

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes November 14, 2023**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, November 14, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Corey Clayborne, Chair; Fred Missel, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Luis Carrazana; Lonnie Murray; and Karen Firehock (participating remotely);

Members absent: none

Other officials present were: Kevin McDermott, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Tori Kanellopoulos; Ben Holt; Rebecca Ragsdale; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum.

Mr. Clayborne stated that Ms. Firehock was requesting to participate remotely.

Ms. Firehock stated that she was located in Howardsville, Virginia, and she was requesting to participate remotely due to an illness.

Mr. Murray motioned that the Commission allow Ms. Firehock to participate remotely. Mr. Moore second the motion, which carried unanimously (6 – 0).

Public Hearings

ZMA202300004 Cornerstone Community Church

Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager, said that this item was a proposed rezoning involved changing the property from R1 residential to commercial use. She said that to orient them, the property was on Stony Point Road. She said that it was across from Riverside Village and adjoined commercial properties to the south. She said that residential areas with Wilton, Avemore, and Cascadian nearby were to the east, while Darden Towe and the Elks Lodge were directly to the north.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the next slide was an overview of the property's location and aerial view of the surrounding area, which had been developed with mixed-use properties like Riverside Village across the street. She said that County park land now existed along the southern edge of the property, and there was a stream buffer. She said that there were three existing structures: a garage storage building, an existing home, and a carport. She said that currently, there were two existing entrances, but only one entrance would be proposed when the property developed.

Ms. Ragsdale said that one of the other existing conditions to discuss that evening was the limits of the floodplain when the rezoning for this property was proposed in the past. She said that at that time, the floodplain line was shown in red on their official maps. She said that the parcel was

outlined in a pie shape. She said that however, these were changing or anticipated to change with new FEMA mapping. She said that this property would not actually be within the floodplain, but the 100-foot stream buffer for the stream would remain in place.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the property was zoned R1, surrounded by commercial and residential areas in brown. She said that the dark green area represented the mixed-use development, Riverside Village, which had up to 36,000 square feet of commercial space that was approved and located along the road. She said that with recent history in mind, a minimum and maximum were established for this area. She said that the maximum remained unchanged, but the minimum was reduced.

Ms. Ragsdale said that this proposal involved a 3.5-acre parcel where the applicants intended to initially use the space for religious assembly seating up to 300 people, and may also consider other commercial uses in the future. She said that there were some setback issues that would be discussed and outlined in the report. She said that the next slide depicted the Pantops master plan, and indicated that the portion highlighted in orange represented urban density residential areas, which anticipated non-residential uses as well.

Ms. Ragsdale clarified that this designation was the same as Riverside Village across the way. She noted that the private open space, or green area, was not clearly visible in the legend, but followed the current limits of the floodplain. She said that the applicant likely had a number of illustrative slides and detailed information about their plans for using the site. She said that in the concept plan, a building envelope had been proposed in gray, which generally aligned with what they would develop on the property. She said that the existing buildings were visible beneath it.

Ms. Ragsdale said that along the edge of the gray area was the required 50-foot building setback line required in commercial districts. She said that currently, were several encroachments, and concurrent special exceptions had been granted to allow this structure to be as close as 28.5 feet from the property line.

Ms. Ragsdale said that another structure, at approximately 47.5 feet, also encroached on the setback area. She said that the setback for the other structure would be removed. She explained that the tan areas represented parking envelopes, while the green area was a 100-foot stream buffer with commitments for replanting and removing existing gravel.

Ms. Ragsdale mentioned that they had received considerable feedback regarding the site's potential development and uses, with concerns related to traffic and the types of establishments that may be built there. She provided a list of the types of uses that would be permitted, stating that these were consistent with the master plan and anticipated uses for non-residential areas in this location. She compared them to what was approved for Riverside Village and found them quite similar in terms of what is allowed by right.

Ms. Ragsdale stated that these proffers only applied to by-right uses and they did not limit special use permit uses. She said that potentially, this allowed not only religious assembly use but also other by-right options for the church. She said that for example, if the parcel remained R1, a special use permit would be required specifically for religious assembly and another one for child daycare centers.

Ms. Ragsdale said that rezoning to commercial allowed those to be by right. She said that the commercial district also allowed residential uses by special use permit, providing additional options in terms of uses. She said that the initial application was reviewed, proposing 13,500

square feet of commercial uses in addition to the religious assembly use. She said that the initial trip generation data was provided, and there were no concerns regarding traffic or potential commercial uses. She said that they understood that religious assembly uses typically occurred during off-peak hours.

Ms. Ragsdale said that as indicated in the staff report, they supported the request, finding it consistent with the recommendations of the master plan and the character of the area, particularly with similar development across the street. She acknowledged the commercial development across the street and addressed the issues currently in place, such as setback encroachment. She said that the FEMA map had not officially changed, and she said that they would not support development or parking in the floodplain, which was a major issue with the prior rezoning.

Mr. Murray asked if Ms. Ragsdale had an explanation for the reasons the FEMA designation would change.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she was not an engineer, so she could not speak to the modeling behind it. She said that however, the County Engineer had reviewed this and did not anticipate any significant changes from the preliminary FEMA maps currently available. She said that an engineer representing the applicant may provide additional details on this matter.

Mr. Missel said that his question was the same. He said that he presumed that the reason must be due to the presence of the road, as it had not been updated since its construction.

Ms. Ragsdale said that there were also changes to the map, including the development of Riverside Village since the previous maps.

Mr. Missel said that he had one question that may be more appropriate for the applicant. He said that regarding the alignment mentioned as going down to one access point, he asked if it would align with the street across the way.

Ms. Ragsdale said that they anticipated that with the site plan.

Mr. Missel said that he did not notice anything in the plan that required it, but maybe that was not a rezoning issue.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she pointed out several issues where the necessary details would be included in the site plan, and she was satisfied with the current state of affairs. She said that the focus shifted from the concept plan, which required rezoning, to awaiting the site plan for further resolution.

Mr. McDermott said that typically, that was a requirement came from VDOT that they aligned those two. He said that this aspect would be assessed during the site plan stage.

Mr. Bivins said that in the narrative provided by the applicant, they mentioned using the house as a parsonage. He asked if it proceeded to C1, whether a residence would be permitted.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she turned to the Zoning Administrator because they had not yet addressed that question. She said there was a provision in the commercial districts for a dwelling if it was occupied by a caretaker or employee. She said that they would need to discuss this further.

Mr. Bivins said that if the residence operated as a parsonage, which was the home of a church employee such as a minister, then it should be acceptable in the commercial zoning district.

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to gain some clarification for his own understanding. He asked if it was correct that a 20-foot buffer was acceptable for current residential use, but for commercial use, it was already included at 50 feet.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she could explain that in more detail. She said that there was a 50-foot setback for structures, and a 20-foot use buffer, also known as a screening area within the ordinance. She said that these measures would be implemented to ensure adequate distance and privacy. She said that the focus was on addressing setback encroachments.

Mr. Moore said that he understood, and that it was an existing building. He said that he remembered reading about a rezoning request for a childcare center in the area several years ago, which had been rejected. He asked what the reasoning for that ruling was.

Ms. Ragsdale said that there were several distinctions between this proposal and the previous one. She believed that there was more detail in this proposal and a greater analysis concerning the proffers and traffic analysis. She said that the floodplain was a significant factor in these matters. She noted that some items were left unaddressed when it reached the Board of Supervisors, such as the setback issue not being addressed when applying for the special exception.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had one question, which may also serve as public knowledge. He said that if he recalled correctly from the packet, there was a list of acceptable uses under C1 with some items struck out. He said that hypothetically speaking, if they assumed that the church receives a new building elsewhere and vacates it. He asked if Ms. Ragsdale could discuss the checks and balances in place if one of those uses, which were not stricken from the packet, becomes available. He asked what measures would be taken to address community displeasure with such a use.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the failure to eliminate the use could potentially allow it in the future if not checked out. She said that the proposal left some aspects undefined, particularly regarding a 300-seat church's specificity. She said that the concept plan had less detail than expected, providing flexibility for various uses. She said that since the community meeting and review of this rezoning, they had carefully considered the remaining items on the list and received feedback. She said that if there was uncertainty about other uses on the list, that would be the time for the public to express their concerns. She said that staff would then revisit the list with the applicant regarding proffers and concept plans before the public hearing with the Board.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Kendra Moon stated that she was representing Cornerstone Community Church with Line + Grade Engineering. She said that since 1933, Cornerstone had been in existence and currently had over 100 members. She said that the church did not have a permanent home and they temporarily hosted their services at the Regal Cinemas movie theater. She said that tonight, they were there to discuss the rezoning of this property along Sony Point Road, where they were under contract. She said that this location was ideal because it featured existing infrastructure that could be utilized in the near term and renovated.

Ms. Moon said that also with the C1 rezoning, Cornerstone had the opportunity to expand and accommodate potential future partners who may assist in funding their growth. She said that they chose a rezoning over a special use permit to avoid returning in three years for revisions or a new permit. She said that the existing metal garage onsite would serve as the main church building in the near term, with plans to expand upon it. She said that the residence may be used as a parsonage in the short term. She said that the site was currently zoned R1.

Ms. Moon said that as they could see from the map, the surrounding uses were more intensive, including highway commercial and R10 to the rear. She said that it appeared out of place at present. She said that rezoning was inevitable for this site, particularly since the comprehensive plan designated it as urban density residential and it fell within a neighborhood service center. She said that they believed that the church use aligned with this classification, as it was considered a primary use in the urban density residential designation.

Ms. Moon said that it also allowed for other primary and secondary uses such as childcare, offices, and commercial activities. She said that it was also noteworthy that, as an urban density residential area, there remained potential for a special use permit up to R15 within this region or parcel. She said that the parks and green system, which occupied half of the site, would likely be adjusted in future comprehensive plans to only include the stream buffer. She said that this was due to its creation to protect sensitive environmental features like floodplains, and they anticipated that it would no longer be within the floodplain.

Ms. Moon said that in 2019, there was a rezoning application for a daycare, proposing to retain all existing structures onsite, including the parking area within the floodplain. She said that the main concern across the board was the floodplain, and traffic was also a concern due to peak traffic coinciding with rush hour. She said that a church's traffic impact was mostly on Sundays, making it less significant. She said that since the previous ZMA, FEMA had released a draft revision of their floodplain limits.

Ms. Moon explained that this update was based on new construction as well as increased accuracy in topography and modeling systems, however, FEMA remained conservative in their floodplain limits. She said that the current limit was shown on the map in red, while the pink area represented the actual elevation designated by FEMA from a field run survey. She said the draft floodplain limits were shown in blue. She said that they were expected to be adopted in 2024, but it was not certain.

Ms. Moon said that since the beginning of the application process, the onsite stream had been designated as perennial. She said that as a result, a 100-foot stream buffer had been implemented from the start. She said that the applicants were unaware of this condition and its impact on the usable area of the site. She said that recognizing the importance of the environment, they were not informed about it beforehand.

Ms. Moon said that there was a phase one immediate move-in plan and a Phase Two vision for the church and site's potential development. She said that parking had been initially planned in this area but would now need to be considered elsewhere due to the changes. She mentioned that a special exception coincided with the application. She said that the applicants were no longer proposing to keep the carport and a portion of the garage, as they encroached on the R10 residential zone at the rear of the site.

Ms. Moon said that they proposed retaining these two buildings; one would be 2.5 feet into the 50-foot setback, while the other would be 21.5 feet away. She said that they did propose installing screening behind the garage building to minimize any negative effects on the neighboring residential property. She said that she would next discuss how the site could evolve in the future. She said that although they initially provided more specific concepts, they chose not to limit options by presenting only one idea. She said that the site's geometry, stream buffer, setbacks, and use buffer significantly restrict potential development.

Ms. Moon said that it was unlikely that the area would become densely built with ample parking, as they encountered during their research. She said that to address one of staff's questions, they proposed closing the northern entrance and maintaining the southern entrance in its current location, which aligned well with Riverside Village. She said that VDOT would ensure that that happened appropriately.

Ms. Moon said that she would briefly skip over the uses but would like to emphasize the importance of checks and balances. She indicated on the slide the entrance corridor, and the Architectural Review Board would have to review buildings. She acknowledged that there were some concerns in the community meeting regarding flashy vape shops; however, she believed the ARB would address these concerns as well as the regular site plan process, which required them to meet the County ordinance.

Ms. Moon said that the last proffer to discuss was stream buffer mitigation and they proposed replanting the stream buffer in areas where it had been disturbed. She said that it was a significant area. In the case of the proposed gravel parking lot removal, she said they would replant and address any other disturbances during the site plan process.

Ms. Moon added that a stream buffer mitigation plan must be developed for review by the County Engineer. She said that in summary, the church had been responsive to staff and community members, she said that they made changes as necessary to protect sensitive environmental features, remained consistent with the comprehensive plan, and ultimately provided a permanent church location for the congregation of 100 people or more.

Mr. Missel said that Ms. Moon had shown a few outdated concept plans. He said that he would like to know if there were any new concept plans.

Ms. Moon said that they had been working on some diagrams to ensure that the parking and buildings could be accommodated on the site. She said that however, she did not have any prepared for the presentation tonight.

Mr. Missel said that he had been thinking mostly about the constraints. He said that given that the site was so small when they took everything else out, he was curious as to whether he thought they could fit the necessary parking and have any green space left. He acknowledged that they already had a lot of green space.

Ms. Moon said that they made sure of that before moving forward with this.

Mr. Bivins said that he was directing his question to their counsel. He said that he would ask the client to examine the future use table and suggested revising it to better reflect the type of traffic generated by a church. He said that he believed the site would be difficult to see that a food and grocery store might be suitable for the space, given the current traffic situation. He said that

another suggested one was visual and audio appliances, which he compared to a modern-day Best Buy. He said that that was number 13. He said that if they considered the constraints as a religious organization, their future use table would ideally restrict the property for other entities to have the same light footprint and traffic flow that the church might have. He said that there would not be a Sunday church service, but it could still have a minimal impact on the restricted area. He asked counsel if he had gone too far.

Mr. Herrick said that he was not suggesting that. He said that the uses, restrictions, and limitations that the applicant was willing to offer on those uses were part of a proffer. He said that it was obviously up to the applicant to offer what it wished through proffers. He said that certainly, it was appropriate for the Commission to state the impacts that were of concern to the Commission; however, ultimately it would be up to the applicant to decide what to include in its proffers and determine which uses it wished to proffer out.

Mr. Bivins said that he was considering the potential implications for those beyond them if the project were to proceed.

Mr. Clayborne opened the public hearing for public comment.

Kirk Bowers stated that he was a long-term resident of the area, having lived over 35 years within half a mile from the location in question. He said that his opposition to rezoning Parcel 078058KO was strong and based on the following context and historical perspective. He said that for many years, his family and he had lived, worked, and paid taxes within half a mile of this property's location, which was an area that had been home for half of his lifetime. He said that as a civil engineer with a professional license in land development and civil engineering. He said that he possessed a deep understanding of the process and requirements involved. He said that throughout his career, he had completed numerous projects in Northern Virginia and the Albemarle area.

Mr. Bowers said that when they moved to this area, the property was surrounded by woodlands and featured a driveway leading to a large, beautiful house that also housed a doctor's group office. He said that the house had been demolished, and the woods cleared. He said that they witnessed construction of Fontana, Cascadia, Wilton Farms, and other site development projects. He said that the changes were accepted as part of the Pantops Growth Area Development Plan, which constituted 5% of the reserved land for growth areas. He said that this was one of the few remaining parcels of land in this area, situated near the intersection of Route 250 and Route 20.

Mr. Bowers said that he urged the Planning Commission to recommend denying this rezoning application for the following reasons. He said that traffic had increased exponentially over the past 35 years. He said that the current traffic count at this location was an average annual daily traffic of 8,000 vehicles per day. He said that even on Sundays, there was a significant amount of traffic in this area as people traveled to Darden Towe Park for recreation and visited the various subdivisions located nearby. He said that the master plan for Pantops stated that it should contain small-scale mixed-use development patterns compatible with surrounding uses. He said that a church at this location was not compatible with the surrounding areas. He said that a mixture of residential and commercial uses would better serve this property.

Mr. Bowers said that this would not disrupt the existing development pattern of the area. He said that parking on the site needed to be relocated as shown on the concept plan. He said that the current layout did not work effectively. He said that it was also too vague to make an informed decision based on what was presented. He said the property was too close to Route 20, as the

property across the street, Riverside Village, was offset by at least 40 feet. He said that there has been considerable skepticism regarding the FEMA plan due to numerous changes in policy criteria over the years. He said that he was quite skeptical about these changes as well.

Dick Ruffin stated that he lived in Riverside Village in the Rivanna District, across the street from the subject property. He said that while he did serve as Chair of the Pantops Community Advisory Committee, which hosted a public meeting on Cornerstone's initial application, he was speaking tonight in a personal capacity. He said that many of those in the neighborhood would prefer to maintain the single residence with its R1 zoning that it had been for decades. He said that he acknowledged that this preference was not realistic given the vision in the Pantops master plan and the market dynamics in the area. He said that it was understandable but not practical to expect the property to remain undeveloped.

Mr. Ruffin said that given these factors, he said that it was inevitable that there would be development on this property. He said that the question, in his view, was not whether it would be developed, but what kind of development it would be. He said that among potential users, a community-oriented church could be as good an option as they might get. He said that a church was preferred over dense housing, high-traffic retail, a school, or crowded offices. He said that Cornerstone, which saw itself as a community builder, avowed a particular intention to reach out to the surrounding community and become an integral part of Pantops.

Mr. Ruffin said that he believed they should welcome such outreach and do what they could to encourage them to assist their ongoing efforts to create in Pantops a lively, diverse, pedestrian-friendly, and well-connected community. He said that it was not difficult to imagine that they might want, at some point, to help beautify the promenade along Free Bridge Lane. He said that for those who worried about traffic, he asked what could be better than a religious institution whose peak usage occurred when traffic was lowest. He said that it was true that some traffic would result from their proposed office space.

Mr. Ruffin said that however, given that most of the property would be dedicated to a space for worship, it was unlikely that community traffic would be as significant as it would be with most other options. He said that no doubt, lurking behind such concerns were unspoken fears that Cornerstone may not be able to meet whatever financial commitment it made to secure the property and would sell to another potential user. He said that a user taking advantage of C1 might then do things that the neighborhood would find objectionable. He said that theoretically, it was possible, but in his view, unlikely.

Mr. Ruffin said that considering this, Cornerstone, after several moves in recent years, deeply desired a permanent home. He said that it had every incentive to make it work. He said that their experience indicated that alternative users would be hard to come by. He said that it was evident from the Riverside Shops, which had only half the space rented after five years. He said that other areas, such as Cascade, had not shown any interest at all. He said that every option had risk, and Cornerstone was not exempt from risk, but he believed the Planning Commission should take the risk and recommend support for the application.

Richard Allen said that he resided in Riverside Village in the Rivanna District. He said that he wanted to address the potential consequences of Cornerstone moving on from this property. He said that he wanted to stand with Commissioner Clayborne's remarks at the beginning, where he expressed concern about considering uses beyond just a church for this site. He said that he was aware of the commercial pressure along Pantops and the numerous glitzy automobile sales

options nearby. He said that this property was almost 14,000 square feet, which could eventually transform into an exclusive small and upscale commercial area. He said that his fear was that within five years, a small retail auto sales operation would be established adjacent to their residential neighborhoods of Wilton Farms and Riverside Village. He urged the Planning Commission to reject this proposal.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there were any other members of the public who wished to speak on this item. Seeing none, he asked the Clerk if there were any speakers signed up online who wished to comment.

Ms. Shaffer said there were none.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the applicant would like to give a brief response to the public comment.

Ms. Moon said that she appreciated everyone who spoke. She said that she would speak to the fact that while they understood the concern for future uses, specifically they had made efforts to exclude any facilities that were out of scale or not walkable. She said that this site would inherently limit the size of a facility that could be constructed on it. She said that they had specifically excluded automobile service stations and truck repair shops, ensuring that small auto shops would not be seen in the area.

Mr. Clayborne closed the public hearing and the matter rested with the Commission.

Mr. Moore asked for clarification regarding the staff's response about the permitted exclusions for uses within the C1 zoning. He asked staff to reiterate these exclusions. He asked if the church were to sell in the future, those profit exclusions would still apply.

Ms. Ragsdale said yes, those ran with the land.

Mr. Murray asked what would occur if the newly released FEMA maps did not align with the flood plan.

Ms. Ragsdale said that if approved, they could develop according to the concept plan they provided, which might leave some parking area in the floodplain, an issue she would not encourage. She said that this, as she mentioned earlier, was something that remained unaddressed as a concern.

Mr. Murray said that he understood that in the past, FEMA had occasionally underestimated the extent of flooding. He said that for example, there had been instances where the area experienced flooding despite FEMA's predictions, such as at Free Bridge Auto. He expressed his concern about receiving reassurance that the floodplain was not a floodplain.

Mr. Missel said that he shared the question about FEMA but also believed that, if understood correctly, regardless of the end result as to whether the maps change or not, it would supersede their ability to develop. He asked if this understanding was accurate.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the parking was permitted in the floodplain, but it did not allow for overnight parking. She said that the concept plan aimed to decrease the area designated for parking. She said that no habitable structures were allowed within the floodplain.

Mr. Missel said that he had generally looked at both the positives and negatives of the situation. He expressed his concern about FEMA and the draft proposal, specifically whether they were relying on it too heavily. He said that eventually, it would be superseded by law. He said that there was no concept plan provided, although Ms. Ragsdale referred to a concept plan. He asked if she was referring to a concept plan or the site development plan.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the terminology used by staff was concept plan, but in terms of how the applicant had labeled it, it was the plan. She said that the major element of the plan involved the building envelopes. She said that considering all factors such as property and ordinance regulations, they determined there were no concerns beyond this type of plan for this specific site.

Mr. Missel said that with the positive aspects, he acknowledged the limitations of the site. He said that its surrounding area was part of the Pantops Master Plan. He said that it was a constrained site with specific requirements from the ARB as street trees and site planting for tree canopy coverage within the development and parking areas. He said that there would be access control to be determined by VDOT, and was not something that the applicant could easily bypass. He noted that stormwater management must be considered, as if the entire parcel was paved, it would be necessary to find a way to handle runoff. He said he would support this application as presented.

Mr. Bivins said that he had been waiting for this property to turn over, because it felt to him that the area had evolved past the single-family home there. He said that he had been expecting something to happen there. He said that he was on the Commission when an applicant came through about the daycare center there. He said that there were a whole host of things that he thought were not appropriately addressed when that application came through.

Mr. Bivins said that balancing the use on this property for it to be primarily a Sunday-focused or even Wednesday, if they had midweek Bible study, was something that he was quite willing to accept and quite supportive of. He said that however, he suggested that the applicant look at those uses being proffered and see if those uses aligned with such a constrained piece of property. He said that the proposal for the development of the area might send the signal that they were trying to find a structure when lots of churches were looking to get out of their structures.

Mr. Bivins said that the development would benefit those who could attend events by providing them with similar good conditions and seating within the community. He said that he supported the application. He said that he believed that establishing a car dealership in that location would be challenging due to its distance from the Pantops car center. He said that the largest car dealer in Charlottesville had closed its dealership on that corner and relocated. He said that it would be difficult to place a car lot there. He said that therefore, he was in favor of the plan and believed that using the site for a church or limited use facility was an appropriate application.

Ms. Firehock said that she was in support of the site concept plan. She acknowledged that it did not have all the details they would like but believed that it met their statute for what was required. She said that she was not concerned with the commercial building encroaching into the buffer because that building was already there. She said that the changing of the use and zoning made it an encroaching structure, and it was already there. She said that it seemed that the new design would be less impactful than what was currently present. She said that she was in support of it.

Mr. Clayborne said that when he initially reviewed the matter, he struggled with it. He said that it was often the case that when listing items, one may forget something. He said that after

discussing the context of the situation across the street and considering the vacancies present there, such as at the restaurant nearby, where it still did not seem as bustling on weekends as he would expect. He said that taking this into account, along with the site constraints, he had shifted his position to support the proposal. He said that in his view, the potential benefits outweighed the risks in this instance, so he was in overall support of the application.

Mr. Bivins stated that the Commission was not addressing the exceptions. He said that although they had been informed about the exceptions, their task was not to rule on them; instead, this responsibility would be left to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Herrick said that special exceptions are for the Board of Supervisors to consider. He said that typically, the Commission had not made recommendations on special exceptions, however it could if it chose to do so.

Mr. Missel moved the Planning Commission to recommend approval of ZMA202300004 Cornerstone Community Church for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (6-0).

Adjournment

At 8:44 p.m., the Commission adjourned to November 28, 2023, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium.



Kevin McDermott, Deputy Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 12/19/2023
Initials: CSS