them great visibility for their business. She said she does not think it precludes it converting, in the future, into the types of structures discussed in the form-based code project.

Ms. Firehock said there was talk about the pedestrian experience of that area. She said anything that adds more vegetation will certainly improve the experience. She said she regularly took her car to one of the repair shops behind the parcel, and she used the car rental place there on almost a weekly basis for renting cars to leave town. She said she then walked back from that location down Route 29, and it is a difficult and unfriendly place to be walking. She said this applicant is not responsible for fixing this, but it is really a site designed to be accessed by auto and is not a pedestrian destination.

Ms. Firehock said she thinks the proposal is a great improvement, and nothing the Commission would decide on that evening would prevent it from eventually evolving into the type of development they hope to see at this corner.

Mr. Bailey agreed. He said it was unfortunate timing-wise, but from the perspective that the Commission was being asked to look at it being in keeping with the Entrance Corridor Overlay, and with the proposed vegetation, it is a significant improvement over what exists there today and makes it much more friendly

and inviting for the neighborhood.

Mr. Bailey said the unfortunate part he wrestled with was that when thinking about trying to achieve the small area plan vision, although it is within rights of the Highway Commercial District, is that a car dealership is not a place where people come together, so it does not promote more walking. He said it promotes in and out, and when one perhaps needs a car. He said it is on a prominent corner of the corridor, within the Core, and with the vision they want to go in, it does not promote the coming together of the neighborhood or area. He said this is where he struggled, but that it is within the applicant's right.

Mr. Bailey said with regards to what was presented and what Ms. Firehock stated, it is an improvement over what exists today, and there is nothing to prevent it from achieving the vision down the road. He said he supposed that the concern is since the by right, the special permit transitions with the land, it could get stuck in that use, which is not one that promotes community gatherings. He said this was more of a comment than a question, but he wanted to put it out there for the public.

Mr. Bivins said it sounded as if the Commission understood that this was a piece of timing and is within the rights of this particular property owner to move in the direction that they want to move in. He said as Counsel has advised and as staff has revised, the conversation that evening was to see whether or not what is being proposed to the Commission is in keeping with the context of visuals, which they received something from the ARB on and, given the conditions outlined, the ARB would find this in keeping with the general hope for design of that particular corner. He said he believed Ms. Maliszewski said they would have to have a particular approved site plan before they got the CO permit.

Ms. Maliszewski said she could not hear what Mr. Bivins said and asked him to repeat it.

Mr. Bivins said Ms. Maliszewski has assured the Commission that through the ARB, before the applicant can receive a CO permit, they will have to go before the ARB and have the site approved and move through all the various parts of the process they will need to.

Ms. Maliszewski said a site plan amendment is required.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Maliszewski to present the possible motions on the screen. He asked the Commissioners if they were ready to take action.

Mr. Bailey moved to recommend approval of SP202000014 1680 Seminole Trail Outdoor Sales, Storage, and Display with the conditions stated in the staff report.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Mr. Bivins thanked the applicant for his work, adding that he knew he would continue working with County staff to make this an interesting and appropriate site.

### **Action Item**

#### **ZMA201900004 Breezy Hill**

Mr. Bivins noted that this was an item coming back before the Commission and that he would let Counsel kick this off before moving through the process in order to provide the procedural process for the action item.

Mr. Herrick said he thought it was important, given the volume of comments the County has received on this item, to take a few moments to set the stage for where they are. He said procedurally, there has already been a public hearing on this item before the Planning Commission. He said it was then referred to the Board of Supervisors in the fall, which has now referred it back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Herrick said the item is before the Planning Commission for a non-binding recommendation. He said

the Board has asked for the Commission's recommendation, but the Board of Supervisors will ultimately have the final say on this.

Mr. Herrick said as noted, because a public hearing on this has already taken place, what is before the Commission that evening is not a public hearing. He said the Commission can choose to accept public comment that evening, but it was not required to do so because the Commission has already held a public hearing in this matter.

Mr. Herrick said he also wanted to briefly go over the role of the master plan and Comprehensive Plan. He said the master plan is not a contract nor an agreement, but is a guide to orderly development. He said the master plan is helpful and informative and should be given the appropriate weight, but it is ultimately not determinative.

Mr. Herrick said as the Commission has discussed at prior meetings, moratoriums on development under Virginia law are not enabled. He said a local governing body does not have the authority to enact an ordinance that would establish an outright moratorium on all zoning changes in a portion of a locality until highway improvements are made. He said current and projected traffic, however, can be a consideration in individual applications. He said along those lines, if traffic impacts do become a determining factor, it would be better to focus on statements on the current state of the road infrastructure, whether approval or denial is being recommended, than on the six transportation improvements listed in the master plan.

Mr. Herrick said he simply wanted to go over a few parameters of the discussion in trying to be responsive to some of the comments that have been received. He offered to answer any questions the Commissioners had now or at the conclusion of the presentation.

Hearing no questions, Mr. Bivins asked for the staff report.

Ms. Megan Nedostup, Development Process Manager in the Planning Division of Community Development, said that as Mr. Herrick just advised, they would discuss the Breezy Hill proposal and changes that have occurred since the proposal was last heard at the Planning Commission in July. She reminded the Commission that this was a request to rezone seven parcels that together are approximately 84 acres located along Route 250 East in the Village of Rivanna Master Plan area, near Glenmore, from RA to R4 Residential.

Ms. Nedostup said she would give a quick overview of the location of the proposed development, present a quick slide that Mr. Herrick briefly covered on the meeting history of the project, present some of the changes that have occurred since this was last heard at the Planning Commission, and conclude with the updated factors favorable and unfavorable.

Ms. Nedostup said since this has been heard as a public hearing previously, she would not be presenting all of the information from her previous presentation. She said if there were questions regarding that information, however, she would be happy to answer them and bring up the previous slides the Commission has already seen.

Ms. Nedostup presented a map to provide orientation as to the location of the proposal. She indicated on the map to Route 250, noting that she drew in a red line to denote the edge of the Village of Rivanna Master Plan. She said this line follows Route 250 east and that going west towards Charlottesville is the Village of Rivanna Neighborhood Model Development. She indicated to the location of Glenmore, noting that the site is outlined in yellow gold, with the Running Deer neighborhood to the east.

Ms. Nedostup said on July 7, 2020, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the project and voted to recommend denial. She said on September 2, the application was heard at the Board of Supervisors as a public hearing and was deferred at the meeting by the applicant, with the Board accepting the deferral.



Ms. Nedostup said the Board then voted on October 21 to send the application back to the Planning Commission for further consideration, which was the reason for the present meeting.

Ms. Nedostup presented the revised concept plan. She said the applicant has made a number of changes since the application was last before the Commission. She said those changes are fully outlined in the staff report, and she would cover a few key changes. She indicated again on the map to Route 250 and Running Deer Drive.

Ms. Nedostup said density was reduced from 160 units to 130 units, which equates to a gross density of 1.6 units per acre and a net density of 1.9 units per acre. She indicated on the map to Block 5 and said it was offered to be proffered to limit the density to 1 unit per acre in that area.

Ms. Nedostup said the roads were revised to include curb, gutter, sidewalks, and planting strips for street trees.

Ms. Nedostup said the applicant has offered to proffer that construction traffic be prohibited from using Running Deer Drive.

Ms. Nedostup said a proffer was offered to restrict Block 6 (in the very back of the property) to one dwelling via a deed restriction.

Ms. Nedostup said additional erosion and sediment control measures, along with grading and lots outside the stream buffer, were added to the concept plan and proffers.

Ms. Nedostup presented another part of the concept plan showing the newly revised lot layout. She said the lots are larger in the Block 5 area where the density was reduced, and there is now one unit in Block 6.

Ms. Nedostup said the factors favorable and unfavorable have been updated to reflect the changes by the applicant. She noted that the factors listed on the screen in italics were newly added factors and that those with a strikethrough were removed factors.

Ms. Nedostup said she would read aloud those factors that are now applicable to the application. She said Favorable Factor #4 was added and read it aloud: "The proposal's affordable housing proffer would generate \$422,500 of monetary contributions." She noted that this number was reduced to reflect the 15% of 130 units rather than the 160 units that were previously before the Commission.

Ms. Nedostup said Favorable Factor #5 is, "The proposal meets the applicable Neighborhood Model principles."

Ms. Nedostup said the unfavorable factors include those elements that do not align with the master plan. She said Unfavorable Factors #4-7 have been addressed with the revisions.

Ms. Nedostup said staff acknowledges that the applicant has addressed a number of concerns identified and raised by staff, members of the community, the Planning Commission, and the Board. She said staff's recommendation of denial, however, has not changed.

Ms. Nedostup noted for the Commission and for the public that the County has received approximately 234 emails since the Board voted to have the application heard by the Planning Commission, and that she would provide a summary of the majority of the concerns that were included in that correspondence.

Ms. Nedostup said the concerns from the community were consistency with the recommendations of the master plan, including transportation recommendations, density recommendations, and the overall density of the proposal; the transition of development from Rivanna Village as the center; concerns raised about the increased traffic from the development, specifically around adding vehicles to Route 250 going into Charlottesville; impact and safety concerns to Running Deer residents with the connection to Running Deer

Drive; safety concerns regarding access from Route 250 for emergency vehicles; the impact to school capacity; and environmental impacts.

Ms. Nedostup concluded her presentation and offered to answer questions.

Ms. More said she believed she knew the answer to her question, but she wanted to ask it to Ms. Nedostup simply for the purpose of having it as part of the record. She said when she watched the Board meeting, she heard this come up in some of the final discussions and although she believed it was clarified there, she wanted to clarify it here. She said during discussions of what the by-right number would be, she kept hearing people referring to 65-66 units. She said she did not know if they actually have a by-right number, but her understanding is it would be much lower, and the 65-66 range is what the plan recommends, particularly on the guidance given by the Planning Commission in the work session. She asked Ms. Nedostup if this was correct.

Ms. Nedostup replied yes. She said the parcels are currently zoned Rural Areas, which would involve a determination on the number of development rights, which has not been done to date. She said the applicant has done their own calculation and in their narrative on previous submittals, they have said there would be 24 by-right units. She said the 65 number would not be by-right and would need a rezoning, which was the guidance given by the Planning Commission at the work session in July 2019 on the interpretation of what was provided in the master plan.

Mr. Bivins said they had received a big package of information from the applicant, and this is an action item before the Commission where they can work off of the information that has been presented to them and talk to each other about it without having to hear from the applicant. He said certainly, given the amount of excellent public communication they have received, they can simply make a recommendation back to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Bivins said that before moving in that direction, and given the materials they have received (including Ms. Nedostup's report and the applicant's reports), he would like to get a sense from the Commissioners as to whether or not they need to hear from the applicant. As he did not hear any feedback from the Commission, he noted that if he heard nothing, he would take this as they did not need to hear from the applicant, and they would then talk amongst themselves.

Mr. Bivins reiterated that the Commission had a lot of information and received a great deal of what he deemed to be thoughtful input. He said Ms. Nedostup laid out the arguments, both pro and con (mostly con) for the Commission, and the community stated this all quite well. He said the Commission received a document the day prior from Mr. Armstrong that he believed was an attempt to extend his conversation, but may have been thorough enough such that the Commission can have its conversation without hearing from him.

Ms. Firehock said she did have a very minor question for the applicant, and she did not ask it to staff because it was not one the staff would give. She said she understood the applicant was proffering the one unit on the far parcel, but she was curious as to why they would even have one house there rather than turning it into a park or some kind of other amenity. She said she was just curious about that design choice for the layout and did not know if staff could answer that. She said she was assuming that the applicant would be presenting, and the Commission would hear about that.

Ms. Firehock said she was also somewhat curious about the traffic calculations and the 10 hours saved per year. She noted that having said that, she was not going to demand to hear from the applicant that evening, but these were a couple of things she wondered about.

Ms. Firehock added that she was not at the Planning Commission meeting when they had denied it that summer, as she was out of town. She said she did read the meeting minutes, but she was still curious about those two items.

Mr. Bivins asked if there were any other Commissioners with specific questions, or if the applicant could simply answer those questions.

Ms. More said she did not. She suggested if they were going to hear from the applicant about those two specific questions, it should only be about those two and not an opportunity to expand.

Mr. Bivins agreed.

Ms. Firehock said this sounded fair.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Rapp if there was a way they could have only those two issues answered.

Mr. Rapp asked Ms. Schaffer if she could patch Mr. Armstrong through.

Mr. Armstrong said he could speak to those two questions.

Mr. Bivins noted that the Commission was not asking Mr. Armstrong to give them a treatise on all the various things he would like to and that they only wanted responses to those two questions.

Mr. Armstrong acknowledged that the Commission had received a lot of communications and said he appreciated their position on that. He said Mr. Bill Wuensch, Traffic Engineer with EPR, was present if there were questions the Commission had for him later. He said Mr. Franco with Roudabush, Gale & Associates was present as well. He said he would stick to what had been asked, however.

Mr. Armstrong said regarding the reason for having one unit on the rear parcel, there is a house there now, and it seemed logical to leave that existing unit in place there as it currently exists in the fabric of the neighborhood. He said this is not a "fall on your sword" kind of issue, but something that seemed to make sense to the applicant.

Mr. Armstrong asked Ms. Firehock if she could repeat her first question.

Ms. Firehock said she was asking if the applicant could elaborate on the ten hours of time saved per year (or 2.5 minutes saved per day). She said it was hard to explain this, but she thought it was complicated modeling, and she wanted to get her head around how the applicant came to those numbers.

Mr. Armstrong agreed it was complicated. He asked if it would be better to have the traffic engineer tell Ms. Firehock about that, or if he should offer a layman's interpretation.

Ms. Firehock replied that it was up to him.

Mr. Bivins reminded Mr. Armstrong of what the Commission asked him to do, explaining that if Mr. Armstrong is to pass his time, the time is up when Mr. Wuensch finishes.

Mr. Armstrong replied that he would try to give his best interpretation and if it was not satisfactory, the Commission could call on Mr. Wuensch later. He said the signal improvements the applicant is proposing is a complete reconfiguration of the existing signals at Milton Road, at the intersection of Route 250 and Louisa Road. He said by doing this, it provides additional capacity for those intersections to move more cars through. He said the frustrating thing people see right now is because those signals are not synchronized, are not timed, and do not have the modern sensor and computer technology that lets them talk to each other, one might get a green at one and a red at the other, or a red at the first one while the second one seen down the road is green and by the time one gets to the second one, it is red again.

Mr. Armstrong said synchronizing those signals means, in simple terms, that if one gets a green at the first light and drives the speed limit, they should get a green at the second light. He said it moves traffic through those almost as a single unit rather than as two independent stop lights.

Mr. Armstrong said the effect of this is saving each commuter who drives through from a theoretical starting point of the Village of Rivanna or Glenmore to a theoretical end point in town 2.5 minutes on their commute daily. He said this was not changing the world, but it was 2.5 minutes better after Breezy Hill, including the new cars from Breezy Hill, than it would be if Breezy Hill were not developed. He said they were not just mitigating the impact of the traffic Breezy Hill would cause, but were improving beyond that and providing a broader community benefit.

Mr. Armstrong said the other numbers were just math. He said multiplying this by the number of cars that go through the intersection every day, this is 2.5 minutes multiplied out to 11,000 vehicle hours per year. He said when this is totaled, the exact number in the report is 11,350. He said the applicant did not have this much supporting data and numbers the last time they spoke to the Commission. He said he hoped this answered the question concisely.

Mr. Bivins asked the Commissioners if they could move forward with their own conversation.

Ms. Firehock said she wanted to make a comment based on Mr. Armstrong's response about the traffic. She said it sounds like this was basically synchronizing the lights, which she recalled doing in Charlottesville and it coming to about \$45,000 per traffic light, which was years ago. She said she did not know what the going rate was currently and would not ask Mr. McDermott to tell her. She said this is the type of project that the County could undertake. She said it obviously requires money, but she wanted to throw it out there as an idea for the County to do themselves if they want to solve that.

Ms. Firehock said to her, the question is if the developer's additional traffic project warrant approving this development, or if the County could simply do this fix sometime in the future. She said she was not suggesting they decide this that evening, but was putting it out there that it is a straightforward, relatively simple solution that could be considered in the future.

Mr. Randolph said he would recall, as listeners in the Village of Rivanna area who served on the CAC will also recall, that after the new bridge was put in across the railroad tracks, they had a meeting with Mr. Joel DeNunzio (regional representative of VDOT), who explained that there was coordination between the traffic lights at the Milton Road/Route 250 intersection and at the Route 22/Louisa Road intersection. He said if this was done in 2014, then it has supposedly been operational now for almost six years. He said it might be longer because by the time that bridge was opened, it may have been 2013 and not 2014, though he believed 2014 was probably a more accurate figure.

Mr. Randolph said during that six years, traffic volume has continued to increase coming down onto Route 250 heading west in the morning. He said those who have some experience in the congestion on this corridor, living with it on a daily basis, well understand that past technological fixes do not begin to address the fact that the volume of automotive traffic has been increasing significantly year by year.

Mr. Randolph said into the mix comes Breezy Hill, hence the basis for the 223 emails that were received since the community became aware that this application would be moving forward to the Planning Commission. He said from that 223 total, he eliminated a couple of people who resubmitted. He said he thinks 223 does represent the thinking of where people are somewhat justifiably suspect that technological changes are going to solve all of the transportation ills of the Route 250 Corridor.

Mr. Bivins asked if they wanted to hear from the Transportation Director.

Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Bivins if she could make a quick comment back to Mr. Randolph.

Mr. Bivins replied yes.

Ms. Firehock said for the record that she was not suggesting that these solutions and traffic problems are simply just with the lights. She said she was just saying that what the developer had proposed was

something that could be done by another party. She said she did appreciate Mr. Randolph's background.

Mr. Bivins said he understood. He asked if they wanted to hear from Mr. McDermott.

Mr. Randolph said this was fine. He told Ms. Firehock he was not directing his remarks to her, but more to the argument that the technology fix would solve the problem. He said he thinks this is putting a band-aid on an open wound that requires significantly more surgery than what \$1 million would be able to address.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. McDermott to weigh in on the conversation and provide what would hopefully be an optimistic view on what he sees in the future before coming back to the conversation. He said they were pausing and putting a bracket around transportation and related solutions, and Mr. McDermott would be that bracket before coming back to the discussion.

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Chief of Planning, said he runs the Transportation Planning Division and wanted to make a couple of points to Ms. Firehock's point about the improvements. He said this is absolutely something the County could do on their own, but he wanted to clarify that it probably would not be a \$45,000-per-signal fix. He said he would estimate that they were looking at a couple hundred thousand dollars, at the least, for something like this. He said it could be even higher, dependent on whether the current poles can handle the signals they would put on them, and so they would have to evaluate that. He said the new technology is fairly expensive and keep this in mind that is not something the County could go out and fix right away.

Mr. McDermott agreed with Mr. Randolph that technological fixes are not going to solve all the problems on this corridor in any manner. He said staff did review the application, and VDOT reviewed the data from the signal changes that the Transportation Engineer provided. He said VDOT did agree with the improvements' ability to improve the congestion situation at those two signals.

Mr. McDermott said he had not heard that those signals were previously timed and if they were, it was likely done with much older software where there is now better software available to use nowadays. He said staff did agree that there looked like there would be a significant improvement from updating those two signals to be a coordinated system.

Mr. McDermott pointed out that there is a lot more friction on this corridor, meaning they see a lot more congestion there than he thinks is entirely reflected in the results of the analysis because the amount of time that looked like was coming through on the analysis does not always match up with what staff sees from reports as far as congestion between Route 250 and the City. He said much of this could be due to minor accidents and problems that are slowing things down. He said staff did see an improvement in the general congestion levels, however, if the signals were upgraded.

Mr. Randolph said he wanted his fellow Commissioners to notice that with Mr. McDermott's helpful update of what the real costs may well be with the installation of new poles to hold up the signalization, the \$500,000 proffered by the applicant for transportation or schools could evaporate and end up all being dedicated solely to the transportation improvements, with nothing therefore available to address the impacts on increased enrollment for the nearly overenrolled Stone Robinson Elementary School.

Ms. More said she had comments, but she was not sure if they were at that point.

Mr. Bivins said this was among the Commission now, and so the conversations and discussions they would have at this point on would move them to a point where they would hopefully make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors one way or the other. He said at some point, he would assume they would hear from the Commissioner in that jurisdiction to set the stage. He asked Ms. More to go ahead with her comments.

Ms. More said if Mr. Randolph wanted to set the stage, this was fine. She said she did not want to preclude any discussion, but she wanted to make sure that her comments were very direct about why she feels the

way she does about this, which is the same way she felt about it before. She said the reason why she wanted to be very clear is because she noticed at the Board that there seemed to be some comments that some of the unfavorable factors had been checked off the list.

Ms. More said while this is a good thing, in her mind, some of the most unfavorable factors remained and still do now. She said she worries that while she does think it is an indication that the process worked well, she does think it moved forward from the Commission the last time to the Board, and the applicant was able to adjust. She said lots of things were addressed, but the underlying concerns, at least on her part, still remained and still do now, which is why she wants to be very clear about where she is coming from. She asked if she should stop there in her comments.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. More if she could pause there and let Mr. Randolph make some comments.

Mr. Randolph said there was a lot to be said, but he wanted to go ahead and take two selective quotations from emails that everyone had received. He said the first was from an individual who lives in the Village of Rivanna, who said, "I understand that we need additional housing in the County, but jamming it into an area that ignores the master plan for growth in the area creates additional gridlock on 250 and overcrowds our school justifies common sense."

Mr. Randolph said the second remark also came from a Village of Rivanna resident who said, "As a retired career civil servant, I worked under the watchful eye of public scrutiny and public trust. I encourage the Board and thereby also this Commission to earn the public's trust and follow the Albemarle County's master plan, and deny the developer's request for Breezy Hill development."

Mr. Randolph said he would skip a couple of sentences, noting that the resident ended his letter by saying, "I respectfully ask you to earn the public citizens' trust and deny the Breezy Hill request."

Mr. Randolph said in remarks he sent everyone, he wanted to concentrate on what he viewed as the major objection to this application, and this involves the master plan's guidance regarding density, as well as the Comprehensive Plan approach that staff in the Community Development Department has followed for as long as he has been involved with the County (nine years).

Mr. Randolph said in the 5-12-2010 master plan, page 20 makes clear that, for the Village of Rivanna, the total number of new dwellings "is to be between 300-400 units." He said Rivanna Village, permitted in 2015 for up to 400 units, will at final buildout probably come in with some 300 units, and may even become below at 290. He said this does not mean the potential extra residential capacity of some 100 units accrues automatically to another development.

Mr. Randolph said the primary reason why the 2,007 maximum buildout number for Rivanna Village's total dwelling units fell from some 600 in 2007 to some 400 in 2015 was more stringent federal wetland and intermittent stream standards. He said those tighter federal standards ensure that new residential development in the Village of Rivanna works with the environment rather than in spite of the environment. He said shoe-horning in new development just to satisfy a total buildout number that is no longer operationally feasible is not sound planning.

Mr. Randolph said the revised development plan for Breezy Hill, at 1.9 net dwelling units per acre and 1.6 gross dwelling units per acre, still remains out of whack with the stated goal in the master plan of a tapered density for the edge of the proposed expanded development area. He said given that Breezy Hill is east of Carroll Creek, its residential density should continue to lessen as Running Deer is approached. He said the latest Breezy Hill application continues to ignore that stated expectation and planning guideline.

Mr. Randolph said this resubmittal neuters the master plan by proposing a much higher level of density than the master plan advises is appropriate as a transition from Development Area to Rural Area occurs.

Mr. Randolph said in Block 5, there is a proposed buffer. He said this buffer is a mere fig leaf covering an

egregious repudiation of the master plan's stated goal of concentrating density in the center of Rivanna Village and having that density transition into approximately one dwelling unit per acre when abutting Running Deer Drive.

Mr. Randolph said he rested his case on the master plan and Comprehensive Plan's approach to tapered density. He said the resubmittal they have has not altered the ills seen previously in the application that summer. He said he therefore urged rejection of the application.

Mr. Keller said he felt the same as he did when the application came before the Commission before. He said he did not see significant changes, and did not think anything was gained by going over the points he made last time, although he thinks there are a number of very important points that were made by the various Commissioners who came together to address this and similar issues they are facing. He said he also planned to vote "no."

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Nedostup if she had a piece of information to share.

Ms. Nedostup said she wanted to clarify one thing. She said the transit and transportation proffer with the signals is a separate proffer from the cash proffer for transportation or schools. She said there are actually two different proffers that could address transportation. She said one is that the applicant has offered to upgrade, design, and install the signal timing coordination, which is separate from the \$500,000 proffer for transportation or schools that was also offered. She said these were Proffers #2 and #3 in the Commissioners' packets.

Ms. More said she believed Mr. Randolph covered many points, and so she would be concise. She said one of the notes she had that Mr. Randolph touched on was the idea that there is a reduction in the density of the overall Village of Rivanna at full buildout and that somehow, these units could be transferable to another property. She said she wanted to push back on that rationale as a convenient theory by someone who would like to selectively use the master plan for one purpose, but not another. She said she would like to set that aside because she heard that at the Board as well and it makes zero sense to her.

Ms. More said what she would also like to focus on is what she said before, when this was before the Commission, that she understands the principles and ideas behind master planning, that they are asking the community to engage in this process, and while this document is used as a guiding tool, it offers communities a sense of what to expect.

Ms. More said there were two things she focused on in her notes that have come back to the Commission yet again, which were that the density exceeds the recommendations and the idea of the edges being less dense. She said this was in the master plan and Comprehensive Plan as a basic planning principle that they have a transition to the edge. She said to her, these make up the bottom line and are the most important things they still have not addressed with this current resubmittal. She said she cannot support it and would recommend denial.

Mr. Randolph thanked Ms. Nedostup for correcting him about the proffers, as he did misspeak. He said there is therefore about \$1 million in the mix: \$500,000 for transportation, and \$500,000 for transportation and/or schools. He said his point was that by the time Mr. McDermott finishes the work on the transportation needs, he feels that in all likelihood, there will not be much in the way of funds available to address the educational impacts of having the additional enrollment at Stone Robinson. He said he did misspeak and thanked Ms. Nedostup for correcting that.

Mr. Bivins asked if anyone else wanted to offer their observations.

Mr. Bailey said his position on this matter had not changed since the last time. He commended the applicant for trying to address some of the areas. He said as has been previously stated, however, they seem to have fallen short on some of the major components.

Mr. Bailey said less directly to the application, which he believed was well-covered and discussed at that point on key principles like transition at the edge, what he was left with (which may be a future matter for Transportation) is the amount of engagement from the community about the transportation issues and the plan from a County Planning perspective to address this area. He said he saw many of the recommendations and echoed what Ms. Firehock said about possibly increasing signalization. He said it would be great to look at some of these improvements from a County perspective to the residents.

Mr. Bailey said in some ways, he was grateful for the opportunity to hear this application in the sense that it illuminates a safety issue in the County, as evidenced by the outpouring of emails to this matter due to those traffic issues.

Mr. Bailey said with regards to the specific application, he does not think it meets the criteria that has been set forth in the master plan. He said he does think this is an opportunity for the County not to let it fall off the radar that some attention needs to be addressed to this area.

Mr. Bivins said he has asked Mr. Rapp to make sure that at least once a year, Mr. McDermott can talk with the Commission about the major places around the County that he believes require attention. He said every year, Mr. McDermott puts together a list of priority traffic projects that analyzes traffic, accidents, the road conditions, and other various items. He said Mr. McDermott has been presenting this to the Board of Supervisors, and the Commission had this presented to them recently. He said it would help to have it presented again and, as Mr. Bailey just spoke to, add onto that some of the opportunities that lie in front of them, either through County or state funding. He said there is a whole host of funds that Mr. McDermott is aware of to get those done.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. McDermott if he wanted to clarify any of this. He added that Mr. McDermott should expect to hear from him soon about those issues.

Mr. McDermott said he would make a plan to come back to the Commission and talk about the future priorities. He said this segment of Route 250 has already been looked at and prioritized. He pointed out that the County has already put some significant funding to that corridor, in working with the state, through the diverging diamond that is nearing construction, as well as improvements to the Pantops area on Route 250. He said they were working on this, but he would be sure to come back to the Commission and talk more about future plans soon.

Mr. Clayborne apologized for not asking his question to staff earlier. He asked if staff could share more about the 130-unit number the applicant came up with while making this proposal again, and what the magic number was in terms of dropping 30 units, knowing that density was a major concern. He said this was probably more of a question for the applicant, but he had failed to ask him this earlier. He asked staff if the applicant had shared anything with them.

Ms. Nedostup replied no. She said the applicant had not shared anything with staff that would help answer the question as to why it was 30 units dropped as opposed to 50 or 65.

Mr. Bivins said the Commission was moving in a direction.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Bivins if he was ready for a motion.

Mr. Bivins said he was.

Mr. Randolph moved to recommend denial of ZMA201900004 Breezy Hill for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Ms. More seconded the motion to deny, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Mr. Bivins said the Commission recommended denial of the proposal that came back to them to the Board



of Supervisors. He said perhaps this will be a project that goes before the Board, and that staff and the applicant would know this. He said that evening, the proposal laid out before the Commission with the changed conditions and proffers was being recommended “no” and they were not supporting this project.

Ms. Firehock said she wanted to clarify that normally when a Planning Commissioner votes “no,” they should state the reasons for their denial. She said she had simply voted no, but that she was going with the same reasons that Mr. Randolph espoused in his motion. She said she believed this was assumed, but wanted to make sure, as this is important.

Mr. Bivins said the Commission has been following the tradition that when each Commissioner supports a motion that comes before them, they are supporting the motion and explanation that comes forth in the motion. He said he believed they are doing that, and that for anyone who has read or listened to their meetings over the course of the number of times that this application has been before them, no Commissioner said they were changing their opinion or position from what they stated at the previous public meeting. He said he believed what Ms. Firehock had said was well understood and that she was in the same company as all the Commissioners in this decision.

### **Committee Reports**

Mr. Keller said Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) met the prior week, and there were two items that he thinks would be of interested to the Commissioners. He said they can find out more about this by going to the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission (TJPDC) website, then to the Greater Rivanna River subsite.

Mr. Keller said the first item was about looking at the Smart Scale transportation process to add more citizen involvement but at the same time, if the Commission remembered the kerfuffle about one of the projects that was out of sync with the Commissioners and counselors, taking a look at the full process to make sure the timeline works well. He said he did not believe this would affect the next round, which is currently underway, but would affect the one after that.

Mr. Keller said the second item, which has been alluded to by nearly every Commissioner at some point, is a study that VDOT undertook with a consultant to look at two pedestrian/bicycle Rivanna River crossings in the greater Woolen Mills area, or from Free Bridge to past the Woolen Mills area. He said originally, he understood there were six proposed crossings that were considered, and VDOT actually narrowed this to two: one that is an extension of Chesapeake Street across and up to the State Farm area, and the other going from the Woolen Mills area to a small island and going across from there.

Mr. Keller said a rough conceptual design was done through cost estimates, and they then held a public participation Zoom meeting that was very well attended, with over 60 participants. He said he attended as well, as well as some things with the Rivanna Trail that had been offshoots of the TJPDC that he thought were all relevant to his and Mr. Clayborne’s positions as the Commission’s representatives on the Rivanna River Study, Phase 3.

Mr. Keller said for details, he would encourage Commissioners to visit the TJPDC website for both of those items.

Mr. Bivins said he thought he saw a bridge behind Woolen Mills. He said he was there for a tape cutting, and there is a bridge that goes behind the renovated buildings to the back.

Mr. Keller said there is a Moores Creek crossing that has not been opened to the public, and perhaps Mr. Rapp or Mr. McDermott could explain why.

Mr. Bivins noted he did not go on the bridge or trespass, as he saw the tape on it.

Mr. Rapp said Mr. Bivins was correct that there is a bridge back there. He said there is still some permitting

that needs to be accomplished before it is officially opened to the public for use.

Mr. Keller added that for anyone who has not been to the Woolen Mills building, which has one restaurant open, it is a nice experience for those who have people they want to be with, but can distance in that outside space and still enjoy good food.

Ms. Firehock said the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Committee met that day, and the committee will primarily be considering the projects for the next two-year period rather than a five-year period because they are trying to make some adaptations based on COVID-19 and the fact that the County is not currently proposing to raise the property tax rate in light of the pandemic. She said it is an eye-opening experience, and they did not make any decisions that day, but were talking about ways to try to accommodate as many projects as possible. She said they will be meeting again for another two-hour session in a couple of weeks.

### **Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: November 18, 2020**

Mr. Rapp said at the previous week's Board meeting, there were no public hearings from development applications or other Community Development items. He said therefore, there was nothing new to report.

### **Old/New Business**

Mr. Rapp said he has put together a draft meeting schedule for special meetings and work sessions for the 2021 calendar year.

Mr. Rapp noted that the Planning Commission for the following Tuesday, December 1, has been canceled, as there were a few applications that asked for deferral as they work out some additional items.

Mr. Rapp said there would be a joint work session between the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors on December 8 to talk about the housing policy, as requested by the Commission and Board.

Mr. Rapp said he attached the 2021 meeting schedule, using a similar approach as has been done in years past. He said for the most part, there will be meetings on the first and third Tuesdays of each month, with a work session on the second Tuesday of each month and the fourth Tuesday off and the exceptions of holidays and months that might have an extra weekend. He asked for the Commission to look at this before officially putting the calendar out to the public.

Mr. Bivins said the Commission typically adopts the calendar at their first meeting of the year, and so they had a month before getting there. He asked the Commissioners if they know they are definitely going to be away on a particular date, to let staff know sooner than later, recognizing they are still in an extraordinarily fluid time. He said the Commission will adopt the calendar at their first meeting of 2021, on January 12.

In closing, Mr. Bivins said this had been a good meeting. He said they dealt with what he thought were some important and difficult issues, and thanked the Commission and staff for their work and attention to all the details. He said if there were still people from the community listening to the meeting, he wanted to thank them for their thoughtful comments and for feeling free enough to share their thoughts with the Commission. He said they actually were read and digested, and as seen that evening, they helped inform the Commission's decision and discussion.

**Items for Follow-Up**

There were no items.

**Adjournment**

At 7:31 p.m., the Commission adjourned to December 8, 2020, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



---

Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 12/15/2020
Initials: CSS