

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
Regular Meeting June 28, 2022**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, June 28, 2022, at 5:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Karen Firehock, Chair; Corey Clayborne, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Luis Carrazana; Lonnie Murray; Fred Missel; and David Bailey.

Members absent: None.

Other officials present were: Candice Perkins, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Ms. Firehock established a quorum.

Mr. Herrick noted that Mr. Bivins was also present.

Matters Not Listed on the Agenda

Ms. Firehock asked if there was a member of the public who wished to speak to the Commission.

Mr. Williamson said he was glad that Mr. Bivins and all of them were present in person today. He said he spent two years with them Zooming into his home office, he felt weird seeing them without backdrops, especially Mr. Bailey. He said the reason he, Neil Williamson from the Free Enterprise Forum was coming before them, was to correct the record. He said there were comments made in the earlier session regarding agriculture in Albemarle.

Mr. Williamson said he did some research in the break and had some facts to share. He said the one that was not a fact was about 40%, not 4% agriculture in the area, but that was his back-of-the-envelope math, so he had real numbers from the USDA from 2017. He said the land area in farms in 2017 was 182,781 acres. He continued that the market value of products sold from Albemarle County farms was \$29,647,000. He said the total farm production expenses, or the money that the farms put in locally, was \$45 million. He said the challenge was that they had a lot of smaller farms, and they had a lot of products that worked here that required less space.

Mr. Williamson said he worked in the wine business, and about eight years ago, Loudoun County eclipsed Albemarle for the largest number of vineyards and wineries, but were a strong number two. He said the Monticello appellation, which included much more than just Albemarle County, was still the dominant appellation for quantity and quality of wine.

Mr. Williamson said he brought all this up because as they considered agricultural uses, those were real small businesses in Albemarle, and zoning impacted them. He said the wineries, distilleries, and others had state code protecting them, but the other farms had just the Right to Farm Act, so he encouraged them to consider those small farms that were keeping their rural areas rural. He said oftentimes, they saw so-called development area folk driving through the

rural areas, thinking of it like parkland. He said the production of those farms were what kept it rural. He said he appreciated the opportunity to speak and was glad to be back in person with you.

Ms. Firehock thanked Mr. Williamson and welcomed him back. She asked if there was anyone else who wished to offer comments at this time.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Firehock said there was nothing on the Consent Agenda.

PUBLIC HEARING

SP202200005 Community Christian Academy at RiverStone Church

Kevin McCollum introduced himself as a Senior Planner with the Planning Division of Albemarle County Community Development. He said tonight, he would be giving staff's presentation on special use permit application SP202200005, Community Christian Academy at RiverStone Church. He said this was a proposed special use permit for a private school in an existing building. He said the subject property was located at 1515 Insurance Lane and was set back about 350 feet from Seminole Trail. He said the property was located between the two entrances to the Hollymead PUD neighborhood, which were North Hollymead Drive and South Hollymead Drive.

Mr. McCollum said the property was zoned PUD and was in the community of Hollymead in the Places 29 Master Plan. He said the future land use designation for the property is commercial mixed-use, which called for commercial, retail, employment uses, supporting residential, office, and institutional uses. He said the existing building was currently used by the RiverStone Church. He said the parcel included existing parking, a play area in the rear, and was surrounded by some green space.

Mr. McCollum said west of the property, across Insurance Lane, there were six buildings within the Hollymead Office Complex. He said these buildings were mainly used as office spaces, including for engineering, medical, and insurance businesses. He said there was an existing Montessori School at 1552 Insurance Lane, which received a special use permit in January of 2019. He said the Hollymead PUD also consisted of single family and multi-family homes, a clubhouse, and a Hollymead Elementary School.

Mr. McCollum said the applicant had requested a special use permit to establish a private school for up to 100 upper elementary to high school students. He said the school would operate from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, August through early June. He said the school did not intend to have consistent after-school activities on the property and would therefore have limited overlap with the existing church's hours. He said adjacent to the building was a large parking lot for parking, student pick up, and drop-off circulation. He said there was an existing basketball hoop and gaga ball pit located in the grassy area on the side of the building, and the applicant had suggested a fence would be provided for any balls that may roll into the road.

Mr. McCollum said the conceptual plan provided an overview of the proposed site layout. He said minimal site changes would be made. He said the plan showed the parent pick-up and drop-off circulation loop and identified the grassy outdoor play areas, gaga pit, basketball hoop, and the proposed fence. He said the factors favorable for this project included institutional uses, such as

private schools, were consistent with the master plan, the proposed school was accessed from adequate public roads for the use, and no detrimental impacts to adjoining properties were anticipated. He said staff did not have any factors unfavorable at this time.

Mr. McCollum said staff's recommendation was for approval with conditions shown on the slide and also in the staff report. He said that concluded his presentation. He said there was a slide with motions. He asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Firehock asked if there were any questions. She said with there being no questions for staff, she understood the applicants did not have a formal presentation for this evening. She said if anyone would like to ask the applicants questions directly at this time, they could do that. She asked the applicant to approach the podium and state their name into the microphone.

Ms. Moore introduced herself as Kimberly Moore, Executive Director of Community Christian Academy.

Mr. Bailey said the map orientation and proposed drop-off and entry he assumed was not turning across traffic, and the maps were backwards from orientation. He said he was assuming they were not having people turn left across traffic to get in. He said this was kind of different from how it was oriented in the map.

Ms. Moore said that the flow of traffic was what VDOT asked them to have as the flow, so all traffic coming to the site would come in at the north entrance of Hollymead where the stoplight was, and would flow in this direction, leaving through the south entrance. She said if they were outside, across the street, looking at the building, this would be the correct directional flow.

Mr. Bailey asked if they would be turning right off of North Hollymead onto Insurance Lane.

Ms. Moore said you would be coming north of the building and going south. So yes, you would theoretically cross the northbound lane to come into the parking lot, and then you would exit the southbound lane, not crossing the northbound lane.

Mr. Bailey said they would have to turn left in and left out and into the school, so they were crossing traffic.

Ms. Moore said yes, he was correct.

Mr. Bailey said that this was recommended by VDOT.

Ms. Moore said this was what VDOT asked them to do. She said the school had no opinion about how the traffic should be done, and they would follow what the County said.

Mr. Bailey said he was more curious and trying to understand.

Ms. Firehock said Insurance Lane did not have a lot of traffic on it, so it could be a conflict being created.

Mr. Bailey said he was curious what the justification was behind it.

Ms. Firehock said it was so lightly traveled that it would be an issue.

Mr. Bailey said it was addressed; VDOT suggested it because there was the stoplight at North Hollymead, and it made sense that it was most logical to do that.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there would be scholarships available for underserved populations.

Ms. Moore said that was a great question and had nothing to do with the location. She said their school was started ten years ago because they felt there was a lack of opportunity for a lot of families to have a private Christian education because of the high cost of tuition, so over half of the student body did qualify and received significant scholarships to come to school. She said she did not have any hard data, but she thought it was easy for her to say they were probably not only the most ethnically diverse population, but also the most socioeconomically diverse private school population. She said each year, a third or more of their students had at least one non-Caucasian parent. She said this was actually key to their mission, which was to provide a socioeconomically and ethnically diverse population to make sure that a variety of populations were served.

Mr. Clayborne thanked Ms. Moore for sharing that. He said with the circulation arrows on the diagram, it seemed complex. He asked if she could explain what that was about.

Ms. Moore said yes. She said that was a recommendation from Community Development that came from VDOT as well. She said they wanted to maximize the number of feet that cars could back up. She said it was a significant amount of space that cars could back up and was highly unlikely that they would have that many cars. She said their current location at Cross Life Community Church had about 80 students and they did not have more than four or five cars backed up at a time at drop-off, so this was quite a bit of space, but she was sure it was based on some VDOT calculation.

Ms. Firehock said that answered a lot.

Mr. Bivins asked if Ms. Moore could talk more about the age of the students.

Ms. Moore said the age of the students for the entire school was kindergarten through 8th grade at this time. She said at this location, they would actually just move the middle school, but to maximize numbers, they wanted to open flexibility of upper elementary, such as 5th graders, but for the time being, they decided just to move 6th grade through 8th grade, which were 12- to 14-year-olds.

Mr. Bivins said the hours of operation would be from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. He asked if they anticipated having any special events and if they needed anything for that occasional time when they might have an evening program or something similar because the church had some big spaces.

Ms. Moore said yes. She said they did not want to have events when the church was using it, so they would not schedule any consistent events during the evening or late afternoon, so just as they did at Cross Life Community Church, they had a church calendar and they worked with the secretary when they wanted to hold some kind of special event to make sure the calendar was clear and there were no competing events.

Mr. Bivins asked how often they thought they would do something like that.

Ms. Moore said two to four times per year.

Mr. Bivins said looking at the image in front of them, he would like to know if they intended to keep the gaga pit that was there.

Ms. Moore said they did not intend to change any of the existing things that were there or to remove them. She said the only change they were recommending was putting a small fence that would block any balls. She said she went out there and measured it. She said there were a lot of great natural barriers such as hills, trees, and bushes, but there was a small gap behind the gaga ball pit of 32 feet, and they did not want any concerns about balls rolling off the property, so the church had agreed they could put up a 32-foot-long fence to block that area.

Mr. Bivins said he was glad to hear that. He said he examined the site over the weekend and was glad that she was speaking about children from the 5th grade, because he saw balls on the other side between the asphalt and South Hollymead Drive. He said if the fence could be longer than 35 feet to cover that gap, he would have that discussion with his colleagues, because he saw lots of balls on the other side of the green area there.

Ms. Moore said the 32 feet was an estimate, but it would fill the gap.

Mr. Bivins said it would fill the gap. He said that was how they should do it.

Ms. Moore said that was her long measuring tape.

Mr. Bivins asked if they were bringing the kindergarten through 4th graders to this new location or if they were staying at the other location.

Ms. Moore said that was correct. She said they were not looking to replace their current location, but simply were outgrowing their location and turning away students, so they wanted to add a second location for their older students.

Mr. Bivins said this was additive. He thanked Ms. Moore.

Ms. Firehock said it was now time to open the public comment period. Seeing no one approach the podium, she asked if there was anyone signed up online to comment on this matter.

Ms. Shaffer stated that there were no speakers.

Ms. Firehock asked if there was anything the applicant would like to add to what they had stated. She asked if there were any other questions. She said the public comment was now closed and the matter was now before the Commission again for discussion. She asked the Commissioners for their thoughts. She said it seemed like a very straightforward application; it was a new use in an existing building that was already built to host larger events.

Mr. Clayborne said he did not know if they needed to add this as a condition or if it was already covered in an ordinance or code, but since it was a church building and was being used as a school, perhaps some sort of identifier on the exterior doors in the case of a public emergency that would be typically seen at a school may be something that should be considered.

Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Clayborne to discuss this further.

Mr. Clayborne said most public schools have a sign at the door with a label so that police know to go through what doors.

Ms. Firehock said she understood, and the doors were labeled.

Mr. Clayborne since this was a church and not predominantly used as a school, it was something they should consider. He asked if that was a requirement in code. He said it was a private school so –

Mr. Herrick said to Commissioner Clayborne that he suspected that was covered by the building code or the Department of Education. He said he was unsure if that was a land use matter for the Planning Commission as it was a building code issue or something for the Department of Education to regulate.

Ms. Firehock said it may be outside of their purview.

Mr. Bivins said it was out of their purview because the Commonwealth did not regulate private schools.

Mr. Clayborne said the reason he brought it up was because there was mention of signage and pavement markings, so it seemed to fall in the same wavelength.

Ms. Firehock said that was VDOT related.

Mr. Clayborne said he understood.

Mr. Bivins said he did not see anything about the condition for the fence, which he did think there should be, unless they were talking about general accord with the concept plan, and the concept plan was the sort of pencil drawing, and if that was the concept plan then the fence was there so that would work. He said he would like the fence to cover more territory because there were some gaps there.

Ms. Firehock said it was hard to tell, because of the words “dumpster” and “closure” it was hard to tell if the fence was going underneath those words and was just covered by the label.

Mr. Bivins said he thought the fence should definitely be inclusive around the dumpster and to the back wall of the building to the HVAC unit. He said he would like to put language in that in conjunction with the church, that the school be allowed to have four special events, because right now there was nothing in there.

Ms. Firehock said unless he was trying to put a restriction on that because he was worried there would be a large number of special events.

Mr. Herrick said for the fencing requirement, perhaps that could be added as 1D. He said currently there were three items listed that were major elements within the development and essential to the development. He said if the Commission felt that fencing was another one, perhaps that could be added as Condition D, that the fencing was deemed to be an essential element.

Mr. Bivins said thank you.

Ms. Firehock said they wanted to put it down, because it was in the narrative but not part of the plan, and the line was a bit vague. She asked if they wanted to say how wide they wanted it to be, or just what Mr. Bivins had described.

Mr. Bivins said fencing was essential.

Mr. Herrick said as noted, the concept plan, though not terribly specific or dimensional, did show the fencing in that general area. He said it would then be up to the Zoning Administrator to determine whether or not they were in compliance with the concept plan.

Mr. Bailey asked for one clarification. He asked if they had by-right to have special events if it was not listed. He said he saw hours of operation listed, which seemed to mean that special events would have to happen within those hours of operation. He said he wanted to understand flexibility-wise if they wanted the children to have a good school, and if they were asking to have special events, if that needed to be provided for in this.

Mr. Herrick said that might require a separate special use permit depending on the size of the special events, because special events was a separate use category. He said he supposed one could make the argument that a graduation ceremony or something like that would be customarily incidental to the use of the school building.

Ms. Firehock said they had the hours of operation that ended at 3:30 p.m., and a graduation ceremony could happen in the afternoon or evening. She said they could have up to four school-related events that may take place during evening hours per year or something like that.

Mr. Herrick said that in addition to number 3, there might be some additional language at the end of the three provided that there may be up to four school-related events per year outside of these hours, or something to that effect.

Mr. Bailey said that rather than having them come back at some point, it seemed like they had already put on record that they expected to have a certain amount, so why should they not give them the flexibility.

Ms. Firehock said they should, because if they did not, someone could complain that their operating hours were only until 3:30 p.m. and they were not supposed to be having this graduation event at 5 o'clock.

Mr. Bailey said they were high schoolers, so hopefully they were graduating people.

Ms. Firehock said they could just put a comma at the end of Monday through Friday and add "and up to four events per year that may take place outside of school operating hours."

Mr. Missel asked if they had to assign a number, or if they could just say ancillary events or events associated with the education in order to provide them with more flexibility.

Mr. Herrick said he would be careful with leaving it totally open.

Ms. Firehock said they legally did not have to, but it probably would not be a good idea to just have it open.

Mr. Missel said he was thinking of things like teacher work hours that extended beyond those times. He said the question was if the hours of operation meant the doors locked immediately and everyone was gone.

Ms. Firehock said that was what it would mean. She said teachers would be gone too.

Mr. Missel said he was unsure if that was what the applicant wanted.

Ms. Moore said if it could be changed to 4:30 p.m., then there should not be anyone except for herself. She asked if she could stay there if her office was there. She said that would take care of teachers, and she did not mind kicking them out at 4:30 p.m. She said Mr. Missel was correct in that 3:30 p.m. would be tight if a student needed extra tutoring or something like that. She said they would not hold traditional classes, but if changing it to 4:30 p.m. was not a problem, she believed that would solve all the issues.

Mr. Missel asked if four events sounded right.

Ms. Moore said she thought that would be perfectly find.

Ms. Firehock said they could make it six.

Ms. Moore said they could also use their other campus, so it was not like they had nowhere they could go.

Ms. Firehock said four was enough.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the hours of operation for the school were 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. would anyone staying past 4:30 p.m. be out of compliance.

Ms. Firehock said that was correct.

Mr. Missel said that was his question.

Ms. Firehock said they had the condition they would like to add.

Mr. Clayborne moved to recommend approval of SP202200005 Community Christian Academy at RiverStone Church, with conditions as recommended in the staff report and with the following other additions: to number 1, add letter D regarding fencing shown on the concept plan to be demonstrated in a way that was adequate to provide safety to the children, using two points, which were the end of the dumpster to the end of the existing building; to modify number 3 to have the hours of operation to go from 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and to also allow up to four events outside of these hours for incidental uses to the school.

Mr. Bailey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

ZMA202200003 Firdyiweck-Deal Rezoning

Mr. McCollum introduced himself as Kevin McCollum, Senior Planner with the Planning Division of Albemarle County Community Development. He said he would be giving staff's presentation

on zoning map amendment application ZMA202200003 Firdyiweck-Deal Rezoning. He said this was the proposed rezoning of a two-acre rural area partial to R2 residential. He said the subject property of this zoning application was located just south of the City of Charlottesville and the Interstate 64 and 5th Street intersection and located on Old Lynchburg Road.

Mr. McCollum said the parcel was located at 954 Old Lynchburg Road, composed of two acres in a zoned rural area. He said the area was generally wooded, with one single family detached house with an accessory garage. He said the nearby neighborhoods included the Whittington subdivision that was directly abutting the property, and the Mosby Mountain subdivision, just north along Old Lynchburg Road. He said there was one other abutting two-acre rural areas parcel, and across the street was property that was across from Biscuit Run Park.

Mr. McCollum said as he mentioned, the existing zoning of the property was rural areas, which could be seen in white on the map. He said the adjacent parcel at 90-3B and the Biscuit Run Park property across the street were also zoned rural areas. He said the greenish color that took up the majority of the map was the Wittington subdivision, a planned residential development. He said the light green on the screen just to the north and south along Old Lynchburg Road was R1 residential. He said the applicant was requesting to rezone the property from RA, rural areas, to R2, residential.

Mr. McCollum said the applicant intended to subdivide the property into two one-acre lots for a total of two dwelling units on the two acres, a proposed density of one dwelling unit per acre. He said the conceptual plan on the screen was provided by the applicant and showed a potential subdivision of this property that could follow this rezoning. He said the applicant intended to keep the existing house at 954 Old Lynchburg Road and add one additional dwelling unit. He said the applicant had offered to proffer the development of the site to two single family dwelling units.

Mr. McCollum said subject properties located within neighborhood five of the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan, the future land use was designated as neighborhood density residential, which called for residential uses and a density of three to six dwelling units per acre. He said while the proposed rezoning suggested a density of one dwelling unit per acre, staff believed this was appropriate given the existing density of those existing neighborhoods. He said Wittington and Mosby Mountain were within the same land use category but were closer to one dwelling unit per acre or below.

Mr. McCollum said the factors favorable were that the rezoning request will have minimal impacts on neighboring properties and public facilities and services, the request is consistent with the County's growth Management Policy, and the rezoning request was consistent with the recommendations in the Southern and Western Neighborhoods Master Plan. He said there were no factors unfavorable at this time. He said staff recommendation was recommending approval of zoning map amendment request ZMA202200003 Firdyiwek-Deal Rezoning. He asked if the Commission had any questions.

Mr. Murray said the maps that he looked at showed a stream clearly visible, but there was no stream buffer delineated. He asked if they could show where the stream buffer would fall in relation to that property.

Mr. McCollum said this map came from their GIS and did not have the critical resources layer turned on, but there were no critical resources identified at this time.

Mr. Murray said it appeared that it would come within 100 feet of that stream.

Ms. Firehock said it was 376 feet, and Mr. Murray said it was less than 100 feet. She said they were not necessarily building their house at the top of the triangle. She said the structure would still be limited to being outside of the buffer, but they still would have 100 feet from the stream edge to get a structure there.

Mr. Murray said it was difficult to see how many feet it was.

Ms. Firehock said in the rectangle in the corner, there was a scale.

Mr. Murray said it would have been helpful to have the buffer.

Mr. Missel asked if the setbacks would be the same as the R2 setbacks.

Mr. McCollum said that was correct.

Mr. Missel asked Mr. McCollum if he could explain what a side yard setback was for R2.

Mr. McCollum said in the R2 zoning district, a side setback was five feet.

Mr. Bivins asked if it was approved to go from RA to R2, did it say by definition that they were saying there could only be one dwelling per acre if that happened.

Mr. Herrick said R2 generally fell to two dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Bivins said now the proffer made perfectly good sense.

Ms. Firehock said she understood they were not having a presentation from the applicant, but if anyone would like to ask the applicant direct questions, now would be the time. She said she knew it was in her district, but it was straightforward. She said with that, they would move onto the public comment portion.

There were no speakers in person or online.

Ms. Firehock said it was a straightforward application and the density they were requesting was not as high as the comprehensive plan, but it was in keeping with the density of surrounding properties, so it did not seem to be adding any difficulty in terms of impacts to the neighborhood.

Mr. Bivins said if they could put one house on an acre, that was actually in some cases larger than what was around them in Wittington, because all the houses in Wittington were not all on one acre.

Mr. Bailey said not all of them; several of them were above one acre.

Mr. Bivins said it was mismatched.

Mr. Bailey said it was mismatched. He said the R2 designation would allow for closer to the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Firehock said it was true that it was moving towards the comprehensive plan. She said infill was a good thing in this case. She said if there was no further discussion, she would be comfortable to make a motion if it was put back on the screen.

Ms. Firehock moved for the Planning Commission to recommend approval of ZMA202200003 Firbyweck-Deal Rezoning with the proposed proffers for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Mr. Missel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously (7-0).

Committee Reports

Ms. Firehock said she had a meeting with the Historic Preservation Committee. She said they had been undergoing an interesting exercise, and it was her first meeting since joining the committee. She said they had been looking at what other similar localities and Counties had in place in terms of historic preservation ordinances. She said they were looking into that question of whether Albemarle would sometime in the future have an ordinance protecting historic properties, but she thought they were going about it in an interesting way, which was investigating what other people had in place and why, and what the history was behind why they had what they had. She said she was excited to dig into that and volunteered to get some homework assignments so she could look up some. She said she had not yet received it from the historic planner, but she thought it was a good process.

Ms. Firehock said they also mentioned that the strategic plan for that body had not been updated in some time, more than a decade, and it was quite behind, so they would like, when the Commission got to the comprehensive plan, that they make the recommendation to update that strategic plan and hopefully by the time they got to that section of the comprehensive plan, they will have finished some of this other research, which she thought would be germane to updating their historic preservation chapter. She said they had a rich discussion about how the Planning Commission considered historic properties and what they could and could not do. She said they also talked a little bit about incentives, because there were other ways to get historic properties preserved beyond rules. She said she looked forward to digging in with that committee.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the committee had any connection with DHR or would like a contact.

Ms. Firehock said she was sure they did. She said there were several people on the committee who were historic preservation appraisers and professionals in that field. She said one of the things they did for them was that when there was a property that had historic property, while the owner was not required to maintain it, if it was significant and an important property, they would go out and investigate it and document it. She said at this point all they could do was go out and document something before it was removed. She said the large question for the County was sort of a process of documenting disappearance of properties, and they would like to move into the more progressive practice of inspiring retention.

Ms. Firehock said there had been some properties where, when working with the landowner, they decided to restore it. She said there were some great examples here in the County of someone restoring something and bringing it back. She said when she was on the committee before, several years ago, she was able to tour some of those properties. She said they were doing some good work, but there was much more work to be done, so she looked forward to bringing updates on what they were doing. She said hopefully there would be a much closer relationship between

their work and the Planning Commission's work in the future. She said the CAC met but she could not recall what they talked about so she would provide something in writing.

Old/New Business

There was no business to review.

Review of the Board of Supervisors Meeting

Mr. Rapp said that on June 15, the Board met, and they had a work session during the afternoon where they discussed the ACE Committee, which had been in existence for nearly 20 years now and it was a good time for them to pause it. He said as they assessed the program, they outlined their approach to assessing it, folding that into the comprehensive plan where they got into some of the conservation elements. He said at this point, they had a Climate Action Plan, a Biodiversity Action Plan, the ACE Program, new stream health initiatives that were endorsed by the Board last year, so there were a lot of things that had a lot of similarities, so they thought there might be a way to re-envision those into something new, so they were looking forward to getting into that process in the Commission and committees that were involved in that work later next year.

Ms. Firehock asked if Mr. Rapp was suggesting some sort of environmental committee under which fell ACE, stream health, and something else.

Mr. Rapp said at this point, he did not know. He said they would want people who were more dialed into those, but yes, they had separate committees for each one and they often had overlapping goals, so there was potential there to realign those. He said that was as far as they had taken it; they had just identified it. He said that would be some fun work in the future. He said in the evening, they had a meeting with the Albemarle Business Campus. He said the Board approved that amendment to the rezoning for the modifications to the rear building and the parking structure.

Items for Follow Up

There were no items for follow up.

Adjournment

At 8:00 p.m., the Commission adjourned to July 12, 2022, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting.

Charles Rapp, Planning Director

(Recorded by Vivian Groeschel; transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date:
Initials: