

**Albemarle County Planning Commission  
Work Session and Regular Meeting  
Draft Minutes July 8, 2025**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public meeting on Tuesday, July 8, 2025, at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Fred Missel, Chair; Julian Bivins; Corey Clayborne; Karen Firehock; Nathan Moore; Lonnie Murray.

Members absent: Luis Carrazana, Vice Chair.

Other officials present were Michael Barnes, Director of Planning; Ben Holt, Senior Planner II; Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager; Tonya Swartzendruber, Planning Manager; Andy Herrick, County Attorney; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

**Call to Order and Establish Quorum**

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Mr. Missel established a quorum.

**Public Hearing**

**ZMA2024-08 Brookhill Amendment**

Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager, said that she would be presenting the staff's recommendations for this rezoning. She said that this was a focused amendment to the existing Brookhill Neighborhood Model Development. She said that she would review the details about the location and proposed changes. She said that the changes were limited to a request to increase the maximum number of units within the development from 1,550 to 1,850 units. She said that additionally, there were some proffer amendments.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the Brookhill development was located east of Route 29 on Polo Grounds Road, south of Ashwood Boulevard. She said that it was located in the Places 29 Master Plan area, north of the south fork of the Rivanna River. She said that an aerial image of the site showed that it was under development, with portions already constructed. She said that the development had been approved since 2015. She said that the location proposed for rezoning was indicated on the slide. She said that north of the site was Forest Lakes, to the west was the rural area, and then to the east was the Montgomery Ridge subdivision along Polo Grounds Road.

Ms. Ragsdale said that it was zoned neighborhood model development, as she mentioned. She said that on the zoning map, the white areas represented rural areas, including property south of Polo Grounds Road that was not in the development area. She said that the turquoise colors indicated planned unit development or either. She said that the light green represented R-1 residential. She said that according to the Places 29 Land Use Map, the Brookhill development was indicated NS, which stood for neighborhood service center, which was approved with that rezoning. She said that the Places 29 Master Plan designated it neighborhood density, urban

density, and open space and environmental features indicated in green. She said that the Places 29 master plan was one of their older master plans which had not been updated yet.

Ms. Ragsdale said that Brookhill's designation was consistent with the plan's neighborhood service center urban density designations and then the neighborhood density designations. She said that providing for all the green space, as outlined in the Places 29 Master Plan, and recognizing the streams and natural features on the site, with the pattern of green space along the streams. She said that as mentioned, this request was to increase the residential density. She said that there was no proposed change to the nonresidential uses in the code of development, and the amendment was straightforward in this regard, updating their regulating table for the neighborhood model code of development.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the neighborhood model district was the most detailed in terms of regulations, and those were broken down by block for large developments like Brookhill. She said that there was a lot of detail in the regulations; however, the proposed changes did not alter their minimum requirement for nonresidential development, which remained 50,000 square feet or increase their maximum to 130,000 square feet. She said that the focus of the changes was on the blocks designated as neighborhood center or urban density.

Ms. Ragsdale said that regarding the proffer amendment, with the size of this development, an extensive proffer package was approved to protect resources, provide for adequate parks and greenways, cash proffers, schools, and transportation. She said that there was only one minor adjustment to the schools proffers, ensuring that the proffer for the 7-acre elementary school site could be used for additional community amenities. She said that the transportation proffers also required a slight adjustment to the timing of the Ashwood Boulevard connection. She said that they had discussed the affordable housing provisions at length. She said that Places 29 had not been updated in the comprehensive plan, but they had an updated housing policy, Housing Albemarle.

Ms. Ragsdale said that with the proposed revision to the proffers, the applicant was proposing to partially comply with the updated housing policy, providing 20% of the requested 300 new units as affordable housing. She said that they were not proposing to change any of the other terms and conditions that were offered in the previous proffers. She said that the staff report noted that the proposed revisions would make the proposal entirely consistent with the housing policy, which was related to the 60% Area Median Income (AMI) for rent units, as well as addressing the newer policy recommendations for the term of affordability.

Ms. Ragsdale said that staff had recommended approval of this rezoning. She said that it remained consistent with the density and land use recommendations of the Places 29 Master Plan. She said that the proposal had undergone an extensive review by other agencies, focusing on impacts, particularly transportation. She said that the applicant had provided an updated transportation impact analysis, which found that the existing proffers were adequate to address any trips generated by the additional 300 units. She said that staff had also noted the concern about partial consistency with the affordable housing policy.

Mr. Moore said that he wanted to confirm that there were no changes to the commercial square footage, only the residential number of units.

Ms. Ragsdale said that that was correct.

Mr. Moore said that he also had questions about the affordable housing property tax abatement incentive. He said that he was curious about how the 20% affordability requirement at 60% AMI for 30 years would work if applied only to this proposed new portion of an existing model development.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she believed there were two key components: the policy and the programs to implement it. She said that in staff's analysis, they had focused on the policy aspect, but they had not discussed the implementation of one particular tool that was part of the program.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had a clarifying question regarding policy and implementation, specifically with regards to housing. He asked if Housing Albemarle was a policy that was optional, allowing individuals to choose whether to participate or not, or if this was a function of a policy that was adopted prior to this being implemented, so the applicant could decide what they wanted to do with regards to that policy.

Ms. Ragsdale said that she believed that many rezonings that came before the Commission may not fully align with existing policies, particularly when it came to what applicants were proposing. She said that it was not an ordinance.

Mr. Clayborne asked if that meant that they did have the option to select and choose which projects or initiatives they wanted to pursue.

Ms. Ragsdale said that they were starting to see scenarios like this, where it had been approved under the prior proffers, and this was what they had offered under the new policy.

Mr. Clayborne asked if this development were to start from scratch today, would they be able to choose to participate in their Housing Albemarle policy, or if the applicant would be required to follow the policy.

Mr. Barnes said that for a new development, they would be required to meet the Housing Policy. He said that it was difficult to apply the new housing policy to previously approved developments such as this one.

Mr. Clayborne said that he just wanted to clarify that for future developments, they would be required to do all the things in Housing Albemarle and could not choose to partially abide by the policy.

Mr. Barnes said that generally, yes, but they did not have an enforceable ordinance that required developers to follow the policy. He said that to be honest, there may be times when they had extenuating circumstances that affected it, such as in this case when it was about a proffer.

Mr. Clayborne said that he understood now that there was a difference between a policy and an ordinance. He said that he wondered what the point of the policy was if it had no enforceability.

Mr. Barnes said that the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors had the ability to deny these types of rezoning requests.

Mr. Bivins said that the County should consider asking developers to donate the affordable units to the County so the County could hold them in an affordable housing trust. He said that this way, the County could ensure they were being used and would remain affordable in perpetuity. He said that the only reason the Commission was seeing this situation was because it was an exception that the applicant must receive approval for, and otherwise the County would not have any kind of oversight of this development.

Mr. Clayborne said that he believed that in order to ensure compliance, the County had to have some level of control, rather than begging.

Mr. Bivins said that he believed that was why donating properties to a housing trust would allow the County to have an inventory they could maintain as affordable.

Mr. Murray said that he agreed with Mr. Bivins' point.

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

Ashley Davies, Riverbend Development, said that she was here tonight with Alan Taylor, also from Riverbend, and Scott Collins, from Collins Engineering. She said that she appreciated the Commission's consideration of their request to add 300 additional units to the Brookhill neighborhood. She said that as Ms. Ragsdale had mentioned, this was previously zoned as a neighborhood model district around nine years ago, and it was located within the County's designated growth area. She said that they believed this proposal aligned with the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan in three key areas.

Ms. Davies said that it enabled them to continue preserving rural areas by providing a significant amount of additional housing at various price points within the strategic growth area. She said that Brookhill did an exceptional job of protecting habitat areas and critical environmental spaces on the site. She said that this entire property was 277 acres, and tonight, they were looking at approximately one-tenth of that in this rezoning. She said that they initially provided around \$30 million in in-kind and donations, as well as transportation improvements to the County, and the 50-acre high school site, the 7-acre elementary school site. She said that this included transit stops for future transit routes and a \$500,000 donation to the County once established.

Ms. Davies said that this site also featured a third of its area in open space with four miles of trails. She said that a key component of the initial rezoning was preserving the salamander habitat and providing tunnels under the road to allow the salamanders to access the vernal pools for mating. She said that they were about a third of the way into the site construction, and one could see on the slide the areas shown in light yellow, which represented the neighborhood density. She said that at the initial application time, density was not as welcome in Albemarle County, so they were getting closer to the comprehensive plan's desired density.

Ms. Davies said that their original plan would have included over 500 single-family homes with larger lots, but due to changing circumstances, they were now trying to meet the demand for housing while providing a range of price points and lower price points. She said that the next slide showed the entire community at total build-out, and the diagram highlighted the preserved areas, including over 75 acres of green spaces. She said that these areas would provide a more urban density in the neighborhoods, while also featuring wonderful trails, green spaces, and amenities.

throughout. She said that later this year, the town center would go under construction, bringing the heart of the community to life.

Ms. Davies said that the next slide showed the amenity spaces throughout the neighborhood, demonstrating how the trail network and existing spaces would be accessible from various neighborhood pods, as well as the future ones in the town center area and the school site. She said that residents had expressed a need for more spaces for recreation and community activities, and they were addressing this by adding amenities to the site, which may or may not be part of the school in the future. She said that additionally, the trails were all open to the general public.

Ms. Davies said that the next map provided a sense of the site's build out to date. She said that the areas outlined in pink and the lighter color were already complete and developed. She said that the area in the upper right, marked in yellow, was currently under construction. She said that they planned to start working on the town center later this year. She said that additionally, there were areas currently under design. She said that to give a sense of what had been accomplished so far, the senior living was in place. She said that they had already constructed 762 of the total residential units, as shown on the screen. She said that they also had over 300 units that qualified as affordable units in the first phase of apartments for Brookhill. She said that what was notable about this site was that a significant portion of it was already constructed.

Ms. Davies said that they spent a decade developing their comprehensive code of development for the site, which was extensive. She said that since then, they had been working closely with staff on the affordable units since then. She said that managing a site of this size, with this many units, was a full-time job and required a great deal of complexity. She said that one of the challenges they faced was tracking and complying with the units, auditing, and managing it all. She said that they were proud of what they were providing, and with this new addition, they aimed to increase their offerings to the County. She said that the provided map highlighted the 27-acre area of the site that was the subject of this rezoning.

Ms. Davies said that the additional 300 units would be built in this area, without impacting the green spaces. She said that this proposal offers four key benefits: it was a great location, close to essential amenities for residents, already zoned land where they had invested significant money and resources into the infrastructure and had increased their affordable housing commitment of 20% while also maintaining the rest of the existing proffers. She said that they could see how much of this land is preserved and available to the public, and it was a thoughtfully designed neighborhood. She said that they believe it made sense to align more closely with the comprehensive plan's vision for this site.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was a combined trigger number for Ashwood Boulevard, considering the same developer owned both sections, so they could move traffic onto Ashwood Boulevard in a coordinated manner.

Ms. Davies said that the Ashwood Boulevard connection was entirely tied to the Brookhill rezoning that was approved ten years ago. She said that when the 500th certificate of occupancy (CO) of Brookhill was completed, they would need the connection. She said that they were diligently working towards the completion of the Ashwood/Archer connection; however, there had been some unseen complexities that impacted that. She said that they required approvals from the County, VDOT, and wetland preservation that resulted in an extended timeline and adjustment to that proffer.

Ms. Davies said that the other project was not reliant on that road connection but was planned to be in alignment with the other developments in the area.

Mr. Bivins asked if the school site was specific to an elementary school or if they would have the flexibility to make it a middle school or high school if need be.

Ms. Davies said that she believed both the high school and elementary school site proffers were worded specifically to allow flexibility for the County to use the sites as they saw fit.

Mr. Bivins said that there was a plantation house on this property, as well as a graveyard connected to it. He asked how the developer was approaching the preservation of those historic and cultural resources.

Ms. Davies said that there was a 3.5-acre parcel surrounding the home on this site, inclusive of the graveyard. She said that this property was retained by the family who previously owned the entire site, so the developer of Brookhill had no ownership or control of that property.

Mr. Barnes said that to clarify, the proffers related to the school site had language that allowed for the development of a public park in case the County decided a school was not necessary on the property.

Mr. Bivins said that he hoped the County would never establish another public park. He said that they already had 500 acres of parks that were inaccessible to most people in the development area.

Mr. Murray said that one of the significant challenges they had faced with affordable units was that they often struggled to match residents to those spaces before the time period expired. He said that as a result, he was curious to know the developer's thought process when considering how to strike a balance between increasing the percentage of affordable use units and extending the time period during which those units remained affordable.

Ms. Davies said that one thing she would like to mention is that with the existing apartments at Brookhill, they had not had any trouble in finding tenants for the affordable units. She said that in fact, they were consistently well-leased and remain leased. She said that this indicated a high demand for that affordable housing. She said that unlike the existing proffers for the for-sale units, which would instantly go to market rate, the affordable units at Brookhill provided a more stable and affordable option. She said that as a company, Riverbend had been actively seeking solutions to address affordability, and they had explored various approaches across different sites. She said that at Brookhill, they were primarily considering rental as the affordable solution.

Ms. Davies said that at Victorian Heights, they had successfully implemented the Piedmont Community Land Trust model, which had enabled residents to achieve permanent home ownership and affordability. She said that they planned to replicate that model at the Archer North site and potentially elsewhere. She said that each site presented a unique assessment, and she believed that by examining the different approaches in this area, they could develop a patchwork of solutions to address affordability.

Mr. Missel asked if the developer had considered extending the affordability period beyond the ten years required, in addition to increasing the percentage of affordable units.

Ms. Davies said that they had not considered it yet, but it could be something to discuss.

Mr. Murray said that the County's landscaping policy only really applied to trees, but the developer for this site had invested a lot of money into preserving nice greenways on the property. He asked if they had any plans to remove invasive species within the green space.

Ms. Davies said that it was certainly of interest to her. She said that Mr. Collins and his team may be able to discuss that point in more detail. She said that she did not think they would be planting any invasive or harmful species in their developments, and they certainly would remove any if they were told to. She said that another thing they were working on was not just having the trails available, but also workout stations along the trails.

Mr. Moore said that he appreciated the other Commissioners' questions and comments about addressing affordable housing. He asked how they were going to squeeze 300 more units in such a small geographic area. He asked if they would be building taller buildings or making them smaller apartments.

Ms. Davies said that they had initially planned to have commercial and office space located on the floors above the first floor town center, but they decided to pursue more residential units instead once it was determined there was a lack of demand for office space.

Mr. Missel asked if the additional residential space would result in a change in the percentage of mixed-use and commercial retail components in this development.

Ms. Davies said that the commercial percentage would remain the same as originally intended. She said that the only change was that the office space was being replaced. She said that therefore, they were still looking at the same amount of ground floor commercial space, which aligned with their original zoning.

Ms. Firehock asked if there were any plans to make the rooftops available as leisure space for the residents and visitors. She said that the views from this location would be magnificent.

Ms. Davies said that they would look into the feasibility of doing that.

Mr. Missel asked what the AMI was for the 301 affordable units.

Ms. Davies said that they were 80% AMI.

Mr. Missel asked if mitigating the residual impacts of the increased number of units had been analyzed with regards to the Ashwood Boulevard connector road.

Ms. Davies said that the proffers were not planned with that level of precision. She said that they had had their traffic engineer review it, but at the time, it was about picking a number to make sure they met the necessary timing requirements of the proffer. She said that it was adjusted to give a bit more runway.

Mr. Missel asked if the potential community open space on the 7-acre school site would be maintained by the developer.

Ms. Davies said that they would. She said that one significant advantage of this proposal was that they could build it out as a community park space, and they would be responsible for maintaining it until the County decided it wanted it. She said that this would take it off the County's responsibility until that time. She said that it would remain a public amenity available to anyone.

Mr. Murray said that he would like to add one more point regarding the office space. He asked if they had considered the possibility that market changes may lead to a new demand for office space. He said that perhaps it would be beneficial to make some of these spaces flexible, allowing them to be converted back into office space if the need arose.

Ms. Davies said that one of the benefits of the code of development was that it allowed for the preservation of those uses without removing them. She said that they could, in the future, potentially convert any of those spaces into office space if they so desired.

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

Lindsay Hill said that she currently lived in Brookhill, where she had been a resident for approximately four years. She said that she moved to Charlottesville in 2021 as a graduate student in biology. She said that during her time here, she was working full-time while pursuing her master's part-time. She said that she completed her master's in public health at UVA in 2023, focusing on housing affordability in relation to communicable disease in Charlottesville and surrounding counties in Virginia. She said that she moved to the Brookhill community in 2021, and it was initially affordable for her.

Ms. Hill said that it was a financially viable option at the time, as she was making below the AMI threshold then. She said that the first three years of renewal were manageable, with her rent increasing to around \$1,500 per month. She said that when she was up for a 12-month lease renewal, her rent would have jumped to \$2,100 per month for a one-bedroom apartment, just for her and her small dog. She said that fortunately, they offered alternative lease options with longer terms, which only increased her rent by \$100. She said that since then, her rent had increased by \$100 to \$150 every lease renewal. She said that she was curious to know the basis for the AMI household number, as she recalled a point where she was considering moving back in with her parents due to financial concerns.

Ms. Hill said that she was from Richmond, Virginia, and living in Charlottesville was far from home. She said that thankfully, she was able to secure a higher-paying job, which had been a blessing; however, she was aware that many of her friends who moved out of the apartment complex were not as fortunate, and they were priced out of the Brookhill community. She said that she was grateful that the Commission was discussing affordable housing, as it directly related to her concerns.

Ms. Hill said that she was the youngest person and only minority at the community meeting, and probably had less of an investment since she rented and did not own, although she would like to own at some point. She said that housing affordability had always been important to her, as her mother worked for Virginia Housing, and she believed that stable and affordable housing was



essential for her to stay in Charlottesville. She said that however, if she was unable to buy or continue to rent here, she could not stay in this community.

Ms. Shaffer said that there was one speaker signed up online.

Carolyn Cartwright said that she resided at Brookhill villas. She said that she had lived there for about two years and was employed at UVA. She said that she was very excited about the community and everything it had to offer, including the retail space, so she was glad to see that that would be coming up. She said that she understood the need for affordable housing, but she had concerns about the neighborhood. She said that since the plots had been filled and the houses had been sold, she had noticed a problem with parking in the area. She said that she was concerned about how the increased number of units would affect parking.

Ms. Cartwright said that considering the amenities available and the current amenities that seemed to be degrading, for example, the concrete was starting to chip away in the sidewalks, and the fire pit was deteriorating. She said that she believed additional amenities for youth in the area would become increasingly important. She said that she was aware of the lighting concerns regarding light pollution, but she believed additional lighting to ensure safety for individuals walking through the neighborhood would be crucial.

Ms. Cartwright said that these things would become increasingly important as the population grew. She said that she was a bit confused about the 60 affordable units available, considering the price they had paid for their house, and she worried that the affordable housing may affect their property value and the investment they had made. She said that these were just some of the concerns she had, and she thought they should be considered as they moved forward with this project.

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

Mr. Murray said that he respected the design of this community. He said that it was a good model and he would like to see more of this type of mix of green space and mixed-use buildings. He said that he was glad to see more density in this area.

Ms. Firehock asked if they knew where the additional parking would be, or if the developer felt there was adequate parking already existing in the development.

Ms. Davies said that they had planned 1,100 parking spaces for the future town center area, which was more than sufficient to accommodate the uses they had planned.

Ms. Firehock asked if Ms. Davies had a response to the public comment about the parking issues right now.

Ms. Davies said that the resident who spoke was located in the northern section of the site, which was a considerable distance from the town center. She said that although it was walkable, it was not directly adjacent. She said that the units they were placing within the pink area on the map would have ample parking available, with large parking fields directly adjacent to them. She said that this meant that residents would not need to drive to the town center and park in the neighborhood, reducing the potential impact on their section of the neighborhood.

Ms. Firehock asked if Ms. Davies could address the other comment made regarding increasing rents.

Ms. Davies said that she believed that rents had increased across the board in Albemarle County over the past few years, and the area median income was also rising. She said that as a result, rents had gone up slightly, but they were still lower than the 80% area median income threshold. She said that she would greatly appreciate the opportunity to connect with that speaker after the meeting. She said that she may qualify for one of the units being transferred to the Piedmont Land Trust in the next month or two. She said that if she was interested in becoming a homeowner, this could be a fantastic option that still allowed her to remain in the immediate area.

Ms. Firehock asked if someone was living in an affordable unit, and meanwhile the general regional rent prices were becoming more expensive, did they raise the rate by the same percent on someone in an affordable unit as the market rate units?

Ms. Davies said no. She said that the market rate units were moving at a totally different pace than the affordable units. She said that to qualify as an affordable unit, it had to stay below the 80% AMI, which was constantly being audited with the County. She said that even though the rate may stay below, that could still be unaffordable to some people.

Mr. Murray said that he had mentioned this previously, but he believed this was where part of the challenge lay. He said that they had two distinct economies, comprising individuals who derived their income from investments and those who relied on wages. He said that the 80% AMI for wage employees was significantly different from that of investment residents. He said that he was not sure if this disparity would be something they could consider in the future, as it highlighted the differences between these two populations. He said that they wanted to attract more wage employees to their community and that should be considered in these calculations.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had always been a strong supporter of the project and appreciated the applicant's efforts to reach for the higher allowable density. He said that they had a similar conversation throughout the AC44 process, where they discussed the limitations of their land and the need to make the most of what they had. He said that given their constraints, they must work with what they had. He said that his frustration lay in the County's inability to effectively increase housing supply with the tools they currently had.

Mr. Clayborne said that he had always believed that policy was not just about encouraging change, but rather about taking concrete action. He said that in his opinion, the encouragement they provided was not translating into meaningful results. He said that it may be too early to tell, but it did not seem to be motivating anyone. He said that perhaps they needed to re-examine their approach. He said that he and his colleagues had discussed some interesting ideas during the conversation, including the possibility of using different levers to incentivize change.

Mr. Clayborne said that for example, they could extend the length of affordability and increase the number of units. He said that given the rising costs and rising AMIs, he would like to push for a 60% affordability target, even if it meant taking on fewer units, because 60% would be more effective in addressing identified demand. He said that by pulling on these levers, they may be able to achieve a more realistic goal. He said that he was still supportive of the project, but his growing frustration stemmed from the County's inability to make progress with the tools they had.

Mr. Missel said that he would send Mr. Clayborne some notes about Dr. Pethia's recent presentation to the Commission about the County's housing program status.

Mr. Moore said that he also missed Dr. Pethia's update, although he recalled seeing a version of it at his Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting he had attended not too long ago. He said that when it came to the big-picture issues that preceded them, such as policy and legislative considerations, he thought they needed to consider these factors. He said that this project was a good one, as it added homes above the commercial first floor. He said that staff was satisfied that parking needs were met. He said that the project appeared to preserve trails and other amenities. He said that he thought, similar to what some of his colleagues had said, that while having 80% AMI was a positive step, it was still a challenge for families to reach that higher income threshold, which in their community, was about \$100,000 per year.

Mr. Moore said that this meant that even with affordable housing, the rent would still be quite high, around \$2,500 per month, which was an unaffordable burden. He said that this frustration was what he thought was driving the need for them to discuss this issue further. He said that their liberal-aligned policies were meant to solve this issue, but they were not really addressing it. He said that as a community and as a Board of Supervisors, they needed to consider the lack of a public option, a concept that had been discussed during the Obamacare conversations years ago. He said that this was not a factor that swayed him regarding this particular project, but he believed it was something they must address as a body and with their Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Missel said that it appeared that there may be a trend of adapting to changing market conditions by revising codes of development. He said that he would like to encourage the development community to maintain a focus on good design, appropriate mixes of uses, and staff monitoring to ensure these standards were met. He said that as they had previously discussed, the initial design vision was likely intended to work well, and if that was shifting, they risked losing an appropriate mix of uses in favor of adapting to changing markets.

Mr. Missel said that he believed this change was warranted, as the density was called for in this area. He said that affordable housing was also a concern. He said that he appreciated the applicant's willingness to consider diverse approaches to achieving affordable goals; thinking creatively about these objectives was valuable and he would encourage other large developers to do the same. He said that the retention of affordability had been discussed in the public hearing, and the applicant had offered to consider a duration for this. He said that he would like to note this for the Board of Supervisors, suggesting they consider a new duration of affordability when reviewing the proposal.

Ms. Firehock said that she would like to make a brief comment for the public record. She said that as a member of the Commission when this proposal was first presented, she recalled it was a greenfield site, designated as a habitat core due to its size. She said that she had voted in favor of it last time because of two key reasons. She said that firstly, the developer's approach to environmental sensitivity, including the preservation of natural passageways, the avoidance of stream disruption, and the salamander tunnels.

Ms. Firehock said that secondly, this development acknowledged that in order to preserve the rural area, they had to accept developing sites such as this one. She said that she would like to see this approach applied to future sites, where developers could balance growth with the need to protect green spaces, maintain stream connectivity, and respect the land. She said that she

was glad to see the density be added in height rather than spread out, which was why she could wholeheartedly support this project again.

Mr. Clayborne motioned that the Planning Commission recommend approval ZMA2024-08 Brookhill Amendment, for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Murray seconded the motion which carried (6-0). (Mr. Carrazana was absent.)

### **Adjournment**

At 9:12 p.m., the Commission adjourned to August 26, 2025, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m.

---

Michael Barnes, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date:
Initials: