

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on January 17, 2024, at 1:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium on the Second Floor of the Albemarle County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, VA 22902.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jim H. Andrews, Mr. Ned Gallaway, Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, and Mr. Michael Pruitt.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeff Richardson; County Attorney, Steve Rosenberg; Clerk, Claudette Borgersen; and Senior Deputy Clerk, Travis O. Morris.

Agenda Item No. 1. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by the Chair, Mr. Jim Andrews.

Mr. Andrews announced that Albemarle County Police Master Officer Dana Reeves and Lieutenant Angela Jamerson were present at the meeting to provide their services.

Agenda Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.
Agenda Item No. 3. Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Mr. Andrews said that he had heard of no changes suggested, and asked if someone would like to make a motion.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to adopt the final agenda as amended.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 5. Brief Announcements by Board Members.

Mr. Pruitt said that they had experienced serious weather conditions around the County recently. He said that last week, they experienced significant flooding, and this week, there was considerable ice and snow. He said that some incidents resulting from these hazards had been reported through normal County channels; however, others had not been reported. He said that as people continued to exercise caution, especially on rural roads, he encouraged members of the public to contact them if they encountered hazardous situations or believed that the County or state might have a role in addressing these issues.

Mr. Pruitt said that a person in his district who experienced a very hazardous condition last week managed to keep their self and their family safe; however, this situation would not have come to the County's attention without their efforts to bring it to the notice of them and VDOT. He said that this allowed them to take the necessary steps to mitigate such issues in the future. He said that he wanted to express his gratitude to that citizen and encouraged other members of the public to remain vigilant and contribute to their problem identification process during these challenging times of the season.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that there was a VDOT number for residents to call in regarding unsafe situations in their area. She asked if it could be included in the County's website and newsletter so that people would know how to reach VDOT.

Ms. McKeel said that the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail (ACRJ) Authority would be hosting three public meetings to gather input for the renovation project planned for the jail. She said that the first meeting would be held on January 25, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at Carver Recreation Center, the second meeting would take place on February 12, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at Carver Recreation Center, and the third meeting would be held on February 29, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at Carver Recreation Center. She said that all of these meetings would be recorded, and anyone who was unable to attend could listen to the recording later. She said that she would share the link to the recording with everyone in case they wished to watch it. She said that the information could be found on the ACRJ website. She said that if they were interested, they should visit the site for more details.

Ms. McKeel said that Yancey Community Center held a wonderful MLK (Martin Luther King) celebration on Sunday afternoon, which she and Mr. Andrews attended. She thanked Ed Brooks and the Yancey staff for organizing this event, providing refreshments, and offering a tour of the center. She said that the celebration was wonderful, and she thoroughly enjoyed her time there.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding the affordable housing developer incentives discussion that took place in early December, the meeting materials for the January 23 meeting had been released. He said that the next step was for the PC to discuss this topic during their meeting on January 23. He said that

progress was being made as they had hoped since the December meeting.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding the cold weather, on the way to their current meeting, she observed Dominion crews trimming numerous tree branches. She said that it was important for residents to report trees that had come loose or branches hanging on poles near wires. She said that she received many calls regarding such issues and passed them along as well. She said that each of them had Dominion contacts, so that was an easy way for people to share this information so that repair crews could promptly remove these hanging branches and preserve power. She said that it would be absolutely disastrous to face six-degree temperatures overnight without electricity in their homes.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding animals' welfare, it was important to adhere to state laws. She said that when temperatures dropped to below 32 degrees Fahrenheit, one must make arrangements for their animals, as leaving them outside was against the law. She asked everyone to be mindful of this requirement and take necessary precautions to protect their pets from the cold.

Mr. Andrews said that he agreed with comments already made regarding the importance of being vigilant concerning weather conditions, and he acknowledged VDOT's efforts in ensuring our safety on the roads. He said that he recently attended an event at Yancey, which was initiated by Commonwealth's Attorney Jim Hensley discussing the John Henry James case and other things related to restorative justice. He said that he would like to bring attention to the fact that UVA's outgoing Law School Dean, Risa Goluboff, will be speaking on January 23 at the Belvedere Center at 5:30 p.m. He said that the event was part of Charlottesville's legal history series and was sponsored by the Albemarle Charlottesville Historical Society. He said that she was a renowned constitutional scholar, particularly in the area of civil rights, and promised it to be an engaging talk.

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

There were none.

Agenda Item No. 7. From the Public: Matters on the Agenda but Not Listed for Public Hearing or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

Mr. Neil Williamson, President of the Free Enterprise Forum, said that the Forum was a privately funded public policy organization focused on central Virginia's local governments. He said that this morning, he wrote down some of the goals and objectives for the Comprehensive Plan utilized an acronym famous in MBA classes and similar spaces, which were SMART goals and objectives. He said that SMART stood for Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-based. He said that he was not certain if all of their goals met these criteria. He said that in fact, he observed that many goals found in Comprehensive Plans across central Virginia were siloed and did not recognize the impact of other chapters' goals on the very goals being discussed.

Mr. Williamson said that one specific objective that caught his attention while reviewing the housing chapter was to increase the supply of long-term affordable and workforce housing in Albemarle County by at least 10,000 units by 2040, promoting both the development of new units and preservation of existing units for affordable and workforce housing. He said that the goal appeared straight-forward; however, the second half of that statement seemed misplaced and might belong in another objective regarding existing housing.

Mr. Williamson said that to better understand the situation, he recommended reviewing their building report, which was provided quarterly and had been very helpful. He said that since 2015, there had been only three years where over a thousand units were created. He said that to achieve this goal, they would generally need to double the production of housing units. He said that he wondered if this goal was attainable or merely aspirational. He said that in previous meetings, members of this and previous Boards had sought to be aspirational. He said that it would be great if they could clarify whether this document was aspirational or attainable.

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Mr. Andrews said, if there were no changes to the consent agenda, the floor was open for a motion.

Ms. Mallek **moved** to approve the consent agenda.

Ms. McKeel **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

Item No. 8.1. Fiscal Year 2024 Appropriations.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that Virginia Code §15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total change to the Fiscal Year 2024 (FY 24) budget due to the appropriations itemized in Attachment A is \$76,387. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the amount of the cumulative appropriations does not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached resolution (Attachment B) to approve the appropriations for County government projects and programs described in Attachment A.

Appropriation #2024027

Sources:	Local Tax Revenue	\$76,387
Uses:	Economic Development Authority Fund	\$76,387
Net Change to Appropriated Budget:		\$76,387

Description:

This request is to appropriate \$76,387 from local tax revenue to be transferred to the Economic Development Authority Fund pursuant to the Habitat Southwood Performance Agreement dated July 1, 2019. After Board of Supervisor approval, the EDA will transfer the rebate to Habitat for Humanity.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the Resolution (Attachment B) to approve the appropriations for County government projects and programs described in Attachment A:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
ADDITIONAL FY 2024 APPROPRIATIONS**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors:

- 1) That the FY 24 Budget is amended to increase it by \$76,387;
- 2) That Appropriation #2024027 is approved;
- 3) That the appropriations referenced in Paragraph #1, above, are subject to the provisions set forth in the Annual Resolution of Appropriations of the County of Albemarle for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 2024.

* * * *

APP#	Account String	Description	Amount
2024027	4-1000-99000-493000-934001-9999	SA2024027 SA2024027 Transfer out of GF to EDA	\$76,386.41
2024027	3-1000-11000-311000-110155-1000	SA2024027 SA2024027 Local Tax Revenue to EDA - Southwood Rebate	\$76,386.41
2024027	3-4700-91095-351000-512000-9999	SA2024027 SA2024027 Transfer into EDA Fund from GF	\$76,386.41
2024027	4-4700-91095-491095-950031-9999	SA2024027 SA2024027 EDA Use of Funds from GF	\$76,386.41

Item No. 8.2. Tax Refund Approval Request.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that Virginia Code §58.1-3981 requires that erroneous tax assessments shall be corrected and that a refund, with interest as applicable, be paid back to the taxpayer. Tax refunds resulting from erroneous assessment over \$10,000 must be approved by the Board of Supervisors before any payments are made.

Staff is requesting approval from the Board for the following tax refunds to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981. Each refund amount listed below has been reviewed and certified by staff and the Chief Financial Officer with consent of the County Attorney's Office. If approved,

- \$10,231.18 will be refunded to Burlington #1372 due to amending business license estimated gross receipts to actual gross receipts.
- \$10,499.93 will be refunded to Stern, Evan, and Sandra Feagan Stern due to overpayment of real estate taxes.
- \$13,869.04 will be refunded to Charlottesville Area Dental Access Inc due to amended business tangible personal property returns.

- \$13,938.98 will be refunded to Mountain Industrial Properties LLC due to overpayment of real estate taxes. \$14,404.36 will be refunded to Alltel Corporation DBA Verizon Wireless due to amending business license estimated gross receipts to actual gross receipts.
- \$17,610.24 will be refunded to Sam's East Inc due to a reclassification of type of business.
- \$18,632.06 will be refunded to Blue Ridge Websoft LLC due to overpayment of tangible personal property taxes.
- \$18,690.35 will be refunded to R G Brickman Company due to amending business license estimated gross receipts to actual gross receipts.
- \$19,782.04 will be refunded to Glenbook LLC due to land value change.
- \$24,573.86 will be refunded to Stanley Martin Homes LLC due to land value change.
- \$25,083.63 will be refunded to Kathleen M Wallace due to overpayment of real estate taxes.
- \$27,096.32 will be refunded to Boyd Caton Group Inc due to amending business license statutory assessment of gross receipts to actual gross receipts and filing business tangible personal property return to amend statutory assessments.
- \$32,429.42 will be refunded to Shank, Sara as Trustee of the Sara S Shank 2017 due to overpayment of real estate rollback taxes.
- \$38,639.83 will be refunded to Carlotz Group Inc due to amending business license estimated gross receipts to actual gross receipts.
- \$58,277.82 will be refunded to North Point Charlottesville LLC due to land value change.
- \$61,355.63 will be refunded to 540 Founders Place LLC due to overpayment of real estate taxes.
- \$71,287.79 will be refunded to Allen Allen Allen & Allen Corporation because the business is in the City of Charlottesville and not Albemarle County.

Staff does not anticipate a budget impact associated with the recommended Board action. Tax refunds are a customary part of the revenue collection process and refund expectations are included in the annual revenue budget assumptions.

Staff recommends that the Board adopts the Resolution (Attachment A) to approve the refund requests and authorize the Department of Finance and Budget to initiate the refund payments.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the Resolution (Attachment A) to approve the refund requests and authorize the Department of Finance and Budget to initiate the refund payments:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING TAX REFUNDS

WHEREAS, Virginia Code §58.1-3981 requires that erroneous tax assessments be corrected and that a refund, with interest as applicable, be paid back to the taxpayer;

WHEREAS, Tax refunds resulting from erroneous assessment over \$10,000 must be approved by the Board of Supervisors, after being certified by the Chief Financial Officer and the County Attorney;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$10,231.18 has been reviewed and certified due to business overestimation and that this refund shall be remitted to Burlington #1372 to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$10,499.93 has been reviewed and certified due to taxpayer overpayment and that this refund shall be remitted to Stern, Evan & Sandra Feagan Stern to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$13,869.04 has been reviewed and certified due to amended business personal property return and that this refund shall be remitted to Charlottesville Area Dental Access Inc. to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$13,938.98 has been reviewed and certified due to taxpayer overpayment and that this refund shall be remitted to Mountain Industrial Properties LLC to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$14,404.36 has been reviewed and certified due to business overestimation and that this refund shall be remitted to Alltel Corporation DBA Verizon Wireless to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$17,610.24 has been reviewed and certified due to business reclassification and that this refund shall be remitted to Sam's East Inc to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$18,632.06 has been reviewed and certified due to taxpayer overpayment and that this refund shall be remitted to Blue Ridge Websoft LLC to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$18,690.35 has been reviewed and certified due to business overestimation and that this refund shall be remitted to R G Brinkman Company to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$19,782.04 has been reviewed and certified due to land value change and that this refund shall be remitted to Glenbrook LLC to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$24,573.86 has been reviewed and certified due to land value change and that this refund shall be remitted to Stanley Martin Homes LLC to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$25,083.63 has been reviewed and certified due to taxpayer overpayment and that this refund shall be remitted to Kathleen M Wallace to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$27,096.32 has been reviewed and certified due to amended business filings and that this refund shall be remitted to Boyd Caton Group Inc to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$32,429.42 has been reviewed and certified due to taxpayer overpayment and that this refund shall be remitted to Shank, Sara as Trustee of the Sara S Shank 2017 to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$38,639.83 has been reviewed and certified due to business overestimation and that this refund shall be remitted to Carlotz Group Inc to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$58,277.82 has been reviewed and certified due to land value change and that this refund shall be remitted to North Pointe Charlottesville LLC to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$61,355.63 has been reviewed and certified due to taxpayer overpayment and that this refund shall be remitted to 540 Founders Place LLC to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

BE IT RESOLVED that a refund in the amount of \$71,287.79 has been reviewed and certified due to the business being located in the City of Charlottesville and not Albemarle County and that this refund shall be remitted to Allen Allen Allen & Allen Corporation to conform with Virginia Code §58.1-3981;

Item No. 8.3. SE202300049 Berkmar Self Storage Setback Modification and Stepback Waiver.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that the applicant requests special exceptions for relief from two provisions of County Code § 18-4.20(a) as it applies to Parcel ID 04500-00-00-112E0 in order to develop a proposed hotel. The first request is to increase the maximum 30-foot front setback and the second request is to waive the minimum 15-foot stepback.

First, under County Code §18-4.20, a maximum front setback of 30 feet is permitted from the right-of-way or the exterior edge of a sidewalk outside of the right of way. A proposed special exception would increase the maximum front setback to allow the proposed building to be set back 55 feet from the right-of-way of Berkmar Drive.

Second, County Code §18-4.20 also requires a minimum stepback of 15 feet for each story that begins above 40 feet in height or for each story above the third story, whichever is less. A proposed special exception would waive the stepback requirement of 15 feet for the proposed 49foot-tall hotel.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment C) to approve special exceptions to modify the 30-foot maximum front setback requirement to 55 feet and to waive the 15-foot stepback requirement for the proposed hotel.

By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the Resolution (Attachment C) to approve special exceptions to modify the 30-foot maximum front setback requirement to 55 feet and to waive the 15-foot stepback requirement for the proposed hotel:

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
SE202300049 BERKMAR SELF STORAGE SETBACK MODIFICATION
AND STEPBACK WAIVER**

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the staff reports prepared for SE202300049 Berkmar Self Storage Setback Modification and Stepback Waiver and the attachments thereto, including staff's supporting analysis, any comments received, and all relevant factors in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-4.20 and 18-33.9, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby finds that:

1. The maximum front setback should be increased by special exception to accommodate unique parking or circulation plans on the subject parcel; and
2. The proposed special exceptions are consistent with the intent of the Highway Commercial (HC) zoning district and the Neighborhood Model Principles of the Comprehensive Plan.

Item No. 8.4. Albemarle Broadband Authority Quarterly Report, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.5. Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA) Quarterly Report, **was received for information.**

Item No. 8.6. Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) Quarterly Report, **was received for information.**

Agenda Item No. 9. **Work Session:** Draft Goals and Objectives for Environmental Stewardship, Historic Resources, Parks and Recreation, Housing, and Economic Development.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County is updating the Comprehensive Plan through the Albemarle County 2044 (AC44) project, which is currently in Phase 2. Deliverables for Phase 2 include draft Goals and Objectives for each Comprehensive Plan chapter and Planning Toolkits for coordinated land use and transportation planning. The draft Goals and Objectives for each Comprehensive Plan chapter are developed through collaboration by an interdisciplinary team of staff, in coordination with partner agencies, by reviewing the current (2015) Comprehensive Plan, incorporating best planning practices, using the AC44 Framework, and incorporating community, staff, Planning Commission, and Board of Supervisors input. The draft Goals and Objectives are provided as Attachments A-E, with no changes from the earlier drafts shared with the Board on the Consent Agenda for November 1 and 15, 2023.

At their October 10 and November 14, 2023, work sessions, the Planning Commission provided feedback on draft Goals and Objectives for the following Comprehensive Plan chapters: Environmental Stewardship, Parks and Recreation, Historic, Scenic, and Cultural Resources, Housing, and Economic Development. Staff reports for each work session are provided in Attachments F and G, which include the following information for each Plan topic: a topic overview, key themes from community input, and high-level updates from the 2015 Comprehensive Plan.

Staff is asking for the Board's feedback on the attached draft Goals and Objectives (Attachments A - E). Each Goals and Objectives attachment also includes a topic report with an introduction, summary of Phase 2 community input, recent data and trends, and connections to the AC44 Framework. The draft Goals and Objectives for each chapter are listed under the 'Draft Goals and Objectives' section of each topic report.

During the work session, staff will share a brief overview of the draft Goals and Objectives for each topic, along with a summary of the Planning Commission's feedback, and then ask for the Board's input, including any additions or changes based on the Commission's feedback. Staff will share draft Goals and Objectives for the following Plan chapters at a future Board work session: Rural Area Land Use and Transportation, Development Areas Land Use and Transportation, and Community Facilities. Once staff has received Board input on all draft Goals and Objectives, staff will update Goals and Objectives and move into AC44 Phase 3 (Action Steps, metrics, and Plan prioritization).

There is no budget impact associated with this agenda item.

Staff recommends that the Board provide feedback on draft Goals and Objectives for these five Comprehensive Plan chapters (Attachments A-E), including any additions or changes based on the Planning Commission's input (Attachment H).

Ms. Tori Kanellopoulos, Principal Planner, said that today's work session was on draft goals and objectives for five out of the eight total chapters for the AC44 (Albemarle County 2044) Comprehensive Plan Update. She said that they would start with a brief overview of where they were in the AC44 process, how they drafted goals and objectives, and the purpose of today's work session. She said that they would then move to Board discussion for each of the five chapters. She said that she would share a quick overview of each chapter and a summary of the Planning Commission's (PC's) feedback and then pause for Board discussion and questions for each topic. She said that they should have about 20 minutes for discussion for each chapter and then they would wrap up with next steps.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the AC44 plan was organized into four phases. She said that in Phase One, they developed the AC44 framework for an equitable and resilient community, which provided guidance for drafting plan recommendations and envisioned a community that was green and resilient, welcoming and equitable, connected and accessible, and thriving and prosperous. She said that they completed the land use build-out analysis to estimate capacity in Development Areas for future residential and non-residential development.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that in Phase Two, they updated goals and objectives for each plan chapter and developed planning toolkits for coordinated land use and transportation planning. She said that in phase Three, which they anticipated starting in the spring, they would have updated action steps for each plan chapter and would prioritize plan recommendations. She said that in Phase Four, scheduled for later this year, they would bring everything together into a finalized Comprehensive Plan document and hold public hearings with the PC and Board for adoption.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the Comprehensive Plan was organized into eight chapters, as displayed on the right-hand side of the screen. She said that she would note that environmental stewardship was the new name for the natural resources chapter, and there were separate Rural Area and Development Areas chapters; however, they each had the land use and transportation element combined, so there was no standalone transportation chapter. She said that in each chapter, there were goals, objectives, and action steps.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that goals represented high-level aspirations for the community's future direction. She said that objectives were the outcomes or targets required to achieve these goals, and action steps, which would be in Phase Three, involve specific policies, capital projects, planning efforts, or other activities and projects to implement the plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the process for drafting plan recommendations in phase two consisted of three main steps. She said that in the first step they sought community members' priorities by plan topic and used this input to guide the drafting of updated recommendations. She said that in step two, they solicited community input on planning toolkits, which were the four coordinated land use and transportation topics displayed in the slide and encompass all topics in the current Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they sought Board direction regarding these toolkits and heard that they should explore ways to encourage more density and mixed-use development in Development Areas and prioritize using Development Area land efficiently over potential expansion, and they should continue to explore ways to more equitably allow or expand services and some small-scale uses in the Rural Area, such as mobile health services and community centers. She said that they were using the Board's direction on the toolkits to inform drafting goals and objectives for the land use and transportation chapters. She said that in step three, they would share draft goals and objectives by plan chapter, including the five chapters being covered today.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that goals and objectives had been drafted through a collaborative and iterative process, and while the core AC44 team led the process, numerous County staff and departments contributed to drafting plan recommendations. She said that coordination also took place with partner agencies, such as Albemarle County Public Schools (ACPS) and the Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA). She said that input had also been gathered from County committees. She said that the current Comprehensive Plan's recommendations were reviewed for relevance, updated best practices, and refinements based on community, PC, and Board input.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the purpose of today's work session was for the Board to give direction to staff on any changes or additions to the draft goals and objectives. She said that the finalized goals and objectives would be used to draft action steps that would be shared in Phase Three.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that these goals and objectives presented before the Board today were the same draft recommendations that were shared through online questionnaires and provided to the PC and various County committees, including the Architectural Review Board (ARB), Natural Heritage Committee, and Economic Development Authority (EDA). She said that revisions will be made after today's meeting to incorporate feedback from the community, County committees, PC, and the Board. She said that many staff topic experts were present today to listen to the Board's feedback and direction and to be available for questions.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the first topic was environmental stewardship, which was organized into the following goals: climate action, climate resilience, healthy and resilient waterways and water supplies, biodiversity and habitats, and sustainable materials management. She said that she had the draft goals and objectives listed on the following slides; however, since they had received them in their packets, she would skip through them but could return to any upon request.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that during their work sessions, the PC provided the following feedback: they recommended that dark skies also be included in this chapter along with the historic resources chapter, highlighting that resilience was a priority and that they should also consider business continuity, assisting community members with staying in their homes, and ways to provide funding for implementation.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the feedback also included that they should collaborate regionally for waterways and water quality, consider how new and emerging uses in the Rural Area could impact natural areas and find ways to mitigate those impacts, and then update some of the objectives to be more measurable. She said that this was a high-level summary of the main takeaways from the PC's feedback, which was accompanied by a more detailed summary in the Board's packet from each of the PC's work sessions.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the Board would soon discuss and ask questions about this summary. She said that the Board was asked for input on the draft goals and objectives, building upon the PC's feedback, specifically if the Board affirmed the PC's feedback, and if there was anything they should consider adding or changing in the draft goals and objectives. She said that they appreciated any more detailed feedback that may fall into action steps; the topic expert staff would take note of any potential recommended action steps based on the Board's feedback when drafting plan recommendations.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that when discussing Goal 1, what came to her mind was to ask

developers to use solar panel roofs on their new developments. She said that this would be helpful in fulfilling their Climate Action Plan. She said that they had also discussed recycling by waste haulers, as they currently only had one waste hauling company operating in the Urban Areas and some of the Rural Areas. She said that it could be increased, and she hoped there was a way to ensure that they actually recycled the material. She said that regarding the future floodplain growth, there was a new draft FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency) plan that had not yet been certified. She asked if they were monitoring how climate change was going to impact the plan.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that also regarding climate action, she would like to explore the possibility of installing solar rooftop systems on their County building and other buildings they owned. She said that one aspect of climate action she wanted to address was the significant amount of black asphalt in their area. She said that the use of reflective paints, such as acrylic or latex, had been shown to reduce heat index by up to 10%. She said that she recommended investigating this option as they aimed to lead by example in promoting sustainable practices throughout the County.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that one of her favorites was incorporating pollinator gardens into their properties that they owned. She said that she understood that they also had pollinated gardens at COB (County Office Building). She said that she would like some clarification regarding page 10. She said that it stated that when considering the existing use of land in potential future Development Areas or expansion areas, they should prioritize preserving mature wooded areas over land that had already been cleared for agriculture or grazing or views. She asked if this could be discussed further.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that that information could be found under the community input summary, which was a summary of priorities gathered from the community. She said that in the future, if there was a planned expansion of the Development Area, this would be a factor to consider when examining areas that had already been cleared rather than focusing on wooded areas or those with important habitats.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if that would supersede the expansion of water and sewer systems.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said no.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that was most important.

Mr. Gallaway said that not knowing what the action steps were made it challenging to determine if the objectives were comprehensive or if they were the right goals and objectives. He said that as they continued working on this, he assumed that even if they said they liked these goals and objectives that day, if they began to identify action steps that led back to possibly altering or changing objectives or goals, they would still proceed in accordance with the larger process picture.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that was correct.

Ms. Mallek asked if Ms. Kanellopoulos could describe places where the PC suggestions were already incorporated in the materials.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said they were not incorporated yet. She said that they shared a summary of the PC's feedback with the Board; however, they did not proceed with making revisions until they had an opportunity to hear from both the PC and the Board.

Ms. Mallek said that she would continue with her long-range plan, which involved highlighting some things that she thought were important. She said that she had warned everyone three years ago that this was where she lived, this sort of work, and she said that she was sorry it was going to take a while, but that there were some important things to think about.

Ms. Mallek said that on the 9H, the PC summaries, that they had heard from various individuals in addition to the PC that the dark skies issue should be an environmental stewardship issue, a scenic issue, and an economic development issue.

Ms. Mallek said that communities in Texas, New Mexico, and Nelson County now welcomed visitors who desired to see the stars. She said that they currently had wonderful dark skies but must be cautious not to lose them. She said that she would like to emphasize that the existing lighting ordinance did not work with LEDs. She said that the lumens were not suitable for the new lighting that was now available, and that it was far more devastating. She said that this issue was on their to-do list, which they already had; however, it was something that they should do as quickly as possible. She said that these adjustable fixtures, when left on full blast, were causing damage to wildlife and disrupting neighbors' sleep.

Ms. Mallek said that she wanted to emphasize incorporating the Biodiversity Action Plan everywhere, not just as an add-on, as it had not been well respected in their decision-making so far. She said that it should be part of the regular checklist of considerations. She said that the groundwater study was another matter; previously, the County had a well that was measured frequently. She said that during the recession, the decision was made not to register and read the data, but that it could be easily picked up by a citizen scientist group or other water quality people living near the well in Mechums River to restore that documentation. She said that she learned that the water information and drought data from Goochland were not particularly suitable for their area, and thus their region was not receiving the necessary details to make good decisions.

Ms. Mallek said that under Goal 1, the focus on Objective 1.2 was clean energy generation. She said that one of the drawbacks of focusing solely on one aspect of energy was that numerous other elements may be harmed by a siloed approach. She said that while there were many people in the Commonwealth and locally who wanted solar to be the solution, it must be one of many solutions, otherwise, they risk moving backward. She said that there were consequences for forests, climate change, and the loss of ecosystem services provided by forests if they were not careful.

Ms. Mallek said that the term "future floodplain growth" referred to the increase in floodplain elevation due to rising water levels, resulting in greater impacts as observed during extreme events such as those exceeding 3,000-year storms experienced in recent years. She said that consequently, more acreage would be affected as floodplains expanded.

Ms. Mallek said that she supported numerous aspects of their current policies and was happy to share them with everyone. She said that over the past 16 years since she had been on the Board, people had consistently requested incorporating a tree conservation plan into their development process. She said that she had hoped that this would become more obligatory rather than just chopping down everything and replacing them with trees that were only two inches in diameter instead of those that were two feet in diameter.

Ms. Mallek said that one significant issue was that under the toolkits, this concept might have been suggested by public input, but she was concerned that they were considering this idea under the fourth bullet point on page 10. She said that land primarily used for agriculture was growing food. She said that nowhere in this document had they discussed food production. She said that forests were terrific and that it covered 60-some percent of their County, which was a significant advantage that many others did not have. She said that just because someone was growing crops did not mean that it should be less important. She said that if they could find a way to recognize soil for food production in their Comprehensive Plan that would be a beneficial addition.

Mr. Andrews said that he had a question regarding their process. He said that they had received draft goals and objectives for review, which were currently being commented on. He said that there was also a topic report for each area of focus. He said that he felt that the topic reports appeared inconsistent in relation to the Climate Action Plan. He said that he would appreciate it if Ms. Kanellopoulos could clarify their relationship to each other.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that last year they shared topic reports during the initial phase of engagement. She said that they were meant to provide a basic understanding of trends, challenges, and opportunities by topic for community members to gain a high-level overview of each subject area. She said that they had continued to update these reports where possible. She said that they planned to incorporate a condensed version of these reports into the upcoming chapter narrative. She said that this was still a work in progress, primarily intended to present background data, recent trends, and highlight some of the County's programs and long-range plans.

Mr. Pruitt said that one of the key things that stood out in this chapter was the importance of addressing issues of equity and environmental justice when discussing environmental issues. He said that in his district, people living in neighborhoods that were currently or historically more racially diverse and impoverished faced disproportionate challenges such as higher utility costs, increased heat indexes, and fewer tree canopies.

Mr. Pruitt said that this issue should be explicitly highlighted in their plan and considered when addressing environmental quality concerns. He said that he would like to see a clear discussion of how they would prioritize the needs of historically disadvantaged populations in their decision-making process to avoid exacerbating existing environmental justice issues.

Mr. Pruitt said that he wanted to broadly co-sign many of the recommendations made by the PC, particularly regarding light pollution. He said that he believed this was a critical issue, and he fully endorsed everything that Ms. Mallek also said on that matter. He said that he agreed with the PC that resilience was a critical chapter. He said that he was concerned about some aspects that had been left unsaid in their current goal on resilience. He said that he noticed a heavy focus on government assets, hardening infrastructure, and focusing on green infrastructure.

Mr. Pruitt said that he did not see much about how they might help deal with either a climate shock or a climate strain. He said that he should emphasize that he did not see much distinction being made between a climate shock and a climate strain, which was an important factor to consider. He said that he did not see much distinction between a sudden crisis or an ongoing strain. He said that he was referring to either a continuous decrease in chill hours for their apple orchards, which represented a climate strain, or another situation where people could not go outside for five days due to wildfires in Canada, which would be a climate shock.

Mr. Pruitt said that he hoped that their Comprehensive Plan could make these distinctions and discuss different ways they might respond to both situations. He said that he would be interested in seeing greater emphasis on what they would do to help individuals struggling through these challenges. He said that possible energy support grants or focusing on health issues raised, such as infant cooling hours, could be considered. He said that these were all things that they could provide direct individual-facing services for, and he did not see anything in this document suggesting so.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was curious if any of his peers had considered addressing intangible

aspects in their discussions of environmental stewardship. He said that this document was concrete, and Mr. Williamson's emphasis on measurability was important; however, he also proposed that they incorporate values in their Comprehensive Plan for future reference and decision-making. He said that he proposed that they explicitly acknowledge the intangible qualities they valued in their natural environment, such as beauty, majesty, and wonder in their natural environment. He said that it would be appropriate to include such sentiments in Goal 3 or elsewhere in their plan, maybe Goal 4.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she supported the emphasis on tracking success and implementation. She said that it was important for the Board to maintain a history of their accomplishments and actions throughout the years. She said that regarding Mr. Pruitt's suggestion regarding majestic and beauty, while those words may not be explicitly used, in their Rural Areas, scenic byways, and everything else, they were implied. She said that this County was indeed majestic, and its rural beauty was what set Albemarle apart in her opinion.

Ms. McKeel clarified that she believed that the PC had done a good job with what they had presented. She said that regarding dark skies, she completely agreed that they needed to start looking at dark skies and their outdated lighting ordinance. She said that in some new developments, she could stand in the road and read a magazine at 2:00 a.m. in the morning, which should not be possible. She said that achieving dark skies in their community required collaboration between UVA and the City. She said that in her district specifically UVA's involvement was important.

Ms. McKeel said that she would suggest that LUPIC (Land Use Planning Environmental Committee) could be a great committee to begin that discussion. She said that would be the one opportunity where they had the University, the City, and the County collaborating together. She said that it would be beneficial to begin this discussion at LUPIC and then expand it to all of them.

Ms. McKeel said that another topic she wanted to address was a concern in the Jouett District that had been for quite some time now. She said that she was speaking specifically about this area because it was the most densely populated district, with numerous apartment complexes and old infrastructure. She said that she was particularly concerned about protecting their groundwater and waterways in this district. She said that in her opinion, simply drawing an imaginary line did not safeguard the groundwater in her area. She said that the jurisdictional area was there, but in the Rural Areas along Hydraulic Road and Georgetown Road, she had failing septic systems due to their inability to connect to public sewer. She said that after 30 years, she did not think that was the right way to protect their groundwater. She said that they knew there were better ways to safeguard groundwater in certain areas.

Ms. McKeel said that she was not discussing an expansion of the Development Area; rather, she was focusing on finding solutions for addressing failing septic systems that were 60 years old. She said that in some instances people saw sewage bubbling up due to these systems. She said that she had constituents who did not even realize they had a septic system, thinking they had public sewer access instead. She said that her goal was to determine how they could effectively protect their groundwater. She said that Ivy Creek was currently in poor condition and was located in the same area where numerous failing septic systems existed.

Ms. McKeel said that this area was rural, including Lambs Road, Hydraulic, and Georgetown Road. She said that last year's discussions revealed that staff discovered 254 failing septic systems in the Development Area of the district, situated between Rio and Jack Jouett. She said that this was not an effective method for protecting groundwater. She said that she would like to request that staff consider the best approach for safeguarding groundwater in this densely developed Urban Area, whether rural or developmental.

Ms. McKeel asked whether they should expand their jurisdictional area to connect to public sewers or if they should conduct a groundwater study instead. She said that she was unsure but that they must address this issue. She said that she could not tolerate failing septic systems in the urban ring.

Ms. McKeel said that she would also express her concern about addressing steep slopes in both Rural and Development Areas, ensuring they had the best software, tools, and methods for distinguishing between managed and steep slopes. She said that they encountered this issue during their solar projects at Scottsville and Greystar on Old Ivy Road. She said that the developers of both locations were able to effectively utilize 21st century technology to differentiate between managed and preserved steep slopes. She said that she wanted to ensure that they were up to date and had the ability to do that also. She said that there were advanced tools available that could help them identify which slopes should be preserved and which should not, particularly in cases where preservation was not intended due to infrastructure development.

Ms. McKeel said that after 30 years, their topography had significantly changed. She said that she was getting back to the groundwater study and examining even Urban Areas where the topography had altered. She said that this change affected water flow patterns. She said that for instance, at Hydraulic Road, which would likely become a vineyard, the topography had transformed dramatically over the past five years on that property. She said that one could observe these changes at Ivy Creek. She said that they need to consider that the altered topography after 30 to 35 years. She said that they now lived in a different environment than they did three decades ago.

Mr. Gallaway said that he would call out the last slide that updates objectives for increased measurability. He said that he agreed with Mr. Williamson's comments regarding attainable or aspirational goals and the need to define that distinction. He said that the PC's identification of measurable objectives

was crucial for determining whether resources should be allocated for these steps. He said that without measurable goals they could not assess whether their efforts were worthwhile or not. He said that at the end of this process all of this would coalesce and be able to achieve that.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding Goal 1, its measurability was evident through their Climate Action Plan, which aimed to reduce emissions by 45% within a specific timeline. He said that after examining the objectives, it appeared reasonable that they would assist them in achieving their goal, although he was not an expert to definitively say whether they would. He said if they actually achieved objectives one through four, someone along the way had confirmed that they would, and then could back that up, and they would see it in the action steps.

Mr. Gallaway said that Objective 1.1, however, required further analysis. He said that combining walking, cycling, and transit was understandable from a Supervisor's perspective, as it related to their Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), as they must find if they were providing the necessary infrastructure to increase the use of these modes of transportation. He said that this led him to consider whether the infrastructure improvements would be reflected in the action steps, or if this was just focusing on educating the public about the benefits of walking more or buying electric vehicles.

Mr. Gallaway said that he was unsure of how they could increase the use of electric vehicles as a government. He said that they could install charging stations and create supportive infrastructure, but he was apprehensive about attempting to change people's behavior directly. He said that they could provide education, encouragement, and support, but when it came to allocating tax dollars for behavior change, he became uncertain. He said that to increase walking, cycling, and transit usage seemed more concrete because these changes involved infrastructure improvements.

Mr. Gallaway said that they could not increase transit usage if their existing transit system remained dysfunctional, and they were working on addressing that issue. He said that regarding telecommuting, he did not know if this meant providing broadband access to enable remote work or was this about enhancing telecommuting opportunities within the County only. He said that these aspects were what he aimed to clarify as they delved into specifics of Objective 1 action steps. He said that generally, this type of commentary represented his stance on every single objective throughout all these chapters.

Mr. Gallaway said that he saw verbs such as protect, support, increase, and so forth in these objectives, and the manner in which they would be achieved became important. He said that it was commendable if these objectives were aspirational, implying that they did not need to be funded. He said that if they were achievable, then the Comprehensive Plan should outline both the goal and the means by which it would be attained.

Mr. Gallaway said that Goal 3 had language that specified a specific move by percentage. He said that they would have natural waterways and riparian areas that were healthy, plentiful, and diverse. He asked what the bar was for achieving healthy, plentiful, and diverse natural waters and riparian areas. He said that this was what he was addressing. He said that he could see that these objectives were moving in the right direction but might need refinement. He said that once they saw the action steps, they might identify that an Objective 3.4 was required due to missing components related to it.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding Objective 4.5, supporting the increase of native plant species and removal of invasive species on County-owned properties was clear and achievable since they had control over their own property. He said that now it seemed that they had added an additional tag to this objective, which was supporting the adoption of these actions on private land. He asked if this was merely a high-five for removing invasive species or something more. He said that he wanted to know the specific steps for this initiative. He said that he did not like doing tag-ons that merely appeared like good language to include. He said that they should communicate to their community, specifically mentioning that they would undertake this action.

Mr. Gallaway said that then, if they believed it was important to encourage or support or influence or whatever the term was on private land, that should probably be set up under a different category or perhaps resolved in the action steps again. He asked if these were incentives that they would provide to people to remove invasive species or if they offered assistance like sending their team to their land to remove invasive plants or using goats for this purpose. He said that he wanted to clarify what should be included in tag-on items and objectives that state they will be supportive of efforts outside of their control.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding Goal 5, Objective 5.1 seemed particularly connected to economic development. He said that he did not intend to give Mr. Williamson excessive attention today, and Ms. Mallek also commented on the siloed nature of these chapters. He said that Project ENABLE did not directly address 5.1 yet. He said that the expansion of industries' presence indicated that they had target industries they were interested in bringing into the County or maintaining. He said that in 5.1, he did not believe that it was stated that they aimed to bring in industries that were rethinking and redesigning materials.

Mr. Gallaway said that it could be that they were looking for industries that they identified that they practiced this approach. He said that however, that was different from expanding the presence of industries that process and repurpose materials in the County. He said that companies might do this at some level or measure within their own group without necessarily being material repurposers. He said that his question was whether this was specific to expanding the presence of companies and industries that process and repurpose materials in the County.

Mr. Jamie Powers, Climate Protection Project Manager, said that what they were attempting to achieve in all of these objectives in Goal 5 was to ensure representation from all of the levels of the waste hierarchy. He said that this included considering various actions in the waste sector, such as composting, recycling, and so forth. He said that the most important thing was to think about how they went about redesigning and to rethink manufacturing processes. He said that they recognized the connection between their efforts and Project ENABLE and said that they had been in contact with that department. He said that some work needed to be done to align these initiatives and connect them to the relevant portion of AC44.

Mr. Gallaway asked if it did not specifically attract companies that performed the tasks but rather fostered the desired behavior in existing companies.

Mr. Powers said that the intent was to include both, and this was supported by the SWAAC (Solid Waste Alternative Advisory Committee).

Mr. Gallaway said that was great, and he believed that would become clearer as they identified action steps as well. He said that regarding 5.5, to address food waste and yard trimmings in landfills by diverting from the waste stream, he had question as to how they would achieve that. He said that these action items could include people taking things to convenience centers, then the County diverting that material going somewhere else, and educating people about alternative disposal methods for food waste. He said that to achieve their overarching goal in Chapter 1, they must ensure that if their plan included tangible infrastructure improvements that must be included, rather than just aspiring for behavioral changes.

Ms. Mallek said that she would like to clarify that there were still topics to cover regarding Rural Area land use and transportation. She said that the values of the Comprehensive Plan were, until this draft, an incredibly important part of the process. She said that this was why the narrative was 300 pages long; people could look at it and understand what had happened in Albemarle and what had been important to people in Albemarle for at least the last 100 years. She said that for those who were interested, this document served as a historical reference, and maybe that was a way to use the topic reports, which she thought read very well, but may need cleaning up.

Ms. Mallek said that in the past, Boards of Supervisors had struggled with addressing conflicts arising from opposing goals that might both be true. She said that there had been some consideration of having it be much shorter; however, this was what got lost when they did not take time to provide some extra background. She said that she appreciated the effort that had already been put into creating the background material, which she found fantastic.

Ms. Mallek said that the mention of Ivy Creek made her hair stand on end because that was approximately a quarter mile from the South Fork Reservoir, which supplied drinking water. She said that they could not get closer to potentially polluting their drinking water than right there. She said that there were numerous approaches to consider, but they must recognize that a goal of resolving this problem needed to be added to make it possible for these neighborhoods to be brought in. She said if they were adjacent and already failing, that that met the criteria, and it was a great expense for people.

Ms. Mallek said that she appreciated Mr. Powers' discussion regarding the waste hierarchy. She said that McDonough-Brown-Dart Design Chemistry was founded in Charlottesville 50 years ago and they invented the cradle-to-cradle design concept. She said that they had worked with Mohawk Carpets and various other places over the last decades to change their manufacturing processes so that nothing was left at the end but could be effectively recycled.

Ms. Mallek said that this was certainly possible, however, when the source materials were so much cheaper to buy new, they found themselves back at square one in their national economy. She said that she did not have a solution for that issue. She said that they had several food waste facilities in Mr. Gallaway's district, which was the largest of their local composting sites for food waste and yard waste. She said that that kind of information could certainly be shared to help them improve their waste management efforts.

Mr. Andrews said that he agreed with Mr. Gallaway's remarks regarding measurable outcomes and objectives. He said that these points had been emphasized by the PC as well, which he appreciated. He said that the PC had highlighted some important issues.

Mr. Andrews said that several people had spoken about the overlap between different chapters in the plan, and the tendency to say that a particular topic was covered in one chapter and therefore did not need to be addressed in another. He said that he agreed that they probably needed it in multiple chapters.

Mr. Andrews said that, for example, the issue of dark skies may or may not be considered a historic, scenic, or cultural issue, but it was also an environmental issue. He said that the effects of housing and equity on environmental justice would have overlapped between these topics. He said that this may result in a longer Comprehensive Plan, but he believed that it was necessary. He said that with that, they had heard a lot of support for the PC and measurable actions, as well as specific comments about different items.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she would like to discuss the planning tools for Goal 5, specifically

requiring developers to minimize clear-cutting, preserve large old trees, plant native species, and replace tree canopy. She said that previously they had not been asking that and asked if this was feasible. She asked that, when clearing land for construction or development sites, if they were asking developers to replace the tree canopy. She said that she had mentioned solar roofs, but that she thought the tree canopy was more important.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they had been examining that for the action steps and discussing internally as staff about some of the options for tree coverage. She said that they had been attempting to build upon some of the recommendations in the Climate Action Plan.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that that would help with the carbon dioxide.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that she would like to discuss parks and recreation next. She said that there were seven draft goals: to plan for and provide a countywide parks and greenways system, recommendations for new parks, greenways, and blueways, enhancing and updating existing parks, connectivity, usability, and accessibility in parks and trails, sustainable land management, strong partnerships, and recreational programs, facilities, and athletic fields.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that she would review the PC's feedback. She said that the PC recommended providing equitably distributed parks in Development Areas and addressing gaps in where parks were provided. She said that the PC also recommended that they consider whether the County should acquire more land for parks and explore creative funding options and partnerships, and they emphasized that there should be a system of parks and greenways that were publicly accessible, and that they should be connected with employment, business centers, and housing, and again, updating objectives to be more measurable.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the PC also recommended that they consider identifying where additional parks may be needed in the Rural Area and opportunities for recreation on rural roads, which also aligned with transportation recommendations, as well as considering safety and security measures, including cell towers and parks.

Mr. Pruitt said that there were a few points in several of the objectives of Goal 1 where they talked about the creation of new parks and greenways, followed by discussing the role of community centers. He said that upon reviewing the document, he had noticed that they emphasized maintaining and improving community centers while creating new parks. He said that however, the creation of new community centers was not explicitly considered in the current plan, which was conspicuous given their importance in rural communities for service delivery. He said that in the current draft of the rural area chapter, there seemed to be an emphasis on how they were going to deliver certain key government services in the Rural Area.

Mr. Pruitt said that he proposed that there be more explicit contemplation of the future role of community centers in expanding government reach deeper into the community. He said that he would like to emphasize that community centers, like Yancey in the south side, served as deeply important community fixtures in their government planning. He said that he suggested that they include explicit language contemplating the role of their parks and their community centers in their community in their resilience efforts that they were just talking about.

Mr. Pruitt said that this would emphasize that parks were not just places for recreation but also contributed significantly to their overall community assets. He said that Objective 3.1 focused on enhancing and updating the infrastructure of existing parks and amenities in those parks. He said that the general requirement seemed interesting to him because it implied a continuous obligation to expand or improve or modify some of their existing parks. He said that considering his most frequented park, Walnut Creek, he was unsure what enhancing the infrastructure at Walnut Creek entailed.

Mr. Pruitt said that perhaps more specificity in their objectives would be beneficial. He said that if they were discussing improving their parks, he would be curious about the specifics. He said that the first thing that came to his mind was whether this meant there would no longer be billy goat trails, which was one of his favorite parts of Walnut Creek. He said that when discussing infrastructure and amenities in parks, he immediately noticed the availability of publicly accessible water and restroom facilities.

Mr. Pruitt said that it was a critical part of equity, especially when considering parks as connectors and addressing the needs of homeless individuals who use parks for core services and people traveling through parks during hot months. He said that he would like to emphasize the importance of water and restroom facilities in their public parks and on their interconnecting greenways.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the Rosenwald School on St. John Road was included in staff's data related to the community centers.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that she was unsure.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she wondered if they could increase their parks by accepting proffered areas of land during new developments. She said that if these areas were too small for schools, they could be considered for future parks instead. She said that they should consider these areas for future County parks if the School District did not utilize them. She said that she was thinking of ways to increase parks, which everyone wanted to do.

Mr. Tim Padalino, Chief of Parks and Planning, said that they were indeed examining proffered park properties. He said that there were numerous properties reserved for future dedication to the County for public use. He said that some had been proffered and transferred to County ownership, and others were under easement. He said they were tracking that inventory and working on updating the mapping in collaboration with Community Development staff to monitor the status of these properties, any impending sunset clauses for transfer of ownership rights, and to focus on enhancing access to parks and greenways.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the community centers such as the Boys and Girls Club would serve as emergency centers if required.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that it could serve as a resilience hub or emergency center. She said that previously, there was a project by emerging leaders in architecture that considered both the Boys and Girls Club and the Yancey Community Center as potential good examples for this purpose.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked whether they had identified those community centers that could be used as emergency centers where people could go.

She said that they had been collaborating with the Parks Department, Fire Rescue, the Climate Team, and others in order to implement those recommendations.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to emphasize that looking at community centers was critical, particularly in light of climate change, as they would likely have numerous individuals requiring space and shelter. She said that community centers could serve this purpose, whether in crossroads communities or Boys and Girls Clubs. She said that she wholeheartedly agreed with the discussions regarding community centers. She said that this chapter focused on parks and recreation, and she intended to maintain a high-level perspective. She said that she agreed with everything that was said about specifying actions and methods for evaluating accomplishments.

Ms. McKeel said that their community possessed many exceptional parks, most of which had been donated, which was truly remarkable. She said that it was difficult to deny the benefits of such an offer. She said that her primary concern was how they maintained the parks they already possessed. She said that they lacked a public works department. She said that this affected their ability to provide bathroom facilities in all of their parks due to insufficient staff to manage them. She said that there were only two parks in the Development Area of the County, which were Darden Towe and Charlotte Humphries Parks.

Ms. McKeel said that when considering where the population center was and through the equity lens, her constituents faced challenges in accessing Darden Towe, let alone Walnut Creek. She said that the County should focus on developing pocket parks in areas of density or finding ways to improve accessibility for rural parks. She said that she was unsure how to achieve the goal. She said that suggesting bus transportation was not feasible for her district residents, as they could not reach these locations within two or three hours, let alone spend time in the parks. She said that this was something to think about. She asked who was responsible for maintaining the existing acreage. She said that if they were discussing purchasing or accepting more resources, she wanted to know how they would manage what they already had.

Ms. McKeel said that when examining community centers, existing locations such as Northside Library should be considered. She said that they could consider collaborating with some developers like Stonefield, which was situated in Urban Areas.

Mr. Gallaway said that in general, he believed that among all the chapters they had today, this one did the best job of aligning specific, more specific, achievable goals and objectives that corresponded to what the goal stated. He said that upon reviewing these goals, he noticed that some action items still needed to be defined, but for the most part, this chapter appeared more concrete in many ways. He said that they planned to expand County-owned land for park development. He said that it was a clear-cut approach and specifically stated that the County would take this initiative.

Mr. Gallaway said that there was also a community line in the chapter that highlighted the involvement of teens and seniors. He said that in Urban Areas, they had numerous trails and trailways for walking, which was beneficial for health and enjoyment. He said these walking trails may not hold the attention of teenagers when they repeatedly experienced the same route. He said that considering diverse populations, particularly focusing on age brackets in parks and recreation was important. He said that their current efforts seemed promising, but that the most challenging segment might be preteens and teens in Urban Areas.

Mr. Gallaway said that if all activities catered to eight-year-olds or less or solely focused on walking, they would miss out on opportunities to provide activities for this age group that offered various benefits. He said that his belief was that they would achieve this goal and was looking forward to addressing the action items regarding this topic. He said that item 2.2 was the development of urban parks, pocket parks, greenways, and so forth. He said that when they delved into the details, the details would likely emerge in the action items.

Mr. Gallaway said that he did not want the importance of accessing Urban Areas or the callouts in their Small Area Plan, which stated that if a site was redeveloped and public spaces were incorporated, they would assume responsibility for maintaining them, to be overlooked in the Comprehensive Plan. He

said that they had already agreed upon these aspects in other areas or County documents. He said that when developers undertook redevelopment projects without considering this information and failed to consult the Small Area Plan, the County might have expressed interest in taking over and maintaining the area.

Mr. Gallaway said that he hoped that this topic would be addressed in this chapter as well. He said that it was likely that this issue would be discussed under the heading of increasing the amount of County-owned land. He said that somewhere in this chapter, there might be an action item suggesting that they take ownership and maintenance responsibilities for Development Areas, such as the trailhead at Parkway Place or Rio Point. He said that he was hoping that these types of initiatives would be maintained or captured in this document.

Ms. Mallek said that some of her comments might spill over into community themes, which she was attempting to avoid; however, she might still do so unintentionally. She said that she agreed that running water would be very important; however, she was unsure how they would provide bathroom facilities at numerous locations. She said that moving on to Objective 4.3 on page 5, she wanted to discuss new recreation access improvements at Sugar Hollow in partnership with SNP (Shenandoah National Park). She said that while they should have a kiosk for park access, they should not spend money on building bathrooms or making improvements that attract more people and potentially create water problems for their drinking water.

Ms. Mallek said that this was a challenging situation where every university student seemed to adhere to an unwritten rule of bringing their beer to the blue hole, which was now the brown hole due to its unfortunate degradation, primarily on the South Fork of the Mormons. She said that this had been a nightmare for their Rescue and Police Department for at least the last 16 years, and possibly more than that. She said that she would like to have a lot of care and consideration regarding where amenities would be improved.

Ms. Mallek said that since the derecho, there had been discussion about ensuring that when funds were available, they would be able to improve facilities at fire stations and schools so that they could be used in emergencies like that. She said that they experienced 10 days of 95-degree temperatures with no place for people to cool off. She said that fortunately, the fire departments were able to bring water using brush trucks so that people could get water for their livestock from the dump tank at the firehouse.

Ms. Mallek said that the cattle in Earlysville would not have survived without this assistance because so many people had nothing, and their wells were dry, and the streams were dry too. She said that these existing buildings, which had always been community gathering places, were essential for the country. She said that churches, schools, and firehouses served as gathering points for people, along with country markets and stores, which she said were also incredibly important.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding the proffered lands for parks, she recognized that they had experienced delays in acquiring them. She said that she encouraged all parties to expedite the property transfers to ensure that when ownership changes occurred, they did not get into a tug-of-war about those things. She said that the children in Crozet had long desired a skate park, as advocated by both the Crozet Park Board and the County. She said that organized sports provide an alternative, but there was also a significant demand for outdoor recreational activities beyond soccer and similar sports.

Ms. Mallek said that on page eight, this community theme raises concerns regarding facilities in crossroads communities.

Ms. Mallek said that she urged them to engage in numerous conversations with crossroads community members before incorporating such elements into the Comprehensive Plan. She said that in her recent experiences in White Hall Village and Free Union discussions, they expressed their disinterest in increased traffic, additional development, and heightened difficulties. She said that these areas already experienced constant disruption from logging trucks and gravel trucks due to activities in the countryside.

Ms. Mallek said that under accessibility, she suggested that someone research the Clemyjontri Park in Arlington, which boasted 100% universal accessibility. She said that she had taken her granddaughters there, and that it was fabulous for children both in wheelchairs and running around, and it was a great melting pot. She said that there were funding opportunities from foundations across the country who were particularly interested in that specific topic.

Ms. Mallek said that going back to Goal 6, partnerships and volunteer programs for collaborating on improving public lands required careful consideration. She said that improving had to be in air quotes because they could not have unauthorized and ill-advised trail-making. She said to look at the destruction of the critical resources at Ragged Mountain by people who were trespassing and should not have been allowed to do that, and these actions would only get worse unless they drew a line in the sand on this issue.

Ms. Mallek said that this raised her concerns very quickly. She said that it was a danger when they had generic high-level things that people might misinterpret, leading them to believe that they could go out there without considering the consequences of their actions or whether their presence was even invited. She said that people did not seem to believe that their rules applied to them.

Ms. Mallek said that the last one on Goal 5, sustainable land management. She said that

protecting biodiversity and ecological integrity was incredibly important, which was different than using chemicals everywhere. She said that they must be very careful about chemical use that they were adopting or blessing. She said that their safer chemical policy needed strengthening to ensure proper implementation since its adoption in 2010. She said that these environmental concerns reminded them that they could not claim to care about natural heritage creatures while harming them.

Mr. Andrews said that he believed that the PC had done a commendable job addressing some of the needs and noticed that community centers had been mentioned frequently without clear objectives regarding their role in this plan. He said that he believed this was an important aspect that they should focus on. He said that he would like to request Parks and Recreation to provide a breakdown of the required care for different types of parks at some point in the future. He said that this information would help them better understand the needs of various parks when considering different goals, such as Goal 6, whether they collaborate with outside partners or manage the parks themselves.

Mr. Andrews said that he was strongly supportive of pocket parks and urbanized parks but noted that their care requirements differed significantly from those of larger parks like Biscuit Run. He said that regarding Goal 6, he would like to echo Ms. Mallek's comments and clarify that he was uncertain about the meaning of 'partners.' He asked if external stakeholders were referring to groups that use the parks or if there were other potential partners being considered. He said that he would appreciate further clarification, and that it may come out in some of the actions.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she would like to point out that external stakeholders could also be partners, or they could be using the newly formed County Parks Foundation to help ensure that tasks were carried out properly. She said that this would address Ms. Mallek's concern regarding people going out there and doing whatever they wanted.

Mr. Pruitt said that he agreed with Mr. Andrews' point regarding the need for more information and insight into the costs related to maintaining the parks, especially as it related to his disagreement with Ms. Mallek regarding the water and sewage needs at certain parks. He said that he saw that as a very important element in reducing the accessibility barrier of certain parks by recognizing that there is serious financial challenge. He said that either a framework for how they would approach that be included in the Comprehensive Plan or just more information that may allow a decision point on that.

Ms. McKeel said that the maintenance aspect of the parks was largely dependent on staffing, which was a budget issue.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that a restroom facility would be installed at Darden Towe Park. She asked if staff could provide information on the cost for the restroom, and that she thought it was approximately \$1 million.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that one of the things that staff was listening for today was requests that might be more suitable to address in the budget process. He said that Ms. McKeel mentioned that, in relation to analyzing the cost of maintaining a park, they should consider the amenities within the parks, staffing, and other resources. He said that they would capture some of this information and once the budget was balanced, they would present it to the public. He said that during the subsequent work sessions they would have the opportunity to review this information in the context of competing needs across the County. He suggested that their staff flag some of the operational questions related to parks to more appropriately fit them into the budget process.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she mentioned it to highlight that there was a price tag to that, which was a budgetary issue.

Ms. McKeel said that the pocket parks were walkable parks and not parks that one drove to. She said that regarding the Charlotte Humphries Park, her CAC (Community Advisory Committee) had expressed that they did not want a bathroom or a parking lot there, and that it was a walkable park for the neighbors.

Ms. Mallek said that they also should investigate how other communities had utilized empty urban spaces or taken possession of derelict properties in order to create half-acre parks featuring large trees and seating areas for picnics or other activities.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the third topic was historic, scenic, and cultural resources, organized into four goals: identify, document, and increase awareness about resources; protect and adaptively reuse resources; provide community access to resources; and develop entrance corridors and other scenic roadways. She said that regarding the PC's feedback, they recommended that specific recommendations for Freetown communities in Rural Areas and other communities with under-told histories should be included in the action steps.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they also suggested that Objective 4.1 might need to be split into one focused on entrance corridors and another on renewable energy. She said that the PC also recommended considering a historic preservation ordinance since encouragements and incentives might not be sufficient. She said that they also suggested stricter requirements for demolition to encourage adaptive reuse and considering where arts and cultural resources fit into the Comprehensive Plan, supporting tourism development. She said that this topic would likely overlap with economic development as well.

Mr. Pruitt said that he agreed with nearly everything presented by the PC. He said that he believed these points were well-taken and valuable. He said that he wanted to make an addition by continuing a discussion that he thought they had started in the previous section and that the packet they received helped highlight. He said that the discussion concerned the lack of clarity regarding what they truly wanted from crossroads communities and what they consistently meant by them.

Mr. Pruitt said that there were many places in southern Albemarle and in his own district that they might identify and think of as crossroads communities but which, according to the County, were not considered crossroads communities. He said that when talking to individual citizens, he had consistently found that they thought of crossroads communities as a place to locate services or community needs.

Mr. Pruitt said that however, he believed they were originally conceived of as a historical preservation tool, as Ms. Mallek might sometimes point out. He said that there was still a significant amount of confusion within the community regarding this matter. He said that there was sometimes personal confusion about what they wanted and what they thought of crossroads communities. He said that it appeared that this might be a place where they could seek additional clarity from these issues, but he was not finding it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she also had questions regarding the crossroads communities. She said that she knew that there were seven designated crossroads communities but that the map was not clear enough for her to identify their locations. She said that it would be helpful to know where they were. She said that her concern was that there needed to be better clarification of what services were provided by a crossroads community.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that on page 14 of the recap for engagement, they referred to mitigating the impacts of light and noise pollution to protect dark skies. She said that she agreed with this statement. She said that she believed that LED lights, when used at full force, presented a problem. She said that she also agreed with identifying and protecting historic cultural resources. She said that tying historic tourism and increasing education about local historic resources to the CACVB (Charlottesville-Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau) would be a useful tool.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed with the PC's comments. She said that it was important for them to recognize their historic Black communities in the County.

Ms. McKeel said that she would be interested in exploring further the entrance corridors and other renewable energy and sustainability aspects in more detail. She said that she would like to point out that she had struggled with understanding why the ARB (Architectural Review Board) examined their entrance corridors during their process. She said that they reviewed these corridors and proposals before they even reached the PC, which seemed backwards to her. She said that this practice may lead to confusion in the community, although not necessarily among developers. She said that she observed that developers at CAC meetings mentioned that their proposals had already been approved by the ARB because they were part of the entrance corridor process. She said that perhaps they should reconsider this process.

Ms. McKeel said that her other main point was regarding arts and culture. She said that it was critically important that they continue to support their arts and cultural community. She said that she believed that a great place to do this was in the Broadway corridor. She said that her concern was that the Broadway corridor might be developed in such a way that it chased artists away. She said that they needed to provide more Light Industrial (LI) space alongside arts and culture in this corridor. She said that as they discussed enhancements for Broadway, she was specifically concerned about the potential impact on property values and attracting other players. She said that they must be cautious in developing this area to ensure that their arts community was not negatively affected.

Ms. McKeel said that she would return to the previous discussion by the two Supervisors before her and acknowledge that they must reach a consensus regarding what they meant by a crossroads community. She said that she thought expecting every crossroads community to have a dry cleaner and a Walmart was unrealistic. She said that they needed to have food, and that some of these communities often faced food desert issues, and they needed to explore ways to provide necessary services without excessive spread and development. She said that considering criteria, she was unsure of how they could achieve this, but she did think they should collectively determine the meaning of a crossroads community.

Mr. Gallaway said that the second bullet point on the PC feedback slide had not occurred to him, but he believed that he agreed with the PC and that it may need to be split up. He said that he would like to question how arts and cultural resources were in relation to the Comprehensive Plan. He said that these resources may not necessarily have to be placed in specific locations within the plan. He said that arts and cultural items could often be considered in service of other objectives and things, which may lead them to forget or overlook their inherent value.

Mr. Gallaway said that they should address whether arts and culture items served as tools for achieving other objectives or whether they held worth in themselves. He said that if they held worth in themselves, they must consider how this fit into the Comprehensive Plan. He said that this discussion built upon the question raised earlier, which he agreed with.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding 2.1, he would like to know if there were currently County incentives and grant programs in place to support this.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the staff expert on historic resources indicated the answer was no.

Mr. Gallaway said that if they mentioned incentives and grant programs in this document, they would examine these programs and incentives in the action items. He said that the budget would have to cover all these costs. He said that this specific point highlighted creating new programs that did not currently exist and funded from their own funds. He said they should expect to see the details of this initiative in the action items.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they could also be funded through grant programs or other external funding opportunities.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding potential funding streams, external sources were mentioned. He said that however, the first two funding streams specifically referred to County-based funding. He said that if they were focusing solely on alternative funding streams, they could not suggest that the County would come up with incentives or grants. He said that the proposal must be well-defined.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding Goal 4, Objective 4.1 he assumed it would be included in land use and transportation. He said that Objective 4.1 was about putting things in and that Albemarle County had set a high bar for entrance corridors, view sheds, and specific design elements such as tile color. He said that once the infrastructure was built, the focus should shift to maintaining its quality. He said that this led to discussions regarding medians and litter management in Urban Areas.

Mr. Gallaway said that they had taken steps through street sweeping and other measures to address this issue. He said that they needed to include in the Comprehensive Plan that Urban Areas should be treated with the same level of care and protection as rural environments. He said that most people entered the City through the urban ring and then ventured out to enjoy its surroundings. He said that if it appeared to be in poor condition, that implied that they needed to reassess their approach.

Mr. Gallaway said that he would like to see a recognition that the historic resources within the Development Area were also part of the historic resources. He said that they had implemented signage and wayfinding, but if litter surrounded a historic sign, it contradicted their appreciation for the historic resource. He said that he proposed an Objective 4.3 stating that once the project was in place, Albemarle County would take necessary actions to maintain its appearance. He said that the action items would define specific responsibilities, as they may involve VDOT or private landowners. He said that preserving the appearance of these resources was important.

Mr. Gallaway said that the other two items he would like to highlight from the packet could be found on pages 6 and 7 in the community section. He said that these might fall under the category of incentives and grant category. He said that during the discussion, someone from the community mentioned the concept of incentives over neglect or preventing demolition by neglect.

Mr. Gallaway said that the incentives and grant programs could help address such issues. He said that for instance, if there was a historic structure on private land that was not being maintained properly, and over time, it may become dilapidated and require demolition. He said that if there was a good incentive or program in place, they could help maintain and preserve the structure. He said that he was attempting to connect this idea back to the comment made in the community section.

Ms. Mallek said that the Historic Preservation Committee had some insightful discussions several months ago regarding the concern that equity had been dropped in somewhere in this process that did not seem to be working. She said that they shared valuable details with staff, so she was certain that these would be recognized and considered throughout the process. She said that the call for the ordinance and the requirements for demolition from the PC was incredibly important.

Ms. Mallek said that the pursuit of this ordinance had been ongoing for over 20 years, and they had yet to garner the political will to assert that this was important to their community and was part of their identity. She said that other communities and counties in Virginia had requirements for demolition, and they did not, and they had been told that they did not have the right to do so. She said that she did not understand this, but they must find a better way to address this issue.

Ms. Mallek said that they needed to more affirmatively recognize that they were not just discussing the Monticellos; they were addressing the vernacular architecture particularly found in the Esmont and Keene areas. She said that part of the historic district included all of the workmen's houses situated along the roads. She said that these houses held significant value beyond just the main attraction. She said that unfortunately, this aspect was not discussed much in this context. She said that she hoped that these vernacular architectures, representing regular people's homes, would receive more recognition in the future. She said that these houses were often the ones that got gentrified right away.

Ms. Mallek said that mentioned that somewhere in the document was recognition of historic cemeteries, but this topic required further emphasis because they had not done anything to carry out their statutory obligation from the state in this regard. She said that this was something they should be concerned about.

Ms. Mallek said that she fully supported everything mentioned in the overview, such as systemic identification mapping to ensure they had better knowledge of where things were located. She said that the current Historic Preservation Committee had worked diligently to share information about tax credit programs and outside funding with new property owners who came along. She said she would point out

that they often did not receive this information in time before the individual with the bulldozer arrived and demolished or torn down and taken home an 1820 log house because the owner did not appreciate the importance of it. She said that these were types of losses that the entire community experienced.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding preservation and adaptive reuse, Objective 2.2, she found this concept frustrating because when people purchased a historically significant property and then complained that they could not afford necessary changes without tearing things down or adding various events, they degraded the reason for its inclusion on the National Register. She said that they sought County rule and policy changes for financial support, which she found troubling.

Ms. Mallek said that the access under Goal 3, she believed that ensuring all community members had physical access to properties should be fixed because she did not believe that was the intent. She said that they needed to ensure that they did not put something in print that may scare people or create concerns for those who had spent the last 20 years restoring their house and now had to open it to the public, which was a concern.

Ms. Mallek said that local viewsheds and landscapes held significant importance. She said that she was glad that light pollution was acknowledged because it was part of their historic and scenic resources, in addition to the environmental things. She said that requiring full shielding was within their authority; however, they had not implemented it yet and must do so.

Ms. Mallek said that the entrance corridor was a focus for renewable energy, specifically Objective 4.1, which involved a sustainable building in the historic district. She expressed uncertainty about why this was included but acknowledged that it was not necessarily the ideal location for an industrial-scale solar facility. She said that by emphasizing solar power, they may be neglecting other aspects that contributed to their community. She said that they must be watchful of the potential consequences for other uses when considering any industrial project. She said that other counties had actually analyzed their utility needs and based their approval of solar installations upon that. She said that in other words, Rockingham for example, they had no interest in providing all the solar for some other place. She said that they would take care of their people, and Albemarle was halfway there already with Hexagon. She said that they did not find any need to destroy themselves to take care of others or do outside.

Ms. Mallek said that page 7 discussed the historic buildings in Rural Areas that can be adaptively reused as community gathering places. She said that she would note that this should be allowed under a special permit without loss of historic assets. She said that they needed to be careful not to create a by-right, do-whatever-you-want situation because these places were part of the whole neighborhood.

Ms. Mallek said that she had great appreciation for all the work that Jesse Brookins had done with the marker program. She said that the HPC (Historic Preservation Committee) wanted to merge those two programs together to have them be even more successful, which would be great.

Mr. Andrews said that referring to the list of PC feedback, he certainly agreed with the first bullet. He said that regarding the second bullet, Objective 4.1, it appeared to combine two different ideas. He said that he concurred and believed that recognizing the overlap between chapters was important when discussing renewable energy. He said that this discussion may not be limited to its context within entrance corridors but should consider its broader placement.

Mr. Andrews said that he found that same objective, 4.1, was challenging as a unified objective. He said that the previous slide had discussed this same objective, 4.1, which included design and maintenance of entrance corridors, as Mr. Galloway pointed out. He said that this was something that needed to be reflected in this part of the Comprehensive Plan. He said that his most significant comment was that he did feel that arts and cultural resources had not been adequately addressed in this section; they had merely been mentioned in passing without any specific objectives related to them. He said that he would like to see some expansion on that topic.

Mr. Pruitt said that when considering aspects of historical and cultural value in the Scottsville District, he thought about the incorporated Town of Scottsville, which held significant value and was unique in the County for being their sole incorporated town. He said that he believed it was worth mentioning and discussing the potential for partnership with the town in preserving and enhancing cultural and historical assets.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to reiterate the point raised by Ms. McKeel and later by Mr. Andrews regarding the definition of culture in this context. He said that historic and cultural were consistently said in the same breath; however, culture referred to contemporary culture. He asked if they were talking about street art, graffiti, local theatre, or artisans and crafts people. He said that although these aspects seemed implicated, their objectives specifically addressed the more rarefied and antique culture. He said that if their intention was indeed to include contemporary culture as well, this distinction might need to be emphasized more in their objectives.

Mr. Andrews said that he would follow up on the point regarding crossroads communities, which had been previously discussed. He said that it appeared in this section as part of the topic report, but he agreed that it was not well-defined. He said that he believed it was worse defined than affordable housing. He said that he did not have a clear sense of crossroads communities and the criteria for crossroads communities remained unclear. He said his concern was about how they were addressing this issue and believed that it required further discussion and clarification at this point.

Ms. McKeel said that she wanted to emphasize that they should address both types of litter: visual litter that they could see and litter on the ground that they could pick up. She said that in addition to the plastic bottles that people throw away, there was also an issue of illegal signage that had appeared everywhere.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was not merely about public areas that they could clean up themselves or seek assistance from VDOT for. He said that it was a call out to legal. He said that they had ordinances prohibiting certain signs but lacked those addressing weeds growing tall on sidewalks or medians. He said that it was unclear how they enforced such ordinances or if they were compliance issues.

Mr. Gallaway said that his understanding was that this was also a right-of-way issue, similar to some private medians. He said that they were not public, and they were not managed by VDOT, and now they had to get after the business. He said that it was not simply about needing to spend more money on street sweepers; rather, it involved putting the necessary tools in place to achieve compliance, particularly within or along the entrance corridors' paths.

Ms. Mallek said that she would emphasize one more time that signage, also known as the sign jail, should ideally be reinstated. She said that they possessed state authorization. She said that the County had signed an agreement with VDOT at least 15 years ago, possibly even before her time, to assume responsibility for enforcing sign removal within the highway right-of-way and imposing fines of \$100 per sign for offenders. She said that one of the numerous measures that disappeared during and after the recession due to necessity, but she hoped it would be brought back, was collecting.

Ms. Mallek said that first it was the Christmas lights guy, followed by something else. She said that later it would be tree trimmings, then everything else. She said that they multiplied like coat hangers in a closet, necessitating their removal to prevent hundreds of them from accumulating everywhere one turned. She said that this was a request, and she was unsure if they had the resources, but they should determine how they collected fines to help offset costs over time when someone was en route home to collect all those things and send the bill.

Mr. Andrews said that it sounded like an action step as well.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said she would discuss the fourth topic, which was housing. She said that this topic was organized into six goals, and much of this content was drawn from Housing Albemarle as a starting point. She said that this was noted since this was the most recently updated Comprehensive Plan chapter. She said that the goals for housing were: one, increase the overall housing supply and housing choice; two, increase affordable and workforce housing options; three, preserve and maintain existing housing; four, promote fair housing; five, ensure homelessness was rare, brief, and one time; and six, enable community members to age in place.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the summary of the PC feedback was to prioritize housing recommendations in the Comprehensive Plan, evaluating what was most feasible and what should be accomplished first, to increase affordable housing options in activity centers and employment areas and Development Areas, to consider implementation measures such as using County-owned land for affordable housing, community land trusts, and allowing some additional housing options besides single-family detached in the Rural Area without increasing overall density.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the PC also suggested considering the high cost of assisted living and the overlap with other plan chapters and look for opportunities for partnerships, multigenerational housing options, and accessory dwelling units, consider how aging in place overlaps with service provision in the Rural Area, such as health care and transportation, noting that preservation of existing housing was key, and to continue to support partnerships and programs to do that, and ensure that data was tracked over time and that plan metrics were evaluated to show how progress was being made.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to begin by emphasizing the same objective that Mr. Williamson mentioned because he believed it was central and driving, which was 2.1. He said that all of this information was presented in support of the line that Mr. Williamson highlighted. He said that their goal was to set them up for achieving 10,000 units. He said that he would like to ensure that they all had the same understanding of this objective. He said that it was very important that they drill down into this.

Mr. Pruitt said that it was not clear to him whether the units included in this objective were inclusive of NOAHs (Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing) and if they were using an 80% and below AMI threshold. He said that the term "long-term affordable" made him think of 30-year-plus guarantees. He said that the term "workforce housing" suggested 80% and below AMI. He said that he was inferring these meanings based on his familiarity with the terminology in this field. He said that he thought what he was hearing was that they were aiming to secure contractually committed affordable units of a volume of 10,000 or more, which would be quite impressive.

Mr. Pruitt said that that was also wildly ambitious. He said that he wanted to ensure that they were familiar with this topic. He said that he had previously mentioned that he was familiar with Arlington County, Virginia's affordable housing policies due to personal connections. He said that Arlington was more than twice their size in terms of population, and Arlington had an incredibly robust housing trust fund and had been addressing this issue for a long time. He said that their inventory of committed affordable units was 11,000.

Mr. Pruitt said that he believed this was still an admirable goal; however, he wanted to ensure that they fully understood what this meant if they were discussing this in terms of committed affordable units, not inclusive of NOAHs and not inclusive of things that were 80% to 120%. He said that if that was correct, this was an extraordinary goal, and he just wanted to make sure they were aware of that as they thought about enabling that goal. He said that this would require truly extraordinary funding support and some generational efforts to enable this, which he supported. He said that he wanted to ensure that they adequately crystallized this goal if that was what they aimed for.

Mr. Pruitt said that another significant theme that stood out to him and raised concerns was the lack of a strategic approach to addressing rural poverty. He said that discussions of needs in rural communities primarily focused on the work done through AHIP (Albemarle Housing Improvement Program) and preservation of existing units, but there was no mention of the need for housing in rural communities. He said that preservation efforts had limitations, as buildings could only exist for so long.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to see a more strategic and thoughtful approach that specifically addressed the needs of rural communities. He said that if they stated that they wanted people to age in place, when he had a family of more than two children and they all desired to age in place, he could no longer achieve that by preserving existing housing. He said that he was not suggesting that he wanted to promote additional housing; rather, he believed they must acknowledge that they were already encouraging more housing by not taking more action in this regard.

Mr. Pruitt said that he proposed that they adopt a strategic approach to this issue. He said that he would suggest considering options such as land banking and tailored housing grants that enabled collaboration with private landlords, rather than programs with the same owner restrictions as the HCB (Home and Community Based) program. He also suggested implementing a local housing grant and introducing means-tested tax rebates. He said that these three strategies were specifically tailored to addressing rural poverty and ensuring housing opportunities in rural communities. He said that this was particularly relevant in his district, where he had areas of severe housing need in rural communities and people who were deeply connected to those communities. He said that he spoke as someone who was deeply connected with his rural community in which he grew up and was not there because they did not have a systematic focus on that.

Mr. Pruitt said that lastly, he would like to point out that he had closely read Housing Charlottesville and knew that Albemarle's name was mentioned in every other sentence when they discussed solutions. He said that they needed to grapple with the meaning of that. He said that they were already being considered as a critical regional partner in the housing space. He said that it was essential that they grapple very explicitly with that.

Mr. Pruitt said that if other people were casting their hopes and dreams onto them, they needed to be fully embracing a regional approach to housing. He said that he did not have specific action items for this, but that was something he would like to emphasize. He said that "regional" would be the key term of the next decade, and they should lean into that rather than resist it.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that they had until 2040 to achieve their goals regarding affordable and workforce housing, but she acknowledged that achieving them would be quite challenging. She said that she agreed with many of the points made earlier regarding affordable and workforce housing. She said that she believed that there was a viable way to achieve workforce housing, and that they were moving toward that. She said that regarding affordable housing, she thought it would be more challenging due to the homeless situation or people who were unhoused.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that they had addressed this through Premier Circle and similar initiatives. She said that for affordable housing, she suggested exploring options like land trusts or purchasing properties for lease to entities that specialized in building affordable housing, such as Habitat for Humanity or PHA (Piedmont Housing Alliance). She said that if they had the land that made a significant difference. She said that the land could be in Rural Areas, as for duplexes or fourplexes without fully going in there, because when they went into the Rural Area, they needed water and sewer, so that would be problematic.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that there were areas where one or two-acre plots could accommodate duplexes that could be considered affordable housing. She said she thought that they needed to look at it in a different way if they wanted to get affordable housing. She said that to achieve workforce housing, they were moving in the right direction. She said that she did not believe that affordable housing in its current form was achievable without reassessing their approach. She said that she would like to mention that on page 8, the community input discussed balconies. She said that she agreed that balconies were very important for individuals residing in apartments or townhomes, particularly apartments. She said that balconies offered residents the chance to connect with nature.

Ms. McKeel said that she agreed with Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley's statement regarding balconies because during the pandemic, she had seen pictures of people standing on their balconies singing across streets to each other. She said that although she had not considered balconies specifically before, she thought that this was a valid point. She said that she was unsure if they wanted a balcony on every window, but she believed that it was worth considering.

Ms. McKeel said that their housing options primarily consisted of accommodations for people in true poverty, for which they had a responsibility to mitigate and help. She said that Premier Circle and The Crossings served as examples of how they were doing that. She said that workforce housing, which

was what they were talking about here, also had environmental aspects. She said that they often focused solely on first-time housing for single residences for individuals.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like them to broaden their perspective and consider more rental options or at least rental-oriented housing. She said that they had discussed rental housing, and she believed it was important that they did not limit this concept to everyone needing their own house. She said that there was a place for rental, and she had observed that wealthier individuals were moving toward rental options as they downsized, which was very interesting. She said that she would like them to consider rental as a win-win situation in a way.

Ms. McKeel said that she was concerned about prioritizing efforts to keep people in Rural Areas in their homes, then how would they provide services to them. She said that if they focused on maintaining residents in true Rural Areas, they must also address how they could provide essential services to these communities. She said that addressing crossroad communities or areas that offer amenities like grocery stores or small drug stores might be beneficial for both Rural and Urban Areas. She said that post offices may not be critical to health and well-being but could still be important because many people got their medicines that way.

Ms. McKeel said that she wanted them to consider the other side of this issue, which was how they could provide services for them. She said that as they discussed Rural Areas and addressed this, she would like to bring up a concern she had. She said that she saw numerous McMansion developments in a row, which were not workforce housing. She said that many of them may be by right, and their focus on five-acre and 21-acre mindset might not be helping their stock. She said that she would suggest considering alternative incentives outside of these existing ones if they did not adequately address this issue.

Mr. Gallaway said that they had Housing Albemarle and Project ENABLE in place, and they were actively seeking to implement the actions outlined in those policies. He said that at some point, especially for these two chapters, when addressing the action items, they must ensure that they identify the threads coming from those two plans that they had identified as action steps. He said that he assumed that action steps from those plans would emerge and be prioritized in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gallaway said that if they examined chapter one, and regarding the 10,000 housing units, he forgot where that one fell in. He said that this requirement was specific and measurable; thus, they must state what it entailed and how they planned to achieve it. He said that if it was merely aspirational, they should clarify that as well. He said that if they set an aspirational goal, they still needed to outline a realistic path to achieve a number of units, if that was their objective.

Mr. Gallaway said that 1.3, support for and use of energy-efficient design elements in new residential development, this did not come up during the summer when the Regional Housing Partnership (RHP) held its work session with developers and other stakeholders at the table, but materials were discussed. He said that if they incorporated higher costs for energy-efficient construction materials in the initial construction and building of homes or apartment buildings, it would increase the upfront barrier for potential residents to access these units. He said that he was unsure whether energy-efficient items incurred higher costs than non-energy-efficient alternatives; this was something he would need to research further. He said that he was not suggesting that they disregard the energy-efficient use of materials; however, if an individual could not get into a unit because they could not afford the higher upfront cost of entering the unit, they would not be able to recoup the financial benefits of being there. He said that this was a dilemma that needed to be addressed or at least discussed.

Mr. Gallaway said that electric vehicles served as a good example of this issue. He said that in the past year, electric vehicles were doing terrible. He said that there was a premium for purchasing an electric vehicle, which should be recouped down the road after a certain period of time. He said that if one could not initially afford the vehicle, they could not recoup the cost later.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was a topic that required discussion, and they should not assume that everyone could afford higher costs. He said that perhaps they assumed that, and they should state it. He said that they must now consider not just subsidizing getting the units online and making the rent affordable but also going further because they wanted premium things done in addition to simply getting the unit online. He said that the same applied for design concepts. He said that this was when issues like setbacks arose, such as the cost of reaching floor four and having to set it back. He said that this would increase costs for all units in that particular building.

Mr. Gallaway said these discussions must be had when addressing barriers to affordable and workforce housing. He said that he assumed that some of that would come out in the action item steps.

Mr. Gallaway said that 3.4, under Goal 3, was ensuring safe, decent, and sanitary living conditions for tenants. He said that this was a significant challenge because he and other Supervisors had experienced emails about facilities being overrun by insects and other things, such as mold, in their jurisdictions. He said that it appeared that when he requested assistance for this matter, the County was sometimes limited in its ability to provide help. He said that the action items he was highlighting from both a legal standpoint and in terms of ensuring this, and what control and authority they had to enforce it and to force the matter.

Mr. Gallaway said that he appreciated the focus on manufactured home parks in point 3.5, specifically for displacement. He said they should not presume that all residents of these parks desired to

transition into different housing types. He said that they may prefer to remain in their current manufactured or mobile home parks.

Mr. Gallaway said that if they ended up getting somebody who bought a mobile home park such as Rio or Berkmar and at some point the rents increased to the extent that residents must vacate their mobile home park, there would be no alternative locations for them within the County or there would be limited options for relocating their mobile home park. He said that he was emphasizing this point to ensure that this issue was not solely focused on Southwood but also addressed potential displacement and relocation concerns for residents who wished to continue living in the park they own.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding Goal 6, he believed that the current objectives did not fully capture the concept of aging at home in this context. He said that he believed that the assumption was someone had moved into a new unit and would age in that place or within their community, which was acceptable. That might be the case for senior living or assisted living. He said that when they said, "aging at home," they must recognize that if they were aging in place and within their community, they had likely been in their home for an extended period. He said that he did not see objectives that were going to continually help them stay in their home long term. He said that it might relate to Ms. McKeel's comments regarding services. He said that he understood that tax incentives for the elderly would help with that, but that when reading these objectives, he could not help but feel that at home was not being addressed.

Mr. Gallaway said that this was a general statement for the entire housing piece. He said that when developers brought them rezonings for increased density, they often presumed that effective transit systems and pedestrian infrastructure were in place everywhere, assuming that every location was an employment center. He said that they did not consider the reality of someone living in Hydraulic working on Pantops. He said that they could not walk to work due to time constraints and the lack of efficient transit systems. He said that in some cases it may take over 30 minutes to reach their workplace via public transportation. He said that he became concerned when they discussed housing development, workforce, and affordable housing near transit lines and employment centers without considering the effectiveness of these transit systems, walkable communities and employment centers there.

Mr. Gallaway said that when addressing action items versus getting to the nitty gritty on the housing pieces, they must ensure that they acknowledged these limitations. He said that they would install sidewalks and expand the microtransit if successful. He said that, however, they should not presume that they would approve developments where transit frequency was insufficient for daily commuting needs.

Mr. Gallaway said that he had conducted a driving tour of his district the day before and had observed a gentleman carrying a Food Lion bag while walking around the corner into Mallside Forest Apartments. He said that the grocery store he visited might have required him to walk from there because there was a transit stop behind Food Lion on Hillsdale, and then across Rio. He said that if a development were proposed around the area today, the rationale for placing it there would be its urban center status, proximity to transit lines, and accessibility to workplaces and employment centers. He said that they should consider addressing these issues in comprehensive planning to ensure that their urban ring could support the density that needed to be there for affordable housing units.

Ms. McKeel said that Mr. Gallaway was correct when he mentioned the current housing stock, as she had a note on her second page regarding the preservation of existing affordable and workforce housing. She said that she was concerned about apartment complexes managed by property management companies in her district, which she frequently received calls about. She said that they must find a solution to address these issues and ensure proper inspections. She said that one recurring problem was mold, among others. She said that their County had limited ability to intervene in these situations. She said that while some property management companies may be doing a commendable job, she was often made aware of those that were not, which posed a significant challenge, which was a lot of their workforce housing in the older Urban Areas.

Ms. Mallek said that she agreed with many of the things that had already been said. She said that she strongly supported and appreciated the comments emphasizing that housing involved various components and that affordable housing went way beyond just the housing unit itself. She said that she agreed because it was the budget at the end of the month or even the third week of the month when the money was gone, leaving them unsure of what to do next.

Ms. Mallek said that this had been a great concern of hers for years regarding their focus on first-time buyers and the lack of affordability over a long period of time. She said that that was a really important change being considered in Housing Albemarle, to make sure that if taxpayer dollars were being invested, that the taxpayers saw a 30-year requirement to stay affordable to make that worthwhile.

Ms. Mallek said that the transportation connection was incredibly important, as well as addressing the large lots in Rural Areas. She said that the 21-acre minimum requirement that was adopted in 1980 had been a topic of debate among many people. She said that no one then thought that anyone would ever have a 21-acre front yard. She said that it was supposed to be the building envelope and septic field and well, two acres at most, and everything else was intended to be maintained in agriculture. She said that sadly, that was not happening.

Ms. Mallek said that there may be another way to achieve that goal. She said that the downzoning provided exemptions for five two-acre lots per parcel, which led to numerous very small lots in the Rural Area. She said that the houses were very close to each other, barely enough room for wells

and septic systems on each one when they were right next to each other like that. She said that it was the residue where the costs were out of this world. She said that there may be some other thinking that could happen, possibly not in the Comprehensive Plan, but she thought she better mention it now so that it did not slip her mind. She said that that had been a concern expressed to her many times.

Ms. Mallek said that only in passing in this document so far was there an emphasis on smaller housing types that they had talked about a lot, such as middle density, which was not so much the 12 units per acre, but was going to be met by having the bungalow courts and smaller houses. She said that an elder from Southwood in 2008 expressed their preference for staying in their current decrepit trailer rather than moving into an apartment due to the need for space for their chicken and garden. She said that considering that different people had varying preferences for living spaces, they must emphasize alternative options for higher density developments.

Ms. Mallek asked whether the costs of having decent insulation in energy materials were really that much higher. She said that having really good windows may be higher, as opposed to the windows that many of their track developers install, which allowed daylight to enter all around them. She said that they had all heard about the horror stories when LEAP (Local Energy Alliance Program) began their weatherization visits. She said that brand new houses, costing \$600 a month in electricity during August, discovered that daylight was entering around the houses when they removed the frames to inspect them. She said that it became evident that the work had not been done properly, and they all needed to ensure that that did not happen.

Ms. Mallek said that there were numerous manufactured home neighborhoods in the White Hall District, providing good housing for people. She said that one example was a place on Three Notch'd Road, situated right across from the Highlands in Crozet. She said that this was a 55 and older community, and around 25 years ago, as leases expired, they replaced the old trailers on wheels with well-constructed modular units. She said that she visited some of these units in 2008, which featured brand new three-bedroom units, well-insulated and equipped with everything required, priced at \$80,000 each.

Ms. Mallek said that she understood the benefits of that. She said that she recognized that there was one zoning barrier regarding County welcoming without, straining was difficult. She said that there was an attempt to put one in near Dickerson Road by GE, but she did not know where it went. She said that she had met with the folks a number of years ago and thought it was a good idea. She said that she was glad that that was happening, but that there needed to be a stronger non-displacement policy.

Ms. Mallek expressed her concerns regarding the recent approval for Crozet Park renovation and 14 additional units on Adele Street and Park Road due to the lack of non-displacement provisions for their tenants. She said that no non-displacement policy had been implemented to protect them. She said that there was a limited one. She knew that when Riverview came up for redevelopment, those were actual homes; but there was some discussion about it back then, and many of those residents were helped to find other places when that redevelopment was approved.

Ms. Mallek said that this was a significant concern for her because people had spent their lives working there and living in the community, just like many of those residents who would benefit from their real estate tax waiver program. She said that they had contributed 50 years of service there and truly deserved to be able to stay in their community with their neighbors and churches in their old age.

Ms. Mallek said that she was unsure whether the 10,000 units in 2.1 referred to building permits or strictly affordable housing units for all income levels. She said that someone could clarify this for her later.

Ms. Mallek said that when implementing changes in densities, having the public process before adoption was very important for ensuring that these changes were fully understood and supported. She said that she had already discussed smaller lot sizes and smaller house sizes in 2.3, and that that was very important. She said that 3.1, the NOAHs was the core of it.

Ms. Mallek said that the universal design in 6.3 was significant because many long-term residents had made modifications to their homes. She said that if they were displaced, they would have to start from scratch and either lower their counters or find a suitable place designed for wheelchair accessibility, which was challenging to find.

Ms. Mallek expressed her appreciation for all the good work that everyone had done on this chapter and looked forward to further progress.

Mr. Andrews said that regarding the first objective, he believed that they needed to discuss strategies for achieving energy efficiency due to potential costs associated with it. He said that they must explore ways to implement these measures without burdening their affordable housing. He said that they had discussed solar in Rural Areas and things like that, and if they did not find a way to get that kind of alternative energy somewhere, they would be in trouble. He said that this was indeed one of those places.

Mr. Andrews said that regarding Goal 2, there had been some questions about whether there was mixing things up here with the idea of supply being increased by 10,000 units but also preserving existing units for affordable and workforce housing. He said that he was attempting to clarify whether these two concepts were separate or if they were suggesting that they would add to affordability through existing

units. He said that there might be existing units that were not affordable but could be made affordable, which would be beneficial.

Ms. Stacy Pethia, Assistant Director of Housing, said that it was a little bit of both. She said that the idea was not necessarily to build 10,000 affordable units by 2040. She said that some of these would be new constructions, while others would be finding ways to make existing units affordable for the people who lived in them. She said that some of that would be done through programs like the Housing Choice Voucher Program. She said that they could use those vouchers to move into privately-owned rental housing, and the housing would be affordable for them, as they would pay 30% of their income for rent, while rental assistance covered the remaining costs. She said that that was what they were looking at but also preserving what they had. She said that if they lost units that were already in existence that were naturally occurring affordable housing, that they would need to build more to replace them, so finding ways to hang on to what they had, building new things, and making market-rate units more affordable for families.

Mr. Andrews said that in connection with Goal 5, they had had some conversations about this. He said that the idea was to consider cost-burdened housing when examining statistics in the packet and topic report regarding cost burden. He said that during their discussions he understood that 48% of those who were cost burdened were already severely cost burdened. He said that he believed it was important for people to understand that severely was not merely the tail end, that it was fully half of the individuals who were cost burdened.

Ms. Pethia said that was correct, and that of the families, individuals, and households that pay 30% or more of their income toward their housing costs, 48% of those spend 50% or more of their income for their housing. She said that this situation was particularly concentrated in households with incomes that were 50% of the AMI or below. She said that it was the families that made the least amount of money or were extremely poor that suffered the most. She said that these families were the hardest group for them to provide housing due to the extreme, really high subsidies required to construct those units and maintain them over the long term. She said that due to decreased revenue from rent collection, it was challenging to keep those properties maintained over the long term.

Mr. Andrews said that when they went to Goal 6, this was to fill in some conversations they had had about this topic earlier. He said that there was a bar graph in their materials that covered single-family households based on generation. He said that the graph did not include people who were 65 or older; it only added up to 80%. He said that this meant that 20% of the population was 65 or older. He said that the number of seniors living alone was over 8,500, and over 5,500 people were 75 years or older. He said that they needed to have a discussion regarding what it meant to age in place.

Mr. Andrews said that one possible solution they could explore was accessory dwelling units, and how they might be utilized to help people stay in their homes while also providing affordable homes. He said that that might extend not just in Development Areas but also into Rural Areas. He said that these were the goals outlined in this document.

Mr. Andrews said that there had been much discussion regarding the 21-acre rule, which did not seem to be reflected as something to revisit in this document; however, people did express concerns about unintended consequences when 20 or 19-acre lawns replaced actual working agricultural areas or forest areas. He said that this could be an important topic for future consideration.

Ms. McKeel said that previously she had expressed her concerns regarding failing septic systems. She said that there was an affordable apartment complex of considerable size, situated just outside the jurisdictional area right off of Hydraulic Road and backing up to Ivy Creek, which had a failing septic system. She said that her theory was that if they did not address this issue, even though it was in a Rural Area, the owner of the apartment complex might decide to sell it, and a developer could potentially replace it. She said that they might lose this large apartment complex in their area. She asked if this was something that Ms. Pethia was talking about when she referenced trying to help.

Ms. Pethia said that those were some of the things that they needed to consider. She said that if they saw a property in that type of condition where the current owner may struggle to maintain it or bring it up to code, such as 60-year-old infrastructure, this was one of the situations where the County could intervene before the property went up for sale. She said that they could approach the owner and discuss partnership opportunities to address existing issues in exchange for their maintaining some of the units as affordable housing over the longer term.

Ms. McKeel said that the complex was already affordable there, situated just outside of the jurisdictional area by a little bit. She said that she was merely suggesting that they should not wait until there was a 'for sale' sign in the front yard. She said that this was what she was seeing in the Urban Ring Rural Area.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would like to suggest that Objective 2.1 could benefit from some revision. He said that it was his concern that it appeared to blend households served with inventory, and he worried about this because he thought it was important that they did their best job. He said that a role that the Comprehensive Plan served was to give their community members tools to hold them accountable. He said that they should be able to follow clear metrics, such as whether the Board was taking the necessary steps to fill an inventory gap. He said that he would be concerned if they were blending households served and inventory together in the way described, including recipients of mobile vouchers. He said that that was behind the scenes and hard to track and would make it difficult for the public to hold

them accountable.

Mr. Pruitt said that he preferred to see goals concretely about committing to an affordable inventory that they aimed to create in addition to households served. He said that he thought it would be valuable to have those separate metrics that they tracked.

Mr. Pruitt said that he had a few brief comments in response to issues other Supervisors had addressed. He said he completely co-signed the concern that Mr. Gallaway raised regarding Objective 3.6. He said that enabling legislation had recently been carried for this issue. He said that Delegate Price last session carried a bill that would enable counties to independently investigate and prosecute instances like those concerning housing conditions.

Mr. Pruitt said that this deserved continued presence in their Comprehensive Plan because Delegate Price had already stated her intention to carry it again. He said that if it did not pass this session, then he thought that this created an affirmative obligation that this needed to continue being a priority when coordinating with their delegation. He said that even if they lacked the power to address a particular issue, there was still a next step identified that they could take.

Mr. Pruitt said that he also agreed with Mr. Gallaway's point regarding the importance of ensuring that people in mobile home communities were not displaced. He said that the current governor made his fortune with Carlyle Group through similar actions, which led to the origin story of Habitat's ownership of the Southwood development. He said that he hoped they had action plans identified around this issue in the future, such as for topics like land banking and having funds set aside to help communities exercise their right of first refusal. He said that he believed mobile home park residents had this right if they chose to form a coalition to acquire their own lots when they were offered for sale. He said that this appeared to be a role in which they could potentially intervene.

Mr. Pruitt said that regarding Goal 5, they should explicitly state something that concerned public education and helping the public hold them accountable. He said it seemed to be hinting at but not explicitly stating the matter. He said that their goal aimed to ensure that homelessness was rare, brief, and a one-time occurrences because they could not eradicate homelessness entirely. He said that homelessness was a state that fluctuated in and out, and it could be as short as an afternoon. He said that they should clearly articulate their objective of eradicating nonvoluntary chronic homelessness, which he thought was achievable. He said they seemed to be gesturing toward this goal, but saying the quiet part out loud might be valuable.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she wanted to address the issue regarding the displacement of people living in mobile home parks. She said that she knew that they experienced this situation with RST, where everyone was removed and supposedly found alternative accommodations. She asked if they had any legal provisions that authorized the County to require the property owner to ensure that residents could remain or to prohibit them from selling the property without providing alternative housing solutions. She asked if they currently had such provisions in place. She asked if they possessed the legislative authority to enforce such requirements.

Ms. Pethia said that in 2019, the Board adopted a policy of non-displacement, particularly concerning rezonings, which would have addressed exactly what happens with mobile home parks. She said that the Board had not yet adopted guidelines to enforce that policy. She said that the guidelines that were brought forward in 2019 and early 2020 were not satisfactory; thus, staff had not presented them again for various reasons. She said that they can reassess those guidelines and bring them forward for consideration.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the guidelines would apply if there was not a rezoning.

Ms. Pethia said that from her understanding, no. She said that it would need to be something that the Board was directly involved in approving or providing funding for. She said that a rezoning or if they were to help fund the redevelopment of the park, they could apply the non-displacement policy; however, they cannot do it for by-right projects.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that if someone was planning to sell a mobile home park and wished for everyone to move, they would likely rezone.

Ms. Mallek said that upon being asked where she would prefer all that solar energy to be directed, she said in every parking lot, every rooftop, rural and urban, but not at the expense of forest or productive land. She said that they had numerous rooftops available for solar installation.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that she would cover the final chapter, Economic Development. She said that this chapter was organized by four goals: lead growth of target industries and primary businesses consistent with the growth management policy; support job creation and employment opportunities; collaborate with partners to support small businesses, startups, and entrepreneurs; and collaborate to enhance career pathways, workforce development, and training.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the PC noted that there was a significant overlap with other Comprehensive Plan chapters, including land use, transportation, and housing. She said that the PC suggested looking for opportunities to leverage partnerships and funding, providing support for small businesses and startups, recognizing that finding affordable space for rent or renovation could be expensive for new businesses just starting out, as well as examining opportunities for career ladder jobs

and career mobility involved collaborating with schools, colleges, and universities.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the PC also recommended exploring sustainable land uses in Rural Areas that could potentially create jobs while also considering potential impacts considering strengthening the language in Objective 1.1 and 1.2 and adding more specific language regarding recreational tourism with associated action steps.

Mr. Pruitt said that he would echo what the PC had already highlighted. He said that he believed it was essential to repeat and further emphasize the point in the draft goals and objectives that economic activities occurred in Rural Areas, and that they typically involved small businesses, independent contractors, and all manner of things. He said that there were types of economic development activities that could occur in these spaces, and that they were important to ensure that people could continue living in and sustaining these communities. He said he thought they owed it to the community to think about what kinds of non-intrusive activities could be sited and supported in those spaces.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she agreed with the feedback provided by the PC. She said that she applauded employment by the industry, and that she understood it was important for Project ENABLE regarding bioscience and medical devices, business and financial services, information and technology, and defense and security, as well as agribusiness and food processing. She asked for more information or details about food processing.

Mr. J.T. Newberry, Deputy Director of Economic Development, said that the food processing target came from a reflection of the density of those types of firms across their region. He said that they had some very big food processors in their area, such as the Pepsi plant in the City. He said that they also had numerous smaller firms that produced various food products. He said that this combination of large and small firms constituted food processing as a target industry for their region due to the density of those firms in their area.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she appreciated the initiative because it involved a significant amount of science, biotechnology, and collaboration with various partners intellectually and in the area to achieve their objectives. She asked if they could discuss Development Areas and Rural Areas based on the Growth Management Policy and its implications for Rural Areas.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that the intent behind mentioning the Growth Management Policy was to differentiate between the expectations for Development Areas and Rural Areas. She said that while there may be some opportunities for development in Rural Areas, the primary focus of the growth management policy was to ensure that Rural Areas were primarily used for agriculture, forestry, and natural environmental protection. She said that the majority of new businesses and growth should be directed toward Development Areas.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to explore whether this could be an opportune moment to reassess their target industries. She said that although she did not disagree with their current choices, she believed it was prudent to periodically review them since they could change over time. She said that they should maintain a careful balance between UVA startups and industry relocations or startups.

Ms. McKeel said that many UVA startups may be acquired and subsequently leave the area within a few years. She said that they should ensure that they did not solely concentrate on UVA startups. She said that Richmond had been discussing reducing its headcount, which usually referred to cuts in budgets. She said that budget cuts implied reductions for UVA.

Ms. McKeel said that they had been discussing diversifying their tax base significantly. She said that the economic development reward from their land purchase in the Department of Defense (DoD) was mutually beneficial. She said she wanted to clarify that she was not talking about their partnership with the DOD because it was advantageous for the community and not dependent on Richmond.

Ms. McKeel said that she wanted to stress that partnering with public schools and PVCC (Piedmont Virginia Community College) was critical for establishing career pathways for this community. She said whether it involved a UVA startup or attracting the right type of industry, which they already had in this area but may be overlooked, these businesses required a workforce. She said that partnering with Albemarle County Public Schools (ACPS), as well as other schools, was critical.

Ms. McKeel said that they should take advantage of the ACPS Center Model, which was a 21st-century model for career and technical education. She said that they needed to ensure that they partnered with them and took advantage of that model. She said that they must update their list of large employers because she believed that the list was outdated.

Ms. McKeel said that as they considered economic development, they must remember that properties designated for land use taxation were not contributing to revenues. She said that they needed to consider how this affected their perceived ability to pay in the community, which often came back to haunt them.

Mr. Gallaway said that generally speaking, he was satisfied with how these goals aligned with the objectives. He said that they had targets for bringing in new businesses and pledged to support existing primary industries. He said he was not satisfied that they had gone far enough in addressing how to grow and expand existing businesses. He said that the Rio District had lost some good productive businesses to outside of the district because they did not have anywhere in the County to relocate to. He said that he

would assume that they addressed this issue through site readiness and the availability of diverse sites that were there.

Mr. Gallaway said that it was great that they knew how to start businesses and had suitable locations for them to start; however, there was a need for addressing the next step when they became successful and when their employee count increased by 50% or 75%. He said that may that could be teased out in the action steps, and that he thought that some of that kind of sense should be in there somewhere. He said he did not know if Goal 1 adequately addressed this.

Mr. Gallaway said that regarding 3.2, which focused on providing clear guidance and pathways for starting a business, there was no issue. He said that they might need to introduce 3.4 or move 3.3 to 3.4, while 3.3 should address providing clear guidance and pathways for how to grow an expanding business in Albemarle County. He said that starting a business implied that they would serve as a resource for them in how to do that, guiding them through the process of setting up their operations. He said that by outlining these steps upfront, they could provide guidance for starting a business.

Mr. Gallaway said that if a business was successful in Albemarle and wanted to stay there, they should tell them upfront how they could do that and then figure out how to help them because that was a worthwhile activity. He said that he did not know whether it was an objective or a goal, that it could be in action items related to the diversity of spaces available. He said that they had so few Tier 4 sites in the County, and they were now focusing Tier 4 readiness in one large section of the County. He said that they needed to have other sites ready for the other things that Project ENABLE said, and that it should be included as an objective or goal, rather than just being at the action step item level. He said that Goal 1 of Project ENABLE stated that they should strengthen existing business retention and expansion to help existing businesses be successful. He said they needed to incorporate elements of that goal into their Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding Goal 1, she said that she would like to understand how the County would lead the growth rather than merely supporting or encouraging it. She said that regarding Objective 1.2, she said that she completely agreed that they must be careful to stop changing Light Industrial zoning to Residential every time they had to or were asked to do so. She said that they should say no; that they were saving that for something else, as that was how they got into this mess to begin with. She said that Objective 1.3 was not always about County barriers and obtaining waivers; rather, it involved investing in poor-quality land due to its lower cost because of constraints and then expecting the County to disregard all rules for their convenience. She said that this had been a source of frustration for her.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding the tourism success in Objective 2.6, they had a real tendency to kill the goose that laid the golden egg, and they needed to be very careful about that. She said that if they aimed to be a tourism destination, they must consider that as they considered other things.

Ms. Mallek said that Goal 4 was pathways for all community members to thrive. She said she loved the concept, but that they must exercise caution not to promise things they had no possibility of doing. She said that she was concerned regarding the "all" aspect.

Ms. Mallek said that for emphasizing that the renovation of manufacturing spaces they had several incredibly successful examples in both the Jouett and Rio districts, as well as at the Murray Plant on Reyes Ford. She said that when she was younger, it had three shifts with 400 people per shift, causing significant traffic congestion during shift changes.

Ms. Mallek said that despite the industry leaving, the site remained a Light Industrial area filled with people engaged in various activities such as furniture production. She said that they could not beat themselves up for hogging everything. She said that their neighboring counties should also experience success.

Ms. Mallek said that she would challenge the land use question regarding not contributing to revenues. She said that the tax for land use property was based solely on the soil, so all improvements, such as housing and other amenities, were at market rate. She said that the state determined these values based on the property's use, whether it was pasture, hay, dairy, or growing soybeans near the James River. She said that she wanted to ensure that this aspect was never left unclear because revenues depended on the property's use rather than being solely residential, similar to how it would be unfair to tax all residential properties as commercial properties. She said that the use of the property was important.

Mr. Andrews said that he believed that the objectives and goals were clearly stated and he concurred with them. He said that he appreciated the efforts made in Project ENABLE and looked forward to revisiting it. He said that he acknowledged the significance of the economic base, its vibrancy, good job opportunities, and a good tax base. He said that he would like to bring up one point related to the topic report on page 16. He said that it mentioned that commute patterns measured in 2014 showed 31,948 commuters traveling into the County for employment purposes. He said that when considering Charlottesville, approximately 6,000 commuters were entering from Charlottesville City.

Mr. Andrews said that this still suggested that not counting Charlottesville, people could live and work in the County or vice versa without much of a commute. He said that surrounding counties presented a problem when people lived out there and had to work in the County or in the City. He said that this issue with housing also highlighted a concern that needed to be considered in economic development as they examined their workforce and wondered where it would come from as they looked

to develop possible industries. He said that he would like to raise the issue of what they would do about finding people and providing them with homes so that they could live, work, and thrive in the County.

Mr. Pruitt said that in Goal 2, they mentioned the phrase “quality jobs,” which never got clarified or emphasized. He said that apart from Goal 4, which focused on prospective workers, they rarely discussed the people who were engaging in this economic development. He said that he found this concerning. He said that their loyalty was not the land where a business operated or the company creating economic activities; it was the workers in their community who contributed through labor and earned wages.

Mr. Pruitt said that they should emphasize attracting businesses that prioritized worker welfare, good labor practices, living wages, education, training, and benefits. He said he was worried that their priorities might encourage warehouse distribution centers and poultry centers, which historically had poor working conditions, worker organizing, and living wages. He said that they should explicitly state the priorities they wanted employers to extend toward their workers, the people that they represented.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they would proceed by updating the goals and objectives and then drafting the action steps for the chapters they had just discussed. She said that shortly that month they would share draft goals and objectives for the remaining three chapters, including Rural Area Development Areas and community facilities. She said that this would include a definition of crossroads communities and more detailed recommendations for those. She said that it would also encompass the multimodal plan and future land use designations for the Development Areas.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said that they would discuss water and sewer topics related to community facilities in future sessions. She said that they would share draft goals and objectives, then would go to the PC for a work session on February 12 before returning to the Board on March 20 for a work session on those three chapters. She said that they would then share the action steps, metrics, and plan prioritization for community input in the spring. She said that they would then return for additional work sessions focusing on each chapter once more details became available.

Recess. The Board recessed its meeting at 4:25 p.m. and reconvened at 4:36 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 10. **Presentation:** Calendar Year 2024 Real Estate Reassessment Update.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that Albemarle County Code §15-700 requires all real estate in the County to be assessed annually as of January 1st each year and requires the County Assessor's Office to conduct a new reassessment. The Constitution of Virginia, Article X, Taxation and Finance, Section 2, Assessments dictates that “all assessments of real estate and tangible personal property shall be at their fair market value, to be ascertained as prescribed by law.” State Code §58.1-3201 requires all real estate assessments to be made at 100% of fair market value.

The Real Estate Assessor's Office has completed the annual reassessment process for CY 2024 and notices are scheduled to be mailed to property owners on or before January 26, 2024. Information traditionally provided by the County Assessor's Office includes the average overall change in assessed value and average change for different property classes. Additional detail is provided regarding single family residential properties, which comprise the vast majority of properties in the county.

Property owners who wish to request a review of their annual reassessment to the County Assessor must do so by February 28, 2024; this level of appeal is referred to as an Assessor's Review and is allowed by County Code §15-702. Appeals may also be made to the Board of Equalization if filed by April 1, 2024, or 30 days after the County Assessor has rendered his decision on a previously requested Assessor's Review, whichever is later.

Preparation of mass appraisals that result in fair and equitable assessments requires the work of competent, well-trained staff in their application of assessment principles and best practices, adherence to Virginia Code and Albemarle County Code, compliance with regulations promulgated by the Virginia Department of Taxation, and guidelines established by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO). The focus of the Assessor's Office in preparation for the 2024 reassessment was to continue the individual review of as many properties as possible and updating property descriptions as needed to create more accurate assessed values. The more accurate the property data in the County's records, the better the valuation model and subsequently, the more accurate the assessment results. This action reduces the chance that a change will need to be made on review. The goal of assessment tax policy in Virginia is to fairly spread the tax burden across the population of the county.

The presentation will include an overview of the reassessment process and outcome for CY 2024, and will highlight statistical information about reassessment results by magisterial district, and the change in value for the “average” homeowner, as well as other information. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) document (Attachment A) and a flyer titled “Why is this notice Important?” (Attachment B) have been prepared by staff and will be included in the mailing of assessment notices. This presentation will provide detailed results to the Board in advance of the results being provided to taxpayers through notices of assessment being mailed January 26, 2024.

While there is no direct budgetary impact specifically related to this information, the results of the 2024 reassessment will provide important information for the current (FY 24) Budget and the upcoming (FY 25) budget development process.

Staff recommends that the Board receive the CY 2024 Real Estate Reassessment report as presented.

Mr. Peter Lynch, County Assessor, said that his office was responsible for conducting an annual reassessment. He said the primary focus of his presentation was the results from the annual reassessment. He said that they also assessed newly constructed buildings and added them to the tax rolls, and they administered the land use program and the real estate exemption for disabled veterans. He said that he would present the overall change in the tax rate but believed that the most important part of his presentation was the support they had for the assessments they determined, so a significant portion of his presentation would be the sales information that they had.

Mr. Lynch said that his staff consisted of nine residential appraisers, one commercial appraiser, one supervising appraiser, and his deputy. He said that the supervising appraiser and deputy oversaw the residential appraisers. He said the resident appraisal staff visited properties and conducted research on sales. He said that much of the work that they were presenting and the numbers they were generating were due to the efforts of the appraisal staff.

Mr. Lynch said that his administrative staff, in addition to answering phone calls from property owners, processed a large number of deeds, plats, and other tasks. He said that he had two administrative staff members and a supervisor to oversee them. He said he had a land use administrator who managed the complex land use program. He said that due to the nature of their work, which ultimately resulted in taxes and tax bills, their interactions with the public could range from cooperative to challenging. He said that the job that all of his staff members did could be challenging at times.

Mr. Lynch said that this first slide was essentially an overview of what they would discuss. He said that he would provide reassessment change and that change over time. He said they would discuss the sales support process for valuation, state sales studies, and offer additional breakdowns of value changes by different groups. He said they would also provide land use information, and they would discuss the review and appeal process.

Mr. Lynch said that the graph showed the annual changes in reassessments over the last 15 years, starting from 2009 when they transitioned from biannual reassessments. He said that during the financial crisis between 2009 and 2013, assessments decreased. He said that following this period, there was a gradual recovery that lasted for seven or eight years. He said that there have been significant increases in assessments over recent years. He said that this year's increase was less than in previous years at 4.07% overall to the tax base based on reassessment.

Mr. Lynch said that discussing sales and sales studies was the meat of what they did and was used for determining these numbers. He said that the 2023 sales data, primarily used for residential properties to calculate 2024 assessments, showed a slightly lower number of sales compared to previous years. He said that this was a topic that everyone had heard about in the news: sales volume was down. He said that in these sales studies they have observed that values had actually been rising while sales volume had been declining. He said that over the past couple of years, the number of sales each year had gone down: 300 last year and 200 this year. He said that their median ratio was now at 100%, which was the required level by state law. He said that their variance, which he would explain further, was 5.21. He said that this represented the range that medians typically fell within when examining individual ratios.

Mr. Lynch said that he had information regarding state sales ratios conducted by the State Department of Taxation. He said that the most recent full report available for all jurisdictions in the state was from 2021. He said they had received the County's ratios for 2022; however, they had not yet received the entire state's report. He said that their ratios, devised or developed by the state, had decreased to 89% and then 87%. He said this decrease was a direct result of the increases in assessments over the last couple of years.

Mr. Lynch said that when the state looked at that data, they looked at the same properties the year after the assessment was determined, and when they sold the year later. He said that appreciation that happened between the time it was assessed, and the next year caused that ratio to decrease. He said because during recent years they had an 8% to 14% increase, it caused those ratios to drop between the two different time periods of the sales study. He said that it was all about the timing of the information that was used in that study.

Mr. Lynch said that among 134 jurisdictions in the state, the average median ratio was 81%, and their ratio in that particular year was 89%. He said that while 89% may not sound great, however, for accurate comparison, they must consider the performance of other jurisdictions in the state. He said that in their frequently asked questions, which was attached to their notice and included in the meeting packet, they addressed the question: "How are we judged?" He said that the answer was that the State Department of Taxation conducted this study to evaluate their performance.

Mr. Lynch said that when they reported their ratio at 89.1%, they should compare it to the

performance of other jurisdictions in the state. He said that overall, there was significant variation among these jurisdictions. He said that when focusing specifically on the 30 jurisdictions that undergo annual reassessments, they achieved 84% to 85%. He said that compared to these figures, the County was doing pretty well.

Mr. Lynch said that this graph illustrated a sales study using over 1800 sales. He said that each sale was represented by a dot, the ratio was represented by a dot. He said that if the sale price was lower than the assessment value, the ratio was below 100%, and if the assessment value was higher than the sale price, the ratio was above 100%. He said that they plotted each sale and calculated the median of all sales. He said that the COD (coefficient of dispersion) represented how tightly clustered these sales values were along the line.

Mr. Lynch said that moving on to their study results, this slide focused solely on single-family residential properties, including detached, townhouses, mobile homes, and other similar dwellings. He said that the data was categorized by value range, which was determined by the final assessment of each property. He said that this information showed the count of properties in each range, the average change in assessment each year, the number of sales supporting these values, and the median ratio of sales in each group. He said that they aimed to avoid assessing properties within specific value ranges at different percentage rates. He said that one of the things they consistently monitored was that their ratios remained consistent or within the same range across all value ranges. He said they conducted the same study for all properties based on different criteria to ensure that their model was accurate.

Mr. Lynch said that this slide also demonstrated an example of a home worth \$150,000 that increased in value by the average increase of 4.4%. He said that based on the current tax rate, if it were to remain unchanged, the taxes would increase by \$53.80 for the upcoming tax year. He said that similarly, a median value home of \$453,000 would have an approximate increase of \$146 in their tax bill.

Mr. Lynch said that their annual land book created in May had specific methods for categorizing properties. He said that one way was by magisterial district and the other was by state class code. He said that the variance in district averages could be observed based on the district. He said that the Town of Scottsville, although having a small number of parcels, typically followed the trends of other areas; however, this year experienced a larger increase due to sales in that area. He said that he had prepared a list of neighborhoods within each district, along with their percentage-wise average changes, which he would send after the meeting.

Mr. Lynch said that the breakdown was by state property class code with urban residential represented at the top. He said that it referred to properties with County water and sewer access. He said that other residential, rural, apartments, or commercial properties were classified based on their acreage. He said that regardless of how one looked at these properties or groups of properties, there was going to be a difference in how much the values changed on average.

Mr. Lynch said that this slide was important because it shows how many people were going to experience a change in their assessment in a certain range. He said that the majority of properties, approximately 58%, would experience a change in assessment ranging from -5% to +5%. He said that while they could talk about the averages in any specific group, the individual experiences could vary significantly. He said that an additional 32% of properties would experience a 5% to 15% increase in assessment. He said that the majority of properties would fall within this range, while others would experience different results above or below it.

Mr. Lynch said that he chose to present this slide this year because it was based on their records and represented the year built for each single-family home. He said that the discussion surrounding the reasons for the significant increase in property values in Albemarle County included the possibility that after the Great Recession and financial crisis, the number of houses being built decreased substantially.

Mr. Lynch said that he wanted to visually demonstrate the decrease in that activity during the years between approximately 2003 and 2017. He said that the limited supply of houses on the market was one of the factors contributing to increased property values. He said that particularly in the current situation where there was a very low number of properties available for sale, this resulted in properties continuing to rise in value. He said that this had been especially evident in the increases over the past couple of years.

Mr. Lynch said that they would shift their focus to land use. He said that land use referred to preserving land through restricting development. He said that the primary objective of land use programs was to maintain qualified uses on a property and qualify for a lower tax assessment, a land use assessment, and protect that land from being developed. He said that if development occurred or if there was a change to a non-conforming or non-qualifying use, then the property would be rolled back, and the taxes would be recovered.

Mr. Lynch said that 2023 was a revalidation year. He said that in the fall of 2023 they underwent a process that resulted in a reduction of properties in land use. He said that approximately 160 properties failed to validate, and they received no information from them. He said that these properties would receive a notice at the end of the month stating that their property was no longer in land use, and their assessment would be based on market values instead of land use values. He said that some of these properties would reapply and return to the program if their use had continued. He

said that the revalidation served as a check every two years to ensure that properties remained properly qualified.

Mr. Lynch said that the deferred value and deferred taxes continued to increase due to the ongoing rise in market values. He said that land use rates remained relatively steady and low; however, the difference between market values and land use rates determined the deferred value. He said that that amount, despite the reduced number of parcels, was increasing, though probably not as much as it would have if those parcels were still in the program.

Mr. Lynch said that when a property no longer fulfilled its intended purpose for qualification, they would roll it back. He said that this could encompass various scenarios. He said that for instance, in 2016 and 2017, certain areas underwent complete redevelopment, and hundreds of acres were removed from land use for new subdivisions. He said that this represented a classic rollback situation, but it could also be that a property had a house built on land that was previously qualified. He said that in this case, the two-acre area supporting that house will be rolled back.

Mr. Lynch said that it could be that one ceases the land use, such as agriculture, deciding not to engage in farming anymore. He said that any of these scenarios, along with a few others, would result in a rollback. He said that these rollbacks accumulated over time. He said that the amount rolled back recovered some of that \$13 to \$14 million that was deferred each year. He said that in 2019, with the assistance of the County Executive and Board approval, they added a land use administrator position.

Mr. Lynch said that this addition had resulted in closer monitoring of the program due to the increased capability to focus on this task without compromising appraisal staff's ability to conduct reassessment work simultaneously. He said that adding this position was key for achieving these results and maintaining them. He said that was why there was a significant change in results from 2019 to the subsequent years.

Mr. Lynch said that regarding land use, they employed SLEAC (State Land Evaluation and Advisory Council) use values determined by the SLEAC Council, which was established by state law. He said that their role was to determine use values throughout the state for each jurisdiction. He said that while the County was not required to use these values, they must consider them. He said that in Albemarle County, they had chosen to use those values. He said that this report outlined these values. He said that the agricultural was based on a soil class, which determined which value within the eight was used. He said that the same soil classes were used to determine the forestry quality and rate.

Mr. Lynch said that the land use rates had experienced a slight decrease since last year. He said that if one was examining a value based solely on land use without considering market factors, it would be determined based on these changes and rates.

Mr. Lynch said for some general information, they had created 386 new parcels this year through plats recorded in 2023. He said that their total number of parcels now stood at approximately 49,500, nearing 50,000 parcels. He said that last year saw 991 parcels created. He said that their current rate was about one-third of last year's rate.

Mr. Lynch said that reassessment notices would be mailed out on January 26th, accompanied by an FAQ document that was included in this presentation's packet. He said that they were also including a small flyer that informed the property owner of the significance of this notice when they receive it. He said that during a meeting, he was told by someone that they look at their notice and say, "This is not a tax bill." He said that the key point is that when one received a tax bill, it was too late to appeal the value. He said that this year, they changed it to read "This will affect your tax bill" so that recipients understand its importance and could take necessary actions in time.

Mr. Lynch said regarding the review and appeal process, they recommend for property owners when they receive their notice and see their value to give them a call, and they can explain the process, specifically related to the caller's property and neighborhood. He said they can provide sales that were used to determine the caller's property value specifically, rather than just overall information. He said that, if necessary, they could arrange an appointment to visit the property if the information they had was not up-to-date.

Mr. Lynch said that in some cases, this may lead to a review request, and they asked that the applicant or taxpayer fill out a form so that they can track their reviews. He said that they requested that they allow them to conduct an interior inspection because understanding the interior condition was a big part of it when contesting their assessment, was the interior condition, and anything they were unaware of that could impact the value. He said that they would send the results in writing.

Mr. Lynch said that the next step was to proceed to the Board of Equalization. He said that the Board of Equalization was a judicial body that the Board of Supervisors established and provided members to. He said that those members would hear both his side of how they determined an assessment and the applicants' information they provided, and they would then determine if a change in value was appropriate or if they would keep the assessment as is. He said that the Board could decide to increase or decrease the value depending on the information presented. He said that these hearings typically commenced around May or June and may continue through August, depending on the volume of cases. He said that all hearings must be completed by September 1.

Mr. Lynch said that the application forms for review could be found on their website. He said that one could go on the website, fill it out, and send it in. He said that when it came to the Board of Equalization, they ensured that they controlled the process more thoroughly in order to verify that they knew who was providing the necessary documents on time. He said that these documents were available by contacting his office. He said that once they received them, they logged them in and sent them via email or through some other means to the property owner. He said that the property owner then returned the forms to them, making the appeal official. He said that the deadline for review was February 28, as determined by code. He said that the Board of Equalization form must be submitted by March 30, after which they would process them, present them to the Board, and conduct any necessary hearings.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she wanted to confirm that everything above the red line on slide 6 was sold for more than its assessment. She asked if she was correct or not.

Mr. Lynch said no. He said that this was an assessment-to-sale ratio; thus, everything above the line was assessed at a higher value than the sale price. Conversely, he said that everything below the red line was assessed at a lower value than the sale price.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that since she had a concerned constituent inquire concerning this matter, she wanted to ask if, when an appeal was submitted for review, was it the date of receipt or the date of postmark. She said that she understood that if someone submits their appeal online, there was no issue.

Mr. Lynch said no. He said that last year they conducted a review to ensure that all of their communication materials were consistent in terms of wording and messaging. He said that the rule was that submissions must either be received by the deadline or postmarked by the deadline.

Mr. Gallaway asked whether the materials being sent to the Board would be spreadsheets.

Mr. Lynch said that they would be spreadsheets.

Mr. Gallaway asked whether the data on slide 10 could be broken down by district.

Mr. Lynch said that the spreadsheet would contain the average change for each neighborhood, but it would not include individual parcels.

Mr. Gallaway asked whether the data was available for each magisterial district.

Mr. Lynch said no, but he could compile it.

Ms. McKeel said that Mr. Lynch should send the breakdown to everybody.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the data could show detail down to specific neighborhoods.

Mr. Lynch said yes. He said what he had ready to send to them was the average change by neighborhood in each district, and he confirmed that they were requesting was what percentage of their district property had gone up a certain percentage in each group.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked how Keswick would be split since it crossed district boundaries.

Mr. Lynch said that the neighborhoods were assessing neighborhoods, and they were broken down further from magisterial districts. He said that there could be several market areas in Keswick. He said that market areas were given descriptive names so they would have some idea of where they were.

Ms. Mallek asked what "forestry nonproductive" meant.

Mr. Lynch said that he believed it was the rocky side of the mountain.

Ms. Mallek said that landowners should be aware that mailing a response would not receive a postmark until the following day due to the mail being sent to Richmond for postmarking. She said that to ensure timely postmarking, one could carry the mail to their local post office and request immediate postmarking in front of them, with a picture taken for verification.

Mr. Lynch said that sometimes, responses were not postmarked at all, so landowners should make sure to drop the letter off in person to receive a postmark. He said that if they waited until the last day to drop off the package at the post office to ensure its arrival, they should confirm that it is postmarked.

Ms. Mallek asked if the boxes located on the property would be operational for these types of drop-off deadlines or if their usage was limited solely to tax payments.

Mr. Lynch said that he would ask his colleagues in revenue administration to check the payment drop boxes. He said that at 5 o'clock on the deadline, they would check the boxes. He said that they did not recommend dropping them in the tax payment area due to the potential for them to get lost among numerous tax payments.

Mr. Andrews said that he had a couple of questions regarding land use. He said that he would like to clarify some points regarding the claw back. He said that he would like to ensure his understanding was correct. He said that he knew that if agricultural land was converted to development, it would be five years. He said that this was not necessarily the case if someone simply ceased land use.

Mr. Lynch said that the roll back was still five years. He said that the rollback was calculated in the same manner but may involve a different number of acres. He said that when they say they performed a rollback on a parcel, it could involve only two acres being rolled back or the entire parcel being rolled back. He said that the calculation was based on the current year and the five previous years, with simple interest added to each previous year.

Mr. Andrews said that it appeared that nonproductive, rocky, and low value per acre soil classifications followed pretty much the same way. He said that if one's soil was rated at an eight, it was deemed unproductive but was taxed at a lower rate due to its agricultural status. He said that this distinction was interesting because although the land was intended for agricultural use, it was the worst classification.

Mr. Lynch said that was correct. He said that as long as it was in production, they would have it in the program. He said that it would be assessed at a lower amount during that time.

Mr. Andrews asked if the soil classification was determined by broad areas and past studies or if they went out to investigate soil types.

Mr. Lynch said that the Department of Agriculture had conducted studies in the past. He said that they collected core samples from various locations and created maps that depicted elevation contours. He said that the maps determined the type of soil present, which was then assigned a grade from one to eight.

Mr. Andrews said that there was no risk in speaking with an appraiser, but if one filed an appeal to the Board of Equalization, there was a risk the Board would decide a higher valuation.

Mr. Lynch said that the risk existed, whether it was a review by the Assessor's Office or the Board of Equalization. He said that if they found something that would cause a higher valuation, it would be increased. He said that it did not happen often, though it was a risk. He said that the point was that they were attempting to determine the proper value, not specifically the lowest value.

Ms. McKeel asked whether they would be sent a copy of the presentation.

Mr. Lynch said yes.

Ms. McKeel said that she was surprised that they received mail without a postmark.

Ms. Mallek said that if one examined the County mail closely, one would notice that it featured a generic circle, which indicated that it has been processed by a mailing service; however, it did not display a date, which led to people becoming extremely frustrated.

Mr. Lynch said that he was talking about incoming mail.

Ms. Mallek said that this was the same situation where people asked, "Well, when was my tax bill mailed to me?" She said that they could not provide evidence for anything in such cases. She said that this was why everyone needed to sign up for email notices regarding their tax bills.

Mr. Lynch said that he learned that this year, that he spoke to the post office who said that they had no control over it. He said that they mentioned it was handled at the processing center.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was unsure if they frequently received appeals where people complained about postmarks and other issues. She asked if they would consider including information about such concerns in the flyer accompanying their notices. She asked if they did not receive many complaints of this nature.

Mr. Lynch said that he did not pay attention until they reached the deadline. He said that they did not receive many of them; there were only a few. He said that at this point it was too late to include it in their flyer. He said that it was a good suggestion for the future.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, asked Mr. Lynch to explain what occurred in 2019 regarding the additional staff member that was hired.

Mr. Lynch said that in 2019, they hired him, and he began digging really deeply. He said that the land use administrator was a farmer who understood both sides of the program. He had owned property that was in land use or had farmed property owned by others that was in land use, and he would fill out forms for them. He said that upon further examination, the administrator discovered that there was an essential rule for this program that they were previously unaware of. He said that when the state legislature established the program in the 1980s, they decided that properties must meet minimum size requirements.

Mr. Lynch said that to qualify for the program, one must have at least five acres of agricultural land and 20 acres of forestry. He said that due to the numerous smaller properties in existence, they decided not to suddenly remove them from the program. He said that as long as the same person owned properties that were adjacent to each other and they were conducting the activity across them, they could continue to qualify by aggregating them. He said that they clarified that it applied as long as there was no subdivision of those properties, any of the properties included. He said that once subdivision occurred any of the properties attempting to aggregate with them no longer qualified.

Mr. Lynch said that the land use administrator discovered that the definition of a subdivision depended on the County's definition of a subdivision, which had changed several times over the last 20 years. He said that it had evolved from requiring that an actual subdivision be one to two properties or more to, at some point five years ago or so, any boundary line adjustment made to one's property being considered a subdivision. He said that anything adjusted in any way could no longer aggregate. He said that it was not that they could not qualify by themselves; they just could not aggregate with others.

Mr. Lynch said that led some properties to be removed from the program, and others experienced rollbacks. He said that prior to 2019, they lacked the ability to determine whether the information they received accurately represented the situation on the property. He said that since then, the land use administrator had been able to dig into the paperwork and to identify what was really going on and if things were changing and ensuring they were properly qualified for land use. He said that this improvement was primarily due to having more staff members dedicated to tracking these changes and ensuring compliance.

Mr. Richardson said that he was bringing up the issue because they had positions requested in the budget that were not funded. He said that this was a position that was funded in the budget and competed with other positions. He said that this quality assurance piece was essential for their program. He said that comparing 2019 and 2018 to the years afterwards revealed a significant difference, approximately \$700,000. He said that this was a quality assurance piece based on performance.

Mr. Richardson said that the Board was good to ask questions about how their systems, technology, and investment in human resources contributed to their effectiveness in delivering services to their community. He said that their organization was rich in human resources; they did not produce products but provided services to their community. He said this was a poignant example of the management and performance of efficiencies in Finance and Budget work.

Mr. Richardson said he also wanted to point out that Mr. Lynch highlighted assessment growth at 4.07%. He said this was after two years of 8.4% and 13.46%, which was an average of 10.93%. He said that they had seen assessment growth decrease, approaching 7%. He said that last fall, Dr. Cheryl Bailey had predicted an economic downturn specific to the growth they had seen over the last two years. He said that she estimated that growth would be around 4%. He said that they continued to work on the budget, and this would be a challenging budget process. He said that as they knew, they had seen growth decrease from 13% to about 4%.

Mr. Lynch said that he would provide what he had already prepared, which was an email that included each of the districts and the neighborhoods within the districts, along with the average change by neighborhood. He said that he would also provide the information presented in slide 10 by magisterial district.

Ms. McKeel asked if he would send the presentation.

Mr. Lynch said he would send the presentation.

Mr. Pruitt asked if that was a reasonable workload request. He asked whether it would be as simple as changing Excel filters or if it would require staff hours to produce the documents.

Mr. Lynch said that it was not a significant request thanks to the pivot tables.

Ms. Mallek asked if the office was notified proactively when building permits were issued.

Mr. Lynch said yes. He said that they had created an interface between community development and his system that brought those permits in.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding houses under construction, previously, one had to wait for a phone call from the builder to confirm that the house was ready. She said that nowadays, they could do it at 30%, 60%, or 90%, as far as when to bring it in, rather than waiting for the builder's call.

Mr. Lynch said that they did not depend on the builder to inform them when they had completed their work. He said that quite often, they sold the property as soon as it was finished. He said that if that was not the case, they would visit the site to ensure its completion. He said that starting from January 1 of every year, they must conduct inspections and assess the property based on its percentage of completion at that specific point in time.

Ms. Mallek said that she commended the new land use administrator on his work and how he

helped residents, especially older residents, to understand and work through the process.

Agenda Item No. 11. Closed Meeting.

There was no closed meeting held.

Agenda Item No. 12. Certify Closed Meeting.

There was no closed meeting certification because no closed meeting was held.

Non-Agenda Item. **Recess.** The Board recessed its meeting at 5:28 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00 p.m.

Agenda Item No. 13. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Jeff Richardson, County Executive, said that this January 2024 report presentation focused on partnerships, specifically between the Department of Social Services (DSS) and the Book Basket Partnership. He said that it aligned with their Strategic Plan, particularly goals 1.2 and 2.3, which involved developing human service initiatives that will assist the community in accessing existing resources and fostering community partnerships and engagement around County priorities.

Mr. Richardson said that *Book Baskets* was a local nonprofit organization that aimed to promote reading through book ownership. He said that the Book Basket supplied books for the County's Bright Stars and Family Support Program. He said that program staff brought books during home visits, using them as opportunities to build connections, emphasize the importance of literacy, and provide books in the family's primary language whenever possible. He said that Bright Stars and Family Support provide direct services to over 250 families combined. He said that this was another excellent outreach initiative from the Bright Stars Program.

Mr. Richardson said that this was a photograph taken in December at the Albemarle County Police Department (ACPD) Annual Awards. He said that this fell under Goal 1 of creating a safe and healthy community. He said that ACPD partnered with the Police Foundation to honor a dozen officers and community partners for their contributions to the community during the 29th Annual Awards Ceremony held in December.

Mr. Richardson said that some highlights included Officer of the Year James Potter, who was the primary responding officer on over 500 calls for service last year and resulted in over 50 arrests. He said that their *Rookie of the Year* last year was Amanda Conner. He said that in her first year as a rookie in ACPD, Ms. Conner made 74 arrests, 310 traffic stops, 5 DUI arrests, and marked over 346 extra patrols. He said that the Chair of the ACPD Citizen Advisory Committee, Richard Hewitt, was recognized for 10 years of service.

Mr. Richardson said that Christmas tree recycling supported Goal 2, which was designing programs and services that promoted an equitable, engaged, and climate-resilient community. He said that the Board likely knew that they were currently accepting trees at eight locations until January 21. He said that the recycled trees would be chipped into mulch, which would be available for free starting Monday, January 22 at Darden Towe Park and Claudius Crozet Park. He said that the County's Christmas tree recycling program had been assisting residents in appropriately disposing of trees and reducing landfill impacts since 1988. He said that each year, the program collected approximately 2,300 trees countywide.

Mr. Richardson said that the updated new employee orientation information was part of Goal 6, which focused on recruiting and retaining engaged public servants who provided quality government services to advance their mission. He said that the Board had effectively supported Goal 6, and they had discussed it extensively. He said that this related to workforce stability. He said that over the past year, he had provided data regarding the number of vacancies they had had and how they had reduced them.

Mr. Richardson said that it was also important that the County onboard new employees in the most effective manner possible. He said this involved welcoming them into their organization and spending time on the front end to clarify their roles, both at an organization-wide level and within departments. He said that they had dedicated two-day training for this purpose and that had been launched one year ago. He said that since January of last year, they had onboarded 159 employees who had attended the two-day training.

Mr. Richardson said that if the Supervisors wished to attend some of the broader training that spanned two days to see what they covered, they should let him know, and they would communicate that to Human Resources for them to sit in and listen as a new employee joining Albemarle County Government. He said that this would not be the complete two-day training but would provide exposure to the impact at an organization-wide level.

Mr. Richardson said that in November, Albemarle County received the 2023 Virginia Government Finance Officers Association (VGFOA) Innovation Award for its finance training platform. He said that the

procurement team implemented an on-demand online video training platform for Local Government and School employees. He said that the training platform housed finance and budget training videos, categorized for ease of accessibility and digestibility in three-to-ten-minute increments. He said that the innovative approach aimed to make training more efficient for busy individuals by providing easily accessible content.

Mr. Richardson said that he had discussed Mr. Henry's visit to Orlando in November during the previous Board meeting. He said that the attached photograph was of Mr. Henry at the Installation Innovation Forum in 2023. He said that Deputy County Executive Henry attended a Department of Defense (DoD) event during those days and served as a guest speaker, and he presented on the County's role in the Rivanna Futures property acquisition.

Mr. Trevor Henry, Deputy County Executive, said that he would like to provide a quick update regarding the Association of Defense Communities. He said that he and Economic Development Director Barry Albrecht would be attending the upcoming national conference later in the spring, which would take place in Crystal City, Washington D.C. He said that the conference focused on meeting policy makers, senior government officials, and defense executives to discuss policies and budgets. He said that it would be an excellent opportunity for them to connect in April.

Mr. Henry said that in the near future, they had been invited to present at the General Assembly Military and Veterans Caucus. He said that this would be his fourth time attending. He said that the caucus started that day and would run for four to five weeks. He said that Secretary Crenshaw presented the matters from his area of responsibility and key initiatives in the Commonwealth that he was working on and his division was working on. He said that he mentioned their project and the partnership that he had through his staff with Albemarle County.

Mr. Henry said that he, Mr. Albrecht, and Ms. Kilroy would be presenting in two weeks. He said that they would present the project from a 30,000-foot view but also drill down into the actual legislative priority request and the next steps of work that they wanted to do. He said that several caucus members were already aware of the acquisition and its vision. He said the event would provide them with an opportunity to present their case to all of them collectively. He said they could report back at their next meeting regarding its outcome and any subsequent steps that arose from it. He said that they had other activities planned in relation to the property with VEDP (Virginia Economic Development Partnership) and the opportunities through the first quarter of that year.

Mr. Richardson said that since MicroCAT's launch in October, they had received 4,381 ride requests. He said that as of January 14, MicroCAT had met the ride demand 97% of the time, surpassing the industry gold standard of 95%. He said that they were extremely pleased with the quality of customer service that their clients had experienced. He said that there had been a steady increase in ride requests week over week, except for the week of Christmas, and there had been a peak of 729 requests in one week.

Mr. Richardson said that with CAPE's (Office of Communications and Public Engagement) support, MicroCAT was now collaborating with VIA to develop the next phase of marketing efforts. He said that this included a larger public awareness advertising campaign and hyper-local community outreach, such as presentations to CACs (Community Advisory Committees) and direct outreach to community groups. He said that MicroCAT would continue to monitor the program and usage to assess efficiency and potential future expansions.

Mr. Richardson said that the Piedmont Pitch deadline was approaching in collaboration with the Central Virginia Small Business Development Center, the City of Charlottesville Office of Economic Development, and Albemarle County's Economic Development staff. He said that they had joined forces to offer educational programming leading up to a pitch competition for local small businesses. He said that entrepreneurs and small business owners in Charlottesville and Albemarle could apply to participate in an eight-week program that included business training sessions, access to industry research, business operating tools, and one-on-one advice. He said that graduates of Piedmont Pitch would complete a business plan and could pitch for up to \$15,000 in prize money. He said that interested parties should visit www.cvsbdc.org to learn more and apply. He said the deadline was February 1.

Mr. Richardson said that AHIP (Albemarle Housing Improvement Program) received a thank-you card from a couple who were served in part by the Albemarle County Assisted Home Performance Program. He said that AHIP completed a comprehensive rehab project for this couple that included a new roof and numerous interior and exterior repairs. He said that some of the work aligned with the Assisted Home Performance Program funding included the installation of a 16 SEER Energy Star high-efficiency heat pump; crawlspace encapsulation, air sealing and insulation; attic air sealing and insulation; removing a chimney below the roof line and sealing the chimney; replacing the bathroom exhaust fans with smart fans; and replacing lighting with LED.

Mr. Richardson said that Executive Director of AHIP, Cory Demchak, felt compelled to share with the County because the client was considering selling their home due to their inability to afford the costly repairs that were needed, and they were falling further and further behind on their maintenance. He said that the rehab project made it possible for the couple to stay safely in their home. He said that with these needed maintenance upgrades, the house would be much more energy efficient. He said that this was a really good new story for what he believed was a key program and a key partner agency in the realm of climate resiliency and affordable housing.

Mr. Richardson said that Ms. Emily Kilroy would give them a report on communications, public engagement, and media coverage from 2023 for the Board's review. He said that he would share a couple of key statistics. He said that they increased their newsletter subscribers by over 20% in the last year, and their social media reach now exceeded one million on Facebook and X, and over 500,000 visitors accessed their website. He said that they hosted 11 projects on their public engagement portal, engage.albemarle.org. He said that there were more than 1,200 media stories published, which equated to approximately 100 per month. He said that more than half of media coverage stemmed from newsletters, press releases, and other items generated by the County. He said that about a quarter were driven by meetings and events, while the balance came from standing interviews the County had and reporter-generated inquiries.

Mr. Richardson said that any feedback provided was valuable, as Ms. Kilroy and her team appreciated input regarding Albemarle County's efforts to effectively communicate its story. He said the Board's feedback also helped them understand how they connected with the community and where tax dollars were being allocated.

Ms. McKeel said that she was planning to share this information with some of her neighbors in order to encourage them to sign up. She said that if she sent them to the website and the newsletter link, they would still have the option to select the emails they wished to receive.

Ms. Emily Kilroy, Assistant to the County Executive, said that they launched the monthly digest approximately a year and a half ago. She said that for individuals who preferred not to receive one-off communications, this was the best option for the average person. She said that they sent it once a month, covering everything they had sent out in the previous month, along with previews of upcoming events, meetings, and important topics. She said that if someone wanted to keep their inbox clean, the monthly digest was their recommended newsletter product. She said that if someone signed up for all of them, they would receive everything they sent, which was at most three items per week. She said that the monthly digest served as a convenient entry point for those unsure about receiving their communications.

Mr. Gallaway said that he especially liked hearing the numbers on MicroCAT.

Ms. Mallek said that she was particularly glad that they had focused on AHIP because they were also partnering with LEAP. She said that this partnership was another way that County investment was helping to provide weatherization assistance to people who truly needed it through these two partners.

Mr. Andrews said that he appreciated the media coverage, and that looking at the Strategic Plan, that he recognized engagement and the importance of an engaged community in achieving their goals by being visible and informing people about what is happening.

Mr. Richardson said that at the conclusion of these presentations each month, they would compile the presentation and send it via email. He said that the email would include talking points for reference while in the community or attending any event. He said that the resource was intended to be readily available for Board members during community meetings or when attending CACs, providing an overview of County government activities.

Agenda Item No. 14. From the Public: Matters on the Agenda but Not Listed for Public Hearing or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

There were speakers from the public.

Agenda Item No.15. Public Hearing: ZMA202200012 Arbor Oaks Townes.

PROJECT: ZMA202200012 Arbor Oaks Townes

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Jack Jouett

TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 06100000003800

LOCATION: Property on the east side of Hydraulic Road, approximately 150 feet north of the intersection of Hydraulic Road and Arbor Crest Drive, and approximately 1,000 feet south of the intersection of Hydraulic Road and Lambs Road.

PROPOSAL: Rezone one parcel of land to R-15 Residential to allow a maximum of 14 residential units.

PETITION: Request to rezone a total of approximately 0.96 acres from the R-4 Residential Zoning District, which allows residential uses at densities up to four units/acre, to R-15 Residential, which allows residential uses at densities up to 15 units/acre. A maximum of 14 single-family attached dwelling units is proposed, at a gross and net density of 14.6 units/acre.

ZONING: R-4 Residential – 4 units/acre

OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): Entrance Corridor, Airport Impact Area

PROFFERS: Yes

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Urban Density Residential – residential (6.01 – 34 units/ acre); supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses; in Neighborhood 1 in the Places29 Master Plan area.

POTENTIALLY IN THE MONTICELLO VIEWSHED: No.

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that at its meeting on Tuesday, October 10, 2023, the Planning Commission (PC) conducted a public hearing and voted 7:0 to recommend approval of ZMA202200012 Arbor Oaks Townes. The PC also voted 7:0 to approve a

planting strip exception request. As a modification of street standards, review of the planting strip exception request is conducted only by the PC, and the BOS does not need to take a vote on this request. A separate central sewer request has also been submitted, but is not yet scheduled for Board review. The PC's staff report, action letter, and meeting minutes are attached (Attachments A, B, and C).

At the PC public hearing, one community member spoke, expressing concern about the potential for additional traffic in the area from this development, as well as how the entrance into the site would be designed and incorporated into the adjacent intersection, which also serves the Albemarle County Public Schools' Lambs Lane campus. As noted in the PC report, VDOT and the County's Transportation Planning team reviewed the application and have expressed no objections. Although Hydraulic Road is a heavily-travelled route in the County, 14 proposed townhouse units would generate a negligible amount of new trips compared to the existing traffic loads. The entrance to the site from Hydraulic Road would be reviewed during the site planning stage and would need to meet all VDOT requirements, including an Access Management Exception from VDOT, if necessary.

Since the PC meeting, the applicant has provided a revised proffer statement (Attachment D) to identify more clearly which elements of the proposed concept plan are being proffered.

The site would be served by public water and sewer. However, the site would require a lift station, with that facility and the onsite sanitary sewer to be privately owned. A request for a central sewerage system has been submitted pursuant to County Code § 16-102. However, because additional information is still needed to review the sewerage system request, action on that request will be scheduled for a future Board meeting.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Ordinance (Attachment E) to approve ZMA202200012 Arbor Oaks Townes.

Mr. Andy Reitelbach, Senior Planner, said that this evening they were here for a zoning map amendment ZMA 2022-12, also known as Arbor Oaks Townes. He said the site was a roughly square-shaped parcel highlighted in yellow in the center of the provided image. He said that it was to the east side of Hydraulic Road. He said that to the west across Hydraulic Road was the Georgetown Green neighborhood as well as the Lambs Lane campus of Albemarle County Public Schools (ACPS). He said that at the bottom of the screen, there was the intersection of Georgetown Road and Hydraulic Road.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the current zoning was R-4 Residential, which permitted four residential units per acre. He said that because this property was just under one acre in size, by right the property owner could have constructed three residential units on the property. He said that the overlay districts for the property included the Entrance Corridor Overlay District and the Airport Impact Area Overlay District. He said that Hydraulic Road was a designated entrance corridor. He said that surrounding the site were various zoning districts, such as R-10, R-15, R-4, and a few small commercially zoned properties. He said that Georgetown Green across the street was zoned R-6. He said that the school campus area was zoned Rural Areas.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the site was part of the Places 29 Master Plan and was designated as Urban Density Residential. He said that Urban Density Residential recommended residential uses at 6.01 to 34 units per acre, along with supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, and small-scale commercial office and service uses. He said that it recommended that a residential building height was a maximum of four stories or 45 feet.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the adjacent properties of the site were also designated Urban Density Residential. He said that farther to the east, there were several properties designated for Neighborhood Density Residential. He said that across Hydraulic Road, Georgetown Green and the school campus property were designated for Rural Areas.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant's proposal for this project involved a parcel currently zoned R-4, which allowed four residential units per acre. He said that the property was approximately 0.96 acres in size. He said that the existing use of the property was a vacant lot with several scattered trees. He said that the applicant was looking to rezone the property to R-15 Residential with proffers. He said that R1-5 Residential would allow 15 units per acre. He said that due to the property being just under one acre in size, the applicant could do a maximum of 14 units. He said that the applicant had proffered that they would only do a maximum of 14 units, and that they would be single-family attached units such as townhouses.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the applicant was proposing a cluster division, which would require a minimum of 25% of the space to be retained as open space. He said that as a result, the density would be approximately 14.6 units per acre. He said that the applicant proposed that 15% of the property be allocated for affordable housing, which would amount to two units.

Mr. Reitelbach said that for other parts of this proposal, the applicant had submitted a planting strip waiver request. He said that the planting strip waiver request was reviewed solely by the Planning Commission (PC), and the PC had approved the request during their review. He said that no action was required by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the site would also necessitate a central sewerage system. He said that a private lift station and forced main would be required, which had been reviewed by the ACSA

(Albemarle County Service Authority). He said that at present, there were no concerns expressed by staff, the ACSA, or engineering or planning staff during the conceptual stage of a zoning map amendment (ZMA). He said that final approval of the central sewerage system would occur at the site planning stage once there was a full design and engineering of the site and the central sewerage system.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the provided slide displayed a conceptual plan that had been provided and proffered by the applicant. He said that north was depicted to the left, while east was at the top of the image. He said that the central parking lot was also designated as a private street. He said that two rows of townhouses were situated nearby. He said that Block 1, consisting of approximately six townhouses, would be located to the north of the parking lot on the left side, and Block 2, consisting of eight townhouses, would be situated to the south of the parking lot. He said the open space surrounded these areas, particularly at the northern tip of the property.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the applicant had proposed dedicating approximately five feet of right-of-way for a sidewalk along Hydraulic Road, along with a planting strip separating the new sidewalk from Hydraulic Road. He said that currently, there was a sidewalk in this area, but it was adjacent to the travel way of Hydraulic Road.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the concept plan had been proffered by the applicant, featuring two blocks of townhouses, totaling 14 units. He said the applicant proposed subdividing the townhouses into separate lots, creating a private street that primarily functioned as a parking lot.

Mr. Reitelbach said that due to clustering requirements, 25% of the site must be retained as open space, with most of that space located to the north of the site. He said that several recreational and community amenities were proposed for that area. He said that a pump station would be required for sanitary sewer purposes. He said that the applicant also proposed dedicating approximately five feet of right-of-way for a planting strip and sidewalk along Hydraulic Road.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the proposal included proffers such as a 15% affordable housing totaling 2 units and a concept plan outlining major elements like right-of-way dedication, sidewalk construction along Hydraulic Road, and a maximum of 14 units. He said that the applicant had also proffered open space dedication of 25% of the property, which would be dedicated to the HOA (Homeowners Association).

Mr. Reitelbach said that there were several positive aspects of this rezoning application. He said that the rezoning request was consistent with the recommendations of the Places 29 Master Plan, including both land use designation and density. He said that the request was consistent with the majority of the applicable neighborhood model principles. He said that staff identified only one concern regarding this ZMA: the absence of provisions for an interconnection between this parcel and the adjacent parcel to the east.

Mr. Reitelbach said that at the public hearing held on October 10, 2023, the PC voted 7-0 in favor of recommending approval of this ZMA. He said that following the public hearing, the applicant made minor revisions to the proffer statement, which was included in the packet as Attachment D. He said the revisions listed the three major elements of the concept plan discussed in the earlier slide.

Ms. McKeel said she needed help with the interconnectivity. She said that there was another townhouse community adjacent to the property and a single-family house as well. She asked if there had ever been a discussion about simply installing a stub out. She said she understood that the couple was not interested in connecting, but she wanted to know if a stub out was considered.

Mr. Reitelbach said that they had had some discussions regarding this matter. He said that one of the challenges was that when someone arrived at that property, it necessitated a retaining wall of approximately four feet due to grade differences. He said that there could be an issue with future connectivity if the retaining wall was not already constructed during the development phase.

Ms. McKeel asked if there was discussion about a connection to the neighboring townhouses.

Mr. Reitelbach said that there was no discussion with staff regarding that because those developments were already constructed, and it seemed that there would not be an appropriate place for interconnections to occur.

Mr. Gallaway asked if Arbor Crest looped around.

Mr. Reitelbach said that Arbor Crest Drive was not a public street. He said that it was a private street that solely provided access to the single-family home behind this development.

Ms. Mallek said that the southern parking streets had permeable parking spaces, which differed from those on the north side. She asked if there was a reason for this distinction.

Mr. Reitelbach said that he was not aware of a specific reason for that. He said that the applicant may be able to provide more information regarding why they were only proposing it for the southern parking spaces. He said that during the design phase and site planning, due to engineering and stormwater management requirements, the applicant may need to use all the parking spaces with permeable pavement.

Ms. Mallek clarified that they would dedicate the right-of-way and also build the sidewalk.

Mr. Reitelbach said yes.

Mr. Andrews asked if the walking path allowed access to other properties.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the applicant proposed the path as a way to access the public sidewalk from the community amenities.

Mr. Andrews said that there would not be pedestrian access to the other properties.

Mr. Reitelbach said no, just along Hydraulic Road.

Mr. Andrews said that regarding Hydraulic Road, turning in and out involved both left and right turns. He asked if the project would be affected by the Lambs Lane internal roadway plan in any way.

Ms. McKeel said that she would like to point out the Lambs Lane campus access had not been determined yet, and VDOT would consider this factor during their decision-making process.

Mr. Reitelbach said that this location was directly across from the Georgetown Green and Lambs Lane entrance. He said that if the rezoning was approved, the intersection would likely need to be configured with that intersection. He said that VDOT was aware of this and considered it during the review process. He said that since the final Lambs Lane layout had not been determined yet, there was no specific comment made at that time.

Ms. McKeel said that when working with VDOT, they preferred for them to be directly across from each other. She said that this arrangement was preferred because it allowed them to have something to work with.

Mr. Andrews said that he understood that the planting strip exception was under the purview of the PC. He said that they were considering a proffer of a five-foot right-of-way for planting purposes. He said he wanted to ensure that he understood the relationship between these two aspects.

Mr. Reitelbach said that the planting strip exception request was for the private street exclusively, situated between the parking spaces and the sidewalks in front of the townhouses. He said that it was determined that the private street primarily functioned as a parking lot, so having a planting strip between the sidewalk and parking spaces was deemed inappropriate.

Ms. Mallek asked whether there would be any trees or plantings between the buildings.

Mr. Reitelbach said that in the blocks, since those were merely building envelopes, there may be some landscaping. He said that as a site plan was required, they would need to meet the canopy requirements for residential properties. He said that there would be some trees somewhere on the site; however, this had not been fully determined at this stage. He said that they did have to meet all landscaping requirements in the site plan section of the ordinance.

Mr. Andrews opened the public hearing.

Mr. Katurah Roell, representing the applicant, Fusion Properties, said that he would address concerns and answer any questions that arose. He said that regarding tree plantings, there would be trees and shrubs in the front yards since the planting strip and sidewalk were best positioned by the parking lot. He said that the remaining trees in the dotted area and the black backyard of Block 1 would also be preserved due to the large oak trees on the property. He said that the rest of that area consisted of scrubs and brush. He said that they chose this layout to preserve the large standing oaks.

Mr. Roell said that along the frontage, between VDOT, significant improvements for school activities, and the master plan, they hoped it would not impact their site. He said that they had aligned themselves with these developments after a year of collaboration with VDOT and neighbors. He said that ARB (Architectural Review Board) desired plantings along the frontage, but VDOT prioritized site distance. He said that eventually all parties reached a consensus; however, there could be no frontage trees due to requirements and future improvements, including widening.

Mr. Roell said that regarding the connection to the back, they negotiated with the rear property owner in exchange for acquiring their land for their small driveway and providing them access to their property from the rear. He said that the couple was quite elderly, with her being bedridden, and they preferred not to make changes until necessary. He said that they constructed a four-foot wall that fell to their house, which was at least six feet below their rear wall. He said that the design ensured that future access for potential purchasers or developers would have a reasonable grade and approach.

Mr. Andrews confirmed with the Clerk that there was no one from the public who signed up for comment.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she had a question regarding the two units for affordable housing. She asked whether they were for sale or for rent.

Mr. Roell said yes.

Ms. McKeel said that she understood that the private street was really a parking lot. She asked for help to understand with the HOA and the maintenance responsibilities for the parking area over the next two decades. She said that in her district, she had a parking lot street that has had deep potholes at times, which raised her concerns. She asked if the HOA was set up to manage the street.

Mr. Roell said yes, and it was similar to Hollymead Town Center. He said that the HOAs in older neighborhoods often had less clear language and determinability. He said that newer HOAs, however, were more descriptive, responsible, and consistently collected dues to cover costs and future improvements for maintenance of both streets and open spaces.

Ms. McKeel said that that would be in the maintenance agreement, and that someone would be responsible for collecting funds.

Mr. Roell said yes. He said that they collected funds. He said he had maintained various projects, such as Hollymead. He said that HOAs were designed to collect funds, manage them responsibly, and then ensure tasks such as mowing grass, maintaining grounds, managing open space, parking lot improvements, and street improvements were completed. He said that previously, there had been instances where needs were identified but funds were unavailable or there was no clear direction provided.

Ms. Mallek said that in the applicant's narrative, it mentioned saving as many trees as possible. She said that she had heard similar statements from others before. She asked if they would identify the trees in subsequent plans provided to staff regarding which trees should be protected. She said that she did not see any mention of a tree conservation plan or anything similar.

Mr. Roell said that the area was in open space, making it unaffected.

Ms. Mallek said that she was considering the construction process when carpenters often parked their trucks directly over the roots. She said that as a result, the trees died, and they had to be cut down.

Mr. Roell said that they built and took care of things, but in the north half of that site, it consisted of oaks. He said that that was the open space area they specifically designated to preserve that large area. He said that the southern side consisted of scrub, brush, grass, bushes, and dead locust trees. He said that they maintained the oaks. He said that the green swath in front was filled with large oak trees along the front, in front of the power lines. He said that they planned to expand the sidewalk by five feet, which required cutting down all oak trees along the frontage. He said that they had discussed this extensively with staff.

Ms. Mallek said that regarding the comments regarding compliance with the EC (entrance corridor) guidelines in terms of orienting buildings, there was a description stating that the design did not meet the design guidelines due to its positioning at the side of buildings rather than the fronts.

Mr. Roell said that they presented some designs to the ARB for the project, which will incorporate a stunning mountain view across the high school's open parking lot. He said that the design will maintain a height of two and a half stories or potentially include an upper deck that maximized the view.

Ms. Mallek said that the applicant proposed preserving some existing trees in the large open space, as mentioned in the staff report. She said that another question concerned the appropriate design of green spaces, which should provide buffering and screening for the entrance corridor frontage. She said that the layout did not meet all of the EC design guidelines because building fronts should be oriented to the street.

Mr. Roell said that they intended to play on that aspect, as those would be the front of the homes with an entrance. He said that there would be a small corner terrace that overlooked the view he described.

Mr. Andrews said that he would close the public hearing, and the matter was now back before the Board. Hearing no additional comments from the Board, he said that they would look to take an action.

Ms. McKeel **moved** that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Ordinance, Attachment E, to approve ZMA202200012, Arbor Oaks Townes.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP FOR
PARCEL 06100-00-00-03800**

WHEREAS, application ZMA 2022-00012 was submitted to rezone Parcel 06100-00-00-03800 from R-4 Residential to R-15 Residential with proffers; and

WHEREAS, on October 10, 2023, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of ZMA 2022-00012;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that upon consideration of the transmittal summary and staff report prepared for ZMA 2022-00012 and their attachments, including both the Project Narrative last revised May 5, 2023 and the "Proffer Statement for Arbor Oaks Townes Subdivision" dated November 15, 2022, last revised December 22, 2023, the information presented at the public hearings, any written comments received, the material and relevant factors in Virginia Code § 15.2-2284 and County Code § 18-18.1, and for the purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practices, the Board hereby approves ZMA 2022-00012 with the Project Narrative entitled "Narrative for ZMA 2022-00012 Arbor Oaks Townes TMP 061-00-00-03800" dated November 5, 2022, last revised on May 5, 2023, and subject to the "Proffer Statement for Arbor Oaks Townes Subdivision" dated November 15, 2022, last revised December 22, 2023.

Agenda Item No.16. Public Hearing: ZMA202300008 High School Center II at Albemarle High School.

PROJECT: ZMA202300008 High School Center II at Albemarle High School

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Jack Jouett

TAX MAP/PARCELS: 06000-00-00-078A0

LOCATION: 2775 Hydraulic Road, between Lambs Road and Georgetown Green

PROPOSAL: Rezone 9.9 acres from RA Rural Area - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots) to R-10 Residential - 10 units/acre

PETITION: Rezone a 9.9 acre portion of the 216.7 acre Lambs Lane Campus, along the Hydraulic Road frontage, from RA to R-10 for the construction of a new High School Center. Public uses, like schools are allowed in all zoning districts. The rezoning is to allow reduced setbacks and flexibility in building height and residential uses are not proposed.

OVERLAY DISTRICTS: Entrance Corridor, Airport Impact Area

PROFFERS: Yes

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Area – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources; residential (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots).

The Executive Summary as forwarded to the Board states that at its meeting on November 28, 2023, the Planning Commission (PC) voted 7:0 to recommend approval of ZMA202300008 High School Center II at Albemarle High School for the reasons stated in the staff report and as discussed at the meeting. See the PC Staff Report (Attachment A), the PC Action Letter (Attachment B), and the PC Minutes (Attachment C). A special exception (SE202300039) has also been requested to modify the maximum front setback requirements of the R-10 Residential District.

Public uses are allowed in all zoning districts. The purpose of this rezoning is to allow flexibility in setbacks and building height to efficiently use already developed portions of the high school site. Staff and the PC support this flexibility in setbacks and building height, but not any future R-10 Residential uses, if the public use of the property ever ceased. An important element of the proposal is an increased setback along the Georgetown Green residential development. To limit potential future residential uses and address setback issues, proffers were submitted after the PC's public hearing (Attachment D) that:

1. Prohibit residential uses on the property, and
2. Establish a minimum setback of 50 feet along the shared property line with Georgetown Green, as depicted on the Concept Plan.

The Commission expressed no concerns about an increased maximum setback, and was not required to act on that request (SE202300039). Because special exceptions are subject to Board of Supervisors approval, only Board action is required. The purpose of this rezoning is to reduce setbacks from the current Rural Areas zoning, which requires a minimum 75' front setback. R-10 Residential zoning would allow a minimum front setback of 5' from Hydraulic Road, although the concept plan indicates that the proposed building would be set back a minimum of 35' potentially. Because R-10 zoning permits a maximum front setback of only 25', a special exception is also sought to waive this maximum front setback requirement. *County Code* § 18-4.19(4) allows the maximum front setback for a non-infill development to be increased by special exception to accommodate low impact design, unique parking or circulation plans, or a unique target market design. Staff believes that permitting a greater front setback on this property would accommodate a building location that is consistent with setbacks of buildings along that segment of Hydraulic Road, avoid disruption to existing parking and circulation plans and accommodate the future Lambs Loop Road.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached ordinance (Attachment E) to approve the ZMA202300008 High School Center II at Albemarle High School rezoning, as well as the attached resolution (Attachment F) to waive the maximum front setback requirement.

Ms. Rebecca Ragsdale, Planning Manager, said that the project was situated right across the street from Arbor Oaks. She said that this was a rezoning proposal for a portion of the Albemarle High School site. She said that it was along the frontage of the property, along Hydraulic Road, near the corner with Georgetown Green and Lambs Road. She said that the total property acreage was approximately 216 acres; however, this rezoning was for 9.9 acres, primarily to provide the school with flexibility in planning ahead for the campus in terms of setbacks. She said that due to the property being zoned Rural Areas, a 75-foot setback was required from Hydraulic Road. She said that this was limited to the 9.9 acres. She said that their requests entailed flexibility but also limited the uses, focusing on design flexibility.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the area proposed for rezoning included existing parking lots and the Building Services quadrant of the campus. She said that it was situated adjacent to Georgetown Green. She said that there were nearby institutional uses, churches, industrial facilities such as the Loaves and Fishes Pantry, and some residential areas and offices across the street.

Ms. Ragsdale said the site was zoned Rural Areas and was at the edge of the Development Area. She said that Georgetown Green was zoned R-6. She said there were nearby R-4 zones and a mix of commercial in the Development Area side. She said there were some industrial facilities with Loaves and Fishes Pantry. She said that this area was in the Rural Area, and it was along the edge of an already developed campus. She said that it was adjacent to a neighborhood service center and areas shown for Residential, Georgetown Green, as well as in the Rural Area.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the concept plan was included in the packet, which encompassed the existing parking area and Building Services. She said that the intended purpose was to provide Schools with flexibility in building height and setbacks. She said that regarding R-4, the minimum setback was 5 feet to the front, while the maximum setback limit was 25 feet. She said that they anticipated not getting any closer than 35 feet. She said that to exceed this maximum, a special exception was required in addition to acting on the rezoning.

Ms. Ragsdale said that another element of the concept was that no structure would be closer than 50 feet to Georgetown Green, which was important in terms of having increased setbacks for residential lines with more intense uses. She said that the blue line represented the future Lambs Lane loop road, which had detailed plans from the Schools. She said they would guide them through their campus planning and what they had planned so far. She said that the rezoning aimed to provide flexibility for Lambs Lane planning as it evolved, and that it was reviewed by various parties, including ARB (Architectural Review Board).

Ms. Ragsdale said that they felt that having buildings closer to the road along this stretch was consistent with the development pattern. She said that they would not typically approve more intensive zonings in Rural Areas; however, in their Comprehensive Plan, they discussed maximizing and utilizing their existing facilities and sites. She said that this was one that was already developed. She said that with a modern-day site plan, they would meet modern-day landscaping requirements and stormwater requirements, which would be beneficial.

Ms. Ragsdale said that it did go to the Planning Commission (PC) with a recommendation of approval and significant support. She said that they did not find any detriments to adjacent properties due to the increased setback to Georgetown. She said that they recommended approval.

Mr. Pruitt asked if the proffered restrictions on more intensive uses were applicable across all land or if they would be specific conditions that the current owner must agree to.

Ms. Ragsdale said that they believed that it was important to have certain conditions run with the land, so the proffers would run with the land, not with ownership or with Schools.

Mr. Pruitt said that he was unclear about the mechanical process involved.

Mr. Andy Herrick, Deputy County Attorney, said that the matter concerned zoning enforcement. He said that if a future owner failed to comply with the proffers, which involved code compliance, the Zoning Administrator, Mr. Bart Svoboda, would be able to ensure that the property remained consistent with how it had been proffered. He said that to clarify, yes, proffers did run with the land.

Ms. Mallek said that she was confused about why there was a jump to R-10 when it was merely a setback issue that could potentially be resolved by obtaining a waiver for the building. She said that she wanted to understand better the true reason behind this situation. She said that it appeared that there was no reason other than the setback in height for this decision.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the discussion regarding this matter had occurred, and there was no alternative option in the ordinance for Rural Areas zoning district. She said that in the case of the current zoning of the property, there was no special exception option available, unlike in Development Area districts. She said that they tried to find the least intensive way to go about it, which led them to develop this solution.

Mr. Andrews asked if that restriction was based on their authority or their ordinances, or if that was the reason they could not do this without a special exception.

Ms. Ragsdale said that they did not expressly allow that for the Rural Areas zoning district.

Mr. Andrews said that was due to the local ordinance.

Ms. Ragsdale said yes.

Mr. Herrick clarified that special exceptions could only be granted where the ordinance allowed for them, and there was no provision for special exceptions in cases of varying a setback in Rural Areas.

Mr. Andrews opened the public hearing and asked the Clerk if there were any speakers from the public.

Ms. Claudette Borgersen said there were none signed up to speak.

Mr. Andrews asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Mr. Kagan Squire said that he was a project manager working on High School Center II. He said that he was there with their consultants Quinn Evans and the Director of Building Services, Lindsay Snoddy. He said that they would be reviewing their request to rezone a portion of the Lambs Lane parcel which houses three County schools and several support facilities. He said that they would provide information on the plan schedule and overview of Center II, highlight the latest community engagement efforts they had been making to assist in the planning and design of the new facility, and discuss the traffic impacts from this project. He said that they would also be sharing an updated design for this building.

Mr. Squire said that the Center II project had recently completed its schematic design phase which was presented to the School Board last week. He said that initial cost estimates had come back higher than expected, but they were currently working through potential options to help bring these higher costs down. He said that they would continue with the design of the building through the end of this summer, with construction projected to begin in late fall of 2024, and the school facility opening for the 2026-2027 academic year.

Mr. Squire said that for this project, they were requesting to rezone approximately 9.9 acres of the Lambs Lane campus. He said that this request aimed to offer flexibility in design regarding setback and height restrictions. He said that their application requested a minimum setback of 35 feet from Hydraulic Roads and 50 feet from the Georgetown Green neighborhood property line. He said that the new building would accommodate approximately 400 students daily and would be approximately 60,000 square feet.

Mr. Squire said that the red-shaded area on the map displayed on the slide represented the proposed rezoning boundary of the parcel. He said that they limited the rezoning effort to this area to establish a clear boundary between the adjacent Development Areas and the Rural Area, thus meeting the Comprehensive Plan's intent to maintain a buffer between these two zoning districts. He said that this also helped preserve the rural character of the remaining portions of the parcel.

Mr. Squire said that the blue-outlined area within the proposed rezoning boundary outlined the potential location for Center II. He said that the dark-red-outlined area represented where replacement tennis courts and additional parking, intended for High School Center II, were proposed. He said that the blue line connecting Lambs Lane to Hydraulic Road was the proposed routing of the future loop road, which was part of the Lambs Lane Master Plan. He said that although building the loop road was not a part of this project, they had accounted for the space required to accommodate this in the future when that project was initiated.

Mr. Squire said that ACPS had held several community engagement opportunities for diverse stakeholder groups to seek feedback on the planning, programming, and design of Center II. He said that these opportunities dated back to spring 2020 before the project was paused due to the pandemic. He said that with efforts restarting this past spring, these groups included students, families, teachers, ACPS staff, local agencies, business leaders, and community groups.

Mr. Squire said that a traffic impact analysis was conducted in partnership with the local government to study the six intersections surrounding the Lambs Lane campus and this stretch of Hydraulic Road. He said that each intersection was evaluated using a scale to determine its current and future level of service, with 'A' being the best and 'F' being the worst. He said that the study also investigated the impact of completing the future loop road and considered three different scenarios for the best placement and terminus point for this proposed road. He said that the traffic impact analysis (TIA) assumed that the development of Lambs Lane campus would generate an increase of 25% over the existing total traffic entering the existing school complex and assumed an annual 2.2% growth rate over the next 10 years.

Mr. Squire said that for the two main intersections affected by this project, which were Hydraulic and Lambs Road, number three on the slide, and Hydraulic and Georgetown Green, which was number five, the projected levels of service in peak hours did not exceed a "C" level of service post development. He said that although the TIA was still being finalized, it recommends the best location and terminus for the future loop road. He said that the Center II project aimed to construct a small portion based on the TIA's recommended routing and to reconfigure the existing internal connector road in front of Albemarle

High School (AHS).

Mr. Squire said that the projected parking and transportation impacts were displayed in the current slide. He said that there was a need for 127 additional parking spaces for Center II. He said that it was estimated that Center II would generate 40 student drop-offs and pickups, 4 to 5 buses, and 20 bikers and walkers for the Lambs Lane campus. He said that bike and pedestrian facilities would be incorporated into the proposed final site plan. He said that of note was that Building Services would be relocated off-campus to another location, and the existing building would be demolished. He said that this would result in a decrease in traffic generated by that facility.

Mr. Charles Tilley said that he was with Quinn Evans Architects. He said that he would guide them through some images of the plans they were developing. He said that the location indicated on the slide represented High School Center II, the new building, which was approximately where Building Services was currently situated, as Mr. Squire mentioned. He said that the large triangle in the plan was AHS, and Hydraulic was located on the right-hand side. He said that they would be constructing an extension and realigning the road as it came off of Hydraulic, proceeding straight down and turning back toward the front of AHS, creating that connection.

Mr. Tilley said that they also proposed shifting some of the tennis courts around and adding parking for the center and the campus. He said that they had spent considerable time discussing traffic flow with the School Administration, particularly regarding parent drop-off and pick-up. He said that the line work displayed on the current map showed the development that ran through the on-campus roads. He said that the next slide was a closer view of the building, with the front of the building facing north toward the front of AHS, and the southside of the building primarily consisting of academic spaces.

Mr. Tilley said that the building featured a large central common space. He said that as the road approached the south edge of the property line, it turned northward and connected back to the front of campus. He said that they planned to convert the existing road into a pedestrian way that flowed back up toward Hydraulic Road. He said that the path would provide a safe route for students walking or biking to school. He said that the plan included developing a courtyard for indoor-outdoor spaces adjacent to the school. He said that the dashed line represented the future Lamb's Lane extension, which would connect at that point.

Mr. Tilley said that next was a brief early perspective, looking up from the Hydraulic viewpoint. He said that this was the center entrance to AHS. He said that one could see the entrance of AHS to the right and the proposed building in the background. He said that they aimed to preserve many of those great views toward the mountains as one entered the campus. He said that the building was roughly of the same scale as AHS but shifted slightly to the south.

Mr. Tilley said that as one entered the campus and looked back toward the building, this was the north face of the building. He said that this entry draws one into the building, creating a plaza in front that will see numerous students from AHS coming to and from this building during the day. He said that they wanted to make that connection a strong one. He said that upon entering the building, there would be a large common space for students and after-hours use. He said that the building beyond these stairs houses the two-story academic areas where all student labs were located. He said that looking back toward the front, this area was the administration section located to the left. He said that AHS could be seen out of the window to the left, while the courtyard was situated to the right.

Mr. Tilley said that next was a view of the courtyard. He said that the terrace parking was situated just below Hydraulic, which was located above that area. He said that to provide an understanding of the overall sustainability approach incorporated into the project, the building was oriented toward the south, maximizing daylight in classrooms. He said that the building had been designed around this courtyard featuring native landscaping and rainwater, stormwater collection features that could serve as learning opportunities for students. He said that the project would be pursuing LEAD Silver certification and would include geothermal HVAC systems.

Mr. Squire showed a slide and said that it listed just some of the ways that the project and the rezoning aligned with the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Pruitt said that he appreciated the informative presentation and that he was broadly supportive of the project. He said that he wanted to draw everyone's attention to a specific line from the PC that he found helpful. He said that Mr. Bivins stated that this was in his district, his neighborhood, and his street. He said that Mr. Bivins had been supportive of the project since its inception and that throughout the various iterations of the project, the team made strong efforts to engage with the community regarding issues not only related to the project but also concerning life near the high school. He said that they should consider their own experiences in high school and the communities they passed daily. He said that he believed that was a very powerful statement.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said that she was genuinely impressed by the natural lighting proposal, which featured clear story lighting. She said that she believed this was an excellent idea. She said that she found it particularly impressive that this center section was designed for students to use after school for studying. She said that she thought the proposal was outstanding.

Ms. McKeel said that she wanted to express her gratitude to the School Division staff who hosted community meetings with the neighbors at Georgetown Green to alleviate their initial concerns about this project. She asked if the stormwater issues that the neighborhood currently faced would be alleviated with

the new stormwater management system.

Mr. Tilley said yes. He said that all of the area of Building Services, which included sheds in the back and other similar structures, did not have stormwater facilities that they were aware of. He said that this was part of the problem, and they would be developing the entire site to accommodate the stormwater.

Ms. McKeel said that they also wanted to ensure that there were plantings for buffering, which the plans had accommodated. She said that the only other concern mentioned in the meetings was the noise from the generators affecting Georgetown Green. She said that the School Division agreed to provide buffering for those generators to minimize noise levels. She asked if everything was clear regarding this matter.

Mr. Squire said that they committed to working with them once they progressed further in design to accommodate all of that.

Mr. Gallaway said that he came in tonight seeking clarification regarding the tennis courts and parking. He said that he did not fully understand that aspect, and it had been made clear in the picture and the fact that the loop road would remain in its current location. He said that his only questions did not seem directly related to this application. He said that he would ask them and perhaps address them in a future CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) or budget discussion. He said that he was not expecting the large commons area in the Center II. He said that he believed that these centers would not necessarily be attached to existing high schools.

Mr. Gallaway said that he understood why they were doing this and did not dispute the decision. He said that assuming that that had all been discussed and figured out, and he would appreciate being directed to the relevant conversation regarding programmatically how this would work in proximity to their largest high school already. He said that he would imagine that there would be benefits to that, and he was curious what the School Board and administration had discussed when they brainstormed on that. He said that if this information could be provided at some point, it would be greatly appreciated.

Ms. Mallek said during her drive to the site that day, she realized that she should ask if the trees currently located to the west of the Building Services Department would remain. She said that they were tall and effectively screened many of the poles and other structures toward the football field.

Mr. Tilley said that they were not going to be touching any of the area near the stormwater behind Building Services, and that the pine grove located on the corner of the property near Hydraulic would all be kept as it currently was.

Ms. Mallek said that the pine grove had been there since she was there in the 1960s. She said that Corey Clayborne and the PC asked about the possibility of designing the area so that it could potentially be used as an emergency shelter in the future. She said that they had previously discussed emergency shelter options at their schools and firehouses earlier today. She said that perhaps the commons area could serve as a gathering place for people during emergencies. She said that regarding generators, she would like to know if they were running 24/7 for school operations.

Mr. Tilley said that no, they were there for backup purposes. He said that they had some food services, which included refrigerators and other equipment. He also said that there were life safety systems and that kind of thing.

Ms. Mallek confirmed that it would only be in times of power outages.

Ms. McKeel clarified that the concern of the neighbors at Georgetown Green was that the generators would be tested once per week.

Mr. Andrews closed the public hearing and brought the matter back before the Board for additional comments.

Mr. Pruitt said that perhaps this was better suited for other matters from the Board, but he would go ahead and address it now. He said that he wanted to ensure that they fully addressed the issue that he believed Ms. Mallek and Mr. Andrews were focusing on, which was that they had imposed a restriction on themselves against special exemptions in Rural Areas. He said that this was the primary reason that they were going through a fairly arduous process that day. He said that the nature of both their questions led him to wonder if they believed that this was actually serving the County or if it was something that should be revisited as they reviewed their zoning code. He said that he wanted to clearly highlight and draw everyone's attention to this matter.

Ms. McKeel said that during the PC meeting, there was a suggestion that an additional floor could be added to the building. She said that this idea came from someone who worked at the University of Virginia, who often constructed an extra story with a blank floor until it was needed due to cost efficiency. She said that although this design was not currently included in the plans, she would like to suggest that in future school and facility designs, they should consider incorporating such a feature. She said that by planning for potential growth 10 to 15 years ahead, they could save costs by leaving space above for future expansion. She said that this practice was common at the University of Virginia.

Mr. Andrews said that he was supportive of the plan, appreciating that they were primarily asked to consider the rezoning and setback. He said that he particularly liked that the view to the west had been maintained. He said that he was not particularly interested in revisiting the ordinance at this point, he acknowledged that this was a very unusual case since they were attempting to find a way to work around the setback requirements for a use that was otherwise allowed in Rural Areas.

Mr. Andrews said that if there were no other comments or concerns, the matter was open for a motion.

Ms. McKeel **moved** that the Board adopt the ordinance attached to the staff report as Attachment E.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

**ORDINANCE NO. 24-A(3)
ZMA 2023-00008**

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP FOR
A PORTION OF PARCEL 06000-00-00-078A0**

WHEREAS, application ZMA 2023-00008 was submitted to rezone a 9.9-acre portion of Parcel 06000-00-00-078A0 from Rural Areas (RA) to R-10 Residential with proffers; and

WHEREAS, on November 28, 2023, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission recommended approval of ZMA 2023-00008;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that upon consideration of the transmittal summary and staff report prepared for ZMA 2023-00008 and their attachments, the signed Proffers dated January 3, 2024, the information presented at the public hearings, any written comments received, the material and relevant factors in Virginia Code § 15.2-2284 and County Code § 18-17.1, and for the purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practices, the Board hereby approves ZMA 2023-00008, subject to the signed Proffers dated January 3, 2024.

Ms. McKeel **moved** that the Board adopt the resolution attached to the staff report as Attachment F.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Andrews, Mr. Gallaway, Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Mallek, Ms. McKeel, and Mr. Pruitt.
NAYS: None.

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE
SE 2023-00039 HIGH SCHOOL CENTER II
AT ALBEMARLE HIGH SCHOOL**

WHEREAS, upon consideration of the staff reports prepared for SE2023-00039 High School Center II at Albemarle High School and the attachments thereto, including staff's supporting analysis, any comments received, and all relevant factors in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-4.19 and 18-33.9, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby finds that:

1. The maximum front setback should be waived by special exception to accommodate unique parking or circulation plans on the subject parcel; and
2. The proposed special exception is consistent with the intent of the R-10 Residential zoning district and the Neighborhood Model Principles of the Comprehensive Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves a special exception to waive the 25-foot maximum front setback requirement of County Code § 184.19 on Parcel 06000-00-00-078A0.

Agenda Item No.17. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Mallek said that in their mailboxes, there were some handouts from her. She said that one was about the NACo (National Association of Counties) blueprint from the meeting that weekend. She said that this particular storybook was written by Matt Chase, who was the Executive Director of NACo, National Association of Counties, with assistance from his sixth-grade son. She said that over Christmas break, his son had said that he did not know what counties did. She said that the reason he shared them during the meeting was what he learned about the difficulty of AI (Artificial Intelligence) and the implicit biases that arose when using AI to write this book.

Ms. Mallek said that he had to spend days working around these issues because every time they included a female character, they had to ensure she was dressed in a business suit, and all the different ways to depict people. She said that she appreciated seeing regular-looking people in this story because achieving this could be quite challenging. She said that this experience highlighted that there was a much larger problem with AI and its potential biases. She said that they would likely face significant challenges when dealing with AI in the future, especially when trying to present factual information without falling into biased patterns. She said that writing this simple children's story proved frustrating for him but also served as a valuable lesson.

Ms. Mallek said that the second item was the failure of the United States Postal Service. She said that they talked about this a little bit and had a briefing with federal representatives, and that she had asked Mr. Perez if this was on the White House's worry list, and he said not today, although many people from other states in the room expressed that they faced similar problems. She said that the seven-day mail delivery time from Charlottesville to Earlysville was another concern. She said that they had just learned that mail sent to the County did not have a postmark. She said that to gather more information, they could check their local post offices in their region. She said that she would bring this issue to VACo (Virginia Association of Counties).

Ms. Mallek said that the information she had received from people who had spoken to the Earlysville Postmistress and other rural places was that centralization was being considered. She said that mail sorting would no longer occur at the remote locations closest to the people, but would be moved to the 22906 post office, which was the least efficient in their region. She said that they would be getting rid of the sorting staff at local post offices, and this was just the next step to shutting them down altogether. She said that the federal government could not seem to figure out how to gain control of the Postal Service, which was their problem.

Ms. Mallek said that addressing this issue would require all of them to take action because this was a disaster. She said that it was indeed a health and safety issue. She was certain that she was not alone in representing people who could not drive and relied solely on their mail for everything, including receiving medication and sending tax bills. She said that one of her elder constituents from Jarman's Gap faced difficulty in sending her tax bill due to the mailbox flag being up for five days. She said that she finally walked down to her mailbox and took out her tax bill because she was afraid that someone might take it, and this was due to the chaos caused by the current Western District Post Office at that time. She said that they were doing much better now, but still delivering twice a week to the rural areas of Albemarle County in 2023 was pathetic.

Ms. Mallek said that she hoped that she would be able to generate enough momentum on this issue to prompt some action somewhere. She said that one of her constituents said that this was the most important issue for equity that they could think about because anyone, regardless of their means, had access to a functioning postal service. She said that this connection allowed them to maintain contact with the world and their families. She said that they did not need a phone or internet because they could still survive; all that was required was an address. She said that she was very concerned about this matter and would gather additional information, keeping the Board informed of her findings. She said that she hoped that they could pool their stories together and share them.

Agenda Item No. 18. Adjourn to February 7, 2024, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium.

At 7:24 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to February 7, 2024, 1:00 p.m. Lane Auditorium. Opportunities for the public to access and participate in this meeting are posted on the Albemarle County website on the Board of Supervisors home page and on the Albemarle County calendar. Participation will include the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public will be received.

Chair

Approved by Board
Date: 06/04/2025
Initials: CKB