

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
Final Minutes January 14, 2025**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, January 14, 2025, at 4:00 p.m.

Members attending: Fred Missel; Luis Carrazana; Corey Clayborne; Julian Bivins; and Karen Firehock, Lonnie Murray.

Members absent: Nathan Moore.

Other officials present were Michael Barnes, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Bill Fritz, Development Process Manager; Syd Shoaf, Senior Planner; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to order and Establish Quorum

Michael Barnes, Director of Planning, said that he would be presiding over the meeting for the election of the Chair this evening. He said that following the election, he would pass the gavel to the newly elected Chair, who would conduct the rest of the meeting. He said that he would also like to recognize their Interim County Attorney, Andy Herrick, and the Clerk to the Planning Commission, Carolyn Shaffer. He said that the second item on their agenda was the public comment portion, which he would like to move, provided there was no objection from any Commission members. He said that he would like to move to schedule the public comment portion for after the scheduled public hearing, which was currently item number seven on the agenda.

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Barnes established a quorum.

Public Hearings

SP202400018 Charlottesville Community Church

Syd Shoaf, Senior Planner, said that he would be presenting staff's recommendations for Special Use Permit SP202400018 Charlottesville Community Church. He said that this permit seeks to allow religious assembly use for up to 500 seats. He said that the subject property, located at 26 Pebble Drive, south of Charlottesville, was 6.81 acres and zoned R1 Residential. He said that Pebble Drive was accessed via Scottsville Road, or Route 20. He said that 26 Pebble Drive served as the subject parcel, as well as the parcel to the rear, which was TMP 90-35F. He said that the comprehensive plan designates it as Office/R/Flex/Light Industrial.

Mr. Shoaf said that the adjacent parcels to the north were part of the Avinity Estates Subdivision, zoned Planned Residential Development PRD). He said that the parcels to the rear and south were zoned R1 Residential, each containing a single-family residence. He said that the adjacent parcel to the west was zoned Light Industrial and were home to Martin Roofing. He said that to the east, across Route 20, the parcels were zoned Rural Areas. He said that the site currently featured an existing single-family residence and a detached garage. He said that Pebble Drive served both the subject property and the rear parcel, with a 50-foot private right-of-way.

Mr. Shoaf said that the site's topography was sloped, with steep slopes managed, and it was located within the entrance corridor overlay district. He said that the applicant would provide

further details on their proposal, but he would provide a general overview. He said that this special use permit seeks to allow religious assembly use for up to 500 seats, with three distinct envelopes: a building-parking envelope, a building envelope, and an open space amenity area.

Mr. Shoaf said that in addition to the proposed landscape buffers around the property's boundary lines, the applicant is also seeking to relocate and reconstruct the existing Pebble Drive to better suit the topography near Scottsville Road. He said that a 10-foot shared use path was proposed along the frontage of the property, and there was also a potential location for a 10-foot shared use path or a 5-foot primitive trail to the Avinity Estates subdivision, pending approval from the Avinity Estates Homeowners Association (HOA).

Mr. Shoaf said that the streets within the Avinity Estates neighborhood were private streets, so it was up to their discretion as to how it was used. He said that the special use permit was reviewed under the factors for consideration outlined in the zoning ordinance. He said that staff believed that, with the proposed conditions, the special use permit would not harm adjacent parcels, would not alter the character of the nearby area, and would remain in harmony with the R1 Residential zoning district, and was consistent with the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Shoaf said that there were six total conditions for this proposal. He said that the first condition required development to be in general accord with the provided concept plan, including the location of proposed building envelopes, parking envelopes, open space envelopes, and landscape buffers. He said that the second condition limited the area of assembly to a maximum of 500 seats. He said that conditions three, four, and five related to transportation improvements on the site.

Mr. Shoaf said that the sixth condition, which was bolded, would be filled in with a date five years after its approval by the Board of Supervisors. He said that overall, there were two positive aspects: the use was consistent with the review criteria for special use permits in the zoning ordinance, and it was also consistent with the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods Master Plan. He said that staff had no concerns and recommended approval with the conditions as outlined in the staff report. He said that he was happy to answer any questions from the Commission.

Ms. Firehock said that on the path that would be constructed by Route 20, she assumed it did not connect to any existing paths on either side, as the other parcels did not have that path.

Mr. Shoaf said that was correct at this point. He said that there was no path on Avinity Estates or the single-family residence to the south. He said that there was a path located two parcels over, which was the Kappa Sigma site, which had been recommended for approval by the PC earlier last year.

Ms. Firehock said that on Route 20, on the other side of the road, there appeared to be a development that ends abruptly in a slope that does not connect to the other side of the road. She said that she would appreciate Mr. Shoaf's insight on whether he believed this path could potentially connect topographically in the future. She said that although he was currently using a laser level to assess the situation, she would value his opinion based on his visit to the site.

Mr. Shoaf said that was the County's goal. He said that they aimed to establish a network along Route 20, as outlined in their long-range plans. He said that if this project was approved and they proceeded to the site plan phase, they would begin examining the engineering and grading necessary to create a connection between this site and adjacent parcels, making it feasible to link them.

Ms. Firehock said that her next comment was a quick check-in for the public. She said that the building envelope referred to the area on one side of the parcel where the building would be constructed, but it did not include the actual building itself.

Mr. Shoaf said that that was correct. He said that it was the area in which staff was willing to allow the proposed buildings to be constructed. He said that he hoped they would not build a two-acre building. He said that provided was the illustrative plan, and it served as an example of what this development may look like if it were to be approved.

Mr. Bivins said that to follow up on his colleague's question about the sidewalk, he would like to reiterate a point he had made before. He said that he had previously expressed concern that why they would build a sidewalk if it was never going to be connected to anything. He said that his question was, why do they ask applicants to build a sidewalk to nowhere on both sides? He said that he believed it did not make sense. He said that the Avinity people had already stated that they did not want the project in that location, citing concerns about flooding, and that they would not build a path there. He said that similarly, Martin Roofing would definitely not put a sidewalk on their property.

Ms. Firehock said that it was a very steep entrance. She said that they must violate the slope ordinance to install it.

Mr. Bivins said that his point was that if there was a sidewalk to nowhere, it raised questions about why they were asking them to install it. He said that he had another question. He said that on page three, at the top, it stated that the project narrative proposed a facility not to exceed 55,000 square feet. He said that he was unclear about the total square footage of the three buildings in the plan. He said that he wondered if the total of 55,000 square feet was the combined area of all three buildings, or if that was the maximum size for the facility. He said that on the agenda, it mentioned 13,100 square feet.

Mr. Shoaf said that he did not have the agenda in front of him that had the 13,100 feet.

Mr. Bivins said that on the agenda, under SP202200012, it stated that they were allowed to build a 13,000-square foot building. He said that however, the staff report indicated that the actual building size was 55,000 square feet, which included all three buildings. He said that he was simply asking if that allowance was for all three buildings, as that would make sense to him.

Mr. Shoaf said that he was reviewing the agenda provided here, but he was still not seeing the specific item he was looking for. He said that the numbers mentioned reminded him of SP 20200012, which had been presented to the Planning Commission in December. He said that he believed the 13,000 square feet was the building size for that specific project. He said that it was not listed in the materials provided.

Mr. Missel said that it was a different agenda.

Ms. Firehock said that the agenda that was emailed and the one that was printed might be different.

Mr. Bivins said that he assumed it was an editorial change. He asked if they were at 55,000 square feet across all three of the buildings.

Mr. Shoaf said that yes. He said that they did not condition the building size, which was noted in the narrative provided by the applicant. He said that the applicant could provide further detail about whether it was one specific building or the total across all buildings.

Mr. Missel opened the public hearing. He asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Scott Collins said that he was representing the Charlottesville Community Church for this application. He said that the site was 6.98 acres, which meant that it could be suitable for by-right solar panels. He said that this was a unique project for him; typically, he presented to the Planning Commission on projects in rural areas, discussing traffic, impacts, noise, and other concerns. He said that tonight, he had the opportunity to discuss a church project within the development area, which was ideal since the congregation was already located there. He said that the church had owned the property for about a year, currently residing 500 yards away at the Mountainside View School.

Mr. Collins said that they were excited to establish a permanent residence, believing it would help their church grow and expand as desired. He said that being within the same vicinity area was a significant advantage. He said that he would like to discuss the property's history, as it played a role in the site's challenges. He said that he would briefly outline it. He said that this property was originally part of the Avinity development in 2013, when the rezoning for the second phase was approved. He said that it was initially a single-family residence, intended to be combined with the Avinity Estates rezoning.

Mr. Collins said that the property's owner who was elderly and ill, was selling the property with the intention of using it to pay medical bills and provide for her family later. He said that she passed away soon after they had the property under contract to be incorporated into the rezoning, and her son decided to keep it. He said that the property was removed from the rezoning, and it remained a rural property. He said that the son lived there for a while before moving on. He said that now, they were ready to sell the property, and he had worked with several builders on this site, finding it to be very challenging in terms of topography.

Mr. Collins said that one of the biggest challenges was access from Route 20, as it was a heavily trafficked road with a significant amount of traffic coming from both directions. He said that adding a left turn lane, in particular, was costly and could be a significant barrier to development. He said that this was why few residential developments had been built in this area, as the costs of infrastructure improvements along Route 20 were difficult to justify. He said that when the church acquired this property, it presented a unique and feasible opportunity.

Mr. Collins said that the site was not subject to the same traffic patterns as other areas, as it was not located at peak PM or AM hours, eliminating the need for a left turn lane. He said that to address the need for deceleration, a right turn lane was being considered, which would allow for safe entry into the site. He said that he would show a few pictures to give a better understanding of the terrain of the property. He said that currently, the site was quite steep, with a significant incline from Route 20 to the back of the property.

Mr. Collins said that the house at the rear of the site was barely visible, and the terrain made it difficult to access. He said that the existing Pebble Drive, which served the house and adjacent property, was also a challenge due to its steep grade. He said that the right-of-way for this driveway was owned by the property, but its steepness presented a logistical hurdle. He said that going back to the original picture, it was clear that there was no suitable landing at the intersection with Route 20, especially when considering the low-volume commercial entrance and turn lane.

Mr. Collins said that to meet the speed limit requirements at this intersection, a landing was necessary, and then the road must tie in with the existing grade, which was steep and not particularly inviting, especially for a church. He said that they had reviewed the possibility of modifying the roadway, and it appeared that the road would need to veer into the site, allowing

for a longer roadway to be built as it approached the site. He said that this design enabled them to create a landing at Route 20 and bring the road up to grade, where it could then tie back into existing Pebble Drive, which flattened out as it approached the site.

Mr. Collins said that their goal was to make this transition more inviting. He said that as shown in this scenario, the edge of the new road was essentially on the edge of Pebble Drive. He said that they were working to incorporate the road and build it from the landscape strip out to their site. He said that next was another picture, showing the road's approach to the top of the site, where it became flatter. He said that this illustrated the concept of establishing an edge and building the road out in this way.

Mr. Collins said that a significant aspect of this project would be the buffer between the development and Avinity Estates. He said that he had included this original approved plan for the Avinity Estates development plan, which was a PRD. He said that he would point out that the buffer was set up with a proposed 8-foot wooden fence, 5 feet into the property, and landscaping was intended to go between the fence and the property line, featuring significant landscaping screening with evergreen and deciduous trees. He said that deciduous trees were spaced about every 25 feet, with evergreen trees staggered in between.

Mr. Collins said that this buffer plan had been proposed for the Avinity Estates five to six years ago. He said that the next image was an example that illustrated what actually existed on the property. He said that if that buffer had been installed, the property would have been more screened from the Avinity Estates development, and vice versa. He said that the Avinity Estates development, which had been completed five to seven years ago, had been experiencing issues with what had been promised. He said that this should be rectified and updated. He said that he wanted to bring this to the Commission's attention.

Mr. Collins said that regarding the pedestrian pathway along Route 20, he had developed projects in the area, including Spring Hill, Avinity Estates, and Galaxie Farms. He said that all of these projects had pedestrian pathways in front of them. He said that the ultimate goal was to create a pedestrian connection between Mill Creek and the area where Avon Street tied back into Route 20, forming a pedestrian pathway network. He said that he agreed that if a pathway was not needed or connected to other existing paths, it may not be necessary to build it.

Mr. Collins said that perhaps the condition could be imposed that the church would build the pathway if or when asked, across the frontage where it tied into other properties. He said that ultimately, the idea was that these old properties would be developed, redeveloped, and a pathway would be created, with the County potentially filling in any gaps. He said that they would be happy to go either way on that one. He said that they had reviewed the conditions and accepted them. He said that they were here to discuss and answer any other questions regarding this request.

Mr. Bivins said that if he understood correctly, the applicant was not required to plant trees eight feet off the fence. He said that it would be the responsibility of Avinity's. He said that he wondered how the applicant would go about getting those trees planted.

Ms. Firehock asked if it was included in the Avinity site plan to have that landscaping, therefore they were in violation and should be made to put it in.

Mr. Missel asked if it was part of the approved site plan.

Mr. Collins said that it was part of the approved site plan. He said that he was showing the plan from the approved site plan.

Mr. Bivins said that the applicant would then have a course of action to get some trees planted.

Ms. Firehock said that it was not this applicant's job to enforce it.

Mr. Shoaf said that that was correct. He said that Mr. Collins had shown that it was part of the approved final site plan for the Avinity Estates subdivision. He said that he was currently looking at it. He said that the plan included a six-foot landscaping and maintenance easement along the property line. He said that an eight-foot wooden privacy fence was to be installed eight feet from the property line.

Ms. Firehock said that the County could make them conform to that plan.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had a question regarding the stormwater management facility. He asked if it was planned to be a wet pond. He said that the playground was right there and there was no fencing on the project.

Mr. Collins said that that particular feature was actually a dry pond, consisting of a dry grass swale that filled with water during rainfall and drained slowly over a 24-hour period. He said that it was not intended to be a wet pond adjacent to the playground facility. He said that instead, they were proposing a couple of water quality swales, similar to those seen at JPJ, within the parking lot between parking spaces. He said that these swales would help treat the water as it flowed from the upper part of the parking lot and then drain down to that spot for additional detention purposes.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there would be no situation where on a Sunday, after it had rained on Saturday, and children were playing in the playground, resulting in a three-year-old falling into a pond of water.

Mr. Collins said that most of those would drain out over a 12-hour period, so that situation would not occur.

Mr. Clayborne said that in terms of parking, he would like to know if they were exploring any alternative solutions beyond a sea of asphalt, such as pervious surfaces or other options.

Mr. Collins said that they would definitely consider the overall composition of the parking lot as part of their evaluation. He said that they were looking at incorporating swales to capture drainage, which would help break up the asphalt and provide some landscaping between the parking spaces.

Mr. Clayborne said that he believed he had read that there would be lighting in the parking lot as well. He said that as for the recreation field, he wondered if there was lighting available there as well.

Mr. Collins said that no, there would not be lighting on the recreation field.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there needed to be a condition to make sure that did not happen.

Mr. Shoaf asked if the question was whether there would be lighting on the recreation field.

Mr. Clayborne said that yes, he was wondering if at any point someone could put up stadium lights.

Mr. Shoaf said that they did have a lighting ordinance that would need to be followed, so if this project got approved and moved to the final site plan, their lighting ordinance would apply. He said that since the parcel was also within the entrance corridor, the ARB would review this as well and it must adhere to their guidelines.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had one final question. He said that he was wondering if the building would be powered by a generator, or if that was not a consideration. He said that given the increasing frequency of power outages and resiliency efforts, he wondered if this facility could serve as a community gathering place in the event of a prolonged power outage, such as during the winter months.

Mr. Collins said that was not a bad idea, but it was not something they would make a condition of. He said that as the church evolved, although he could not see it becoming a part of the phase one plan, it could potentially be included in phase two and three. He said that this was going to be a multi-phase project, with at least three or four phases. He said that he would definitely consider when adding a gymnasium towards the end, that would be an excellent thing to have.

Mr. Bivins asked if 55,000 square feet was inclusive of all the buildings.

Mr. Collins said that yes, that was for the whole facility.

Mr. Missel said that besides the plantings that were not existing but should be there, he would like to know if the applicant was planning on planting in the 12-foot landscaping buffer that runs along that border.

Mr. Collins said that they were, yes, considering the possibility that if they did disturb certain portions of it, they could return and landscape those areas afterwards.

Mr. Missel said that Mr. Carrazana had helped him understand this, but he would like to confirm. He said that as they moved along the planned alignment of Pebble Drive, there was a white gap between the building's parking envelope and the building envelope after the curve.

Mr. Collins said that that was part of the existing 25-foot right-of-way.

Mr. Missel said that he was wondering if it would be possible to move the alignment of the existing Pebble Drive, shifting it down so that it was adjacent to the building and parking envelope.

Ms. Firehock said that they would then have more room for a buffer.

Mr. Collins said that it was possible, but the way the current building was functioning suggested that they would like a small gap between the building and the existing grading. He said that they also had some grading issues to address. He said that while there were many factors at play, including the building envelope, grading, and road layout, their goal was to minimize the grading along the edge of the building. He said that however, there would still be a significant amount of grading between the building and the road that they would need to work through.

Mr. Missel said that he was considering the possibility that if they needed the envelope for building envelope purposes, they would have pushed it to the edge of Pebble Drive. He said that the fact that they had not done so with the parking envelope suggested that there may be some flexibility in the current configuration.

Mr. Collins said that to clarify, the grades between the proposed building and Pebble Drive could be as much as eight to six feet. He said that therefore, the building could not be placed directly

there due to the significant grading required. He said that this grading would result in the area being green, but it would be occupied to accommodate the necessary slopes without installing too many retaining walls, which they were trying to minimize.

Mr. Missel asked if they had completed a grading plan yet.

Mr. Collins said that they had done a conceptual plan, but it was not finalized.

Mr. Bivins said that he wanted to know if that plan would address or handle some of the concerns raised by the neighbors regarding the potential for water to flow onto their properties.

Mr. Collins said that it appeared that nearly all the water on the site drained down to Route 20, as could be seen on the site itself. He said that there was limited drainage over that area.

Mr. Bivins asked if there would not be as much shifting over to those last units near the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Collins said that no; the drainage will be going in a southward direction, not northward.

Mr. Missel asked if they would be grading in the 12-foot landscape buffer.

Mr. Collins said that on the northern side, there may be some grading that extends there. He said that they were trying to minimize the grading as much as possible to preserve as many of the existing trees as they could. He said that however, there may be one or two spots where they needed to grade, and in those cases, they would replant trees.

Mr. Missel asked if any members of the public wished to address this item.

Laura Sugg said that she resided in Avinity Estates on Moffett Street, right by the cul-de-sac. She said that she had lived in Albemarle County for over 13 years, including four years at the University of Virginia. She said that as a long-time resident, she was speaking on behalf of herself. She said that she was pleased to hear about the church's presence. She said that the church was not a NIMBY issue, but the NIMBY situation was about the road's location and the buffer.

Ms. Sugg said that looking closely, it could be seen that the area was occupied by townhouses with decks. She said that the noise from the gravel driveway, which was currently unpaved and noisy, was a significant issue. She said that she was aware that the road would be paved, and the landscape would not provide sufficient sound buffering. She said that in the winter, the lack of visual screening would also be a problem. She said that as someone who would be looking at the athletic field, she was concerned about the impact on her neighbors, who would be exposed to parking lot lights. She said that if it was possible, relocating the road would be the most suitable solution.

Ms. Sugg said that there were 21 homes purchased at a higher price due to their location, although she acknowledged that things changed, and she was sure the church would be a good neighbor. She said that the privacy fence did not go all the way down; she had no privacy fence behind her home. She said that she had some scraggly trees and this gravel road. She said that if the road could not be moved, she suggested that the church consider building a tall sound fence to provide both visual and sound buffering on the other side of the buffer zone. She said that she was not aware of what Avinity and Stanley Martin had agreed to in the past, but she did know that their four houses lacked a privacy fence, and the existing fences above were not effective.

Ms. Sugg said that while trees were aesthetically pleasing, they did not provide adequate sound barriers. She said that the current situation would change dramatically, as it would go from a few cars passing by a house to hundreds of cars on a Sunday morning, and potentially on Wednesday nights as well. She said that she hoped that the church had a busy schedule, as that would help mitigate the issue. She said that she kindly requested that either the road be relocated, which she understood was a significant ask, or that the church be required to build a tall, soundproof privacy fence. She said that addressing the light pollution issue was crucial, as it affected the neighborhood's quality of life.

Mr. Missel closed the public hearing.

Mr. Bivins said that there was intended to be a fence in that area. He said that one of the questions was whether the public commentor who was still awake should be working with Avinity to install the fence where it should be and replant the trees where they should have been. He said that it appeared that this was not this applicant's responsibility.

Mr. Missel said that he was also going to ask whether the fence required as part of the Avinity site plan extended all the way down to the end of that cul-de-sac. He said that he was not aware if they had access to that plan.

Mr. Shoaf said that yes, he could display that on the screen.

Mr. Carrazana said that he wanted to follow up on that question to staff. He asked if that was an issue that the County could move forward with, or would the County require a formal complaint from Avinity residents in order to enforce that.

Mr. Bivins said that the complaining did not help in Esmont, where he witnessed an illegal garage operation that was taking place, which was clearly a violation.

Ms. Firehock said that a zoning inspector would enforce that, not Mr. Shoaf. She said that they should receive an answer tonight about whether someone could evaluate the situation.

Mr. Barnes said that it was zoning versus the site plan that already had a bond.

Bart Svoboda, Deputy Director of Community Development and Zoning Administrator, said that it had been duly noted. He said that they would review the site plan to determine if it was a violation. He said that there were some grade changes there, but without reviewing the plan, he was unsure how far down the fence extended and what requirements were in place. He said that they would investigate this further. He said that to Mr. Bivins, they could discuss the garage in Esmont, as he believed that issue had been resolved. He said that they paid attention to the Commission's concerns and strived to have a robust enforcement program, although opinions may vary depending on the perspective of the complainant. He said that they would look into this matter and conduct research to determine if there was a potential site plan violation.

Ms. Firehock said that if Avinity had an HOA, it seemed like something that should be brought to their attention internally. She said that it seemed like they had solved that issue.

Mr. Missel said that he had a question regarding the staff report. He said that upon reviewing it, he did not see a condition specified for the 12-foot landscape buffer.

Mr. Shoaf said that this site was zoned R1 Residential, which meant that landscaping buffers were not required for R1 residential districts. He said that if this were a commercial site, a 20-foot use buffer would be required, preventing them from grading the site. He said that instead, they

would need to provide plantings to meet the buffer requirement. He said that if this proposal was approved, they could discuss landscaping requirements in the site plan stage. He said that at that point, they could review and ensure that the proposed plants were part of their approved plant list.

Mr. Bivins said that regarding condition #4, he would like to know if it was possible to have language to require connection at the appropriate time.

He said that he would like to push back a bit on that point. He said that he observed in areas like Crozet and other places where they had struggled to get sidewalks in. He said that if sidewalks were not included in the development at the outset, they were rarely added later. He said that he wondered if not including sidewalks in the current design might be creating a barrier to future development of sidewalks.

Mr. Bivins said that he was not suggesting that the sidewalk should not be located there. He said that he was simply wondering if it could be reserved or set aside for a specific purpose.

Ms. Firehock said that the area could be reserved and would be added at a later time when there was sufficient connectivity to support it.

Mr. Bivins said that he appreciated what he was saying, and he agreed that in his previous applications in Crozet, he had expressed similar concerns. He said that in particular, he was looking at a certain road, which appeared to have a brewery on it, but he was not sure of the exact name. He said that it was clear that until the Acme Files property was developed, there was no clear plan for sidewalks. He said that as a result, it seemed unnecessary to require people to create sidewalks. He said that if they were to do all of these projects at once, it would be more efficient. He said that in this case, he thought it would take several years before a sidewalk was installed here.

Ms. Firehock said that upon reviewing the aerials, it became clear that the proposed path would be impossible to create, as it would require demolishing the buildings on Avinity's site to make way for it. She said that the path would then need to navigate through the church and the wrecking service next door.

Mr. Murray said that a bike lane in that area would provide a solution for the existing traffic of bicycles on that road. He said that it would allow them to divert traffic off the road for a little while, providing a safer and more efficient alternative.

Mr. Bivins said that what he was suggesting was to give the applicant the opportunity to come up with a solution that worked for today, while reserving the space for potential future development when they were able to connect it up.

Ms. Firehock in the meantime, it could be a good opportunity to incorporate some landscaping, such as bushes or other plants, which would be less obtrusive than the existing asphalt. She said that if she looked at this area, she would see another example of a 10-foot-wide path of asphalt that was quite ugly and served no purpose. She said that it ran into a hill and was never going to be built. She said that there were no connections, and it was simply unattractive. She would much prefer to see some trees or greenery in that area.

Mr. Bivins said that even a small addition for bicycles would be acceptable.

Ms. Firehock said that space should be reserved for a future pedestrian connection when the connections to adjacent properties become possible.

Mr. Herrick said that it could be reserved for dedication upon demand of the County.

Mr. Shoaf said that he had a clarification question regarding the shared use path along Scottsville Road. He said that condition #4 referred to a pedestrian path from that shared use path along Scottsville Road into the site to connect to the future church facilities.

Mr. Bivins said that it was a 10-foot shared use path along Scottsville Road, connecting the path to the property, specifically the section that was colored brown.

Mr. Shoaf said that that was condition #3.

Mr. Bivins motioned that the Planning Commission update condition #3 as stated in the staff report to reserve the space for dedication upon demand of the County for a future pedestrian connection when the connections became possible. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Moore was absent.)

Adjournment

At 10:20 p.m. the Commission adjourned to January 28, 2025, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, Lane Auditorium.



Michael Barnes, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 02/25/2025
Initials: CSS