

A special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on September 10, 2025, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 241, Second Floor, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia, 22902. This meeting was called by the Chair, Mr. Jim Andrews, to allow a quorum of Board members to convene an open meeting for the purpose of allowing a quorum of Board members to discuss and consider public business, including (1) a Call to Order; (2) Work Session on AC44 – Initial Draft Document. (3) From the Board: Discussion of Matters Not Listed on the Agenda; (4) From the County Executive: a Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda; and (5) Adjournment.

SUPERVISORS PRESENT: Mr. Jim H. Andrews, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, and Mr. Mike O. D. Pruitt.

SUPERVISORS ABSENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Mr. Jeffrey B. Richardson; County Attorney, Mr. Andrew Herrick; Clerk, Ms. Claudette K. Borgersen.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order.

The Albemarle County Board of Supervisors meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m., by the Chair, Mr. Jim Andrews.

Mr. Andrews said that Mr. Pruitt (Scottsville District) had requested to participate remotely, in accordance with the applicable Board Rules of Procedure, specifically rule 8.B.1.d., as mandated by the Freedom of Information Act. He asked Mr. Pruitt to please state his current location and reason for remote participation.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was on Rolling Road in Henrico County, and he had requested to participate remotely as he was currently indisposed there for work.

Ms. Mallek moved that the Board of Supervisors allow Mr. Pruitt to participate remotely in the meeting. Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley seconded the motion.

Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, and Ms. McKeel.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Gallaway and Mr. Pruitt.

Mr. Andrews introduced the following Albemarle County Police Department Officers in attendance, Lieutenant Angela Jamerson and Master Police Officer Dana Reeves.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session on AC44 – Initial Draft Document.

Ms. Jodie Filardo, Director of Community Development, stated that joining her today at the table were her Deputy Director of Community Development, Bart Svoboda, Michael Barnes, Director of Planning, and Tonya Swartzendruber, Planning Manager, who would be presenting today's work session item. Also present was the rest of their Long-Range Planning team, including James Wilkinson, Ben Holt, and David Benish. She said that she would like to take a moment to thank everyone who had contributed to their efforts leading up to this meeting.

Ms. Filardo said that to the Supervisors, she wanted to express her gratitude for their relentless review and scrutiny of staff's proposals. She said that their dedication had been invaluable. She said that she also wanted to acknowledge the support from the Planning Commission, the community's engagement through various stakeholder engagement opportunities, and the input from their agency partners and colleagues within the County organization.

Ms. Filardo said that she believed they would move forward by going through the sections one by one, aiming to reach consensus on the items that were in the draft document. If there were any topics that could not be reached by consensus, staff would take note of them and set them aside. After this meeting, they planned to discuss the Buildout Analysis and the draft document with Mr. Gallaway, who was unable to attend today's meeting.

Ms. Filardo said that they would bring the list of unresolved topics to the Board before October 15, which was their anticipated adoption day for AC44. This would ensure that the entire Board had the opportunity to review and consider any outstanding items. She said that she hoped there would be few, if any, items left to discuss at that point, but regardless they would have a way to manage them and reach consensus by their adoption day.

Ms. Tonya Swartzendruber, Planning Manager, stated that they were here today to discuss the initial draft of AC44. She said that their agenda would include a brief recap of the previous phases, a review of the schedule, updates to the draft document, and review of the Planning Commission's feedback received a few weeks ago. They would also be addressing tracking and reporting requirements. She said that staff had a few questions that they would like the Board to answer, including a specific one that they would like clarification on. As they went through each section, they would also be discussing any

additional questions or concerns the Board may have.

Ms. Swartzendruber stated that this was the final phase of their four-phase project, and they were currently in Phase 4, where they would finalize the plan document based on the input they received from the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the community. She said that to recap, their initial phases included developing the AC44 framework with guiding principles for the community over the next 20 years, updating the 2022 Buildout Analysis to establish a baseline for growth capacity, and identifying land use topics that needed further consideration or guidance.

Ms. Swartzendruber explained that in Phase 2, they drafted goals and objectives for each topic chapter and developed planning toolkits to coordinate land use and transportation planning. In Phase 3, they drafted actions to support those goals and objectives, including implementation strategies and “Big Moves” to prioritize plan recommendations. Phase 3 also included a significant engagement process, where they finalized their nine topic chapters through work sessions with the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors from fall of last year to June of this year.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that they also conducted public engagement through open house meetings and virtual check-ins to review each topic chapter. She stated that in Phase 4, they had published the draft document, which was available online and in the packet. She said that this phase also included review and input from the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the community, and then update and finalize the plan according to that input.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that also in Phase 4, that they had held an open house on August 21, 2025, which attracted approximately 30 attendees, including both in-person and online participants. She said that during the event, they reviewed the plan content, provided an overview of the plan's organization, and discussed some of the feedback they had received. She said that to facilitate input, they distributed take-home QR code flyers that allowed participants to access their Phase 4 website and provide feedback online. She said that the topics that emerged from this engagement included transit, Development Area expansion, housing density, public schools, and childcare.

Ms. Swartzendruber stated that their online engagement for Phase 4 included a feedback opportunity, as well as the publication of their plan document. She said that as of their last check, they had over 600 visits to their webpage and more than 100 downloads for each of the three parts of the plan. She said that to gauge participant feedback with the plan document, they included a tool that assessed their comfort level with the proposed content. She said that they received about 16 responses, which echoed some of the topics that emerged during the open house.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that their schedule for public engagement included a review of the public engagement and feedback box, as well as work sessions with the Planning Commission, which they conducted about two weeks ago. She said that they were also scheduled to present to the Planning Commission on September 30, 2025, and to the Board of Supervisors on October 15, 2025, where they hoped to receive a recommendation and final approval to adopt the plan.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that she would like to highlight a few notable edits and additions to the plan document. She said that staff incorporated feedback on the seventh big move, which focuses on social connection and building a sense of community. She said that in the Growth Management Chapter, they added content related to Development Area Utilization Review and criteria for evaluating their Development Area boundaries, as per the Board's direction.

Ms. Swartzendruber stated that in the Rural Areas chapter, they added content supporting agricultural and forestry uses, including distribution and aggregation facilities. The Thriving Economy Chapter had been updated to align language with their Economic Development Strategic Plan and incorporated language to support their local agricultural community and updating their target industries. For Cultural Resources, they incorporated feedback related to actions involving incentives and potential funding, as well as what defined the process of identifying cultural resources.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that the Community Facilities Chapter had been consolidated and shortened, and the Transportation Chapter now included additional content related to recreation on rural roads. She said that as a reminder, they would be incorporating metrics to monitor trends and patterns associated with the Big Moves, including population growth and where it occurs, tracking affordable housing units, and tracking cost burden households. These metrics and tracking would be incorporated into their annual report that staff would deliver.

Ms. Swartzendruber summarized the Planning Commission's feedback, which in general stated that they needed to refine the plan for clarity and consistency in voice. She said that the objectives should be achievable, and they would update them accordingly. Additionally, they should eliminate less suggestive language and be more deliberate in their objectives and actions.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that the PC generally agreed with the content provided in Part 1 but suggested a slight reordering of the chapter to improve its logical flow. For Part 2, the PC recommended highlighting the success of the growth management policy in preserving the Rural Area and clarifying the intention to maintain the current Development Area boundary as it was currently. However, they expressed concerns about removing and adding land within the Development Area.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that the PC was generally comfortable with the content in Part 3 but suggested including zoomed-in or blow-up sections of the Future Land Use Map to make it more

accessible. She noted that once the plan was adopted, these sections would be available as part of their online Geographic Information Systems (GIS) interactive tool, allowing users to zoom in and out as needed. She said that the Planning Commission also suggested that they ensure all data and statistics were up to date, which staff was currently working on.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that additionally, at the Planning Commission meeting, Ms. Filardo mentioned that the Commissioners went through each part of the plan, providing general impressions and thoughts, and then section by section, they provided comments. That process seemed to work well, so she would recommend the Board take that approach to the content as well. She said that they could pause after each part so staff could summarize the Board's feedback and ensure they had received consensus on the proposed items.

Ms. Mallek said that it was important to make sure that they accurately represented the Monacan descendants' experience. She explained that they had reclaimed their identity and tribe's organization, and not all of them left their ancestral land. She said that her neighbors, who were descended from the original Monacan Tribe, had attested that they never left. She said that the larger Monacan settlements were forced to disband to avoid genocide, but she did not want to insinuate that all Monacans had left their area due to colonization. She said that this was the only suggestion she had for this chapter.

Ms. McKeel said that, in general, she thought staff had done a nice job and made it easy to understand. She said that on page 12, she thought it was essential that the Lambs Lane Campus Small Area Plan be included. When they were discussing the Rio Small Area Plan, they also had a small area plan for the Lambs Lane Campus, which was located in Places 29 area.

Mr. Barnes said that staff had discussed that, but since it was specifically a school plan, he was unsure whether it should be included in this section. He said that staff had considered placing school facilities plans in the Community Facilities Chapter of AC44.

Ms. McKeel said that it seemed appropriate to do that. She said that her concern was that that small area plan was related to a transportation project, and she wanted to ensure its importance was clearly stated in terms of the future planning for Albemarle County. She said that her main point was that they should make sure they did not lose track of it.

Mr. Barnes said that staff had not had a full discussion about it, so he would take note of Ms. McKeel's suggestion and see what area of AC44 would be best for those school facilities plans.

Ms. McKeel said that she just wanted to ensure that they included it in the document, so it did not become a forgotten idea in the County's planning efforts. She said that on page 16, she had noticed that the maps appeared to be out of focus. She said that this was a simple fix, but she wanted to request staff to provide clearer maps there. She said that on page 21, she thought they all understood neighborhoods 1 through 7, but she thought it would be beneficial to add a brief description of what those neighborhoods were, rather than just referencing them.

Ms. McKeel noted that regarding land use and climate change, she thought that section was really well done. She said that on page 28, she was looking at the multimodal transportation choices section, and she noticed that it mentioned transit. She thought it was essential to clarify that transit should be timely or reliable, especially since they did not currently have a reliable transit system. She thought this was a small but important point.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that perhaps "reliable" would be a fitting adjective.

Ms. Mallek suggested they add a map with numbers for the neighborhoods, which she believed had been provided to the Board at some point in the past.

Ms. Swartzendruber confirmed that staff would add that.

Mr. Pruitt said that on page 16, he thought the staff had done a good job with the graphics and legends. He appreciated the effort to use County images and minimize images from other sources. However, he did think the first image on that page was of low quality and could be improved. He said that he would recommend creating a vector of 10 graphics to ensure clarity and consistency. For example, the information about Area A was not clearly presented, and it was unclear if the information was available in the next graphic. He thought it was essential to have a high-quality image in this plan.

Mr. Pruitt said that on page 17, he had a minor concern regarding the link to the Scottsville Comprehensive Plan in the appendix. While it was good that they were providing the link, it assumed that the link would remain active, which may not be the case in the future. He suggested creating an archive link or permalink and noting that it was a link to the current Scottsville Comprehensive Plan as of the date of adoption.

Mr. Pruitt said that finally, on page 12, he would like to discuss the context of small area plans. Occasionally, he had noticed that these plans contained language that contradicted the Comprehensive Plan. He said that it would be beneficial to include language about the order of supremacies, stating that the Comprehensive Plan took precedence over subordinate plans, but also acknowledging that subordinate plans could provide additional context or clarity.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that staff were planning to include that for their Future Land Use Map

(FLUM), but it would also be beneficial to include here. She said that she thought that was a really great point that would ensure the Comprehensive Plan would supersede the Small Area Plans.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she would like to build on Ms. McKeel's comments regarding the maps. She said that as she reviewed them, she thought it was essential to include major thoroughfares, such as Route 250 and Route 29, to help users locate specific areas. She said that she believed it was worth considering devoting a full page to a map if it was deemed important enough, rather than including just a few key locations. This would provide a clearer understanding of the area's layout.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she wanted to commend the staff for their thorough review of this over the past year; the more she read it, the more she appreciated their efforts. She said that she genuinely liked the plan and thought staff's work had resulted in an incredibly thorough and well-thought-out document.

Mr. Andrews agreed that staff had done a great job. He said that however, he would add to previous points that the smaller print in the plan could be difficult to read. Otherwise, he liked the way the staff had incorporated the comments made by the Planning Commission. He appreciated the comments they had made about this plan. He liked the way the staff had incorporated a bit of history into this document, whether it was leaving the more detailed history to the appendix.

Mr. Andrews noted that however, he thought it would also be beneficial to include a demographic description here. He said that he thought it would be helpful to the reader, providing context for the plan. He added that he probably would bring up more details about some of the history as they reviewed the growth management, as there were some statements there that warranted further discussion. On page 23, he realized he should have mentioned this earlier. He had trouble fully understanding what was going on here, as several numbers had changed dramatically.

Mr. Andrews explained that, for example, the impact of Biscuit Run and other developments on how they delineated percentages was significant. He said that in some cases, he thought the actual number of acres or approximate number of acres was more meaningful than the percentage. For instance, knowing that 2% of the area was developed might not convey the same meaning as knowing the full acreage being discussed.

Mr. Andrews said that he also looked at this and wondered if they could not include some information in the process of delineating all the different plans. He said that if they were going to see how these things had changed, it would be helpful to have a sense of where they were now, not just relying on the information from the end of 2015.

Ms. Swartzendruber explained that their approach to the FLUM had been to consolidate categories and translate them one for one, which meant that the percentages were likely to remain relatively stable, maybe changing by a tenth of a percent at most due to minor tweaks. As a result, the map would be very similar to the one they had for 2015.

Mr. Andrews said that he thought that was really helpful information for someone to look at and understand they were continuing that expectation as part of this document. He said that he was aware that there were some comments at the Planning Commission regarding ordering, and he was not sure what the best answer was there. He did think that the guiding principles seemed to appear as an afterthought at the end of the document, rather than being a clear and guiding force. He said that he was not sure where it belonged, but it just seemed to have been tacked on at the end.

Mr. Barnes said that one advantage they had was Mr. Wilkinson, who was a long-time editor, writer, and had spent his first couple of weeks reviewing the plan. He had been doing it again, looking for a first-person voice and catching errors, as well as addressing some of the comments they had received and planning questions. He had also heavily edited the first part of the document, addressing some of the concerns. So, when the Board saw the final plan, he asked that they not be surprised to see it reordered. They had taken those comments into consideration and made some tweaks to what they did. They had to be quick on this turnaround, so the section had been rewritten and moved up closer to the front, so it was the same content, just with a different order of presentation. He said that he thought that was what the Planning Commission really wanted from them.

Mr. Andrews said that it seemed like they could move onto the next section, which was the Growth Management Policy.

Ms. Mallek said that she was wondering why they continued to mention the boundary change on page seven, left-hand column, multiple times, even though there would not be a change at this time. It seemed to be repeated unnecessarily, as it was mentioned earlier in the chapter. She said that she was just pointing this out, as the mention of boundary changes in the second paragraph and beyond did not seem to add much value.

Ms. Mallek said that on page eight, in the last paragraph of number two, she thought it would be helpful to include unused commercial space and parking lots when considering the capacity of the Development Area, rather than just referencing the unchanged status from the previous draft. She said that paragraph four was similar; they were ensuring that when they had the build analysis, which was a significant improvement, they were also considering the whole perspective of things that may not have been included in the original Kimley Horn analysis. As it may change in 20 years, they needed to be able to consider that information now to have a valid process for understanding what was going forward.

Ms. Filardo asked if Ms. Mallek was recommending that they incorporate language from the 2025 Buildout Analysis into this section.

Ms. Mallek said that on page eight, she was mentioning that the issue of open parking lots was brought up a year ago, and at that time, it was assumed that only the parking lots that were actively being used were being considered. However, she believed that many people throughout the process had raised the point that to have a truly accurate capacity, they needed to include the unused commercial space and parking lots as well. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the Development Area's capacity.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if Ms. Mallek was saying that they had not accurately counted parking lots in the Development Area, but if they had included them in the developable area, that land could be considered for redevelopment into commercial or residential use.

Ms. Mallek said yes, exactly. She said that the vast amounts of parking space for an empty shopping mall, for example, could be repurposed for other uses.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that they should specify which parking lots were unused and which were actually being used by thriving businesses. She agreed that empty malls and empty parking lots should be considered in their land calculations.

Ms. Mallek clarified that she did not think that they should go through the process of parcel by parcel to determine which businesses were thriving and which were not. However, if there were large parking lots, there was a potential that in the next 20 to 40 years, something else would happen at those locations, such as the redevelopment of Barracks Road, where buildings had been added in the past decade.

Ms. Mallek said that as a result, she expected that many other properties would have land that became more valuable to be repurposed for a garage rather than maintaining 500 parking spaces. This could generate a considerable amount of capacity that was not considered in the initial build-up analysis.

Mr. Barnes said that he would like to offer a word of caution and reassurance. When they started analyzing individual parcels and focusing on buildout, he thought they may lose sight of the bigger picture. He said that the Buildout Analysis was meant to be a global tool that looked at the Development Area as a whole, rather than getting bogged down in parcel-by-parcel details.

Mr. Barnes said that the intent was not to be overly granular, and it was not meant to imply that certain parcels were destined for redevelopment while others were not. With that said, the parcels that they had included in the Buildout Analysis, he did not think the law would necessarily hold them to those specific parcel-by-parcel determinations.

Ms. Mallek said that she was not talking about individual parcels or specific properties. However, she was pushing back on the exclusions that were made by policy during the initial study, as there was significant interest in re-evaluating those properties throughout the process.

Ms. Mallek continued that she would like to focus on pages 11 and 12, which she believed would greatly benefit from being separated into a distinct section or document. She said that this was not as refined as the rest of the text, so it may be better as a separate document to allow for maturation and fully understand what was going on, rather than being vague. She said that another comment was to flip the first two paragraphs, as one was a general introduction and the other was an action. She said that additionally, on page 12, they discussed criteria for removing underperforming areas. She stated that in the old draft, she had written a note that if an area was already developed with water and sewer services, it should not be considered for a land swap. She said that the Village of Rivanna already had public services, so she did not view it as valid for swapping.

Ms. Mallek said that she believed this was another situation where the topic needed to evolve and be deliberately considered for a longer period of time before being thrown into the Comp Plan, which had generated confusion in its current state. Additionally, draft criteria had raised some anxiety that was unnecessary. She reiterated that pages 11 and 12 would be more beneficial as a separate section or document for future refinement. She commented that when land had constraints, that should affect its use, rather than changing the rules to make the constraints go away or getting land from someplace else to avoid the constraints. She believed it was important to view the issue from this perspective, so they were not expanding the growth area without precedent.

Ms. Mallek said that page 13 had the criteria for adding land to the growth area, but she would like to emphasize that they should ensure they had adequately provided services to the existing area before adding them to it. She said that in terms of public water and sewer services, there was already a \$200 million Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) from Rivanna that ratepayers would need to absorb over the next 20 years, partially due to needing to cover the work that was postponed from 2000 onwards. This highlighted the significant financial burden that expanding services could impose on ratepayers. She wanted to emphasize that this cost should not be taken lightly, and they should be cautious about expanding services without careful consideration of the long-term implications.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 14, she said that she would like to encourage a more robust approach to addressing the potential water supply of watersheds. In areas where their goals were less clear, they often encountered compatibility issues, such as the one at Beaver Creek, as residents

frequently disregarded rules regarding vegetation management near waterways. This could lead to erosion, maintenance issues, and other problems. In her opinion, if a potential area was located within a watershed, it should be considered an out, as it set them up for potential future issues and difficulties in maintaining the area.

Ms. McKeel asked if Ms. Mallek was suggesting they remove that entire section.

Ms. Mallek said that if they were still discussing criteria and not postponing that chapter until later, she believed it was essential to state it was a hard no. She said that if it was a problem, it should not be allowed to continue unchecked, resulting in a multitude of issues, including erosion, which could damage the water supply.

Ms. Filardo asked if Ms. Mallek was proposing that if the potential area was within the water supply watershed, they should not consider it for development.

Ms. Mallek said, yes, she believed it should not go onto step 2.

Ms. Filardo said that this point would be the first note that staff would return to for discussion and confirmation of Board consensus.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 16, she would suggest adding a fourth bullet point that reads: Has the current Development Area caught up on services such as bus shelters and transit before they increase the size of the area? She said that this point had been mentioned in two different places in the chapter, so she had included it here.

Ms. McKeel said that while she agreed with the first paragraph on page four, she thought there was some redundancy. She said that she recalled their consultant mentioning that they had a lot of redundancy between their documents. To her, the mention of forestry and natural environment in the Rural Area seemed redundant. She said that the rest of that paragraph could be shortened to avoid repetition. She said that at the end of the paragraph, she thought they could end the statement with "encourage people to live in the Development Area," as continuing to say "instead of the Rural Area" insinuated that the County was trying to control or direct people, and she thought a broader statement of encouragement focused solely on the Development Area was more palatable and effective; they did not need to mention the Rural Area.

Ms. McKeel said that moving on to page six, the second paragraph, she would like to simplify the language. She said that this section was referencing the 1970s, but she would also remove the mention of "possibly due to concerns about annexation" as it was not supported by evidence. She said that it was anecdotal and unnecessary. On page seven, when discussing development objectives, she thought it was essential to include transit-related elements in addition to pedestrian connections.

Ms. McKeel said that on page eight, for the 2022 Land Use Buildout Analysis, she would suggest adding a brief note about the consequences of not building out to the maximum recommended number of units. She said that this would provide clarity for readers and help them understand the implications of only building to a portion of their maximum density. On page 9, she would like to add some information about the cost to redevelop parcels. It seemed to her that the analysis did not take into consideration the cost of developing the parcel, which was a crucial factor in their discussions. She requested staff work that into the language there.

Ms. McKeel said that on page 10, in the first paragraph under section six, she would suggest changing "can" to "will" in the sentence "Limiting the supply of available housing will drive up the cost." And going down the next paragraph, increasing demand for non-residential space will lead to costs rising. She said that seemed to be a fact. On pages 11 and 12, Ms. Mallek had suggested removing certain elements and relocating them, but she disagreed. She said that she thought they were in a fine place where they were. On page 15, she liked the language used regarding public water and sewer, so she would not change that either.

Ms. McKeel said that referring to a potential water area was within the water supply watershed, on page 14, she thought Ms. Mallek was saying that she wanted to make it an absolute, and she would not do that. She said the example of the Woolen Mills project, where multiple experts confirmed they could do it. They had chosen not to, and maybe she was overcomplicating things, but she simply liked the language used here.

Mr. Pruitt said that he actually broadly quite liked where they had arrived at here. He said he thought it was representative of where he felt, and he hoped his peers shared that. Looking at page 11, he wanted to begin by saying that Ms. Mallek had brought this up, but the first paragraph there was somewhat ambiguous, perhaps because it was representing this Board's own indecision. However, he thought it was correctly observed that the next paragraph actually began by introducing the facts of the case. In his opinion, the first paragraph may not be necessary at all.

Mr. Pruitt said that he heard some concern that the criteria for removing underperforming areas and adding new areas might be too specific. He personally thought it was essential to include this in the Comprehensive Plan. Otherwise, it felt too consequential and substantive and did not capture the essence of what a Comprehensive Plan was about. He did not think excluding this would be appropriate, as it would undermine the ability to have meaningful discussions about removal or reallocation of Development Areas and developments. If they did not include this, it would be like having a cost of control

without a clear framework, which would run counter to the Growth Management Plan.

Mr. Pruitt said that he believed these criteria were the right ones, and he was not sure it was suitable to have red lines at this stage. He said that he did not necessarily agree with Ms. Mallek's viewpoint that extending water and sewer was a hard line. He said that if there were significant policy failures, then they should be considering how to rectify them. Moving to page 14, he was sympathetic to Ms. Mallek's suggestion, but he had concerns about how to quantify and depict what constituted a watershed area. He was not sure how to provide clarity or granularity on this issue.

Mr. Pruitt asked if a water supply watershed should be a control area, or would it be a massive area covering hundreds or thousands of acres, or if it would be a specific width around a particular intermittent stream. He said that he did not know, and therefore he was not sure he would be comfortable including it in the plan. However, he did agree that this section demanded further serious thought, especially if they were considering removal and reallocation of acreage. He thought they would engage in further discussions, especially in subsequent conversations about implementing this policy. He said that he also agreed that the pragmatic elements of the Growth Management Policy could be easily overlooked, such as costs and protection of the watershed.

Mr. Pruitt said that for example, they had the caption on page 4, which read, "the Growth Management Policy directs density in the Development Area to protect the character of the Rural Area." He said that was probably the popular understanding of what their Growth Management Policy was doing; however, he also thought that might mischaracterize it, because it framed it as protecting the character of the Rural Area and overlooked the actual pragmatic reasons to control the expansion of development, which was directly related to the expansion of costs necessary to undertake capital improvements and to protect water supply. He said that otherwise, he agreed that generally checking for consistency in voice throughout the document was important to address.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if Mr. Pruitt was suggesting that the reference to potential area in a water supply shed should remain on page 14 or if it should be taken out.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was not suggesting it be taken out or left in. He said that he believed Ms. Mallek was suggesting it remain but be viewed as a bright line rather than a criteria; therefore, if it met a component of that, it would be ineligible. His own suggestion was that it remain as a consideration but not be the deciding point.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page six, on the right-hand side, the last paragraph in the middle said, "food access/community gardens" and elsewhere in the document it said, "food access, community gardens." She suggested that they take out the slash and replace it with a comma, which was better and grammatically correct. She agreed with the second paragraph on the left-hand side, where they had removed that part, and she did not disagree with anything where they referred to the past, which would be two generations ago for some people.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that as they went through this, she did not know how much they had to refer to or maybe even have a link to past history because things were changing so fast nowadays. Even from 2020 to 2025, in five years, things had changed a lot. She wondered if people really cared that much about the past; she thought they mostly wanted to know what was going to happen and what they could do. She said that she thought they should remove that section if it did not flow.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page seven, Ms. McKeel kept bringing up transit, which she was very much in favor of. However, she did know they did not have a large enough population to support it, so she guessed they should leave it in because of their desire for more transit. But that was something they were going to have to work hard on to make a reality. She did not want someone to read this and not understand the difficult and long-range improvements they needed to make to get improved transit.

Ms. McKeel noted that it should at least be considered as important as the other items listed on that page.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she understood and agreed. She said that on page 9, #5, she agreed that they should shorten that history there. She said that when this issue came up about swapping land development versus rural, she thought it was brought up by Mr. Pruitt, and others seemed to like it. She said that at first, she did not support it and was a strong advocate for Development Area boundaries. However, as she understood it more, she had come to see it as a viable option. They would not be swapping forestland, farming, or agricultural land.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that they would be swapping areas in the Rural Area that would not be suitable for housing with development land, such as areas along the river that Mr. Gallaway mentioned. Therefore, she could support swapping land in cases where it made sense. Otherwise, they had vacant land that was only vacant because of labels. She said that they could swap it to keep the percentages the same while allowing use of the land in a different way. She said that on the following pages, she was supportive of the language as proposed.

Mr. Andrews said that he would have to push back on some of these topics, as well. He said that on page six, this was just an issue he had a number of times that this comment had been made in meeting after meeting. He said that at the very end of page six, it said that "starting with the 48,000 acres in the Development Area in 1971 to 23,800 today" made it sound as if they were slowly chipping away at the Development Area. However, there was a massive rezoning in 1980 that significantly impacted the

size of the Development Area.

Mr. Andrews explained that without reference to that massive 1980 downzoning, this paragraph became very misleading to him. He thought that it was essential to include that fact in this section. He said that additionally, he had a question. He asked what the plan was with respect to the 2025 update of the Land Use Buildout Analysis. There were numerous references in here to 2022 and references to the 58%. However, according to the 2025 update, they were actually now at 56% but how there were some issues with that, and it could be interpreted as 70% if they took out the North Fork development. He said that considering that nuance, he would appreciate it if they could acknowledge that and explain what the plan would be.

Ms. Swartzendruber clarified that they intended to address all that by updating any references to the 2022 Buildout Analysis with current, updated information that would come from the 2025 Buildout Analysis. This draft, however, was published before the 2025 Analysis was complete. Therefore, staff recognized that they needed to revise the references to the analysis.

Mr. Andrews said that he just wanted to know between now and October 15 how they would deal with this. He would caution, for example, that even when referring to the 2025 Analysis, throwing out the 56% figure without the caveat that it depended on one parcel and how they calculated that parcel was not helpful. He would leave staff to think through how it should be handled and updated.

Mr. Andrews said that he appreciated the comment about recognizing, generally, the capacity for redevelopment represented by oversized parking lots, without specific parcel information. He also thought it would be nice to have actual acreage or square miles instead of vague percentages. On page nine, the first paragraph mentioned 7% of land and 0.3% of the land, but it would be more informative to include actual acreage or square miles.

Mr. Andrews said that with respect to the discussion about "will" or "can" driving up costs locally, he would not necessarily disagree with Ms. McKeel's comments about that; however, he noted that in the Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Murray stated that it was not a proven fact that prematurely expanding Development Areas would necessarily lead to housing affordability. He also pointed out that they already had more units in the pipeline than they needed, but it was unclear whether they would actually be built in a certain timeframe. He thought there was some nuance here regarding how the economics worked and how builders would construct these developments.

Ms. Bart Svoboda, Deputy Director of Planning, agreed that there was probably a way to word it so that it acknowledged the potential for market influences to affect affordability and how it may change.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like to suggest that they consider whether the numbers were helpful, or were they creating more of a mess that they then had to deal with, rather than serving as a Comprehensive Plan and guide. She said that she thought they all wanted to avoid anything that was written in a way that seemed to force the County in one direction, either making it easier to expand or harder not to expand. She said the 58%, based on the 6 to 34 units she had discussed at the last meeting, still lacked a solid basis and did not provide much useful information. She urged staff to consider this as they moved forward, and to avoid chasing a cycle of discussion without making progress.

Mr. Svoboda said that they could discuss influences on value rather than specifying a certain direction.

Ms. Mallek said that recessions and depressions certainly had effects, but it was a terrible circumstance that they could not plan for.

Mr. Andrews said that on page 10, in the last paragraph, he understood that the Comprehensive Plan included a determination that they were not currently expecting to expand the Development Areas, and, as a 20-year plan, they were not trying to go beyond that. He said they were not attempting to anticipate changes that may occur beyond the scope of this plan. It was intended to be reviewed and reassessed over the next five years.

Mr. Andrews said that therefore, he would prefer that it be stated that "if" rather than "when" the Board determined changes to development or expansion; it should be considered rather than assumed. In this plan, they had not explicitly stated that this was an inevitable event. It may become a reality in the future, but it was not currently part of this plan so it should not be considered as a factor.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if Mr. Andrews was saying that if they said "if," then that could imply that there could be a swapping of land or other changes to the Development Areas.

Mr. Andrews said that it did not rule it out, and it would allow for other factors to be considered. He said that he was relieved that the first paragraph from page 11 was being removed. He thought the criteria for removing underperforming areas from the Development Area, and the concept of swapping, were included here for a reason, and he understood why they were necessary. However, he felt that they had not fully articulated those concepts yet, and he felt the information on page 12 was vague in terms of being a policy.

Mr. Andrews said that furthermore, it was different from the more specific language on pages 13 and 14. He noted that there were already development area utilization reviews, one through six, that he thought established a useful framework. This was what they wanted to examine; how well the Development Area was being utilized and consider ways to utilize it more effectively. That was something

they should be doing before they started making significant changes, such as swapping areas.

Mr. Andrews said that so, when they got to page 13, he saw that the impacts and standards listed were not just suggesting the addition of land to the Development Area. Many of them were actually based on how well they were utilizing the Development Area. Therefore, he would suggest changing the heading of page 13 to something like "criteria for assessing the adequacy of land in the Development Area" rather than "criteria for adding land." That way, they were not implying that the focus was solely on adding more land, but rather on really examining these criteria and recognizing that they were the standards they were using to evaluate the Development Area's adequacy.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that she appreciated that suggestion.

Mr. Andrews said that he appreciated the discussion the Planning Commission had on this topic, but he was unsure if they ever got to a consensus on a number of things.

Ms. McKeel said that she was unsure if this was the appropriate time to discuss it, but she just wanted to clarify that the Board had never voted to expand the Development Area. The community seemed to think they had, but they had not. Having said that, they had discussed swapping land in the Development Area between the Rural and Development Area for some parcels that would never be developed. Having said that, she thought it would be helpful to have a map of the developable area in the Development Area when they discussed capacity analysis.

Ms. Filardo acknowledged that members of their community were very interested in such a map as well. The tricky part to this, and there was some discussion, not at this most recent planning commission, but months ago now, when they were talking about naming names on which parcels even might be swappable. There was some real concern that staff did not want the government to put their thumb on the scale, favoring one parcel over another, because it may impact market values.

Ms. Filardo said that staff had resisted that for that reason. Now, certainly, if the Board directed them to do that, staff could build that and do it; however, she thought they had been very cautious about not doing that in advance. She said the criteria were all outlined here. So, if they had a parcel that was more than two acres and the land value was more than the value of the improvements, one could kind of infer that that they were one of the parcels they had chosen. She said they had been reluctant to do that because they did not want to specify which parcels were seen as prime land to the County in that regard.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she thought they had a number of parcels that would be developable, privately owned, and they didn't know if the owner wanted to sell or not. They also had a number of developments that had been proposed but never got developed. She said that therefore, it was a constantly-moving target.

Mr. Svoboda agreed that the criteria was very hard to establish, as it was difficult to define what that actually meant. There were just so many variables, including the condition of the property, location, and other factors. There were some things, and they had probably all done this, that they wondered why one building was taken down and not another nearby. He said that putting the County's thumb on the scale added even more complexity.

Ms. McKeel said that made perfect sense.

Ms. Mallek said that the answer about the cost to redevelop a site was, she was guessing, always more expensive than developing on greenfield land. However, they were unlikely to redevelop at all if they continued to offer less expensive alternatives. She just wanted to bring that up because it was mentioned on page nine. Regarding the map on a watershed, watersheds were clearly delineated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and had been for hundreds of years, with very clear and well-established maps.

Ms. Mallek said that the watershed was defined by the height of land, from one end to the other, and they would have no trouble establishing that. The water planners had been doing this since the Rivanna Water Sewer Authority (RWSA) was founded, and it was a well-established process. Additionally, the constraints on a parcel would be a significant burden, taking years to figure out, and that was a terribly onerous task for staff to undertake.

Ms. Swartzendruber stated that it sounded like they had received consensus on most points, but the question that was still unclear was on pages 11 and 12. It had been suggested that this information be removed and placed in a separate document, and she would like for staff to receive clear direction on that.

Ms. Filardo said that it sounded like the Board was supportive of removing the first paragraph on page 11. She said that however, she had not heard consensus for moving the entire section to a different document.

Ms. Mallek said that she was not suggesting throwing it out, but perhaps including it in a future work, such as the appendix. She knew that including it in the body of the document would mean they really nailed it down and wanted their citizens to trust what they read. She said that this was why she thought it needed more time to be refined.

Ms. Mallek said that she was quite taken with the suggestion to change the title, which she

thought helped a lot. So, if she failed to get it moved to the appendix or incorporated into a future document, that would at least be a helpful compromise. However, she did not think this section was of the same quality as the rest of the document, and this was why she was suggesting it needed further development.

Ms. McKeel agreed with changing the title of the section, but she did not think the information needed to be moved entirely into another document.

Mr. Pruitt agreed with changing the title; however, he thought that if this information was not included in the Comprehensive Plan, it would be inappropriate for the Board to consider the changes suggested in this section, so he thought it was necessary to leave it in the document as it was proposed.

Ms. Filardo said that she was hearing that the title on the top of page 13 would change to "Criteria for Assessing the Adequacy of Land in Development Areas." She said that the language of the section would remain. She said that the other thing she would like to get a little more clarification on was on page 14, where they were discussing the potential area's location within a water supply watershed. She was hearing that they all liked having that criteria included, but that Ms. Mallek wanted parcels within watersheds to be removed from consideration.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would support keeping that in.

Mr. Andrews said that he was not confident that he saw where the limits would be, so he would support keeping it in.

Ms. Mallek said that those on well water were trying to protect the drinking water.

Ms. Filardo said that she understood. She said that they would keep that language as-is.

Mr. Andrews said that next, they would discuss Development Areas Land Use.

Ms. Mallek said that they must consider reduction of minimum lot size, and she had noted that for cottage colonies to succeed, they had had two failed ones in Crozet because the minimum lot size was too big, making it difficult for people to own small houses with common land and a small parcel, thereby limiting their ability to build equity.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 13, under middle residential, she suggested they add the focus on minimum block size to complement the discussion on housing unit size, particularly for tiny houses of permanent income-restricted purchasers. Since the Crozet Master Plan already addressed middle residential, she expected this concept to be incorporated in other areas as well. She said that she appreciated the local images that had been added to the plan as well.

Ms. Mallek said that under 2.6 on page 39, the language made it sound like everything had been finished. She said that she still supported requiring special permits for industrial uses in Development Areas, so 2.6 seemed a bit prejudicial.

Ms. Filardo said that she understood Ms. Mallek's point, and staff had been trying to work out timing for some of these items because they were unsure of when they would all come together. She asked if Ms. Mallek thought the language should say something to the effect of considering allowing data centers in the Development Area in general.

Ms. Mallek said that they had already passed Phase 1 of their Data Center Ordinance, so she wondered if referencing 2.6 was just causing unnecessary controversy. They had already passed one set of regulations and they knew that further deliberation was still to come.

Ms. Filardo suggested they strike Action 2.6.

Ms. Mallek was grateful for the completion of this section, page 40, 4.1. She was thankful that they now had proper spacing of trees, as this was something they had been trying to address for 15 years. When left to the developers, they often installed fewer large trees that were then too big for the space. She had been working to trim Old Trail trees every year to restore them to their original state. Additionally, Action 4.4 protected clusters or groves of healthy native canopy trees, especially in buffers. To effectively implement this, they would need a strong determination of enforcement and more severe penalties.

Ms. Mallek said that currently, people simply removed the trees without consequence. She said that the only recourse was for the developers to replace the trees with a small, insignificant alternative, which was not enough to fix the damage of removing the trees in the first place. She said that she knew that it was difficult for staff to enforce this, especially when construction activities were taking place over the weekend. However, it had been a rampant issue for a very long time.

Ms. McKeel said that on page three, activity centers, which were explained later in the document, were mentioned at the very bottom of the third paragraph. To clarify, they could say that activity centers were discussed in later sections. She said that it mentioned walkable activity centers, and she thought a reference to the definition in another area of the plan may be appropriate. She said that she was trying to ensure that readers knew where to find relevant information, in other words.

Ms. McKeel said that additionally, they talked a lot about one university, where they studied and were citing 23 studies by Rutgers University. She thought they needed to cite it properly. Every time they mentioned it, it needed to be cited. If they were going to mention one study, then it needed to be cited. She said that on page seven, she was unsure where the arrows were pointing to. On another note, she agreed with Ms. Mallek that reduction in minimum lot size, missing middle development, and infill opportunities were something they should prioritize and normalize throughout the County.

Ms. McKeel said that additionally, she wanted to make sure transit connections were mentioned in the description on page 19 for Office/Flex/Research & Development uses. She said that furthermore, on page 38, it talked about coordinating with Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for approval of urban street standards in Virginia. She had a meeting scheduled right now with Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) because they had changed their standards for art at certain intersections, which they believed slowed down traffic. She was not expecting staff to change this, she was just using this as an opportunity to say that, as far as DRPT was concerned, and certainly perhaps VDOT as well, their standards were changing in terms of limitations on public art.

Mr. Barnes said that they could discuss that further in the Transportation Chapter. He explained that their multimodal plan was done with DRPT guidelines and VDOT regulations applied more for urban streets. He appreciated Ms. McKeel's point.

Ms. McKel said that regarding Ms. Mallek's point on Action 2.6, she had no issue with removing that section. She said that however, she did like the stress on using performance standards for data center development. She said that they would not just be generally encouraging data center development; rather, they would be expected to meet specific performance standards, and that was a critical component of their consideration of them. She said that also, she was glad to see all the references to the importance of tree coverage.

Mr. Pruitt said that he supported the previous idea of striking 2.6, which was the data center-related one. And he thought he had mentioned this before, but as a general philosophy, he believed they should be using their Comprehensive Plan to be doing long-range visioning. He did not necessarily see it as a place to state things they were already doing. Additionally, 4.6 referenced the Biophilic Cities Network, and he was unsure of how this related to their work for 15 years in the future. He assumed that this was more of a short-term consideration.

Ms. Filardo said that it appeared there was consensus from the Board to remove 4.6.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that Ms. Mallek had mentioned cottage colonies. She asked if she could expand on that.

Ms. Mallek explained that two projects she mentioned were two projects that failed to move forward because the lot size minimum of the County regulations was too big. She was asking to have consideration of smaller minimum lot sizes so that those kinds of things could succeed in the County. In finance, banks all had a limit on the percentage of the value that could be in the land, and if the lot size is too big, then it was more expensive than the household.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she did agree with the smaller lot size and tiny homes because she thought they needed to really look to address people's needs, and looking at tiny homes on smaller lots, such as half an acre, could certainly meet a lot of people's needs. She said that she wanted to commend staff on reducing the number of activity centers in this plan. She said that additionally, the explanation for the purpose of the centers was well-put. She said that on page 36, she had heard constituents suggest putting another bridge from Pantops into Charlottesville for pedestrians and cyclists. However, there were sidewalks on both sides of Free Bridge Lane. She was wondering if the County could work with VDOT to narrow the traffic lanes and add more sidewalk when they made improvements from Rolkin Road down to Route 20. She said that additionally, she concurred with the suggestions to remove actions 2.6 and 4.6.

Mr. Andrews noted that on page four, they had more references to the 2022 Buildout Analysis and the 58%, and he hoped that would be updated in the final draft document. He said that regarding the Future Land Use Map, he would be remiss if he did not mention that there were going to be requests to affect changes on parcels designation from time to time. He just wanted to ask what the procedure might be, if there had been a discussion of the procedure for any consideration if it was to come forward from an owner, developer, or through the County. He asked if this could be done through a petition or request.

Mr. Barnes said that they were working on a policy that would allow for private individuals or developers to nominate a change to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map for the parcel that was affected.

Mr. Andrews said that he appreciated that. He said that furthermore, he was glad to see 2.6 and 4.6 were going to be removed. He said that he recalled a list of points from the Planning Commission discussions that were relevant to this section, but he could not find that list.

Ms. Mallek said that on the bottom of page five, adjusting the boundaries of the growth area was still an issue. They needed to determine the approach that would be taken.

Non-Agenda Item. **Recess.** The Board recessed its meeting at 4:01 p.m. and reconvened at 4:11 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 2. Work Session on AC44 – Initial Draft Document, *continued*.

Ms. Filardo asked if Ms. Mallek would prefer that the last bullet point on page five be removed.

Ms. Mallek said that if there were other places it was being considered, then that was what she would suggest. She said that as someone who raised local food and sold locally, she would like to push back on page seven, which stated that agricultural products were dependent on the availability of local distribution facilities. She said that while they were assisted by such infrastructure, she did not think it was accurate to say that they needed to build all sorts of facilities.

Ms. Mallek said that the food hub went belly-up for reasons unknown. She said that aggregation had been helpful, but she was concerned about the words "depends on" in this context. She said that many farmers sold directly to consumers, others sold to established markets in Augusta, Rockingham, and other areas where there were already established systems in place. She said that she thought "assisted by" was a perfect solution.

Ms. Swartzendruber noted that staff had intended to change that; it was just a mistake.

Ms. Mallek thanked staff for that. She said that on page 8, she mentioned this earlier in their work sessions when they discussed the study at Yancey. The study at Yancey was conducted in 2010 and again in 2015, and it was settled. She said that the study had already identified agricultural support industries in the blue area. Consequently, everything in the white area south of the blue area was directly adjacent to the drinking water source. The terrain was sloping, making it impossible to build on. Therefore, she would propose that there was no need to revisit the Yancey study amidst the other master plans that required renewal.

Ms. Filardo said that she had received feedback from other individuals about the possibility of eliminating these studies altogether. Given that the Board had recently passed the Economic Development Strategic Plan, perhaps there was a way to approach this by using language that indicated the Board would be supportive of projects that aligned with the directions established in the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Ms. Mallek said that she would be happy to have the information removed, but she also thought Ms. Filardo's suggestion was not necessary, either. She said that they did not need a long explanation just to refer to something else. She said that they could take it out and it would stand on its own just fine.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she understood Ms. Mallek's intent to remove it, but she did not hear what she thought about the second part of Ms. Filardo's suggestion.

Ms. Mallek said that she did not think it was necessary to have anything other than let the Economic Development Strategic Plan stand on its own. She said that they had enough other plans to allow it to stand on its own.

Ms. Filardo said that if it pleased the Board, she was fine with that, as she knew they had adopted the Economic Development Strategic Plan as it was. She explained that when this proposal first came forward, staff had suggested exploring opportunities at the interchanges, but they had received pushback and feedback on the need for the Yancey and Shadwell studies. She said that it seemed that those studies may not have been as necessary as initially thought.

Mr. Barnes explained that initially, the idea was to conduct a study to help solve or contextualize the existing zoning in those areas. He said that however, he understood the opinions that the studies may not have identified a solution.

Ms. Filardo said that her thought was that the Economic Development Strategic Plan could serve as the framework for future projects for those areas.

Mr. Barnes said that on page seven, where it discussed these types of supporting uses in detail, with regard to Ms. Mallek's comments on revising the verbs there, he believed they were really talking about these types of supporting non-residential uses that supported agriculture and forestal uses.

Ms. Mallek said that she recalled a yogurt company was interested in developing the high ground to the south of Yancey, but after conducting an air quality study, they realized it was not feasible due to dust and air pollution from the lumber yard. She said that since Patrick took over, the lumberyard had become extremely successful and busy, playing a crucial role in their timber industry. With their significant investment over the past decade, they seemed secure in their operation. Although the yogurt company could not move forward, she was hopeful that another agricultural project may emerge in that area, more compatible with the land.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that if they could align these two areas with the Economic Development Strategic Plan, she thought it would be beneficial to allow potentially feasible developments to be considered in the future.

Ms. Filardo said that she believed that that would be in keeping with their normal practices when staff brought forward applications for development.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 9, 2.1 was a great improvement. She said that somewhere in there it was mentioned that the minimum lot size was five acres from the 1980s. However, it was two acres, not five acres. She said that the addition on 2.3 was very much appreciated. She said that on 2.5, the Transfer of Development Rights was a painful topic during 2008 to 2010. They had spent years and many hours of staff time on this.

Ms. Mallek said that everyone had been waiting for direction from the State, and perhaps Stafford had adopted something, but it was not ready to be included in this plan. She strongly suggested this be considered for future work. She said that the main issue was that receiving areas would be in Rural Areas, but they could not be; they must be from the Rural Area transferred to the Development Area, not the other way around. She said that she would be supportive of 2.5 being included for future work.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding action 4.5, she questioned the intent of that action. She said that she was unsure of what it meant.

Ms. Filardo said that she did not recall the word "only" being included in that action and suggested striking the word.

Ms. Mallek said that striking "only" would make sense. She said that regarding 5.1, the end of the first paragraph, if adaptive reuse was not feasible meant it was a handover to demolition. She said that she would prefer the last sentence to be removed and instead focus on adaptive reuse, restoration, and other preservation efforts.

Ms. Filardo said that she just needed a point of clarification. She asked if Ms. Mallek was suggesting that if there was a 1,000 square foot old country store that could be adapted into a wine tasting room, but they wanted more than 1,000 square feet, they could reuse the existing 1,000 square feet and then add more to it, or did she simply did not want them to demolish the initial 1,000 square feet?

Ms. Mallek said that her main concern was the demolition aspect. She said that additions seemed to be strictly limited based on the County's regulations. She said that adding small additions to make something viable for use, while avoiding destruction of the original structure, would be great.

Ms. Filardo said that she believed that was staff's intent with this language; however, if it was being misinterpreted, they would revise the wording.

Ms. Mallek said that in the third paragraph, she questioned where some of this information came from. She said that she did not think they should be considering restaurants in the Rural Area whatsoever because it could lead to further development of intensive uses such as a Buc-ee's. She said that she was greatly concerned about the potential of that type of development being allowed to occur in the Rural Area. She believed that existing buildings could possibly be acceptable, but that was as far as she would go in terms of allowing restaurants.

Ms. Filardo stated that she had heard discussions about allowing an accessory use to an existing building, such as if a wine tasting room wanted to have a small kitchen, and that was the direction staff was trying to go with these new guidelines.

Ms. Mallek said that described in that way, it made sense. She said that she mostly just wanted to avoid large developments in the Rural Area. She said that she was also concerned that if they allowed one type of use, they could not say no to another.

Mr. Svoboda said that they could establish performance standards that included limits on square footage. For example, in Little Washington, they could set a specific square footage threshold, and if a business exceeded that, it would be subject to certain restrictions. Similarly, they could differentiate between country stores and convenience stores.

Mr. Svoboda said that, for instance, convenience stores were limited to 15 seats, whereas country stores were not. This type of differentiation would apply to other businesses as well, such as those in commercially zoned property. The idea was to create a tiered system that took into account the specific needs and characteristics of each business, whether it was a winery, an equine facility, or something else.

Mr. Svoboda said that if they had one of the old mansions, such as the 15-room estate on Round Top, it was theoretically possible to make it viable for a large-scale operation, but it would require significant modifications to the property. He was not sure if it was worth it, but there were ways to implement regulations that were similar to those for country stores, with limitations on the type of activities that could take place on the estate.

Ms. Mallek said that she felt that was opening up a can of worms. She said that they had similar situations in the past that had caused widespread turmoil, particularly when someone bought an old historic property with the intention of transforming it into something entirely different from its original state. She was not keen on that review personally.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 12, Action 7.3, staff had been trying to develop a solution for commercial stale zoning. She strongly recommended that they revisit a case-by-case approach, rather than trying to create a one-size-fits-all solution. When a landowner expressed interest in a particular property, they could conduct a Comparative Market Analysis (CMA) or submit a special permit

application, just like any other property. The County did not need to waste staff time trying to develop a solution that would work for all properties, as each one was unique.

Ms. McKeel said that on page four, as stated, local agriculture had remained relatively stable. However, she thought that was an interpretive statement, and they had data that directly addressed that issue. She said that according to the 2022 U.S. Department of Agricultural Census from 2017 to 2022, the number of farms in Albemarle County had decreased by 5%, and the number of acres and farming had decreased by 8%. This suggested that local agriculture was not as stable as stated. She suggested using the exact data to describe the situation, rather than making a generally conclusive statement. She said that she did not disagree with Ms. Mallek's statements about 2.5, and she had the same note about 4.5, and she wanted to mention that.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to discuss the Rural Area interchange. He would like to exercise caution when considering the idea of completely deleting the criteria or action related to it, and instead, referring to the Economic Development Strategic Plan and the uses identified within it. If they did that, they would still be in a position where staff would likely recommend rejecting applications that fell outside of the considerations for these interchange areas.

Mr. Pruitt said that he understood Ms. Mallek's comment regarding the past feasibility studies at Yancey Mills. What he would like to raise was that if they were going to discuss a yogurt shop that was initially proposed, but ultimately did not move forward, then they should also acknowledge that without a study that assessed potential land use impacts, he would not assume that applicants would come forward with a plan that they might think was feasible, but would ultimately be rejected by the Board due to lack of guidance.

Mr. Pruitt said that if they were going to entertain the possibility of any use type in these areas, they needed to create a roadmap that outlined how people could use those areas. He thought it would be beneficial to include a section that acknowledged the need for guidance and pointed to other plans as a compromise. Without that, he anticipated that any application submitted in these areas would be met with a staff recommendation to reject it.

Ms. McKeel asked what Mr. Pruitt thought about taking out the last paragraph, leaving the first two paragraphs. She thought that left it open in the Comprehensive Plan. She said that they could add a sentence to refer to the Economic Development Strategic Plan instead.

Mr. Pruitt said that there was also reference to the small area plans.

Ms. Filardo said that given that staff would be coming back to the Board with thoughts on how to amend land use designations in the Future Land Use Map in the near future, would that provide the necessary coverage for developers in these areas if someone were to bring forward a project that was not aligned with what the Future Land Use Map indicates? It appeared that this would provide the coverage he was looking to provide to developers without requiring them to conduct these studies. She asked if that would work.

Mr. Pruitt said that he thought that this could be fine. He wanted to balance the need for preserving staff time. And if it was going to be staff time that was spent on something they might not have control over, then that sounded like staff time wasted. So, he recognized that, but at the same time, if they wanted to do anything in these areas, he thought they had to either have a Small Area Plan where they acknowledged that they would invite certain types of use systems.

Mr. Barnes said that staff would rewrite this section and bring it back for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would endorse the removal of 4.5. He said that on another note, he did think Comprehensive Plan was the exact place for future work. He had heard reference that some things may not belong in this plan; rather, they should be separated out for future work. He said that however, he thought that those items that needed future work belonged directly in the Comprehensive Plan. He thought that being exactly what an action or objective in the Comp Plan should be, it should be them identifying something that was a part of what they wanted to do in the future as part of this Plan.

Mr. Pruitt said that in that respect, he thought that if the Transfer of Development Rights program in this program was unfinished, then it definitely belonged in the Comp Plan. He said that similarly, 5.1 would be refined further. He generally endorsed the concepts it included, and he would note that paragraph 3 almost certainly precluded a Buc-ee's from ever being supported due to the considerations given to appropriateness for water and sewer, road capacity, and impacts to surrounding areas.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page 2, Objective 5, she would take out the word "essential" because that was subjective. Additionally, she would take out the mention of "rural residents," because they had a significant tourism industry in their area, with Charlottesville and Albemarle generating billions of dollars annually, and tourists often visited their Rural Areas. Therefore, she said she would simply state that the services would be available for whoever needed it in those areas.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page 8, she was wondering if they were looking at removing this section or just looking to see what came in with restrictions and as guided by the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Ms. Filardo said that she believed that staff would come back with language that discussed considering projects that advanced their Economic Development Strategic Plan, and they would engage in a process to update the Comprehensive Plan amendment for that area.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that regarding Transfer of Development Rights, she would appreciate more information on what that meant.

Mr. Barnes said this meant that development rights in one area were reduced by another area purchasing those rights. He explained the idea behind their specific approach was to recognize that the receiving area was typically a Development Area. Since it did not make much sense for someone in the Development Area to be required to purchase rights to do what they wanted, they thought this program should have receiving area in the Rural Area. He said that while it may turn out to be a bad idea, this construct was a reflection of some of the discussion they had with the Board, and it was a good time to further explore the details of this proposal.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley thanked Mr. Barnes for the explanation. She said that for 4.5, she agreed with taking out "only." She said that for 5.1, the first paragraph, she recalled that they had discussed removing this section. However, she was having trouble with the concept of adaptive reuse not being feasible. She said she agreed that some developers may say it was not feasible to tear down the building, but they did not want that to happen. She said that however, if a building really should be torn down, she was thinking about how to handle that from a practical standpoint. Perhaps staff could determine whether adaptive reuse was feasible rather than leaving it up to developers, who may tear it down preemptively to avoid the costs of preserving and rehabilitating it.

Ms. Filardo said she thought that by striking out the last sentence in this paragraph, they were not losing anything. The purpose of this section was to encourage people to rehabilitate and bring back to life antiquated or unused structures. She said the purpose was to explore why a building went out of business in the first place, and to consider whether it was too small or needed adjustments. She said by removing that sentence, it did not encourage people to demolish the building, which was the concern raised by Ms. Mallek. However, she believed the encouragement for reusing existing buildings remained in the first couple of sentences, and removing the last sentence did not detract from that.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she thought they should remove the words "affordable" and "healthy" from the list of examples for adaptive reuse in the Rural Areas. She said that this could be interpreted differently by different people, and the main focus should be on providing food in general. She said that furthermore, she disagreed with Ms. Mallek's recommendation to discourage restaurants in the Rural Area. She said that smaller establishments may be appropriate in certain areas throughout the County, and the criteria staff had included for determining that appropriateness would be good safeguards for development.

Ms. Filardo said that this paragraph started out with small-scale uses, so by definition, it was limiting it to buildings that were one to two stories or footprints of 5,000 square feet or smaller. She said by the fact that this proposed restaurant use was nestled in this paragraph, she was wondering whether that meant that this use was being informed by those earlier sentences.

Mr. Svoboda said, yes, it talked about it in there or suggested maybe one way of reading it was that it was a standalone use and not associated with an event venue or a country store. So arguably, if they took Dr. Ho's in its infancy, way back when, as more of a country store that morphed into a restaurant, and Yoder's in Madison was probably a similar example. He thought the ability to be able to do this with the right performance standards was beneficial to them if they wanted to compete tourism-wise with the Route 151's in the world, but at the same time, not get out of hand where they had just a plain restaurant somewhere else.

Mr. Svoboda said that he thought it was worthy of being in there to have the discussion, where were they somewhere between a homestead and a store in the Rural Areas. He thought what they wanted to see in those Rural Areas when it came to tourism was a balance, and then how much of that was enough for them as a community, as a County. He thought how they got there was a good question.

Ms. Mallek asked if there were restrictions in the County that would prevent something similar to Dr. Ho's from being created today.

Mr. Svoboda said that there were likely only two places where an establishment like that could be developed today. He said that it could go where it was right now or in Earlysville Green. He said that considering Batesville, for example, if someone wanted to open up a sandwich shop, they would have to do the whole store. He said that he believed that the proposed language would help them allow food service to stay viable, but they must be careful in how they worded it.

Ms. Mallek said that perhaps if it was an accessory use, that would help clarify the intent.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if there were size restrictions.

Mr. Svoboda said yes; however, this was a guide in kind of crafting what they wanted. The real substance was in the Zoning Ordinance. In terms of the specifics for what was allowed for country stores, the Zoning Ordinance had much more detail. The Comprehensive Plan may identify it as something they wanted to do, but they still must determine where it was actually feasible in the County. It was possible that there may only be one or two locations where these uses could actually occur, and it was worth

investigating further as part of their Economic Development planning.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she believed they would work it out. She said that regarding 7.5, she would support removing that section entirely.

Ms. Filardo said that Supervisors McKeel and Mallek were in favor of removing that section.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley stated that she was also in favor of removing that section.

Mr. Andrews said that he would like to confirm if there were any remaining open issues from their discussion. He said that he was generally in agreement with most of what had been said. However, he had a concern regarding Action 5.1, which mentioned increased adaptive reuse of structures that provided essential services. Specifically, the word "essential" was being removed, and he disagreed with the proposal that the phrase "for rural residents" should be taken out.

Mr. Andrews said that he did not want to see the phrase "for rural residents" removed, as it was crucial to ensure that the proposed uses would serve the rural residents. He said that he did not want to compromise the integrity of that by allowing uses that would not benefit rural residents, especially if they were being placed in Rural Areas. It was also on page 11; the objective was repeated throughout this section, and he believed it was an important point that should stay in the document as proposed.

Mr. Andrews said that furthermore, he thought it was extremely difficult to try to allow the things they did want and discourage the things they did not want. He believed that in 5.1, they had a contradiction between essential services and then discussing restaurants and other amenities as whether or not they were categorized that way. However, he thought that was wordsmithing at this point. He did not think he had a disagreement with what was being discussed as far as allowing this to be considered. Furthermore, 2.5 mentioned creating a Transfer of Development Rights program for the Rural Area, and he did not mind taking the whole thing out, but if they just kept the first sentence, it would simply be looking into whether it was viable, without specifying the areas involved.

Ms. Filardo asked the Board if they would be agreeable to leaving the first sentence only in 2.5

Ms. Mallek said that she agreed with that.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that Ms. Mallek had suggested removing the last bullet point on page five.

Mr. Andrews said that he thought taking it out made sense.

Ms. Filardo said that the consensus she heard regarding 5.1 was to remove "essential" from the first paragraph and add back in "rural residents."

Mr. Andrews said that next, they would discuss the Transportation Chapter.

Ms. Mallek said that she had shared all of her comments related to this chapter earlier in the session.

Ms. McKeel said that she only had a few comments. She said that on page six, she saw a red flag when they started discussing MicroCAT. She said that because MicroCAT was currently a trial, and it would be very expensive if the County decided to take it over. She said that the language here suggested that it was a service provided by the County, but that had yet to be determined. She asked if they could refer to the funding for the program or something else to clarify the current situation with the program.

Ms. Filardo asked if it would be appropriate to add a sentence at the end to state, "funding for MicroCAT would be reviewed with each budget cycle."

Ms. McKeel said that would be fine, so long as it gave a clear view of the situation. She said that she was glad to see mention of improving transit access to the airport, which was currently nonexistent. She said that also, under 2.3, she was wondering if they should mention Virginia Breeze.

Mr. Pruitt said that regarding 4.1, he was unsure if the action verb "prioritize" was effective.

Ms. Filardo asked if "support" would be a better word to include there.

Mr. Pruitt confirmed that yes, that would be a better word. He said that he had no other comments on this section.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page 13, there were numerous colors on the map, which was beneficial, but some colors were similar, making it challenging to distinguish. She said that to improve clarity, they should consider adding dots to add greater contrast. Additionally, on page 19, 2.4, she would also suggest replacing "appropriate" with "feasible," as the latter better conveyed the potential costs and practicality of implementing such measures.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on action 6.7, she would suggest they say "prioritize" installation of red-light cameras at high-crash intersections.

Mr. Andrews said that next was the Thriving Economy Chapter.

Ms. Mallek said that on page four, the third bullet mentioned "sectors," but the list was referring to specific employers. She said that additionally, on page five's last paragraph on the right-hand side, she would appreciate it if there could be a mention of the efforts of their family vineyard winery owners, with the assistance of the Charlottesville Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau (CACVB), recognizing tourism for the Wine Enthusiast Award. She said that the current text gave the impression that the CACVB was solely responsible for the achievement, whereas it was actually the winery owners who earned the recognition.

Ms. Mallek said that in the middle of the non-residential land use category, she would like to request that manufacturing be listed as a potential use. Additionally, when reviewing the three bullets below, she suggested considering adding a point about avoiding the conversion of light industrial and manufacturing to residential uses. This was particularly relevant, as it related to the fact that they had given away hundreds of acres of formerly light industrial and high industrial land to residential uses. She said that finally, page nine stated "ensure data remains current," but it did not specify how they would do it. She asked staff to consider how they would realistically accomplish that.

Ms. McKeel expressed her gratitude to staff for the language about diversifying the tax base and economy.

Mr. Pruitt asked if they had discussed action 3.3 in the past.

Ms. Filardo said they had discussed a Defense Production Zone in various contexts before, but she did not think they had ever formally presented it to the Board for their consideration and a vote.

Ms. McKeel asked if staff could define what that the Defense Production Zone was.

Mr. Ben Holt, Senior Planner II, clarified that Action 3.3 was a new action that was not present in the previous draft.

Ms. McKeel said that this was a new concept in the State, as well.

Mr. Pruitt said that he did not recall discussing it previously, and honestly he did not know what all a Defense Production Zone would entail. He said that it sounded fine at this stage, and he had no reason to oppose it.

Ms. Filardo said that she would suggest changing "pursue" to "consider" in Action 3.3, which would allow for further contemplation and research before committing to it entirely.

Mr. Andrews said he had almost nothing to add to what had been said, but he would like to reiterate that they had mentioned the Buildout Analysis in this section. There was also discussion about updating it two to three years, but they recently discussed it being implemented as more of a tool, so this section may need to be updated to reflect current thinking. He said that if there were no further comments, they could move onto the Housing Chapter.

Ms. Mallek said on page seven, she had noted that modular structures could acquire equity for the owner. She said personally, she would like to prioritize the use of modular units whenever possible due to this fact. She said in contrast, mobile and manufactured homes were treated as personal property, which meant they did not have the same financial benefits and equity ladder as modular homes.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 12, according to the second paragraph, the Zoning Ordinance restrictions could limit or prohibit the development of these units. She said she was not aware of any such restrictions in Albemarle, so she would ask that they ensure they were referring to Albemarle's own restrictions in this case.

Mr. Svoboda said that staff would review that section.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 15, action 1.5, she had made a note that they should add smaller lot sizes where appropriate, and for 1.6, she believed upper floors over 14 feet with a first floor for commercial use would allow for flexibility and potential future changes.

Ms. McKeel said that she was grateful for the addition of the Asset-Limited, Income-Constrained, Employed (ALICE) data, as it was specific to magisterial districts and only included employed individuals rather than students. She said additionally, she would like to suggest referencing the Economic Policy Institute Family Budget Calculator, as it allowed for County-level analysis and was more current than what they were currently using.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was generally supportive of this chapter. He said that there were a few things he would like to discuss regarding the Objectives and Actions. He said that regarding Action 2.1, he had previously discussed this topic, but he was not sure how it had concluded. Nevertheless, he thought it was essential to have a more comprehensive policy conversation about manufactured housing, rather than being constrained to this specific approach. He said he was concerned that manufactured and mobile housing may not be economically viable in the Development Area, and he had heard similar concerns from some of his peers.

Mr. Pruitt said that to address this, he would suggest that they consider adopting a broader

definition of manufactured homes, such as allowing them by-right in certain zoning districts and even considering a new zoning district specifically for manufactured housing. He said this would enable a more thorough discussion and collective consideration by the Board, potentially leading to the establishment of zoning districts tailored to manufactured housing.

Ms. Filardo said that they would strike "Development Areas" from the end of that Action.

Ms. Mallek asked if this also referred to modular homes.

Mr. Pruitt said that on page 17, Action 4.4, they discuss reducing involuntary displacement and increasing access to equitable relocation options. He said tools that were available in some localities were a variety of things, such as requiring relocation plans and other measures. He wondered if they could simplify this by just saying reduce and ease involuntary displacement, without getting into specifics. However, a more comprehensive approach to displacement would involve exploring local options regarding displacement, which went beyond just reducing displacement.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page 12, they discussed form, and focusing on form, rather than density. She asked whether or not this section was necessary if form-based code could address this issue.

Mr. Barnes said that the intent was to encourage development that would match the form of the existing residences in the area, even if it may be different internally.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they could use the word "varied" on page 14 instead of "diverse." She said that regarding page 16, she understood that the legislature had given churches the right to include residential units on their property. She said that this perhaps such units could also help address their low-income and very low-income housing needs. She said perhaps they could consider allowing those units by right on church property, given that they had sufficient land.

Mr. Svoboda said that they would have to look at any legislative changes to the code and see what that was. If not, if it was not there and they were interested in doing something like that, then there were possibilities to look into that as far as code changes. He said he thought there was a potential opportunity to explore this further.

Mr. Pruitt clarified that the bill had not passed, and he would be surprised if it did.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she did not know that, so she appreciated the update. She said that additionally, on 3.1, she was wondering what tenant protections specifically would entail.

Ms. Filardo said that she knew they had had some conversations about the Tenant Protection Act and how they did not enforce that. There was work being done in Richmond to change their ability to enforce the Tenant Protection Act. She was not sure where that stood, but she believed this was where that came from. She said they had had several people come to the County asking for help, and they had told them they could not assist.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she hoped that bill would pass, and at that point staff could revisit this Action.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked why LGBTQ+ individuals were specified in Action 6.2. She said she was wondering why other groups were not considered.

Ms. Filardo explained that this came from statistics that they had seen, and staff had also noted, that LGBTQ+ individuals were the most highly discriminated against in terms of housing. She suggested that in the context of the next 20 years, perhaps the approach would be to remove the specific reference to LGBTQ+ individuals, allowing them to work with anyone, including local advocacy groups, to improve staff training and other initiatives. This way, they could provide assistance to everyone, regardless of their background or identity.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would strongly encourage the preservation of this language in the Action. He said that there were unique challenges, particularly in the context of shelters, for LGBT individuals and LGBT youth. There was data that supported this, and the barriers were evident, even locally in Albemarle and Charlottesville. He said that providers of low-barrier shelters may still discriminate and not allow LGBT people from even staying in shelters. He said that there were ongoing concerns, including the difficulties transgender people faced when seeking shelter that was further complicated by strong directions from the federal administration.

Mr. Pruitt said that as someone who worked in housing, specifically discrimination in housing, he wanted to emphasize that these challenges were distinct and did not apply to other protected classes. If they were considering this in other contexts, it would be more appropriate. However, in the shelter and supportive services context, where these barriers were unique, he believed it was essential to continue differentiating.

Ms. Filardo asked if they could add "and other advocacy groups" to be more inclusive in the statement.

Mr. Pruitt said, sure.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that in the next Action, 6.3, "engage individuals with lived experience of homelessness in the design of rapid rehousing programs" She asked if that was a feasible approach for staff to implement.

Ms. Filardo said that she would follow up with Ms. Pethia to discuss implementation of that Action, because she was unsure of what the specifics would be. She said that staff would modify it as needed.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was supportive of the concept but was interested in how they would identify the process.

Mr. Andrews said that he was supportive of this section and the addition of advocacy groups to the LGBTQ+ housing action. He said that one comment he would like to make was related to the Planning Commission. He was concerned that another potential loss of affordable units may have occurred due to a lack of community awareness, and he was wondering if there was an objective measure, such as Action 7.2, that they could work on to increase community awareness of affordable housing opportunities. He thought it was crucial that they did not risk people not being aware of the opportunity for affordable housing. If this had already been addressed, he did not see it.

Ms. Filardo said that she had added a note to include a 7.2 for promoting affordable housing awareness.

Ms. McKeel said that the Board did not hold a vote on it, and she was not sure if there was consensus, but they had discussed funding to purchase derelict houses, specifically in the Development Area, as a way to provide more affordable housing options. Given that they had a number of derelict houses and the potential to purchase them at a low cost, it could provide more affordable housing. She thought it was worth considering including it in the discussion.

Mr. Andrews said that he thought it was something that would be best phrased as a suggestion to study the issue.

Ms. McKeel said that she thought it should at least be included in the Comprehensive Plan, so it was not lost as a potential avenue in the future.

Ms. Mallek said that to add to the church properties discussion, one of the reasons the bill had failed last year was due to the inability to treat church properties differently from other properties in the same zoning category.

Ms. Mallek said that she had noted a point about preservation of Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAAs) in Action 2.3, but she was unsure if it was intended for this section or not. She would leave that thought with staff to ensure it did not get lost.

Mr. Andrews said that next, they would discuss the Environmental Stewardship Chapter.

Ms. Mallek said that referring to page 13, she grew grass-fed beef, and she wanted to clarify that there was a huge difference in emissions between pasture-raised cows and feedlot ones. She said that she greatly appreciated much of what staff had included in this chapter. She said that she was grateful to see mention of the sewage sludge ordinance, because every time there was a renewal with a certain percentage increase, they were losing another 500 to 1,000 acres from being usable for food production.

Ms. Mallek said that more information was available all the time about the contents in the sludge and what was happening, which was taking huge numbers of acres out of food production altogether because it was now considered poison. She hoped they would consider this. She noted that the Don't Spread on Me representatives had provided a draft to everyone, which they had worked hard on to give Mr. Herrick a starting point based on Fauquier's 25-year effort.

Ms. Mallek said that with Action 3.2 on page 17, this was a really great idea, and she would just like to encourage the County to bring back the monitoring of the County well and establish cooperative agreements with private well owners who could either have someone come and read the depth of their well or do it for them and report similar to their stream health civilians who monitored the streams. They could get a lot more widely distributed information about groundwater and well depth, which was lost when the County abandoned tracking the well on the Mechums River during the recession in 2009.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding Action 3.4, she would like to know whether they had the authority to require that septic systems be attached to public services when a property was being sold. She said that on page 18, 4.1, she strongly supported considering impacts to biodiversity as part of the site review process. This had been discussed since the first plan was introduced in 2006 or whenever it was. This would be a significant step forward, providing people with enough information to make the best recommendation and decision.

Ms. Mallek said that for Action 4.2, she suggested adding a provision to avoid new roadways for all construction, as this would help carry out many of the bullets. She said that on Action 4.4, she noticed that there appeared to be a duplicate of the third and fourth bullet points at the bottom of page 18. She said that she was unsure of what action this referred to, but she had made another note that they should restore degraded streams and wetlands to improve habitat and flood resiliency, so she would ask that

staff ensure that was included.

Ms. Mallek said that additionally, they should remove obstructions such as the Mechums Pump Station, which caused downstream erosion. She knew that in Action 5.3, they were discussing migration barriers, but also, the erosion caused by this was also important. She said that for Action 6.7 on page 20, she asked that they please consider language to raise the standards for stormwater facilities, as some of the older ones are failing. She said that they could not expect Homeowners Associations (HOAs) to pay for new stormwater facilities when the fault lay with the original developer and the County.

Mr. Svoboda said that he would discuss that further with Ms. Mallek because the regulations were much different now than they were 20 years ago.

Ms. Mallek said that finally, on page 21, Action 6.13, she would like to suggest that they emphasize tree conservation, as well as increasing the number of trees planted, because preserving large trees had a much greater impact on the canopy than planting smaller ones that may not be as significant in the long term.

Ms. McKeel said that she thought this chapter was excellent and she was supportive of almost all of it; however, there was noticeable redundancy. She knew there were many people in their community who, if they tripled the size of this chapter, would be thrilled. Having said that, she thought it was worth considering where there was redundancy and streamlining the document by incorporating elements from other well-executed documents they already had published. She said that the redundancy made the chapter too long, but other than that, the chapter was very well-written, and she supported it.

Ms. Mallek said she would like a redline version because if not, they would never know until it was too late what was taken out of the document.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed with Ms. McKeel.

Mr. Andrews said that he agreed with the Planning Commission that throughout the document, there were some places where things were immeasurable. He said that additionally, Commissioner Firehock had pointed out that Action 7.3 was just asking them to take action without specifying how they would do that.

Ms. Swartzendruber noted that the Planning Commission had pointed out that Action 4.8 was reading like two actions that were combined, and she wanted to clarify that this would be split into two action items.

Mr. Andrews said that the next chapter they would discuss was Parks, Recreation, and Open Space.

Ms. Mallek said that on page 20, she was wondering whether the table was necessary.

Ms. Filardo said that they could replace this with a chart instead of a table, possibly a graph or another visual representation.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated the additions to the 4.2 policy update, particularly the inclusion of current information, which had been significantly advanced over the last 16 years. She said that on 4.7, removal of invasive species, she recommended that certified County staff be the only ones using chemicals to remove invasive species, rather than relying on volunteers, who may not have the necessary certification. This approach reduced liability risks and ensured that only trained personnel were handling hazardous materials.

Ms. Mallek said that she also wanted to mention that recognizing gravel roads for low-barrier recreation in the Rural Areas should be included, although she would leave that to staff to determine the correct location.

Ms. Swartzendruber said that she thought that it was addressed in the Transportation Chapter, but they could double-check. She said it was part of the Rural Rustic Program, but she would verify that to make sure.

Mr. Barnes said that it was mentioned in Action 4.3 of the rural section of the Transportation Chapter.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated it. She said that regarding Action 6.1, she would greatly support future Boards in avoiding the six-year ordeal of synthetic turf fields, which had been involved in numerous lawsuits nationwide due to their content and consequences. She said they had also had great success with returning to natural grass fields, and she believed they should avoid reliving the experience of turf.

Mr. Svoboda said that the language may also refer to changing the type of grass on the field, rather than specifying turf.

Ms. Mallek said that her recommendation would be to specify the language so that turf was not a consideration. She said she had two new additions to include, and she would hand them over to staff to review and edit as needed. She said that she would like to encourage landowners and neighborhoods

partner to develop community trails, as was already happening in the County. On private property, landowners were offering access for people to walk through, and individuals were accessing the trails through their own property. By having conversations and allowing Parks staff to engage with landowners, they could increase awareness and invite participation from these individuals.

Ms. Mallek said that one final point she would like to bring up was access to park areas, particularly limited access to sensitive areas where resource protection was crucial, unless extraordinary measures could be taken. She believed there was a bullet point in this document that discussed increasing accessibility and opening up more remote areas for public visitation. However, there were certain locations, such as the rock outcrops at Arrowhead, that required guided tours due to the unique and protected plant species found there. She said that she would give her full comments to staff for their review.

Ms. McKeel said that on page 11, she thought it would be helpful to see the total acreage. Additionally, she would like to see a separate column or line to indicate which trails allowed biking and which did not. She believed there was room for a couple more columns on this page, so she would like to request that they add those.

Ms. McKeel said that she had many constituents who could not access many of their parks due to lack of transportation. She asked what this document had to say about making parks more accessible, particularly through the concept of urban and pocket parks.

Mr. Andrews said that Action 7.3 was the only reference he saw for pocket parks.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to see something in this document for the folks in urban areas who need access to green spaces. Unfortunately, simply telling them to ride the bus or find alternative transportation was not a viable solution. She said that Fairfax County had some strict language in their ordinances regarding trail placement in neighborhoods, which they should consider. On page 18, she would like to revisit the Small Area Plan for the Lambs Lane Campus.

Ms. McKeel said that she thought there was opportunity to explore trail connections on that campus. She said that additionally, there was water infrastructure behind some of those facilities that could also have more trails and recreational opportunities. She said that although the properties were owned by the School Division, she would like for County staff to consider connections that could be made using those properties. She said that Action 3.7 was concerning to her. She asked if they would be putting in public restrooms in all of their public parks. She said that she would recommend adding "where feasible" to provide some flexibility in that respect.

Mr. Pruitt said that with Action 5.6, the only mention of the Three Notch'd Trail was in the context of leveraging the study. He believed the Comprehensive Plan should be forward-thinking and visionary, and he thought capping this through the context of the most immediate action they had in front of them was limiting. For a project that would last years and a plan that would last years, he wondered if the language should be broader and more inclusive, similar to the previous action they had considered in the Rural Areas. Specifically, the Rural Areas Transportation Chapter had prioritized the federally supported Three Notch'd Trail shared use path. He was wondering if they should either bring this language here or only include it in one section and not the other.

Ms. Filardo said that she thought they could take it out of this section since it was addressed elsewhere.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page 25, sections 7.1 and 7.3, there was mention of donations to the Parks Foundation. She was unsure of what the goal was here.

Mr. Barnes said that he thought the intent here was to aggregate development as it happened, rather than having a small, isolated dog park on individual properties. He said that could they instead aggregate some of these developments and use the Parks Foundation as a vehicle to put them into a larger County parks system that would be close to neighborhoods, allowing people to walk to them. He believed that was the underlying intent here, which was to use the Parks Foundation as a path to create a larger and more equitable parks system.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed with that motive, but she was unsure if the Parks Foundation would be able to help in that way, considering they may be limited in their funding and availability.

Ms. Mallek said that people could always donate directly to the County for various things. She said that the Parks Foundation was doing its own thing.

Mr. Holt said that he thought they could also add language to suggest publicly accessible green spaces, because he believed that was the intended purpose, to redirect funds that would have gone towards private green spaces and allocate them to publicly accessible spaces.

Mr. Andrews noted that he still thought pocket parks were a priority but had noticed they had been dropped from a few different places in the document. Additionally, he wanted to mention that Ms. Firehock had brought up a great point at the Planning Commission meeting that they should encourage participation with the Department of Wildlife Resources Birding and Wildlife Trails Program.

Ms. Mallek said that one question she had regarding 7.3 on page 25 was to avoid the trap that they had been in for years, where affordable housing responsibility was bought out by a \$16,000 one-time fee. She suggested making sure that if they were going to receive cash for something, it was a substantial amount, rather than just a cheap cop-out. Even a small park, like a 0.25-acre park, located right next to a housing complex, could be wonderful to have, especially if it included amenities like swings, allowing parents to take their children there instead of having to travel.

Mr. Pruitt said that unfortunately, he would have to leave the meeting so he could get home to have dinner and take care of his dog. He said that he would review the remaining AC44 chapters and submit any comments he had on them, but at this point he did not have any major critiques. He said that the Board knew his position on the implementation and the Big Moves.

Mr. Pruitt left the meeting at 6:35 p.m.

Mr. Andrews said that he understood. He said that they only had a few chapters left to discuss, and there would still be a quorum without Mr. Pruitt, so he would suggest the Board continue and finish with the work session.

Ms. Mallek said that since AC44 was a long-term plan, she would ask they strike the end of the paragraph on page 14 to avoid prioritizing examples that were actually short-term items. She said that on page 17, Action 2.8, she thought murals should be included in this section. She said that in Action 4.8, she would ask that they only refer to cemeteries, rather than specific types of cemeteries, because all cemeteries should be preserved and protected.

Ms. Mallek stated that in the Community Facilities and Services Chapter, she wanted to clarify Objective 2 on page 2. She said that on page 16, Action 2.1, she was concerned about the third point, because it sounded like they were encumbering ACSA (Albemarle County Service Authority) and RWSA (Rivanna Solid Waste Authority) to provide services where they were not intended to go.

Mr. Barnes said that their current policy was part of that assessment.

Ms. Mallek said that they had only ever considered it for adjacency and immediate failures of buildings, which had only happened twice in 50 years. She said that it had never been considered for future development, so the way it was worded here gave her concern.

Mr. Svoboda explained that if it was cheaper to hook up to public water and sewer, they could do so, but if it was cheaper to have well and septic, they would do that.

Ms. Mallek noted that septic fields now cost \$30,000, which was twice the hookup fee, so she supposed that one was no longer relevant. She said that moving on, Action 2.4, she was wondering who was responsible for that task.

Ms. Filardo replied that the Office of Drinking Water was responsible for that.

Mr. Svoboda clarified that those were central, not individual, systems.

Ms. Mallek said that she wholly supported Action 2.8 at the bottom of the same page, which highlighted the RWSA's decision not to apply sludge to fields locally. This was also in support of the County adopting the state-mandated reporting requirements as quickly as possible, which would provide them with additional information on the applications they were receiving, and potentially bring things under control relatively quickly, as had been the case in other Counties that had been implementing this approach for a long time. This was a valuable resource for doing their homework on the sludge issue.

Ms. Mallek said that she would be very interested in the user numbers mentioned in Action 3.1, specifically regarding the resources for renovations in the Central Library, which had been underutilized for 15 years. She had been told that there were more County users than City users, but she had not seen any recent update on this since many circumstances downtown had changed. Additionally, she had been informed that people's library usage patterns had shifted, so she would like to obtain more information on this topic at some point.

Ms. Mallek said that on page five of the Plan Implementation, under the legislative decision, the last line of that paragraph seemed a bit prejudicial, implying that certain things would be approved without explanation. She would leave that thought with staff; she had never seen anything like that before in a Comprehensive Plan. Perhaps rephrasing the message to applicants to emphasize that only those applications in line with Board policies would be considered, rather than implying a specific outcome, would be more accurate. She commended staff for all their hard work.

Ms. McKeel asked if the Board members could send in their remaining suggestions and comments to staff prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Andy Herrick, County Attorney, noted that the Board had two meetings between now and then.

Mr. Barnes said that staff would be working to incorporate Board feedback from this work session into the final document they would present to the Planning Commission in about a month. He said that however, if they needed more time, they could push the schedule back.

Ms. Filardo said that Board members were welcome to call her, and they could talk through the chapters in detail to make sure all their feedback was incorporated.

Agenda Item No. 3. From the Board: Discussion of Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 4. From the County Executive: a Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

There was none.

Agenda Item No. 5. Adjourn.

At 6:48 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to September 17, 2025, 1:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium, Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA, 22902. Mr. Andrews said information on how to participate in the meeting would be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 01/21/2026
Initials: CKB