

A regular meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on March 16, 2022 at 1:00 p.m. This meeting was held by electronic communication means using Zoom and a telephonic connection, due to the COVID-19 state of emergency.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Ned Gallaway (arrived at 1:27 p.m.), Ms. Beatrice (Bea) J.S. LaPisto-Kirtley, Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Ms. Diantha H. McKeel, Mr. Jim Andrews, and Ms. Donna P. Price.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Jeffrey B. Richardson; County Attorney, Greg Kamptner; Clerk, Claudette K. 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, Ms. Donna Price.

Ms. Price said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." She said that the opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting were posted on the Albemarle County website, on the Board of Supervisors' homepage, and on the Albemarle County calendar. He stated that participation included the opportunity to comment on those matters for which comments from the public would be received.

---

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

---

Agenda Item No. 4. Adoption of Final Agenda.

Ms. McKeel said she would like to have a very brief discussion at the end of the meeting about the magisterial district mapping they would be talking about next Wednesday.

Ms. Price said they would add that under Item 19. She asked if there were any further amendments. Hearing none, she asked if there was a motion to adopt the agenda as amended.

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Gallaway.

---

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

Ms. McKeel thanked the Board of Supervisor members who had signed up for a tour of the Albemarle County Regional Jail.

Ms. Mallek said it was time for the drinking water clinic for testing of well water, which was sponsored by Virginia Cooperative Extension. She said pickup day was May 2, and drop-off for samples was May 4. She said more information and forms can be obtained by calling the Cooperative Extension Office, 434-872-5480. She said she was sure they would have things online as well. She said it was also time for the Volunteer Firefighter scavenger hunt, which was one of their fundraisers they did for outfitting their building. She said after 65 years, they had raised a tremendous amount of money and were on their third facility in that period of time. She said the scavenger hunt would be done via car, which had been popular during the Covid-19 pandemic. She said it would take place at various businesses within the Crozet Fire Company's 78 square miles that cover. She said the date was March 26, and advance tickets could be purchased at the firehouse or online at the fire company website.

Ms. Mallek said she wanted to make people aware of the "gold card" for senior citizens who would like to go to Albemarle County Public Schools events such as plays or music events and not have to buy a ticket online.

Ms. Mallek said that Rosie May Garrison Keaton, who was born in 1928, passed away on March 2. She said she was the last surviving Albemarle citizen who was born in the mountains that had become Shenandoah National Park. She said she was four years old when her family was evicted from their land, and they moved into western lands of Albemarle County. She said Rosie had a sparkle when she met her at age 79 and still had it when she was making cider at age 91. She said she loved music and was a regular with her husband, Woodrow, playing mountain music into the early 2000s at gatherings all around the district.

Ms. Mallek said the Garrison family was one of the hundreds who were memorialized at the chimney erected by the Blue Ridge Heritage Project at Byrom Park. She said Rosie and her family were

among the 125 descendants who dedicated the chimney on November 5, 2016. She said the stone came from a farm up the road, and the chimney was built by masons from the area. She said they also built the pavilion next to the chimney, which provided shade and rest for hikers in the park as well as their families who visited the memorial. She said that Rosie's sparkle would live on in her granddaughter, and those songs would live on forever.

Ms. Price thanked Ms. Mallek for her remarks and said it was good to remember the impact on people, even if it were for the greater good, there were individuals that had to change. She said she had several announcements. She said they had continued to receive communications from their community members about debris on the roadways or rights-of-way from primarily the January 3 storm. She said it had been well over 60 days. She said it largely fell under VDOT to clean up, unless it happened to be on a utility line, and then the utility company was responsible. She said the Culpeper VDOT district estimated that the debris to be removed would exceed 600,000 cubic yards. She said if that area were measured as the shape of a cube, it would be .193 miles, or over 1,000 feet in length, width, and height. She said the damage that was incurred in this district was immense, so she wanted to applaud the crews who were still out there clearing the debris, and simply asked the community to continue to have patience. She said it would probably be another month or two before they would be able to fully clear the roads.

Ms. Price said last week she had the opportunity to meet with some people from the Downtown Crozet Initiative, and she was impressed with what they had done, and they had information today about the Broadway Blueprint for a similar sort of initiative she had been talking about with the mayor and town administrator in Scottsville. She said it was a great way for community members to get together and put into plans the vision they had for their particular area. She said the ideas for improvement with the plaza in Crozet were impressive.

Ms. Price said a couple of weekends ago, a group in Scottsville gathered together and collected trash along the highway. She said she not only had the opportunity to improve the neighborhood, but also spent 90 minutes in conversation with Vice Mayor Daniel Gritsko of the Scottsville Town Council. She said it was a wonderful opportunity to meet neighbors and collaborate. She said there had been a book signing at Scottsville, and there was a "Picture Climate Justice" exhibit at the Jefferson School that showed how many different demographic areas of their community were working together to improve their policies so they would not further degrade the environment. She said just this week, they received a proclamation from the governor for the recognition of Women's History Month, but they and the County had already done a proclamation, so she would not read it into the record. She thanked the Governor's Office for taking that step and sending the proclamation, and she would give it to the Clerk to be added to the record.

Ms. Price said Item 8.b. on today's consent agenda was a resolution declaring the local emergency had ended. She said that was positive news, but they were not out of the woods yet. She said two years ago this week, they went virtual. She said two years ago, she estimated they may lose as many as 250,000 to 300,000 Americans from this pandemic, and today they were at over 960,000 American deaths. She said 80 million Americans had been infected, which was about 25% of the population. She said today, health organizations were paying close attention to the "stealth Omicron BA2 virus," a subvariant of the Omicron variant they had just experienced but was considered to be more severe. She said it resisted monoclonal treatments, but boosters would help. She said people should get their shots and boosters if they had not already.

Ms. Price said over the last couple of years, only about 10% of Albemarle County's population had been infected with the virus versus 25% of the country, and their infections, hospitalizations, and deaths were similarly lower than other places around the country. She said while they were looking to return to what the new normal would be, they could not ignore that this virus was still out there, and she wanted to encourage all of their community members to continue to practice safety, vaccinations, and booster vaccines so they could continue to get through this.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she neglected to announce that on April 2 and 3, Proffitt Road and Polo Grounds Road would be having their bi-annual road cleanup.

---

Agenda Item No. 6. Proclamations and Recognitions.

Item No. 6.a. Proclamation Recognizing March 2022 as the 20th Annual March for Meals Month.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to adopt the proclamation recognizing March as the annual March for Meals Month and read it into the record. Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Gallaway.

Ms. Goldstein thanked the Board for the proclamation. She said they had dealt with a large increase in people who needed their services since Covid-19 began, so she appreciated the awareness and would like to thank Ms. Price for coming to their next week's Week of Champions where they would be highlighting community members who brought more awareness to the cause.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she appreciated the program that helped so many people who were

unable to get meals for whatever reason. She said it was a way for the County and the Meals on Wheels program to respect that they should care for people as they aged.

Mr. Andrews said that it was important to emphasize connectivity, and Meals on Wheels was one of those examples of how they could maintain connections with people.

Ms. McKeel said it was a wonderful program, and Meals on Wheels was often praised at JABA board meetings. She said it had been critical for seniors to receive meals during the Covid-19 pandemic, but the delivery by a human being was an important interaction for people as well.

Ms. Mallek said that the personal contacts with Meals on Wheels deliverers and recipients could sometimes become decades-long relationships and were very much like a family. She said as they did not have as many multi-generational families living in the same compound as they did when she was a child. She said without that, it was difficult for people to connect with others and that could lead to degrading mental health. She said she was glad to see that Mary Scott Lake had passed along the mantle of being a delivery person to her granddaughter. She said sometimes when there were storms, Meals on Wheels delivery was closed, and she would like to know how those situations were handled.

Ms. Goldstein said that January was terrible. She said they spent those three weeks delivering "blizzard bags," which contained three meals of shelf-stable food so that they could get them to people once a week. She said they would have breaks during which they would send out more food in case there was more snow the next week, which did happen. She said that was the backup plan, and they had a supplemental food program once a month regardless of weather.

Ms. Price said it surprised her that Meals on Wheels had only begun in the early 1970s, because it had seemed like a constant in her life. She said they were a mainstay of organizations that took care of people in need, and there was always a new calamity that would have to be dealt with, whether it was financial like the Great Recession or biological like the pandemic. She said it is comforting to know that there were organizations like Meals on Wheels and people like Ms. Goldstein and their volunteers who worked to take care of people. She said they were all looking forward to moving into a sense of normalcy and personal connection. She thanked Ms. Goldstein for inviting her to be a part of their event next Monday.

Ms. Goldstein thanked the Board for the kind words.

---

**PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MARCH 2022 AS THE  
20<sup>th</sup> ANNUAL MARCH FOR MEALS MONTH**

**WHEREAS,** on March 22, 1972, President Richard Nixon signed into law a measure that amended the Older Americans Act of 1965 and established a national nutrition program for seniors 60 years and older; and

**WHEREAS,** Meals on Wheels America established the March for Meals campaign in March 2002 to recognize the historic month, the importance of the Older Americans Act Nutrition Programs, and raise awareness about the escalating problem of senior hunger in America; and

**WHEREAS,** the 2022 observance of March for Meals celebrates 20 years of providing an opportunity to support Meals on Wheels programs that deliver vital and critical services by donating, volunteering, and raising awareness about senior hunger and isolation; and

**WHEREAS,** the Meals on Wheels program in Albemarle County has served our community admirably for 44 years, serving 322 homebound citizens and delivering 66,720 home-delivered meals in 2021, and volunteers for the Meals on Wheels program in Albemarle County have provided nutritious meals to seniors, individuals with disabilities, and others throughout Albemarle County that help them maintain their health and independence, thereby preventing unnecessary falls, hospitalizations and/or premature institutionalization; and

**WHEREAS,** the Meals on Wheels program in Albemarle County provides a powerful socialization opportunity for millions of seniors and other homebound citizens to help combat loneliness and isolation and deserves recognition for the heroic contributions and essential services they have provided amid the COVID-19 pandemic and will continue to provide to local communities, our State, and our Nation long after it is over.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT PROCLAIMED,** that we, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, do hereby recognize March 2022 as the 20<sup>th</sup> Annual March for Meals Month and urge every citizen to take this month to honor the Meals on Wheels program, the seniors and other disable citizens they serve, and the volunteers who care for them.

Signed this 16th day of March 2022.

---

Item No. 6.b. Resolution of Appreciation for Greg Kamptner.

Ms. Price **moved** to adopt the Resolution of Appreciation for Greg Kamptner and read it into the record. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Mr. Kamptner thanked the Board. He thanked Mr. Larry Davis for bringing him into the County organization in 1995 and thanked the Board for appointing him in 2016 as the County Attorney. He said he had been very fortunate to spend a good part of his career here doing what he loved to do in an organization and community that he cared so much about. He said he also appreciated and thanked his family who put up with his weird schedule. He said probably twenty years ago or so, he happened to be home on a Tuesday night, which was a rarity, because Tuesday nights in the County government were Planning Commission nights. He said one of his children said they did not know what to do with him on a Tuesday night because they had their own lifestyle set up on Tuesdays, and later, on Wednesdays.

Mr. Kamptner thanked his office for making his job a lot easier. He said they were a wonderful group of attorneys, paralegals, and their legal service coordinator, who had a tremendous amount of expertise and dedication. He said they made it a pleasure to work either virtually or in the office with them. He said Marsha Davis, their local services coordinator and his assistant, steered him in the right direction and reminded him of all the different things he needed to do each day. He said she would be retiring at the end of June this year, so their office would be going through a major transition, but they were resilient, and he had complete confidence that they would continue on with the tradition of their office.

Mr. Kamptner thanked the organization overall, including the County Executive's Office and County staff. He said over the last two years, particularly working in virtual meetings, with the duress and pressure they were under to keep government going, there was a certain lightheartedness that worked its way into meetings where they were dealing with some serious issues, and that helped him, but also helped the others who were involved. He thanked the Board and said it had been a wonderful 27 years.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said they would all miss Mr. Kamptner. She said that in her career, she had met a lot of very good attorneys, but Mr. Kamptner was the gold standard of those, and she would miss him a lot even though they had only worked together for two years. She said his reputation preceded him, and his kindness and thoroughness had kept them on a level playing field and kept them out of jail. She said he had been so dedicated over the years and dedicated to everything he did. She said on a personal note, she would miss him because he was a good person and outstanding attorney. She said they would do their best to replace him.

Mr. Gallaway said he was tired of saying goodbye. He asked if as the County Attorney he could outlaw retirements.

Mr. Kamptner said he was afraid not.

Mr. Gallaway said that as things had started to move, and he had started to interact with more people around the Commonwealth, he did not appreciate or understand just how high in regard Mr. Kamptner was held by those around Virginia. He said that he should be commended for that, because that came from all the attributes that he saw working with him on a regular basis, but everyone from afar also witnessed. He said as a Board member, he had an intense trust and comfortability with him as their attorney, and it was critical for elected officials to do what they did with making policy in the government. He said his commitment to Albemarle County was centralized in the fact that he was a community member. He said his faithfulness to the County as an organization and an employer was to be commended as well.

Mr. Gallaway said the wisdom of Mr. Kamptner's counsel was not only the legal counsel, but his specific ability of being able to say yes where others may say no, and doing so in a creative way, was appreciated by him. He said he had been told of Mr. Kamptner's usual daily workload by another staff member, and it astounded him. He said Mr. Kamptner had certainly earned the time in his retirement to be spent doing things he enjoyed and to put work aside. He said he suspected that Mr. Kamptner would do so with the same humility that he had held his position, and he wished him all the best of retirement and was incredibly grateful of his service.

Mr. Andrews said he had not had anywhere near enough time to work with Mr. Kamptner, which he regretted. He said when looking at all the things that must be learned to become an effective Supervisor, he had been recommended by someone to read Mr. Kamptner's land use law handbook, which was advice that he greatly appreciated. He said he was sure Mr. Kamptner would have lots of time to devote to the new addition to that. He said there was more time set aside for proclamations than usual today, so he assumed everyone had a lot they wanted to say, but he wanted to say that he knew that Mr. Kamptner was nearly impossible to replace in his position, so he was grateful to have been able to work with him even if it was for a short while.

Ms. McKeel said she did not remember a time when Mr. Kamptner and Ms. Davis were not around. She said it was very like him to mention Ms. Davis. She said the organization would desperately miss both of them, and she wanted to thank him personally for all of those unscheduled calls she had made to him, and all the hours he had spent advising her over the years. She said he made their

organization, community, and the Supervisors better, and for that they thanked him.

Ms. Mallek said her first memory of Mr. Kamptner was in 2000 when he became assigned to trying to put together a fledgling conservation easements program onto paper, and it was a terrible burden on Mr. Kamptner as the 16 people involved wanted different things, and he was trying to make it all happen. She said he had such respect all across the Commonwealth, and as she began to get involved with State and Supervisor things in 2008, people knew of Albemarle because of Mr. Kamptner and all the positions he had taken in the organization, so it was clear that he had brought recognition and honor to the County on everyone's behalf. She said she was also so grateful that he found solutions when the path forward was unclear. She said he embodied lifelong learning, and she hoped he kept that task, and that in the next 27 years, he found some other things that he wanted to be involved in. She said she was grateful for the interactions they had and guidance he had provided.

Ms. Price said that they had all faced the situations of wondering what characteristics were desirable for an employee or representative, and to her, the most important were ethics and integrity. She said Mr. Kamptner's performance both as a professional and as he lived his life, were the epitome of those character traits, and she believed that was at the core of who he was. She said what was so significant in that those who were in the political world and had to deal with competing interests and influences, they had to struggle more to find what they thought was the balance, but they always knew that when they went to Mr. Kamptner, he could draw the lines that needed to be drawn and give the guidance that helped them make the best and right decisions.

Ms. Price said that in 45 years as an attorney, she thought the act that they as a Board had been able to do that she was most proud of was to have been the first local community government in the Commonwealth of Virginia to be able to remove confederate iconography from courthouse grounds. She said she did not think they belonged in a courthouse at all. She said Mr. Kamptner, along with others on County staff, helped them do it the right way, and she would always take great pride in their ability to do that, which was in large measure because Mr. Kamptner had been able to help them be able to do it right. She thanked him on behalf of on the entire community for his public service.

Mr. Kamptner said thank you.

---

#### **Resolution of Appreciation for Gustav Gregory Kamptner**

**WHEREAS**, for a total of 27 years serving the County Attorney's Office, including six years as County Attorney, Gustav Gregory "Greg" Kamptner has provided the Board of Supervisors and County staff with critical legal advice regarding significant and complex issues in a variety of specialized areas related to land use planning, zoning regulations, ministerial processes, and enabling legislation - freely sharing his expertise with colleagues across the Commonwealth through his highly-regarded and annually updated Land Use Law Handbook and related classroom teaching; and

**WHEREAS**, Greg's many contributions were recognized in 2015 by the Local Government Attorneys of Virginia, which presented him with the prestigious Cherin Award in honor of his distinguished public service that reflects a personal commitment to the highest ethical and professional principles and which has enhanced the image of local government attorneys in the Commonwealth; and

**WHEREAS**, during his six-year tenure as the County Attorney, Greg advanced numerous important Board intergovernmental and public-private partnership initiatives, including the expansion and renovation of the County Courts Complex, and performance agreements for the Southwood redevelopment project, Woolen Mills/Willow Tree adaptive re-use project, Barnes Lumber mixed-use site redevelopment project, among many others; and

**WHEREAS**, Greg further distinguished himself guiding the County through significant disruption brought about by violent civil unrest in the summer of 2017 and subsequent events, and through the application of the new state code enabling localities to move, remove, or relocate war memorials, and through his extraordinary work providing critical leadership and all-around good counsel for Albemarle County and other localities throughout the two years of the COVID-19 pandemic – providing research findings, developing policies and procedures, and preparing model ordinances for the declaration of a local emergency, the continuity of government operations, and the prevention of the spread of the COVID-19 virus; and

**WHEREAS**, as an exceptional attorney who has consistently provided the highest level of dedicated, ethical, and valuable service, Greg has been indispensable to the County government and the epitome of a faithful public servant.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that we, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors do hereby honor and commend Greg Kamptner for his many years of exceptional service to the County of Albemarle, its residents, the County Attorney's Office, the broader community in which we live, and the Commonwealth of Virginia. Albemarle County is strengthened and distinguished by Greg's dedication, commitment, and professionalism in meeting County government and community needs.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that this Resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting, of the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, as a lasting and visible testament to the esteem in which Greg is held, by this Board and previous Boards for his lasting legacy of government service and the tangible results from his work to make Albemarle County better for future generations.

Signed this 16th day of March 2022.

---

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

Mr. Peter Krebs introduced himself and said he was speaking on behalf of the Piedmont Environmental Council. He said a number of Supervisors mentioned some signs of spring, and he wanted to add a few more to the list. He said there were daffodils, allergies, spring break, and also reviewing the list of rural roads slated for paving. He said there were numerous factors that contributed to the decision of whether or not to pave a given road, but conservation and recreation values play prominently into these decisions. He said Albemarle's unpaved rural roads were unmatched in terms of scenery, fresh air, and cost-free public access to open space in rural communities. He said they embodied the characteristics and connection to nature and history that were so important and valuable to them all.

Mr. Krebs said because paving was a one-way process and could change the character of a community, it should be undertaken cautiously and with intentionality. He said he would simply recommend following the example set by their peers in Loudoun County, which was taking a very methodical approach to preserving select rural roads to balance historic, environmental, cultural, and transportation goals. He thanked them for their service and intentional and methodical approach to governing the County and shaping a positive future for them all.

---

Agenda Item No. 8. Consent Agenda.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to approve the consent agenda as presented. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

Mr. Gallaway noted that in the consent agenda, they approved declaring the local emergency had ended. He said it was a handful of days past the two-year mark that the state of emergency was put into place. He said he would love to ask a historian when the last time they had a local emergency that lasted that length of time. He said it was certainly worthy to note that that passed, and Mr. Richardson and Mr. Kamptner should be commended for their leadership through that two-year time, and all of their staff should be commended for the work they did to guide them through this local emergency. He said there was still work left to be done, and they would still be mindful of it all.

Ms. Price said the reason they had done so well was because of everyone who had contributed to this, which were the community members, but also Mr. Richardson, Mr. Walker, Mr. Henry, and Mr. Kamptner and his team had worked for months on end 24/7 to keep their County safe, and they all owed a great debt of gratitude to their standing firm in the face of some opposition to social distancing, masks, and promoting vaccinations. She thanked Supervisor Gallaway for bringing that up.

Ms. Mallek said they had learned so much from their success during the Covid-19 pandemic that was based upon a willingness to change processes for the better, and they learned how to do things better that helped them far into the future. She said she was thinking particularly of having remote participation and meetings for their citizens. She said something that people in their community had learned was how to care better for their neighbors, and she hoped that would continue as well.

---

Item No. 8.1. Approval of Minutes: December 15, 2021.

Mr. Gallaway had read the minutes of December 15, 2021, and found them to be in order.

**By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the minutes of December 15, 2021.**

---

Item No. 8.2. Schedule a Public Hearing to Consider a Stillhouse Ridge Rural Preservation Boundary Line Adjustment.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the County approved the Stillhouse Ridge Rural Preservation Development in 2005. The approval required the dedication of a tract of at least 40 acres to perpetual open space use. The owner granted the County and the ACEA (formerly the Albemarle County Public Recreation Facilities Authority) a conservation easement over a 40.134-acre tract (the Preservation Tract) by deed dated November 10, 2002 (Attachment A).

The Stillhouse Ridge Subdivision Plat prepared in 2004 identified an encroachment by the

neighboring property (Crisler Property) involving the corner of a house and a private driveway to Plank Road (Attachment B, Sheet 3 of 3). Regarding the encroachment, the owner of the Preservation Tract sent a "letter to the owner of the house at the time but did not receive a reply. [He] was not concerned with that small piece as traditionally the creek had been understood as the boundary," according to the owner's email of January 20, 2021.

The Rural Preservation Development was reviewed and approved without mention of the encroachment in the public record. It should have been corrected then, prior to final approval upon the exercise of due diligence. The ACEA agreed on December 9, 2021 that this is subject to correction and authorized its Chair to execute necessary documents (Attachment C).

The new owner of the Preservation Tract, the Daniel Living Trust, plans to exercise its right to construct a dwelling on the property. The trustees discovered the encroachment and wish to correct it to remove any potential defect in the title, which will allow them to secure financing. They agreed with their neighbor to adjust the boundary line to eliminate the encroachment while maintaining the Preservation Tract's qualifying acreage. Thus, the boundary line adjustment will shift 6,656 square feet of land from the Preservation Tract to the Crisler property and will shift an equal area of land from the Crisler property to the Preservation Tract, shown in Attachment D.

The adjustment to the Preservation Tract is open, unimproved land that will increase the conservation values. Virginia Code § 55.1-609(G) permits parties to correct error in deeds that "vary from the actual understanding of the parties at the time it was entered." 1997-1998 Va. Op. Atty. Gen. 124. Here, the Preservation Tract owner notified the neighbor of the encroachment with the intent to correct it. All other parties were on notice of the encroachment by virtue of the survey plat, but none raised it or addressed it. The oversight should have been corrected in the exercise of due diligence. A public hearing is necessary pursuant to Virginia Code § 15.2-1800(B), as this correction involves the disposal, albeit a corrective exchange, of the County's interest in real property.

No impact on the budget is expected.

Staff recommends that the Board schedule a public hearing to consider approving the Stillhouse Ridge Rural Preservation Boundary Line Adjustment.

**By the above-recorded vote, the Board authorized staff to schedule a public hearing to consider approving the Stillhouse Ridge Rural Preservation Boundary Line Adjustment.**

---

Item No. 8.3. Resolution of Intent to Amend the Zoning Ordinance to Revise Stream Buffer Regulations.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that, during a work session on December 1, 2021, the Board of Supervisors reviewed fourteen proposals to improve stream health in the County. The proposals were developed as part of the Stream Health Initiative, a multi-year effort to engage community members and stakeholders to develop strategies and solutions for improving stream health. The Board supported the staff recommendation and directed staff to begin working on those proposals that are immediately actionable and to submit budget requests for those requiring additional resources. Proposal 1, Stream Buffer Overlay District, involves the clarification and expansion of regulations and enforcement mechanisms for retention and management of stream buffers (Attachment B).

Perpetual retention and management of stream buffers is a requirement of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and was required in Chapter 17 of the County Code (Water Protection Ordinance) prior to 2014; one of the reasons cited for its removal was lack of enforcement mechanisms and capacity for enforcement. Current regulations require retention of vegetation and avoidance of impacts within stream buffers during a regulated land disturbing activity (LDA) only. Development and clarification of regulations to require that stream buffers be retained irrespective of a regulated LDA, while maintaining the existing exemptions outlined in Chapter 17 for agriculture, forestry, and other limited activities, would help address known water quality impairments by filtering non-point source pollution and minimizing erosion and sedimentation. Establishing and retaining a broad network of stream buffers on the landscape further supports the County's goals for climate resiliency and biodiversity conservation.

Including a stream buffer overlay in County Code § 18-30, Overlay Districts, and revising other associated sections of the County Code, should clarify permitted uses and activities within stream buffers and should include adequate provisions for enforcement of the regulations.

The process of development and review of the regulations will include the following steps:

- Staff research of other jurisdiction's regulations and development of draft regulations;
- Public input, building on the extensive stakeholder and community engagement efforts conducted on this topic as part of the Stream Health Initiative in 2021. Staff will coordinate throughout the ZTA process to identify any potential points at which additional engagement may be needed and to identify the best tools for receiving public input at that time; and
- Public hearings for Planning Commission and Board consideration of the ZTA.

It is expected that the staff time required for the development of new regulations can be handled by existing staff. The budget impact of the new regulations once adopted is currently estimated at 1 FTE for a new Code Compliance Officer, which will be requested during the Fiscal Year 2024 budget process.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached resolution of intent and endorse the proposed review process.

**By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the attached resolution of intent and endorse the proposed review process:**

**RESOLUTION OF INTENT  
ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT  
STREAM BUFFERS**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Albemarle County Code § 18-1.4, one of the intended purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to “Protect surface water and ground water as defined in Virginia Code § [62.1-255](#)”; and

**WHEREAS**, Albemarle County Code § 18-30.1.1 allows for the establishments of overlay districts for the purpose of imposing special regulations in certain areas that are intended to accomplish the stated purpose of the particular overlay district; and

**WHEREAS**, it is desired to adopt regulations in Albemarle County Code Chapter 18 (the Zoning Ordinance) that are complementary to the regulations contained in Albemarle County Code Chapter 17; and

**WHEREAS**, in conjunction with the County’s Stream Health Initiative, it is desired to implement regulations to protect the surface water resources of the County.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning and development practices, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby adopts a resolution of intent to consider amending *Albemarle County Code* § 1830, and any other sections of the Zoning Ordinance deemed to be appropriate to achieve the purposes described herein.

---

Item No. 8.4. Resolution of Intent to Amend the Zoning Ordinance to Incorporate Housing Policy Bonus Density Updates.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that bonuses to allow additional residential units above the default density are available in all residential zoning districts to encourage development that meets the County’s strategic goals of environmental protection, dedication of public land, preservation of open space, affordable housing, and others. Following a Resolution of Intent initiated on August 18, 2021, these bonuses were amended in December 2021 for consistency and clarity, and were condensed into a single section. That amendment was intended to prepare the density bonus ordinance for incorporation of the Housing Albemarle Policy. The Zoning Text Amendment (ZTA) being proposed in this Resolution of Intent is part of a larger effort to modernize the Zoning Ordinance, as shown on the work plan for Fiscal Year 2022.

This proposed Zoning Text Amendment would incorporate the goals and definitions of the Housing Albemarle Policy into the Zoning Ordinance and would be developed parallel to additional affordable housing incentives, as previously discussed during the February 16, 2022 Board of Supervisors work session. This effort would likely separate the incentives from this amendment, but any public engagement with developers and housing advocates would involve discussions of both initiatives. If necessary, staff would schedule a Board work session to discuss policy changes beyond incorporation of the approved Housing Albemarle definitions and minimum standards.

This Zoning Text Amendment is part of an ongoing effort towards the County’s Comprehensive Plan goal to encourage high quality, mixed-use areas and neighborhoods in the Development Area, but it is not intended to be an all-inclusive amendment to address all of the County’s affordable housing needs.

If the Board adopts the Resolution of Intent, a draft ordinance would be prepared, with public hearings planned for the Planning Commission in May or June 2022 and for the Board in June or July 2022, with potential delays if a work session became necessary.

There is no anticipated budget impact related to this zoning text amendment.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution of Intent (Attachment A).

**By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the attached Resolution of Intent (Attachment A) to move forward with the zoning text amendment and direct the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing:**

**RESOLUTION OF INTENT**

**WHEREAS**, the Albemarle County Zoning Ordinance includes regulations pertaining to bonus densities in Albemarle County Code § 18-2; and

**WHEREAS**, it is desired to incorporate the Housing Albemarle Policy into the bonus density regulations to



further the County's strategic goals related to affordable housing, to create consistency in the application of density regulations between districts, and to amend related regulations, as appropriate.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** for purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practices, the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby adopts a resolution of intent to consider amending Albemarle County Code §§ 18-2, 18-3, and any other sections of the Zoning Ordinance deemed to be appropriate to achieve the purposes described herein; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** the Planning Commission shall hold a public hearing on the zoning text amendment proposed by this resolution of intent, and make its recommendations to the Board of Supervisors, at the earliest possible date.

---

Item No. 8.5. Resolution Declaring Local Emergency Ended (COVID-19).

**By the above-recorded vote, the Board adopted the attached Resolution declaring that Local Emergency is Ended (COVID-19 Disaster):**

**RESOLUTION DECLARING THAT LOCAL EMERGENCY IS ENDED  
(COVID-19 Disaster)  
(Virginia Code § 44-146.21)**

**WHEREAS**, on March 12, 2020, the County Executive, acting as the Director of Emergency Management, declared a local emergency because of the COVID-19 pandemic pursuant Virginia Code § 44-146.21, and this declaration was confirmed by the Board of Supervisors on March 17, 2020; and

**WHEREAS**, on March 18, 2020, the Board of Supervisors consented to the Director of Emergency Management issuing an amended declaration of local emergency to refer to the COVID-19 pandemic as not only an emergency, but also as a "disaster," as the Governor had determined in Executive Order No. 51, and the amended declaration was issued on March 20, 2020; and

**WHEREAS**, there are no further emergency actions related to the COVID-19 disaster to be taken by the County and the Director of Emergency Management.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the declared local emergency in response to the COVID-19 disaster is ended.

---

Item No. 8.6. Completion of the Broadway Blueprint Economic Revitalization Study, **was received for information.**

---

Item No. 8.7. Albemarle County 2021 Fourth Quarter Building Report, **was received for information.**

---

Item No. 8.8. Albemarle County 2021 Year-End Building Report, **was received for information.**

---

Item 8.9. Albemarle County 2021 Fourth Quarter Certificate of Occupancy Report, **was received for information.**

---

Item 8.10. Albemarle County 2021 Year-End Certificate of Occupancy Report, **was received for information.**

---

Item 8.11. VDOT Monthly Report (March) 2022, **was received for information.**

---

Agenda Item No. 9. **Work Session:** VDOT/Albemarle County FY23–28 Secondary Six-Year Plan.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that this item is to present information on the Albemarle County Secondary Six-Year Plan (SSYP) and road paving priorities in advance of the development and approval of the FY 23 - 28 SSYP in May 2022.

The SSYP allocates funding for construction, maintenance, and improvement of roads in the state secondary system. The funds allocated to Albemarle County through the SSYP include state and federal funds for a variety of road improvement programs. The SSYP for Albemarle County is updated and approved annually and identifies the specific funding source, use, and levels allocated for the immediate fiscal year. The SSYP also identifies projected funding allocations for the next five fiscal years.

The Albemarle County Secondary Six-Year Plan Report; March 2022 (Attachment A) provides a detailed background on the SSYP, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) paving programs,

and Albemarle County's paving requests and priorities. The SSYP report is established prior to development of the Draft SSYP in order to inform the development of the Plan.

Attachment A.1 is the Draft FY 23 - 28 Albemarle County SSYP. The SSYP is the plan for expending state funds allocated to Albemarle County for road improvements to the Secondary Road System (roads with a route number of 600 or higher). The majority of the available funding must be used for paving unpaved roads. The report also provides information on the projected funding allocations, the status of the projects currently in the SSYP, and County and VDOT staff recommendations for any changes or additions to the SSYP.

The Albemarle County Unpaved Road Policies and Review Process (Attachment A.2) details the process for adding roads to the Albemarle County Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements, Unpaved Roads (Attachment A.3). This document is a listing of all Secondary Roads that either the public, a County department, or the Board of Supervisors has requested be paved. This list is reviewed and approved by the Board annually and forms the basis of the SSYP for Albemarle County. Additionally, a chart on the last page of Albemarle County Unpaved Road Policies and Review Process gives a description and requirements of each paving type and standards for each.

As part of the discussion, staff will seek feedback from the Board on two areas; a process by which roads could be moved from the "do not pave" list to the paving list, and a process for community members to demonstrate support for paving among adjacent property owners.

#### **Do Not Pave/Pave List**

The "do not pave list" is found on the Albemarle County Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements and includes roads that have been removed from the paving list by the Board. The Unpaved Road Policies and Review Process does not address how a road might be moved from the "do not pave list" to the paving list, in instances where staff has received requests to do so.

#### **Adjacent Property Owner Support Process**

The Unpaved Road Policies and Review Process does not specify how a community member should demonstrate support for paving among the other adjacent property owners. A recommendation has been made that a request must be submitted with a petition signed by at least 50% of the property owners adjacent to or with primary access across the segment proposed to be paved.

Based on any direction received from the Board, staff will continue to work with VDOT staff to finalize the SSYP for public hearing and adoption in May.

The SSYP outlines the expenditure of State/VDOT secondary road construction funds allocated to the County. The SSYP does not require the expenditure of County funds unless the Board directs additional funding from the County General Fund or Capital Improvement Plan be appropriated to a project, such as through the use of the revenue sharing program.

Staff recommends that the Board affirm the proposed paving priorities and proposed funding described in the Draft Albemarle County Priority Paving List for Secondary Road Improvements, Unpaved Roads (Attachment A.3), and in the Draft FY 23 - 28 Secondary Six-Year Plan (Attachment A.1) by approving the recommendations therein. Staff requests direction from the Board regarding the "do not pave list" and the requirements to add a road to the paving list.

---

Mr. Kevin McDermott said he would be presenting a brief work session about the 2023–2028 Secondary Six-Year Plan. He said the plan allocated state and federal funding for construction, maintenance, and improvement of roads in the state secondary system, and that secondary system were those with route numbers of 600 or higher. He said this document was updated and approved by the Board of Supervisors annually, and in FY23 they had an approximate amount of \$694,463 available that must be appropriated to paving unpaved roads. He said that was where most of the money was in the secondary six-year plan.

Mr. McDermott said the process for addressing unpaved roads was guided by a document that the Board approved a number of years back called the Albemarle County Policies and Reviews Process, and the project selection for paving came from the Priority List for Secondary Road Improvements, which was also approved by the Board. He said as a reminder, the Board's preferred method for paving those unpaved roads was through a program called the Rural Rustic Road Paving Program, and the reason they chose that was because it was because it was a faster, less expensive way to pave roads, and it allowed them to maintain some of the rural nature of those roads, by being able to pave them while reducing the width so that they did not have to increase the right of way and things like that.

Mr. McDermott showed a map of the unpaved roads in Albemarle County. He said the ones highlighted in blue were unpaved roads not on the priority list for unpaved roads, and the ones highlighted in red were the ones currently on that list for unpaved roads to be paved, and the ones in green were the ones that Supervisors had requested be removed from paving, so those were not considered for paving right now.

Mr. McDermott said they had identified some small issues they would like to clean up regarding the Albemarle County Unpaved Road Policies and Review Process. He said it set the policy for how they added roads to the paving priorities list, and in that policy, it stated that the request should provide some form of information or confirmation of broader support for the paving project, so that when someone

requested a paving project, they typically would write to them and have some number of the residents on the road who had agreed with them through either a petition or through additional emails.

Mr. McDermott said they had discussed and would like a little more clarity to that statement and would like the Board to consider requiring a petition signed by 50% of the adjacent property owners along that segment, or getting primary access from that segment. He said that would allow them to have a better standard for recognizing if there was support among the landowners along that road for the paving prior to moving forward with putting it on the list and eventually moving towards the paving process. He said he would come back to the questions on the slide at the end of the presentation to give them an opportunity to weigh in.

Mr. McDermott said the other issue they were hoping to discuss was that within the priority list of unpaved roads, there was a section called "Unpaved Roads Segments Removed by the Board of Supervisors," often referred to as the "do not pave list," and those were also shown on that map on the slide prior. He said what had come up frequently was that they continued to get requests for a road to be paved even if it was on there. He said one time, there was a small segment of a road that had been removed from the paving list that someone wanted to add on, and even the Supervisor agreed that the small section should get paved, so they moved forward with it despite the fact they did not have that process defined for how to remove that segment from the "do not pave list."

Mr. McDermott said they also recently had received requests for a road to be paved that was in the Samuel Miller District that the previous Supervisor, Supervisor Palmer, had removed from that list, and those people had called him and asked whether or not Supervisor Palmer being no longer on the Board made it possible to get that road added. He said they simply did not have a process for this. He said he was asking from the Board right now for some direction they could provide on how they could remove those roads from the do not pave list in the future. He said it was a consideration and they could come back to it in a little bit.

Mr. McDermott said some of the Secondary Six-Year Plan project updates were projects on the previous secondary six-year plan, and they included the Rio Mills Connector Road, which went from Rio Mills to the new Berkmar Extension. He said that project included secondary six-year plan Telefee funds in addition to Smart Scale funds. He said that project was now complete, and that road was open, so it would be removed off of the next version of the secondary six-year plan. He said Coles Rolling Road, Wesley Chapel Road, and Reservoir Road were on the previous six-year plan and all three of those were paved and those projects were complete.

Mr. McDermott said Burnt Mill Road was on the previous plan, and it was going through environmental review and some preliminary work this spring, and they were expecting to get that paved in the fall of this year. He said that was the same case for Hammocks Gap Road and Harris Creek Road. He said they were doing work on those and they expected paving to happen in fall of 2022. He said the other project that was still out there with funding on it was the Berkmar Drive Extended Project. He said similar to the Rio Mills Connector, this road had some Telefee funding and some additional revenue sharing funding so that they could move forward with this project. He said that was in design right now, and construction was expected to begin sometime in late 2025.

Mr. McDermott said the recommendations for this upcoming secondary six-year plan were the direction on the questions he had discussed earlier, the completion of the paving of Harris Creek Road, Hammocks Gap Road, and the full funding of Red Hill School Road as the highest priorities on the secondary six-year plan, and moving forward with funding of the paving of Cove Garden Road so they could send notification letters to those adjacent landowners to determine the support. He said that was part of the process they had when a road came up for paving, and all the property owners' comments were collected and brought before the Board when they brought it back for final approval for the Rural Rustic recommendation and to move forward with the paving.

Mr. McDermott said they would also like the Board to endorse the updated priority list for secondary road improvements, and that was included as Attachment A.3 in their packet, and also the County's draft FY23 – 28 Secondary Six-Year Plan, which was in Attachment C. He said if they moved forward with that, they would like to schedule a public hearing for May 18, so they could get this completed in time for development of the final six-year plan and approval by the Commonwealth Transportation Board in June.

Ms. Price asked if Mr. McDermott had a slide with the specific questions he wanted them to answer.

Mr. McDermott said he could pull it up, but the questions were just to have the Board weigh in on whether or not they could add to the policies that they require a petition with 50% of the landowners to add a road to the priority list, and whether or not it would be possible to remove a road from the "do not pave" list.

Ms. Price wanted to clarify those were the only items he wanted the Board to discuss.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the answer to the first question would also answer the second question, which was if a Supervisor were no longer there, and they had 50% of the residents wanting that road paved, it seemed to her that it should happen. She said she had a question regarding Hammocks Gap. She said she knew it was paved about .7 miles in, but would it be fully paved? She said she wanted to know the same about Burnt Mill.

Mr. McDermott said those were partial paving projects. He said Hammocks Gap was one where they could only pave from where it was currently paved up to the bridge, and after that, one of the standards for the Rural Rustic was that they had to have a certain width to be able to pave to, and they could not meet that width past the bridge. He said Burnt Mill was in the same situation, where they could only pave to another secondary road intersection, and beyond that it became too narrow to be paved under the Rural Rustic Program.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked how long a road was kept on the do not pave list when a Supervisor added it. She said it seemed that if they went with what the residents wanted, that might help.

Mr. Gallaway asked if to get to the 50% support of, the road had to be on the list initially.

Mr. McDermott said that just to get on the list, they required that there be some element of support shown, and that element of support was not defined, so he was asking if they could define that as saying to get on the list, you had to have 50% of the landowner's sign.

Mr. Gallaway asked if that was the list to be paved.

Mr. McDermott said yes.

Mr. Gallaway said that for it to not be on the list to get paved, it could be because a Supervisor could say to not put it on the list.

Mr. McDermott said that historically, that was how it had happened. He said that usually a request would come in, and a Supervisor would say they wanted it to be removed because they never wanted the road to be paved. He said his question was if it was a firm never, or if it changed if the Supervisor changed.

Mr. Gallaway said that it seemed to him that if a Supervisor changed, that Supervisors wishes would come into play based on the election of a new official. He said that the current Supervisor would just have to deal with their constituents on the matter, and if they disagreed with each other, then that sounded like an issue for the Supervisor to work through. He said he did not think that asking for the road to be kept off the list was asking for it to be kept off indefinitely.

Mr. Andrews said that when he said 50%, it sounded reasonable, and he appreciated that. He said Reservoir Road was very curvy and had no shoulders, and once it was paved, it was raised up and made it impossible for people to ride bikes, run, or walk safely with the amount of traffic. He said he was not saying they should do anything about that, but 50% of people who wanted the road paved without really understanding what it would do to the character of the road made him think that they should go further than a yes/no answer to paving the road, and make sure they understand how the roadbed height, shoulder, curves, and walkability of the road would be affected. He said that with respect to the designation of a road on the do not pave list, he accepted that elections matter and a new Supervisor should weigh in on whether or not it was a priority. He said that was a perk of office he had not thought through.

Ms. McKeel said that a Supervisor's determination should not last forever, and that was simple to her. She said Mr. Andrews' example of Reservoir Road would lead her to suggest that the road was not well designed, and the paving issue was a problem. She said that concerned her a lot, because they should not be putting down roads that created such problems. She said her concern was to react to give guidance for the future based on an example that sounded like it was poorly thought out when it was done. She said she was concerned over the 50% figure. She said the standard perhaps should be higher than 50%. She said they were not getting a sense of the neighborhood with only 50% and she would not be happy with that.

Mr. McDermott said that the process for the 50% he was asking for was to get the road on the list, and then he would come to the Board just as he did today for this work session and ask for their permission to add it to the list. He said when the road came up for paving because it got funded, however, that happened a number of years after it was added to the list, they would send a letter to every property owner along that road and give them the opportunity to comment. He said he would take all of those comments of either support or disapproval and bring them back to the Board, where the Board would then make the final decision of whether to move forward with that paving. He said the 50% was just to get on the list and did not mean that it would absolutely be paved. He said there would be a chance for everyone on the road to weigh in and for the Board to make a final decision.

Ms. McKeel said 50% did not seem like a high enough number to get on the list, because it did not encompass the entire community's feelings.

Ms. Mallek said this was an issue of longtime concern and interest for her. She said it was as much about the policy, decision making, and impacts as it was about the road. She said her understanding had never been that one Supervisor could take anything off of the list of do not pave. She said she tried to put Dick Woods Road on the do not pave list for ten years, and it was not until the Board majority was willing to recommend it that it actually happened. She said there were many residents who were horrified that it would be paved because it was a major connector from Nelson County and Point South to the City of Charlottesville and was also a major training ground for the public schools' cross-country teams.

Ms. Mallek said the dust was an issue they had in the country, and she had heard realtors tell people not to worry about the dust from the road because it would be paved the next year, and whether they believed it was true or was spreading gossip created a longtime grievance and a sense of betrayal for those residents. She said it was not nearly a reason about transportation and maintenance. She said there was a lot of quality of life in the rural area that was involved with what type of road it was. She said she hoped they would discuss this issue beyond today's meeting so they can learn about the Loudoun program that was mentioned as well as the elements of a road other than transportation.

Ms. Mallek said it was impossible to ride a horse down the roads she once did because the traffic goes by at 60 mph and did not slow down. She said she understood needs would evolve, and they did not need to go back to the 1950s, but there were public spaces that had many different uses, and she hoped they would take the time to think about that. She said it should be a Board action to put a road on the do not pave list as it was for Dick Woods Road. She said there were two Supervisors who led that concern, but it was definitely not a Board action to do that. She said it should be a Board action like it was today to put a road on the list for consideration.

Ms. Mallek said there once was a petition to get on the list back in the 80s and 90s, and that went away and was replaced with a system where one person could call and get on the list, and they would complain each year the road on the list was not paved, but there never had been any process, so it got this built-up angst that only got worse. She said in answer to those questions, Board action would take care of it, and that way the community view was the source of where the Supervisors' intent would come from. She said if people had complained to them for years about their lives being ruined on Dick Woods Road, she would not have been informed enough to push it forward to the Board level those years ago.

Ms. Mallek said she definitely thought the percentage should be higher at something like 70% to get on the list, because that saved a lot of time, and put the responsibility where it should be, with the people in the neighborhoods who developed a sense of cohesion. She said later on today they may talk about roads that people had been arguing with each other for twenty years about this, which was sad, but there should be a substantial vote one way or the other, because otherwise staff would be set up for a lot of unnecessary work and a lot of argument in the neighborhood. She said having the do not pave list published would prevent misrepresentations from happening. She said a citizen called her the other day having seen this agenda and asked about having the Planning Commission involved in these decisions, because if a gravel road in the country was paved, it was a de facto rezoning, and there would be houses built that would break up properties. She said that was an interesting concept to her. She asked Mr. McDermott if she answered his questions.

Mr. McDermott said yes.

Mr. Andrews said Reservoir Road was just an example of why he thought it was important to understand what the change of the character of the road would be due to paving, and that needed to be something that the people who would be affected by it should understand. He said that being said, he had a question, which was if the 50% was all affected residents and was not just 50% of those who responded to a questionnaire. He asked if they had a way of identifying some percentage of people who actually would be affected and get those responses. He said he thought it was something in the rural areas that required a lot of understanding by the people who would be affected, and it would take some legwork to make sure these were the appropriate places to pave. He said over 50% would be fine with him.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said if it was over 50% or 60% got the ball rolling with the residents' standing and how they feel about that. She said she had noticed that rural roads versus paved roads was complicated due to conflicting views. She said she thought that VDOT wanted all roads to be paved eventually.

Mr. McDermott said that VDOT expressed interest in trying to get roads paved because it reduced their maintenance costs. He said he did not think that was a formal policy that included a statement about wanting to pave every road, but yes, they would like to reduce their maintenance cost.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was glad to know it was not mandatory. She said if she wanted to put a road on a do not pave list, she would like to know if it came from herself, or if it came from Board action.

Mr. McDermott said he had never personally been involved in any of the additions to the do not pave list, but his understanding was that in the past, the Board had just said that. He said his issue was that there was no clarification in that policies and review process, so this was the opportunity to say they would do that by Board action, which was what Supervisor Mallek said and the other Board members agreed with. He said they could do that, and they could also have a Board action to remove it from the list. He said he needed to get the direction and he would write it into the policy.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she understood. She asked if they would also have direction from the homeowners on that road. So for example, if 60% of the residents wanted it paved, and a Supervisor said they did not want it paved and they wanted it on the do not pave list, and the other Supervisors did not know that the majority of the residents wanted it paved, what would happen then.

Mr. McDermott said he would always provide the feedback from either the petition, and let them know what percentage they got, and also the feedback when they sent the letters. He said the whole Board would have the opportunity to see that.

Mr. Kamptner said this was the first time he had heard of the do not pave list. He said that because the Board could only act as a Board, it should reserve the power to put things on the do not pave list, and the power to remove. He said the public process would work itself out, but the Board needed to retain that authority. He said he realized that the 50% to get things on the do not pave list was a threshold, but it went through his mind that the owners of three one-acre parcels could outvote the owners of two 500-acre parcels and get on the list. He said he did not want to complicate it, and they could leave things as they discussed, but it was just to get it on the list.

Ms. Price said while very frequently the Supervisors may defer in some areas to the Supervisor of a magisterial district in which a particular item may be located, that was more of a courtesy deferral rather than a de jour waiver, and she believed action should be by the Board and not by individual Supervisors. She said this topic should be considered similarly to what they went through recently with the road naming convention, where the determination was made that 50% was too low of a threshold. She said she believed 60% or 65% was the final number they decided on. She said if there was going to be a change, there should be more of a consensus of the community rather than a simple majority. She said even if more than the threshold percentage were reached, it ultimately was a Board decision, and as Mr. McDermott pointed out, he would be giving them all of that information so the Board would be able to make that decision.

Ms. Price said they had to be very clear that if a road was placed on a list, it may create false hopes or expectations, either that a road will not be paved or that it may be paved. She said it was important that these lists had the caveats included in them, so that any member of the public who looked at that list understood the road names were for roads being considered to be paved and could be removed from the do not pave list. She continued that on page 1 of Attachment A, there were four different columns, one of which was the Telefee funds. She said she appreciated that it probably came from a state calculation, but she noticed that over the years that were listed, there was no indication in an increase in those fees. She asked if Telefee fees were increased, would the state automatically increase the distribution of those funds to communities, or if that was something they had to ask for.

Mr. McDermott said the state increased those. He said in the draft version she was looking at right now, they had taken what they knew they were going to get next year, and assumed that would be consistent over the years, but every year, there was an update to that number, and it typically increased.

Ms. Price asked Mr. McDermott to show slide 6. She said the Berkmar Drive Extension showed Telefee funds through FY25 totaling \$2,288,226, and other funds were mentioned as well. She said if they were only getting \$340k a year on Telefee funds, it would be six years' worth of Telefee funds for a single road.

Mr. McDermott said he would go back and check. He said many years ago, the Board decided to put a lot of Telefee money towards this, and they moved it, and it had built up over multiple years, and was still building up if she looked at the other attachment that was the draft secondary six-year plan. He said they were still getting a few more years of that \$300k added to this, which had been going on for many years to total up the local funded they needed.

Ms. Price thanked Mr. McDermott. She said she understood now that the Board in previous years had decided to do that, and that was fine, she just wanted to understand the math for that. She said she had another question about the Pave-in-Place program. She said on page 2 of Attachment A, it talked about under the Pave-in-Place option, the road was improved to a minimum standard of 18 feet of pavement with two-foot shoulders, for a total of 22 feet. She was thinking that these gravel, private lanes had to be 14 feet with a three-foot shoulder on each side. She said that was not a Pave-in-Place option and was only for rural gravel roads. She said she would send an email about that question because she did not need it answered today. She asked if the Supervisors had any further comments. Seeing none, she asked Mr. McDermott if he had everything he needed today.

Mr. McDermott said yes, he did have everything he needed. He said he would look into the road naming process and find out what that percentage was that they had discussed see if that was appropriate, and would include that in an update to that policies and review process, and he would also describe the roads removed from the paving list in the policies document and make sure it was clear in there that it was a full-Board vote to put a road on the do not pave list, and it was a full-Board vote to remove that from the do not pave list. He said that would be clarified. He said he had their other comments and would incorporate those. He said he would come back in May, and that would typically be a public hearing. He said he could use the vote to approve that public hearing before they left today. He said he could bring those additions back to the Board at that time.

Ms. Price asked if he needed a vote right now to approve a public hearing in May.

Mr. McDermott said yes, whenever they were ready to do so after their discussion.

Ms. Mallek said she may have misunderstood, but she thought that someone said they would be giving preliminary approval to adding Cove Garden Road to the list today. She said Cove Garden was not in her district, but she would like for all of them to learn a bit more about the details of that request. She said she was told it connected Plank Road to Route 29, which had dangerous cut-through consequences, as many of the roads in the Whitehall District had suffered, so she hoped that before they chose to put this on the list, perhaps they could get the new policies in place in two months and also get some more information about that.

Ms. Price said she did not think they would be voting on that, but she asked the Board to make a decision as to whether they would call for a public hearing in May to discuss this.

Mr. Kamptner said in addition to that, looking at staff's recommendation, there were two other items that they were requesting the Board to act on. He said it was in the recommendations section of the executive summary.

Ms. Price said it appeared they had answered the first bullet point there. She asked if each item needed a separate motion.

Mr. McDermott said they typically would ask for Board support of these, and that had been done just through the discussion in the past, but a vote would obviously be even better if they would like to do so.

Mr. Kamptner said a motion to approve all of those would be the most appropriate manner to proceed.

Ms. McKeel asked if she would move the Board affirm the proposed paving priorities and proposed funding described in their priority paving list for secondary road improvements. She asked Mr. McDermott if that was what he was asking for.

Ms. Price asked if that would be an appropriate motion.

Mr. Kamptner said yes if it was referring to Attachment A.3.

Ms. McKeel said she could add a yes.

Mr. Kamptner said he was looking at the executive summary, and it was also referring to the draft 23-28 secondary six-year plan.

Mr. McDermott said it was Attachment C.

Ms. McKeel said C was not listed in the recommendations.

Ms. Price said there seemed to be some confusion.

Ms. Mallek said the list of recommendations was a bit different than what was in the printed version. She said it appeared they were not doing any more pre-decision work on Cove Garden, it would now be put on the list as they always have. She asked if that were what was being suggested, and she would like to know when they would begin to do a new analysis.

Mr. McDermott apologized for the confusion there. He said Cove Garden was on the list, and it was added to the list a number of years back. He said they were at the point now where it was moving to be funded in the next year's secondary six-year plan, so this was where he would typically send the letters out, and it would come back to the Board in May, and they could vote on whether they wanted to move forward with that based on the feedback they get from the public.

Ms. Price asked if she understood correctly that they would be voting on, when they said to fund the paving, they would be approving that the funds would be available, they would send out the notification letters, but the Board would ultimately later come back and make its decision on whether to actually pave the road. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. McDermott said that was absolutely correct.

Ms. Price asked the Board if that clarified things. She asked Mr. Kamptner if it would be appropriate to simply refer that the Board supported the recommendations in Slide 7.

Mr. Kamptner said perhaps it would be a motion to approve the items on Slide 7, and in particular, to endorse the updated County policy priority list for secondary road improvements, unpaved roads, provided Attachment A.3 of the County's draft FY23-28 Secondary Six-Year Plan. He said the executive summary had Attachment C as a map on the online version.

Ms. Price said Attachment C was a map in the hard copy as well.

Mr. McDermott apologized for that.

Ms. Price said that it sounded like it was a motion to approve the recommendations in Slide 7, clarifying that it was referencing Attachment A.1 rather than Attachment C.

Mr. Kamptner said that would be fine.

Ms. McKeel **moved** to approve the recommendations in Slide 7, referencing Attachment A.1. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

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

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

---

Non-Agenda Item: **Recess.** The Board recessed its meeting at 2:41 p.m. and reconvened at 2:50 p.m.

---

Agenda Item No. 10. **Work Session:** Fiscal Year 2023 Community Development Work Program.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that twice a year, the Community Development Department (CDD) updates the Board of Supervisors on those projects above and beyond the date-driven, obligatory work of the department, known as the CDD Work Program. The most recent CDD Work Program update occurred through a report on the Consent Agenda of the December 1, 2021 Board meeting. As time permits and with Board direction, staff undertakes the work on these items. As unforeseen priorities and challenges may intervene, dates included in this packet are best estimates.

This presentation will share the status of previous work program items in Fiscal Year 2022, as well as the list of requests for projects that are not yet prioritized and that are not scheduled to be included in another, larger effort (Attachment A). Several projects are already underway, and others are proposed based on an array of opportunities anticipated in this upcoming year. In addition, staff is furthering investments in capacity to improve customer service. Fiscal Year (FY) 2023 continues the focus on zoning modernization coupled with comprehensive plan and related zoning implementation (Attachment B). These items will be discussed during this agenda item.

The comprehensive plan and zoning modernization work underway have been funded in the existing FY 22 budget. In the proposed FY23 budget, consulting support of \$100,000 is included to support any required zoning ordinance updates related to the stream health initiative. With those zoning ordinance updates, a budget impact is anticipated for the Fiscal Year 24 budget which will be brought to the Board for formal consideration as part of that year's budget request.

Staff requests the Board affirm support for this Work Program to begin in July 2022 and to continue through June 2023.

---

Ms. Jodie Filardo introduced herself to the Board as the Director of Community Development for Albemarle County. She said she was joined today by Charles Rapp, the Deputy Director of Operations. She said they would be presenting the Community Development Work Program update to the Board. She said in case there were detailed questions, they had other members of their staff and leadership team with them who would introduce themselves should they arise.

Ms. Filardo said in 2021, they varied their work program process slightly by providing an in-person presentation in May 2021, and a written program update on their consent agenda in December. She said last May, the Board agreed to add desired projects to a parking lot list for later consideration. She said they appreciated that approach and had been able to complete many projects as a result of that focus. She said they would be reviewing the updates today. She said the purpose of today's presentation was to confirm the list of projects prioritized for FY23.

Ms. Price apologized for interrupting Ms. Filardo, but she received a note that they needed a brief pause. She said she needed to check with the Clerk's Office about technical difficulties.

Mr. Morris said they were ready to resume.

Ms. Price asked Ms. Filardo to continue.

Ms. Filardo said she would start over on this slide. She said in 2021, they varied their work program process slightly by providing an in-person presentation in May 2021, and a written program update on their consent agenda in December. She said last May, the Board agreed to add desired projects to a parking lot list for further consideration. She said they appreciated that approach and had been able to complete many projects as a result of that focus, and they would be reviewing the updates today. She said the purpose of today's presentation was to confirm the list of projects prioritized for FY23. She said today, they were presenting a summary of personnel updates, mandated work metrics, updates on their FY22 Work Program progress, presentation of their proposed FY23 program, a review of the parking lot lists, and would close for questions, considerations, any desire for substitutions, or changes from the parked list or other lists they may have.

Ms. Filardo said that for FY23, CDD was authorized 74.5 FTEs. She said they started FY21 with 67.5 staff members, and seven frozen positions in response to Covid-19. She said those positions were released at the beginning of the fiscal year. She said at the mid-year budget session in December, the Board authorized three additional positions. She said of those three, two had been filled, and sadly the third offer they extended was rejected when it was countered by the individual's existing employer. She said in addition to the positions, the Board approved the one-time funds of \$50k to support hiring two contract certified plans reviewers to assist with the plans review backlog. She said these reviewers had been very helpful in tackling building permit review times.

Ms. Filardo said since July 2021, they had also implemented three organizational changes aimed



at improving customer service. She said the first was the front desk team, which was previously known as "intake," was now reorganized as "application services." She said based on lessons learned from reengineering their processes, anticipating Camino, their new applications portal, they recognized the need for both systems expertise and financial expertise, as well as management acumen in their manager of this team. She said this resulted in the upgrading of the vacant manager position, which they recently filled. She said the entire application services team was moved to their zoning division to align with a front-end focus on the application processes, and to leverage the management strength of the zoning division. She said as of March 14, they finally had a fully staffed front-end team for the first time in almost two years.

Ms. Filardo said with the February resignation of the manager of Geographical Data Services, they took the opportunity to explore the highest and best approach to providing geographical systems services (GIS) to the entire organization. She said with the implementation of the enterprise license agreement dutifully implemented by August 22, the GIS team was now licensed to deploy that functionality broadly across the organization. She said as information technology provided organization line services through their enterprise services team, CDD, IT, and the County Executive's Office evaluated the situation and made an organizational joint decision to move the remaining GDS team. She said this leveraged the existing GIS technical knowledge within IT, while also providing additional technical support and staff growth opportunities to the GDS team members.

Ms. Filardo said in a reverse move, the IT Records Management team moved back to CDD. She said initially part of CDD, Records Management moved to IT in 2019 to utilize that team as an organization line service, however, CDD used so much of this team's capacity that there was no time left for support of other departments. She said now the team was coming back to CDD to align with the work at hand and was positioned to help with the process reengineering with the Camino implementation.

Ms. Filardo said that they started FY21 with seven vacancies. She said since then, they had incurred eight additional vacancies due to retirements, promotions to other departments, and resignations, including two retirements, one internal organization transfer, and five resignations. She said they also added eight new staff members across their divisions, two in building, one in engineering, two in planning, and three in zoning. She said outside of the regular reclassification process for CDD completed in September of 2021, they also promoted eight people within the department, including Charles Rapp, Stephanie Banton, Keith Bradshaw, Emily Cox, Mariah Gleason, Scott Good, Ben Holt, and Rebecca Ragsdale. She said they were pleased to announce the selection of Candace Perkins as their new Director of Planning, who started April 11. She said they presently had seven openings for which they were recruiting.

Ms. Filardo said they would discuss metrics regarding mandated work they were required to perform. She said any of their CDD team members worked predominantly on mandated work, and others worked on both mandated and discretionary projects guided by their work program. She said all of CDD operated with an all-hands-on-deck team approach to getting work done. She said year over year, both their volumes of building permit applications received and permits issued had increased.

Ms. Filardo said over this past year, they had also worked with their building community to make sure they realized both the code of Virginia and Albemarle County required the submission of construction level drawings to accompany permit applications, not just floor plans. She said more thorough applications resulted in more complete plans review, which ultimately resulted in a better and safer built environment. She said, thanks to the Board, they had augmented their plans review team with two retired plans reviewers. She said this additional help had enabled them to process more residential building permits, although they still had a backlog.

Ms. Filardo said the charts on the screen illustrated the work performed by inspectors and code compliance officers in the field. She said at various steps in the creation of the County's built environment, teams of inspectors deployed in the field to verify the work being done on approved projects. She said for example, zoning code compliance officers check to confirm setbacks on the job at the outset, and then checked the completed job prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy to make sure everything was built according to plan. She said they also investigated complaints made by community members. She said the spikes in the complaints chart on the bottom left of the screen represented the receipt of possible, unlicensed homestay information from their third-party software source, Harmari.

Ms. Filardo said in 2021, the CCOs performed 2,275 inspections, and 337 complaint investigations. She said erosion and settlement control inspectors checked private property projects under construction, and worked with builders and developers to ensure that sediment did not impact their roads and waterways. She said their inspectors performed 4,962 inspections in 2021, and building inspectors verified all steps of the building of or renovations to residential and commercial projects throughout the building process. She said in 2021, they performed a total of 39,246 inspections.

Ms. Filardo said in their development process, applications and approvals for subdivisions preceded those with site plans and related approvals. She said subdivision applications increased back in 2020. She said after subdivisions were approved, the next step in the process involved site plan submittals. She said along with site plan approvals, building permit typically arrived. She said in 2021, they began to see the result of subdivision approvals from 2020, as more site plans were submitted than in the previous year.

Ms. Filardo said as they saw in the previous slide, their permit applications were now up year

over year, with the current price of materials and labor, now couples with rising gas prices, they were taking a conservative approach to fee revenues for next year, because they did not know whether the demand for housing supply would overpower the negative impacts of rising raw materials and labor. She said however, based on what they now saw in the pipeline, they were likely to have another big year of community development work ahead.

Ms. Filardo showed a metric informing two major projects for them. She said those were revisions to their development review process and implementation of new software. She said they hoped to drop the total number of touches by staff on development applications to be able to increase the capacity of their development review staff and to reduce cycle times. She said in a revised approach, they intended to perform an initial review and generate a complete set of comments, then perform a review of the fixes recently submitted by the applicant to address their comments.

Ms. Filardo continued that then, if there was something incorrectly done with those fixes, they reviewed the corrections to those, and if the application were still not correct after that, they would work towards denying the application. She said that was a big change in approach, and one they would make gradually as systems tools improved. She said presently, staff touched each development application an average of six times. She said reducing the cycle of frequent reviews and resubmissions would also reward applicants who submitted thorough and correct applications the first time.

Ms. Filardo said she would now recap the FY22 projects. She said the magnitude of work they faced this year was the same as the year before. She said in FY22, they targeted the right new work and also maintained focus on projects already started. She said they sought to complete what they started, invest in tools to improve their capacity in customer service capabilities, and to start the multi-year project of addressing both the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance modernizations. She said they would present updates on each of these major areas in the upcoming slides.

Ms. Filardo showed a slide that she said reflected the overall commitment of their team. She said she was grateful to work with such a capable team of professionals, and was thankful for the support of the Board, County Executive's Office, and colleagues in accomplishing all of this work. She said as they may recall, the annual work program was comprised of those projects that were neither mandated nor under any legislative deadlines or requirements. She said each year, they had worked hard to write that work in their work program, but with that being said, changes along the way could negatively impact deadlines. She said also, whenever an unanticipated, urgent project popped up, often the resources allocated to the work program were diverted to address those immediate needs. She said this practice resulted in work program project deadlines sliding out beyond the original estimated deadlines.

Ms. Filardo said this year had been a really busy year, and still the team kept focus on achieving completions of these projects. She said they were happy to report they had completed most of the projects from their FY22 program, and these 11 projects were projects phased as projects from their FY22 work program were completed in the months noted on the slide. She said they still had two ongoing projects with additional deliverables in the calendar year 2022, which were stream health and wireless facilities ordinance.

Ms. Filardo said in addition, two projects were still to be completed in FY22 from the initial projects on the waiting list. She said the Rio Road Corridor Study was now expected in June 2022, and the developer incentives were coming back in work session again in May 2022 with hopes for Board direction by June. She said the developer incentives, if adopted by the Board, would necessitate additional zoning ordinance work that was likely to be significant. She said as the scope of these incentives was defined, the overall impacts would be outlined to the Board with request for additional support if needed. She said after twenty years of execution and necessitated by staff retirement, supporting the Acquisition of Conservation Easements, or the ACE program, they added a project to their FY22 work program list.

Ms. Filardo said as was customary with program staffing changes, and with the work plan programs, they were conducting a program assessment now. She said they were scheduled to bring that assessment forward to the Board at the June 15 Board meeting. She said as the Board may recall, this historic assessment was the first step in the overall assessment and conservation programs, which would come forward as part of the comprehensive plan process. She said with the move of the Geographical Data Services team to IT, the third project still underway from FY22's work program was the ESRI Enterprise License Agreement completion, which was due in August. She said that would move to the IT Department for completion.

Ms. Filardo said the previous slides were projects from the underway category for their work program. She said regarding FY22 projects impacting their investment in capacity, they had the following updates. The new project management software pilot was complete, and the Jira software package had been selected with help from the Performance and Strategic Management team, as well as Information Technology, and had been placed on order for deployment to the Long-Range Planning team. She said the updated approach for public engagement was deployed for the comprehensive plan with help from the Community and Public Engagement Office, and they would continue to refine this process as the engagement and comprehensive plan phases moving forward.

Ms. Filardo said CDD deployed upgraded software, hardware and training for the digital processing of applications, and their Camino applications portal was in soft launch mode of this past Monday, March 14, 2022, thanks to assistance from CDD, Performance and Strategic Planning, Information Technology, Finance, and Community and Public Engagement teams. She said on this slide,

they were sharing the Go-Live Timeline from the Camino launch, which was previously sent to the Board by email. She said they were pleased to announce the new applications portal, Camino, went off without a hitch. She said until April 1, they were in soft launch mode, which meant they would continue to ask for steady feedback from people using the system in case there were small tweaks that could be implemented to improve their experience with the software. She said as with the core systems modernization, they would learn about that work in just a moment.

Ms. Filardo said there was a tremendous amount of work put in by over 35 people from five departments to make this work possible. She said she wanted to bring awareness to the levels of participation needed across the organization to successfully deploy a project like this. She said at the onset, the Camino project looked like a relatively simple software deployment, however, the project required significant process reengineering, systems integration, website redesign work, records retention modifications, staff and customer training, finance systems processing changes, and new communications. She said the chart on the slide illustrated the impact of a relatively simple deployment.

Ms. Filardo said this entire project taught them many lessons as they anticipated the replacement of the twenty-year-old County-wide system within the next year or two. She said Blue Ridge Homebuilders Association members assisted in the Beta testing of the system and provided early feedback to them. She said they were grateful for the lessons learned on reengineering their processes and exploring their data, and they were also more clear-eyed in recognizing the enormity of a project in front of them with the core system modernization.

Ms. Filardo said the current slide showed the final update on the current work program. She said she wanted to share status on a few key aspects on the comprehensive plan project. She said they were partnering with the Economic Development Office and on-call consultant Kimberly Horn to conduct a buildout analysis of the County's development areas. She said the purpose of the analysis was to provide a database model to communicate the pace and direction of future growth in the County as input to the growth management policy. She said staff was in the process of reviewing data with the consult with the final report expected by April. She said key data from this report would inform the overall process moving forward.

Ms. Filardo said they had received 103 applications for the AC44 Working Group. She said the selection team made up of staff from the Office of Equity and Inclusion, CAPE, the Department of Social Services, CDD, and FES were in the process of reviewing applications as the first step in selecting the group. She said following the selection, staff would reach out to schedule the first meeting. She said conversations with HR were ongoing to determine the appropriate training and onboarding process for group members.

Ms. Filardo said in the initial outreach that the team created a project name, logo and style guide, and the project website went live on February 1, with the URL displayed on the screen. She said that would serve as an engagement hub for the project. She said throughout February, staff conducted five in-person pop-ups and two virtual sessions via Zoom to share information about the project and the AC44 Working Group opportunity. She said they also sent emails announcing the website and working group opportunities. She said they had many interviews that aired on NBC-29, and one interview at the Southwood pop-up.

Ms. Filardo said they piloted the project management software, Jira, to help track project deliverables and progress. She said they built an initial project frame through which to regularly manage workload, they digitized the historic comprehensive plan growth management maps dating back to the 1970 Comprehensive Plan and planned to use a new tool to show the history of growth management in the County. She said next, they were targeting their first monthly newsletter updates for the end of March to be shared with the Board, the Planning Commission, CACs, and community members who registered on the AC44 website, and/or the Albemarle County email list.

Ms. Filardo said the first round of public engagement opportunities for Phase One were being planned for the end of April or beginning of May. She said they were hoping to share dates, format, and locations for public events in the first monthly the newsletter. She said that Charles Rapp, Deputy Director of Operations, would talk through the recommended approach to the FY23 Work Program, followed by an overview of projects that had not yet been accommodated. She said they would then open up for Supervisor feedback and discussion on project accommodations.

Mr. Rapp thanked Ms. Filardo and greeted the Board. He introduced himself as Charles Rapp, the Deputy Director of Operations in Community Development, and he would be discussing the FY23 Work Program with the Board. He said the graphic on the screen illustrated both ongoing and proposed work program projects for the 2023 fiscal year throughout their department. He said similar to last year, the primary focus as shown on top of this chart would be investing in capacity. He said this included the ramp-up of their County View replacement as part of the organization's court systems modernization initiative that would extend multiple years for full implementation.

Mr. Rapp said that later in October, work would begin toward process improvements with development review to achieve greater efficiencies and reduce a high number of reviews and resubmissions that they were currently experiencing on projects. He said two major initiatives that were currently underway and would continue throughout the upcoming year were the comprehensive plan and modernized zoning project. He said the previous slide reviewed the steps of phase one of the comprehensive plan. He said this fall would transition towards phase two where they would focus on policy review for major topics such as land use, transportation, economic development, resource and

rural area planning. He said the next phase of zoning modernization initiative would focus on updates towards development regulations, which included critical slopes, tree cutting, accessory structures, parking, recreational requirements, outdoor lighting, street standards, sidewalks, and landscaping.

Mr. Rapp said they had also added affordable dwelling unit incentives, also known as “developer incentives,” to the list. He said at this time, they did not know what resources would be required to incorporate developer incentives in the zoning modernization project, as the Board would not consider the specific incentives again until their next work session in May. He acknowledged that however, the work would need to be accomplished. He said their expectation was that the developer incentive ordinance work would be prioritized ahead of other items and would cause a shifting of the remaining items further into 2024. He said the items identified as proposed projects for FY23 had been based on recent feedback and broader planning efforts.

Mr. Rapp said in the first half of the year, they were proposing to adopt new water protection related regulations that would prevent incremental development, which would address the accumulation of smaller projects underneath their 10,000 square foot disturbance threshold within the WPO. He said in July, they planned to move forward with their wireless facilities policy and associated ordinance. He said during that time, they would also engage in consultant services and preliminary studies for three potential transportation projects, which included the partial closure of Free Bridge Lane, an evaluation of additional concepts for the Route 20 shared use path, and a potential sidewalk for the Salt and Englewood roadways. He said in response to the recently announced RAISE grant, they were proposing to submit an application to fund the study of planning for Three Notched Trail. He said if awarded, this would provide funding for planning assistance through multiple years for a project they provided with regional and local benefits. He said additional details of this grant application and project would be presented to the Board on April 6.

Mr. Rapp said with the recent adoption with the Rio29 form-based code and the Broadway blueprint, they incorporated the next phase of both projects starting in January. He said the form-based code phase 2 would focus on road networks, building envelopes, and proposed realignment of Hillsdale Drive. He said this work would provide the next step towards encouraging redevelopment of large, under-utilized commercial parcels in the district. He said the Broadway Blueprint Small Area Plan would focus on transportation access, potential pedestrian bridge alignment, and other site features to guide the redevelopment in the area, ensuring it was interconnected in the existing urban fabric of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Rapp said there were two projects that were estimated that would run the full course of the upcoming fiscal year. He said the first policy implementation plan of the recently endorsed stream health initiatives would include draft of the stream buffer overlay zone as well as riparian restoration guidelines. He said in addition, they were hoping to engage in consultant assistance to complete a fee simplification study, which would identify opportunities to simplify how they currently calculated fees for work undertaken throughout the department. He said their current fee structure involved a high number of individual calculations that resulted in a complex and often confusing scenario for customers and administrative staff, making room for improvements in clarity and efficiency.

Mr. Rapp said he would now discuss the parking lot list from the past year. He said in FY22, they attempted to categorize projects into three categories, which were small, medium, and large types. He said where they could, they had incorporated items into an existing project, or put them in the work program for next year. He said staff had not completed specific scoping of any of these, so projects could certainly change categories once they got into more detailed planning for them. He said these projects and others that the Board had in mind could be swapped out with others they had addressed with next year’s work program, however, there were complexities and intricacies involved in moving them around, especially at the staffing, knowledge, skills, and the availability to complete the work.

Mr. Rapp said the current slide showed a list of small resource demands, meaning they required less than 500 hours of work. He said three examples in this resource category were the zoning text amendment to address fill and waste, which they estimated took 330 hours, and the rural area landscape contractors which took an estimated 75 hours to complete. He said as the years progressed, they tried their best to incorporate or combine expiration of these projects and other projects covering similar topics. He said some projects had fallen off the list because the need for the project disappeared due to legislative changes in Richmond or for other reasons. He said they struck through those projects on their list.

Mr. Rapp said in the medium projects resource category, there was the housing policy comprehensive plan amendment, which took an estimated 2000 hours to complete. He said for those projects within the medium staff category, they suggested pairing with the comprehensive plan work where relevant or added them to the proposed work program for now, awaiting Board feedback. He said the final category involved the largest amount of staff resource demands. He said the first example was the form-based code, which required an estimated 4500 hours of staff time to complete. He said that concluded their list of projects and the formal presentation, so he would like to turn the matter over to the Board and was happy to entertain questions or suggestions they may have.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she was glad the department had made good progress, and the software had been popular with the people she sent it to.

Mr. Gallaway said he expected the story about the improvements to the department would continue during the budget discussions. He said the slide about the Camino project talked more about

how many different departments were involved, and it helped show how things were spread out over the budget and not just in the CDD department. He said he had a question about slide 4, when they were talking about the permits received versus the permits issued. He said he did not expect the permits received and the permits issued to be equal to each other, but he would like to know if there was some sort of historical or expected variance or received versus issued that was accounted for.

Ms. Filardo said that there did not necessarily have to be a 1:1 correspondence between received and issued, although they would love for that to happen. She said there were some permits that took hundreds of days to review, and others that could be issued within one or two days, so they did kind of balance out. She said what was shown on that slide was actually calendar year data based on when the actual permit was issued, so they worked backwards to take a look at all of that. She said their hope and target would be that as they improved their processes and improved the quality of the applications that they received, and as new staff was trained, they would get to a two-week timetable to get a permit into the department and issued. She said they were very far away from that, but that was their fervent hope and their goal. She said she did not know if that directly answered his question, but that was the best she could say for now.

Mr. Gallaway said he appreciated her answer. He said that he was trying to understand the key performance indicators for what showed the current movement from the current state to what she just described as their expected state, which was that two-week timeframe. He said there would be benchmarks they would look at to see if they were making progress, and that was what he was trying to ascertain. He said his next question was related as well; the total number of reviews being completed. He asked Ms. Filardo to explain that again.

Ms. Filardo said on development applications, on average, the development reviewers touched that application an average of six times. She said that meant they got the application, reviewed it, sent it back out to the applicant, received an applicant response, sent it back out if the response were not complete or if the response caused other problems, sent out additional information because the new responses caused further discussion, and the process would continue in that way. She said they kept trying to “work with” people, and the back-and-forth discussions meant they were dealing with applications that were not very thorough or complete when they received them. She said what Camino was doing was helping on the front end, so they were hoping to get better applications on the front end so that they got better product in the door. She said they were hoping to reduce that cycle time just because they were dealing with better applications. She said in addition, they needed better tools to enable those kinds of communications to happen differently and faster, which some of the modern community development processing systems enabled. She said they were coming at this opportunity from multiple directions at the moment. She said she hoped that answered Mr. Gallaway's question.

Mr. Gallaway said that Community Development had taken it on the chin with review times and other things, and they were all working to improve that. He said tightening up the front-end application would help with that because they could say they were not taking that application because it was not complete, so they would not begin review. He said that was not necessarily the fault of those submitting the application, because they knew the state of things in Albemarle, and were probably trying to work the system as best they can, which he did not fault them for.

Mr. Gallaway said however, at the end of the day, improving the application end should allow for tighter control over those review points. He said when they did the first review, sent it out and received it again, if review two was still dealing with things that were missed in review one, that was something that should be tightened up on the County's side, and he hoped that system allowed them to police that in a way with benchmarks or performance indicators. He said he hoped it would also boost the performance of the actual work, and that could be tracked as well.

Mr. Gallaway said he would like to make sure he understood the Housing Albemarle incentives and the zoning changes associated. He said the work that was being done was because they were changing in writing what the thresholds were for something like bonus density and those had to all be changed. He asked if that was correct.

Ms. Filardo said yes, there was an array of those kinds of changes. She said some of those changes they had already made with the comprehensive plan update that Dr. Pethia brought forward last year, but they had not rolled them through to the zoning ordinance, so that integration needed to happen. She said similarly, if the County offered incentives, they must be put into regulations so that both the County and the developers had an understanding of how those operated and what the developer got for what they gave. She said all of that rolling through the zoning ordinance was not an inconsequential challenge.

Mr. Gallaway said he understood. He said that the bonus density, where if a certain percentage were met, a certain density was allowed, was one that could be cleanly put into the ordinance. He said he saw incentives along the lines of some of the things they had talked about a month or so ago as a different bucket. He said if he was a developer and the incentive that made the most sense for his development was getting rid of tap fees. He asked if that would need to be cleanly outlined in the ordinance, or if that could be done on an application basis as a performance agreement in a similar way they had done other individual incentive packages under a public-private partnership or some other form.

Mr. Kamptner said it could be done both ways. He said as the Board knows, performance agreements, depending on the project, could take a lot of time, but they did allow for project specific tailoring to fit a particular need.

Mr. Gallaway said some incentives seemed like they could be cleanly outlined, but if they thought they were being exhaustive in their list of incentives, but there was an extra one or one they had not thought of that was not in the ordinance, they needed to have the flexibility to still consider those. He said to him, the performance agreement and the partnership allowed them to do that, but it could also be attached to a performance agreement just like other past partnerships had been laid out. He said he liked the performance agreement piece because it was dictated by meeting an achievement to receive the reward. He said when he heard it must all be layered into the ordinance, it was too restrictive or inflexible. He said if it had to be that way legally, that was fine, but there were some things he thought they could put out and others could have more flexibility. He said that in the CD work plan piece, there was a comment about the analysis of the development area. He asked if Ms. Filardo could restate what that was.

Ms. Filardo said the Economic Development Office working with Kimberly Horn and their team was doing an analysis of the capacity of the County across the development area, given the current zoning they had on each of those parcels.

Mr. Gallaway said when Mr. Rapp was listing the small, medium, and large lists, he did not see the Broadway Blueprint in those groupings when he reviewed the material prior to the meeting. He asked if he missed it.

Mr. Rapp said it had been incorporated into the proposed work program underneath their proposed projects. He said at the start of January, they were proposing to do a small area plan that would address some of those physical features like the connectivity to adjacent neighborhoods, the pedestrian bridge, and all of those things so that they could track with it.

Mr. Gallaway said he missed where it was listed. He thanked Mr. Rapp.

Mr. Andrews said he hoped it was easier on the front end for people to get their applications completed. He said he hoped it helped on their end with the review. He said he was curious about the review process. He said at one point, he was told it was a first-in, first-out process. He asked if there were ways in which Camino would help streamline which proposals would require multiple reviews and which proposals only needed one look before moving ahead.

Ms. Filardo said it may be helpful to differentiate between building permit applications and development project applications. She said this was on a development application, so that would be on a subdivision or a site plan, and those kinds of bigger projects. She said the building permit applications was where they were aiming for two weeks. She said she did not think they would get to two weeks on the development projects. She said perhaps that added a bit of clarity to the situation.

Mr. Andrews asked if for building permits it was still a first-in, first-out situation regardless of the scope and nature of the project.

Ms. Filardo said that they were reviewed in the order they were received, however, a lot of the incomplete applications were sitting and waiting for more information from the applicant, which was where things got stuck. She said they were pushed forward from the application services into the review cycle on a first-come, first-serve basis as they were complete. She said when they got to plans review, for example, they often sat and waited for things such as trust calculations, foundation detailing, wall sections, and all kinds of other things that was driving the move towards making sure they were receiving construction-level drawings at the outset, so that they had all that information and they did not sit in the plan review queue, which was what occurred today.

Mr. Andrews said he thought it was important streamlining and a helpful process. He said he was very much looking forward to the preliminary build-out analysis Ms. Filardo mentioned. He said his only other question was about understanding the process of the parking lot. He said he would like to know if they were looking for any feedback from them on that parking lot. He asked if this was the point where people would look at it and ask why things were on the list.

Ms. Filardo said when the Board allowed them to create the parking lot so that they could get work done, which she believed they had proven they could do when given the freedom to go there, they said they would put everything on a project list and would bring them back to the Board for consideration. She said as things went along, they modified things slightly, because they found a nexus between something they knew needed to be worked on and some other things they wanted, they tried to fold those together as best they could. She said now they were at the place where they had this list of things that had not been accommodated, and they tried their best to accommodate them as much as they could in FY23, but they did that based on their current staffing and trying to predict their future mandated work levels.

Ms. Filardo said they would anticipate hearing from the Board about either other things they wanted to put on the list, or things they would want off of the parking lot list and into the work program, but right now they had their work program fully allocating all the resources they had, so things may have to be swapped out, but if the Board did desire to swap out work for them to do, they needed to know what projects would be changed and what the work would entail. She said she thought they had fully allocated their resources to FY23.

Mr. Walker said for historical context, the Community Development Department was the only

department that brought to the Board its work program for the year and had done so to some extent in an interest to make sure that there was clarity between the staff and the Board about what the work was that they were trying to accomplish. He said no other department had as much legislative and policy issues that came to the Board in the course of the year, and in the past, there had been a tendency to want to do more than what could actually be accomplished, and that led to frustration on the part of staff and on the part of Board members. He said there had been a concerted effort to better align resources capacity with priority interest on the part of the Board.

Mr. Walker said in this example of the work program, the prior projects that had been put on the program and had been completed or were ongoing, and then what was pulled off of that list to focus on for the upcoming year. He said as Ms. Filardo just said, the capacity, to the best of their knowledge, was fully allocated, so there was not room for something else, but they did not want to go into this performance year, aligned with the budget year, without giving the Board the opportunity to suggest other things for them to think about. He said if it were not necessarily captured for this performance year, then certainly there was some consideration about how it could be folded in later. He said he hoped that explained well enough how they wished to align staff and the Board as they went forward into the year.

Mr. Andrews said that was helpful.

Ms. McKeel said this discussion was a bit different than ones they had had in the past, so she wanted to make sure she understood it all. She said in FY23, investment in capacity, and we're doing that right now. She said they all had agreed about that. She said underway comprehensive review was being worked on, and modernization of zoning had all been agreed upon as necessary work that was being done right now. She said also on page 9 of the report was a section of "proposed." She asked if this was the part where they wanted to hear from the Board. She said on page 11, there were small initiatives for discussion, not addressed, medium initiatives, and large initiatives. She asked if they could frame things around what they needed from the Board right now.

Mr. Walker said an example would be that a number of occasions recently involved questions about a snow removal program. He said that would be seen on the list of large items in Community Development that was not resourced going into the upcoming performance year. He said they could discuss whether it was or was not appropriate for Community Development, because he did not know what it was about removing snow from a sidewalk that was a planning, zoning, building, or engineering issue, but that was where it was right now. He said that was an example where he knew there had been interest and discussion. He said that project was not resourced within Community Development, and was not resourced anywhere, so if there was energy among the Board around how they wanted to move forward with that, at least using this opportunity to flag that item and recognize that staff would not be working on it without further direction from the Board was about what this conversation would be best used for.

Ms. McKeel said when she saw what was proposed right now, which was wireless facilities policy and ordinance. She said that read to her that they were looking to propose in the near future a wireless facility policy and ordinance. She said in her view, that was appropriate and needed to be reviewed. She said was unsure what was being referenced with the item "preliminary transportation studies."

Mr. Rapp said that was an approach they had discussed a few times now about wanting to do some preliminary engineering and study before they dived into an application and found out a project may be too complex. He said this was an initial attempt to work with a consultant and perform some preliminary surveying, create some concepts, and find out if a project was feasible. He said they had taken some projects off of Mr. McDermott's priority projects list, other projects that were in master plans and other planning documents and tried to identify at least three of those that they could vet in the first half of this fiscal year to determine if they were ready and viable projects to move forward with funding opportunities before they committed large quantities of resources to them.

Ms. McKeel asked if they were looking at specific projects or at the criteria that would be needed to determine the projects that were not applicable.

Mr. Rapp said they were looking at specific projects, such as the potential partial closure of Free Bridge Lane, and the Route 20 Shared Use Path, which there were still concerns over, so they wanted to take the opportunity to see if a better alignment would work. He said the other was the sidewalk project on Englewood Solomon Roadway that connected Georgetown to Hydraulic and was the primary corridor in that area.

Ms. McKeel asked if these were projects that had been suggested and they were trying to figure out how to prioritize them and where to go with them.

Mr. Rapp said yes, and to give an initial attempt at seeing if there were other major utility issues, right of way challenges, and to identify the constraints of those projects to let them know if they should continue to move forward with them.

Ms. McKeel said it sounded like those projects had been discussed for a while, so with the right amount of work they could do them or not do them and get them done. She said she was in favor of that. She said it would take forever for them to go through the list individually like this, but she said they would need to decide which projects were feasible or not and if not, they should put them aside.

Mr. Rapp said that was correct.

Ms. McKeel said that that where she read the Three Notched Trail and the urban design was where the Broadway Blueprint Small Area Plan that Mr. Gallaway had been searching for was located. She asked if they had completed form-based code phase one and were now planning to move onto the form-based code phase two.

Mr. Rapp said that was correct. He said when they finished and adopted the form-based code, they talked about the next steps that needed to happen, which were that they needed to start getting into some design guidelines, look at the realignment of Hillsdale Drive, look at how they could break up a road network on those very large parcels, and how they could further identify the public investment that needed to happen on those projects so that they could bring something to fruition.

Ms. McKeel said the stream health buffer overlay and the fee simplification study were proposed, and she agreed with them and had no problem with them as they were proposed. She asked if they got to the small and medium initiatives. She said she had used a lot of time without the other Supervisors' input.

Mr. Rapp said that as Ms. Filardo pointed out, staff resources were heavily allocated to what was seen on the proposed list that they just went through, so if they wanted to go through the list of small, medium, and large projects, things would need to come off of the list of what was proposed in order to swap something out.

Ms. McKeel said she understood.

Mr. Rapp said they had done their best to identify how they could incorporate those parking lot projects into those proposed projects.

Ms. McKeel said if she looked at the small initiatives, she did not see anything on there. She said the exploration of public-private partnerships went back a long time ago, and with their economic development, they had come along way with that topic, and while they should always be exploring public-private partnerships, she did not understand why that was listed separately, unless it went back to when they first asked about those partnerships, and that was a long time ago. She said of the medium initiatives, their lighting ordinance was outdated and needed to be addressed, but it was written that they were including that in the zoning modernization.

Mr. Rapp said that was correct.

Ms. McKeel said the stream health had already been addressed, which was good. She said she was interested in, under special events in the rural area, the home occupations in the development area. She said that was an ongoing problem in all the older neighborhoods. She said she did not understand the length of time that took. She said they had a list of home occupations, and perhaps in one meeting they could go through them and check off what was appropriate and not.

Ms. Filardo said that would be a code impact, so that was where the time was taken. She said they could bring it forward to the Board with a list of suggestions or an approach, but it all had to be folded into the zoning ordinance, which was where the time was most invested.

Ms. McKeel said the "big audacious housing project" was her language, and it was from when she had suggested, before their housing policy ever came forward, that they should look at their school properties and look at developing affordable housing for teachers, firemen, and police officers. She said at this point, that could be taken off of the list because of what they were doing right now with affordable housing. She said it had been years since that item had been added to that list, so she was comfortable with it being taken out due to the current work being done for affordable housing.

Mr. Walker noted that staff heard her.

Ms. Mallek said if she looked at slide 9, she appreciated the layout but did have questions. She asked if the software they were buying was a finished product to be used, or if it was something that they would have to work to customize for their own locality.

Ms. Filardo said it would not be bare-bones, and they had figured out that it was more costly in the long term than buying something fully integrated up-front. She said their intention was not to buy a skimmed down version and tweak it.

Ms. Mallek said that was good to know. She said she thought that they had a solar ordinance for the utility scale based on the property that they very quickly instituted rules for so they could do a special permit for the land on Rout 53. She asked if that was not an ordinance and was just a set of performance standards.

Mr. Rapp said that was correct, and they were treated as a special use permit with particular conditions that went with it.

Ms. Mallek asked if they got another application, would they have to do something similar to that all over again and make sure to strengthen it.

Mr. Rapp said that was the approach they had been taking.



Ms. Mallek said she was thrilled with the work they were doing to raise the standards of applications. She said while it may feel like punishment to some people who did not do a good job, it was so much better for people who did spend the time to pay their staff and review the application properly instead of making the Community Development Office fix it for them. She said she knew it had been difficult to get there, and she said they had her full support because she knew it would help in the long run.

Ms. Mallek said clarity for the sake of equal treatment was important, and they should not have even the perception of there being different rules for different people. She said she was excited about the dashboard. She asked if there was a relationship in the priorities that they saw between the number of complaints that came in about a certain type of activity. She asked if there was something perceived as a hotspot, did that get into their evaluation process, and how quickly it should be addressed.

Ms. Filardo said she would like Mr. Bart Svoboda to weigh in on this topic.

Mr. Svoboda asked Ms. Mallek to repeat her question.

Ms. Mallek said it was impossible to have in their work plan in any one year all of the different issues each district had, but using home occupations in the development area as an example, it was not on the list right now because it required a lot of implementation into the rest of the code, but if that or some other issue turned out to be a source of lots of complaints that their department had to deal with, did that change the priority level of the item on the list so that the work associated with it being a to-do item could be prevented.

Mr. Svoboda said that while speaking out of turn since they set the work program and the priorities that they did, but also using the homestays as an example as Supervisor Mallek did, over a number of years, homestays had not appeared on the work program, but it was something they had consulted with the County Executive's Office and the Board about making that a priority to devote resources to and understanding that it would push or delay some things. He said if he used that as an example of when they identified a critical issue, they would likely make those adjustments through the proper channels.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked for an example other than the home occupations that Ms. Mallek brought up that would be a cause of issue.

Ms. McKeel said the issue she was describing in her older neighborhoods that had no HOAs was that landscaping was a home occupation. She said home occupations were supposed to be not seen and not heard. She said people working from home on their computers was not a problem, but when people who had home occupation as a landscaper, it meant trailers, trucks, work vehicles, and other things.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she understood what she was saying. She said she knew they passed something where people were not allowed to park on the street, but that meant they would be on their front lawn or sidewalk, which was what they were trying to avoid.

Ms. McKeel said yes. She said a lot of these older neighborhoods that had these problems were not composed of people who were partial to complaining, but they were trying to keep the property values up as best they can without gentrifying them because they were older neighborhoods without protection from HOAs.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said she understood. She said she was excited about the launch of the Camino software. She said a quote about it in the report was that "users can complete applications and send online payments, enabling faster processing times." She asked if they were planning to reject applications that did not have the things they were looking for.

Ms. Filardo said that what they were doing now was walking people through all the stuff they needed to make up a complete application, so when they put all of that together, and they paid, and pushed the submit button, and they had an integration process that picked up that building permit and sent it onto the County to do. She said then their application services people took a look at it and made sure they got everything, but from there, they were off to the races.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if they filled out the application and did not fill out a couple of things that were needed, would the application be returned to the applicant.

Ms. Filardo said they could not even submit the application, because there would still be things that must be attached that they needed. She said they could not pay or submit the application before putting the missing information in there.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said it sounded like it would be great.

Ms. Price said that she knew Community Development staff performed an admirable amount of work. She asked if Camino worked for existing, already-submitted applications, or would just apply to new applications.

Ms. Filardo said that it only applied to getting applications into the system, but they would continue on the County View system.

Ms. Price said she appreciated the parking lot approach, because CDD was filled to the gills with work and Supervisors continued to request more. She said putting them in the parking lot allowed them to mention things and make sure they did not forget them while not interfering with the workload they had already decided. She said she would not ask to take anything off of the list they had, but she said slides 11, 12, and 13 of the hard copy, prioritizing for the next available opportunity for consideration would be the utility grade solar arrays zoning ordinance updates, and she would expect they would continue to get a lot of those applications. She said she was clearly getting a lot of interest from communications. She said for the medium initiatives, special events in the rural area, and for the large initiatives, the VDOT corridor studies on 250 and 29. She said she was not asking for anything to be taken off of what they already had, but these would be her next priorities for consideration when the time came.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to endorse what Ms. McKeel said about the public-private partnerships piece, and he thought it could be removed because they did that work in other ways. He said the same was true of the "big audacious housing project," and he agreed with that comment, but they needed to be ready if something popped up. He said they should make sure to retain some capacity for the unknown when they arose, even if they were not on the parking lot list. He said he would throw into the bucket for removal "the opportunity zone." He said the opportunity zone continued to go, and he thought it was incorporated into Project ENABLE as a tool that, if needed, would work the same as a public-private partnership, and if the developer or applicant wanted to use a P3 or things under the opportunity zone, either was fine.

Mr. Gallaway said he did not perceive that the opportunity zone program, with its timelines, dates, and everything incorporated with it as being needed on the parking lot list for the future. He said before anything on that parking lot, it was endorsing or agreeing with investing in capacity. He said investing in capacity was what would ultimately allow them to get to the parking lot, among other things, so it was excellent that it was at the top of the list.

Ms. Price asked Ms. Filardo if she needed anything further. She said she was happy to bring next year's work program to them with hopefully other great results.

---

Agenda Item No. 11. **Presentation:** Department of Social Services Advisory Board Annual Report Fiscal Year 2021.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Department of Social Services (DSS) Advisory Board, required by the Code of Virginia, was established by the Board of Supervisors to demonstrate an interest in all matters pertaining to local social services, monitor social service programs, and provide an annual report to the governing body. The DSS Advisory Board enjoys participation from each of the five magisterial districts, meets monthly with DSS leadership, and receives monthly departmental updates by unit. The DSS Advisory Board is pleased to present this annual report for the activities of Fiscal Year 2021 (FY 21).

The theme for the FY 21 DSS Annual Report is 'Creative Pivot for Community Well-being'. This theme reflects the work done by the department in a changing and changeable context. DSS staff responded to national, state, policy, family, agency, and individual-level changes throughout the year, always focusing on sustaining or improving community well-being. Doing work that requires this level of flexibility and responsiveness is difficult and requires a steady focus on the values and intention of DSS's charge. DSS could not simply rely on historic processes or protocols.

This report reveals the following major themes: an increase in the number of individuals in need in our community, an increase in the acuity and level of need experienced by individuals and families receiving services, a focus on community safety, effective relationship-building, and going above and beyond; a changing policy landscape that supported community members struggling during the global pandemic and placed significant additional administrative burden on staff; a largely teleworking team that adapted to ensure best practice expectations were being met, the physical office was sufficiently staffed, and excellent support and supervision was provided; and a change in leadership as Phyllis Savides retired after many years of dedicated service to social work and Albemarle County. The Advisory Board is pleased to submit this report to illustrate the work provided by the DSS staff.

There is no budget impact

This is an informational item only. No action is needed at this time.

---

Ms. Kaki Dimock, Director of the Department of Social Services, said she would present the FY21 report of the Department of Social Services (DSS) advisory board. She said Ms. Emily Dodson, the Scottsville Community Advisory Board Member, and Ms. Mary Stebbins, Deputy Director of DSS, were present.

Ms. Emily Dodson, Scottsville representative of the DSS Advisory Board, said there had been changes to the advisory board roster, so the 2021 board members were displayed alongside the current board members for each of the districts. She said the theme of the FY21 report was "Creative Pivot for Community Well-Being." She said DSS provided services to nearly 24,000 Albemarle County residents over the year.

Ms. Dodson explained 687 community members received support and care from adult services. She said 4,226 individuals received SNAP benefits. She said over 800 referrals were made to Child Protective Services, and of those referrals, 378 were validated and cases were opened for review. She said nearly 15,000 members were enrolled in Medicaid, and over 2,000 patients in the UVA health system who were otherwise uninsured received benefits.

Ms. Dodson said 1,313 households received energy assistance benefits. She said 109 families, or 514 individuals, were aided through family preservation services. She said community-based services assisted an average of 83 families a month in order to build resiliency. She said 75% of youth identified as in "imminent risk" were able to be placed with family or friends. She noted the department was doing well on the state level when keeping children with family. She said in 2021, 13 adoptions were finalized.

Ms. Dodson said on a monthly basis, 394 families received a housing voucher. She said in collaboration with DHCD and Habitat for Humanity, DSS worked on the Southwood Neighborhood initiative for sustainable, permanent housing within the community. She said a formal affordable housing policy was adopted by the County. She said 22 housing vouchers were awarded to Virginia Supportive Housing for the permanent supportive housing component of the Premier Circle Initiative.

Ms. Dodson said Virginia Initiative for Education and Work (VIEW) provided job training services to 166 people. She said 500 people were provided leads. She said a job fair was hosted for women experiencing homelessness. She said there were sessions over Zoom with 10 regional clients and employment outreach initiatives in the Southwood neighborhood. She said the DSS had achieved the designation as official affiliate (One Stop) of Virginia Career Works with Piedmont which worked to identify local needs and develop strategies to address the needs.

Ms. Dodson said DSS leveraged over \$8 million in local government funds to bring in \$176 million in state and federal funds for Albemarle residents. She said DSS collaborated with other organizations, such as the Community Mental Health and Wellness Coalition, the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless, as well as the Marcus Alert Planning Group.

Ms. Dodson said stress had been high within the department; she noted the department had been flexible and resilient, but it took its toll on staff. She explained one in five department staff had left their positions largely due to stress, and many had taken family or medical leave. She said departments were under-staffed and struggling to keep up with state standards. She said there had been a 50% to 62% increase in cases for eligibility. She said child welfare units had seen an increase in cases. She said the department considered relationship building its biggest tool which was made even more difficult during a pandemic. She said the department was remaining resilient and flexible while managing the staff changes and the pandemic.

Ms. Dodson said 7% of the 21,879 children in the County were living in poverty. She said the County was made up of 21,877 individuals who were over the age of 65. She said there were over 15,000 households identified as asset limited, income restrained employed. She said over 7,000 members of the community did not have insurance. She said over 1,000 children were involved with CPS. She said 565 adults were involved with Adult Protective Services. She said 5,535 individuals paid between 31% to 50% of their income towards housing. She said 5,089 residents paid 50% or more of their income to housing. She said there were many individuals and families who depended on services and many who could benefit.

Ms. Dodson said multiple departments worked together to provide housing, furniture, school enrollment, employment, and a donated car to support the needs of a refugee family. She said DSS had identified and amended three main goals: to support community members in living wage employment; to ensure the DSS was an inclusive and welcoming place for all; and to recruit, train, and retain high quality staff.

Ms. Dimock said the supervisors had received the traditional report as part of their attachments. She said she would answer questions about the department, the advisory board, or the report.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the three FTEs employed by the department were administrative rather than field positions. She asked if the greatest need was in the administrative functions.

Ms. Dimock said the three positions were added mid-year for CPS, and they were in the field.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the last slide did not reflect that information.

Mr. Gallaway said the \$8 million to \$176 million was a phenomenal statistic. He asked what the ratio was. He said the achievement should be celebrated. He asked if child homelessness was tracked in the area. He said it was a statistic that was not discussed enough.

Ms. Dimock said it could be expected to be tracked if the county could handle the data; she said it was a difficult number to identify. She said the Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless held an annual homelessness count where it identified on one day all the people it knew who were experiencing homelessness, staying in an emergency shelter, outside, or other supported contexts.

Ms. Dimock said few homeless families were identified in the system. She said the schools knew more and had a more expansive definition of homelessness than the traditional homelessness system of care through HUD. She said the schools identified 362 families of concern; living doubled up or in non-

permanent housing. She said the number could be assumed to be based predominantly in the City and Albemarle, but it encompassed the entire planning district. She said the people could not be precisely located. She said it was suspected several other families were experiencing housing concerns or insecurity that the County was not aware of.

Mr. Gallaway said he wanted to know how the number had changed relative to the poverty rate. He noted the staffing issues due to stress. He asked what the budget did to support the DSS, reduce stress, and help the department with the enormous workload. He asked what the budget provided in terms of tools or resources. He said the issue could come back during the budget conversation. He said he had asked at a previous work session about the DSS and if the budget was enough for the department to address the issues.

Ms. Dimock said the department was working hard to create reasonable case load expectations, flexible work schedules, and celebrate small wins. She said the department looked forward to the results of the compensation study and the wellness and team building support from the HR department. She said the department planned to discuss the resource requests in the next budget work session. She said if the Board had suggestions for ways to keep qualified staff, it would appreciate input.

Mr. Gallaway said he believed the department should be able to use all its resources and not have to worry about coming within 1% of its budget. He said he encouraged the department to ask for all the resources that it needed. He trusted the money would be used effectively.

Mr. Andrews said the return ratio was 22:1 for the DSS budget. He echoed Mr. Gallaway's comments and asked how the Board could help the DSS reach full staffing. He noted he had not appointed a person from the Samuel Miller District to be on the advisory board.

Ms. McKeel noted the \$176 million return on the \$8 million in local funding. She said the community needs slide was informative. She said it put the work in perspective. She noticed the bullet points on the third page of the report. She noted there was an increase in the number of individuals with need and an increase in the acuity and level of need. She said it was not unexpected during a pandemic, and she recognized the stress on the department. She asked how telecommuting helped the department. She noted the DSS employees appreciated being able to telecommute. She assumed the DSS would continue to be able to telecommute.

Ms. Dimock said the staff had benefited from telework programs and permissions from the County. She said there were some floating available offices, but eligibility staff were largely doing the work from home. She said multiple locations had expressed fear of exposure to the COVID-19 virus from in-person work. She said the ability to telework was a critical pivot. She said the eligibility staff would continue to work from home as the County and State unwound from pandemic regulations.

Ms. McKeel noted the retention and recruitment problems. She said the department should be able to continue telecommuting. She noted the school system tracked homeless children. She said the schools had started a program that shuttled children back and forth from the schools in the City and the County because they tried to keep the children in the same school because as the homeless children moved throughout the county, they would typically have to change schools. She explained the County transported children to the same school regardless of where they stayed.

Ms. Mallek said she appreciated staff's empathy and ability to do the job and she noted the job was emotionally challenging. She said the work force center affiliate was good. She said it was beneficial to have a contact to the workforce center and job skills training in the same building as the DSS because people already came to the building for other services.

Ms. Price said a 22:1 return on investment was an incredible accomplishment. She said the Board usually saw community development and land use projects. She said the DSS interacted with 20% of the County. She said it was frustrating to lose 20% of staff with a 50% to 62% increase in case load.

---

Agenda Item No. 12. **Closed Meeting.**

At 4:38 p.m., Mr. Andrews **moved** that the Board go into a Closed Meeting pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) of the Code of Virginia:

- Under Subsection (1), to discuss and consider the appointment of the County Attorney's successor upon his pending retirement; and
- Under Subsection (5), to discuss and consider the expansion of two existing County businesses identified as Projects Poma and Bee Friend, where no previous announcement has been made of their interest in expanding their facilities in the County and where the investment of public funds to support their expansion involves bargaining and, if made public initially, would adversely affect the financial interest of the County.

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

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

Agenda Item No. 13. **Certify Closed Meeting.**

At 6:00 p.m., Mr. Andrews **moved** that the Board of Supervisors certify by a recorded vote that, to the best of each supervisor's knowledge, only public business matters lawfully exempted from the open meeting requirements of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and identified in the motion authorizing the closed meeting, were heard, discussed, or considered in the closed meeting.

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

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

Mr. Andrews **moved** that the Board authorize the Chair to sign an agreement after it were approved as to form by the current County Attorney between the County and Sans Anderson PC to provide County Attorney services for an initial term of 90 days, where Cynthia E. Hudson was designated as the primary attorney to provide the services.

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

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

---

Agenda Item No. 14. From the County Executive: Report on Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Mr. Richardson said he had no report.

---

Agenda Item No. 15. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda or on Matters Previously Considered by the Board or Matters that are Pending Before the Board.

Mr. Kent Schlusell said he lived in the Rio District. He said he had reached out to the Board two weeks prior regarding a questionnaire he received to be on AC44 Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). He said the questionnaire was ethically questionable, improper, and illegal based on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended. He said he had submitted his statement to the Board and County Attorney looking for a legal opinion.

Mr. Schlusell said he had received a response from Ms. Emily Kilroy concerning the comments. He said Mr. Richardson had invited him to discuss the situation. He said he would be remiss if he did not thank them for their time. He said since he spoke, AC44 had withdrawn the questions and stated the questions had not gone through the proper channels of review. He said the people responsible had been talked to and said the selection panel for the AC44 group would be trained to put aside their biases when selecting the committee. He said since the County staff made the illegal questionnaire, he hoped people responsible would be trained to prevent it from happening again. He said the County should make a statement concerning the error, apologize, and ensure that this would not happen again by putting safeguards in place. He thanked staff for handling his complaint in a timely manner.

---

Agenda Item No. 16. **Public Hearing: Overlook Hotel: Pantops PDMC Amendment.**

PROJECT: ZMA202000013 Overlook Hotel: Pantops PDMC Amendment

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna

TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 078000000073A7

LOCATION: Property on the south side of Richmond Road (U.S. Route 250), approximately 280 feet northwest of its intersection with Hansen Road

PROPOSAL: Amend the application plan and proffers associated with ZMA199800020 and ZMA200200008 to allow the construction of a hotel.

PETITION: Request to amend the application plan and the proffers associated with ZMA199800020 and ZMA200200008 to permit a hotel and to remove a tree conservation area, on a parcel of approximately 2.687 acres. No dwelling units proposed.

ZONING: PD-MC, Planned Development Mixed Commercial - large-scale commercial uses, residential by special use permit (15 units/acre); in accordance with ZMA199800020 and ZMA200200008.

OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): Entrance Corridor, Steep Slopes – Managed

PROFFERS: Yes

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Community Mixed Use – commercial/retail, offices, residential (6-34 du/acre, hotels and conference facilities, institutional uses. Secondary office/R&D/flex/light industrial, existing auto-commercial sales & service. Parks & Green Systems – stream buffers, floodplain, steep slopes, privately owned open space, natural areas. In Neighborhood 3, in the Pantops Master Plan area.

POTENTIALLY IN THE MONTICELLO VIEWSHED: Yes.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that at its meeting on Tuesday, January

11, 2022, the Planning Commission (PC) conducted a public hearing and voted 6:0 to recommend approval of ZMA2020-00013, for the reasons stated in the staff report, along with two additional recommendations. The PC also voted 6:0 to recommend approval of SP202100010, with conditions, for the reasons stated in the staff report. The PC's staff report, ZMA action letter, SP action letter, and meeting minutes are attached (Attachments A, B, C and D).

The PC's action to recommend approval of the ZMA included two additional recommendations: 1) Applicant explores pedestrian connections between the subject property and the adjacent property; and 2) Additional landscaping be added at the front of the property on Route 250.

Since the PC meeting, the applicant has provided a revised project narrative (Attachment E) and a revised application plan for the ZMA (Attachment F) to address these recommendations. A letter from the applicant with responses to these recommendations and how they have been addressed is included as Attachment G. Additional landscaping has been provided. The provision for an additional pedestrian connection, which involves the willingness of the adjacent property owner, could not be achieved with the rezoning application. However, future opportunities for an additional pedestrian connection at the rear of the parcel remain and pedestrian facilities will be provided along the property frontage.

In addition, the PC recommended approval by a vote of 6:0 of a special exception request (SE202100016) to waive the requirement for a setback of the building above the third story. The applicant has withdrawn the request for this Special Exception since the PC meeting, following a proposed redesign of the building and a determination by the Zoning Division that a setback is no longer required with this redesign.

Additional comments, which were received from a community member after the publication of the Planning Commission staff report, are included as Attachment H.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Ordinance (Attachment I) to approve ZMA202000013 Overlook Hotel: Pantops PDMC Amendment and adopt the attached resolution (Attachment J) to approve SP2021-00010 Auto Superstore SP Amendment.

---

Agenda Item No. 17. **Public Hearing: SP202100010 Auto Superstore SP Amendment.**

PROJECT: SP202100010 Auto Superstore SP Amendment

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna

TAX MAP/PARCEL: 07800000001300

LOCATION: 1389 Richmond Road, Charlottesville, Virginia 22911

PROPOSAL: Request to amend existing special use permit SP200200013 to allow a landscape easement, required as a condition of the previous approval, to be vacated.

PETITION: Special Use Permit request for outdoor storage, display, and/or sales in accordance with Section 30.6.3(a)2(b) of the Zoning Ordinance on an approximately 3.734-acre parcel. No dwelling units proposed.

ZONING: HC, Highway Commercial – commercial and service, residential by special use permit (15 units/acre) and EC, Entrance Corridor – Overlay to protect properties of historic, architectural, or cultural significance from visual impacts of development along routes of tourist access; in accordance with ZMA199800020 and ZMA200200008.

OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): Entrance Corridor, Steep Slopes – Managed, and Steep Slopes – Preserved

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Community Mixed Use – commercial/retail, offices, residential (6-34 du/acre, hotels and conference facilities, institutional uses; secondary office/R&D/flex/light industrial, existing auto-commercial sales & service. Parks & Green Systems – stream buffers, floodplain, steep slopes, privately owned open space, natural areas. In Neighborhood 3, in the Pantops Master Plan area.

MONTICELLO VIEWSHED: Yes.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that at its meeting on Tuesday, January 11, 2022, the Planning Commission (PC) conducted a public hearing and voted 6:0 to recommend approval of ZMA2020-00013, for the reasons stated in the staff report, along with two additional recommendations. The PC also voted 6:0 to recommend approval of SP202100010, with conditions, for the reasons stated in the staff report. The PC's staff report, ZMA action letter, SP action letter, and meeting minutes are attached (Attachments A, B, C and D).

The PC's action to recommend approval of the ZMA included two additional recommendations: 1) Applicant explores pedestrian connections between the subject property and the adjacent property; and 2) Additional landscaping be added at the front of the property on Route 250.

Since the PC meeting, the applicant has provided a revised project narrative (Attachment E) and a revised application plan for the ZMA (Attachment F) to address these recommendations. A letter from the applicant with responses to these recommendations and how they have been addressed is included as Attachment G. Additional landscaping has been provided. The provision for an additional pedestrian connection, which involves the willingness of the adjacent property owner, could not be achieved with the rezoning application. However, future opportunities for an additional pedestrian connection at the rear of the parcel remain and pedestrian facilities will be provided along the property frontage.

In addition, the PC recommended approval by a vote of 6:0 of a special exception request (SE202100016) to waive the requirement for a setback of the building above the third story. The

applicant has withdrawn the request for this Special Exception since the PC meeting, following a proposed redesign of the building and a determination by the Zoning Division that a setback is no longer required with this redesign.

Additional comments, which were received from a community member after the publication of the Planning Commission staff report, are included as Attachment H.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Ordinance (Attachment I) to approve ZMA202000013 Overlook Hotel: Pantops PDMC Amendment and adopt the attached resolution (Attachment J) to approve SP2021-00010 Auto Superstore SP Amendment.

Ms. Price stated that Agenda Item No. 16 and Agenda Item No. 17 would be heard together during one public hearing.

At 6:07 p.m., Mr. Gallaway disqualified himself from participating in the Overlook Hotel amendment, the Auto Superstore amendment, and related approvals because he was employed by CarLotz which occupied the property subject of the auto superstore special use permit. He said the disqualification form was signed and would be kept in the public records for five years. He said he would also excuse himself for a family matter.

Mr. Andy Reitelbach, Senior Planner of the Planning Division, said the public hearing would cover the zoning amendment and special use permit, ZMA202000013, Overlook Hotel: Pantops PDMC Amendment, and SP202100010, Auto Superstore SP Amendment. He said the two applications were located on a site in Pantops off of Route 250. He said office buildings, the Rivanna Ridge shopping center, Carriage Hill apartment and condo community, and CarLotz surrounded the site.

Mr. Reitelbach said the ZMA request was on TMP78-73A7, a vacant parcel. He said the special use permit request was for TMP78-13 which was in the adjacent car dealership parcel. He said the rezoning application was a request to amend the application plan that was previously approved as ZMA200200008. He said the applicant requested to allow a hotel as a permitted use and remove a tree conservation area that was designated on the application plan in 2002. He said the special use request was to amend the previously approved special use permit, SP200200013, to remove the requirements for an offsite landscaping easement. He said the landscaping easement was located on TMP78-73A7 where the hotel was proposed.

Mr. Reitelbach said the current zoning for TMP78-73A7 was Planned Development - Mixed Commercial (PDMC). He said TMP78-13 was zoned for Highway Commercial (HC). He said the two parcels were in the entrance corridor overlay district of Route 250. He said there were areas of managed steep slopes on both parcels and small areas of preserved steep slopes on TMP78-13, but that the area was not affected by the application before the Board. He noted the area of preserved steep slopes was unaffected by the application.

Mr. Reitelbach said in the Comprehensive Plan, the parcels were designated as community mix use. He explained the use recommended primary uses such as commercial, retail, offices, residential, hotels, comfort facilities, and secondary uses such as flex, light industrial, and existing auto commercial sales and service. He said the building height was recommended to be between two and four stories. He said the rear portions of the parcels furthest from Route 250 were designated for parks and green systems such as stream buffers, flood plains, steep slopes, and privately owned natural areas.

Mr. Reitelbach said the parcel was part of a larger PDMC district that included Rivanna Ridge shopping center and several out parcels. He noted the parcel was the last undeveloped parcel in the PDMC area. He said the applicant requested an amendment to the application plan to allow a hotel use which was currently not permitted on the parcel within the PDMC. He said a hotel was a recommended use in the community mixed use land use designation of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant requested to remove a tree conservation area designated on the original application plan. He said the area was designated for screening purposes; however, the area was devoid of trees and was just grass and shrubs. He said the development was subject to ARB approval as it was in the Route 250 entrance corridor. He said an entrance was proposed directly onto 250 and would be subject to VDOT approval at the site planning stage. He said a direct connection was proposed because there were no available street stub outs.

Mr. Reitelbach said there were managed steep slopes, so any disturbance, grading, or retaining walls were subject to the regulations for managed slopes. He explained the grading would be reviewed by the engineering division at the site planning stage and would ultimately be approved by the County Engineer.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant did not propose development in the rear of the parcel, the part designated as parks and green systems, because it was the location of a proposed future roadway in the Pantops master plan. He said the hotel would have parking to the side and the rear and there would be areas of landscaping around the perimeter, and the rear of the property was undeveloped.

Mr. Reitelbach said the location of the special use permit was the location of an existing auto dealership which would remain at the location. He said the original special use permit from 2002 permitted outdoor storage and display for auto dealerships with conditions requiring an offsite

landscaping easement to screen the use. He said the easement was at the rear of the parcel where the hotel was proposed. He said the applicant requested to remove the language of the conditions so that the hotel could be constructed.

Mr. Reitelbach said staff found the requests were consistent with the Pantops Master Plan and were consistent with the neighborhood model principles. He noted there was no development proposed for the rear of TMP78-73A7 allowing for the expansion of Rolkin Road as identified in the Pantops Master Plan. He said no unfavorable factors were identified. He said the Planning Commission heard the special use permit at a meeting on January 11, 2022. He said the Planning Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval of the special use permit with six conditions. He said the conditions were the same as proposed in 2002 except the conditions related to the offsite landscaping easement had been removed.

Mr. Reitelbach said the public hearing for the rezoning application was held on January 11 before the Commission. He said the Commission voted unanimously to recommend approval. He said the Commission had two recommendations: the applicant explore pedestrian connections from the hotel property to adjacent property, and additional landscaping be added to the front of the property along Route 250. He said the applicant had provided a revised project narrative and application plan as well as a letter describing responses to the recommendations. He said the documents were provided in the packet given to the Board. He said the applicant may have more information on the responses to the changes.

Mr. Reitelbach said the suggested motions for the special use permit and the zoning map amendment were available.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said CarLotz was on the site already. She asked for Mr. Reitelbach to clarify why the application referred to an auto superstore.

Mr. Reitelbach said the auto superstore was just a name the applicant used for the parcel and the name of the original special use permit, so it was kept for the application. He said the car dealership and auto superstore was not changing with the application.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley clarified nothing would change in regard to the car dealership.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant only requested to remove the easement on the adjacent parcel.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked what had been proposed to meet the Planning Commission's recommendations to provide landscaping along the frontage and pedestrian connections to adjacent parcels.

Mr. Reitelbach said the applicant had discussed with neighboring property owners to put in sidewalks and connections, however, it appeared they had been unable to come to an agreement. He noted there was no public right of way, so any connection would require private easements with the adjacent property owners. He said the applicant could provide more information. He said more landscaping had been proposed as shown in the revised application plan. He noted the applicant had returned before the ARB to get their feedback on revised designs.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the right turn out of the hotel site exited into a third lane.

Mr. Reitelbach said there was a right turn lane eastbound onto Hansen Road, and the entrance would be on the right turn lane.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said cars would enter the right turn lane and would then be able to merge into the first or second lanes.

Mr. Reitelbach said that was correct.

Mr. Andrews asked the timing for the possibility of a median strip to prevent people from making crossover turns at the location. He asked if the median would be constructed.

Mr. Reitelbach said the median was proposed by VDOT, and it would be constructed by 2025 or 2026. He said if approved, the hotel would be constructed before the median. He said VDOT was aware of the project, so at the site planning process, it would evaluate the site plan with the assumption the median would eventually be in place.

Mr. Andrews said the entrance and exit from the hotel site was right in and right out. He asked about the tree buffer easement. He asked why there were no trees at the location of the easement.

Mr. Reitelbach said he was not sure of any actions taken, and nature had likely taken its course.

Ms. Price said she presumed CarLotz leased the property, so the property title was with the other entity. She opened the public hearing.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley read the rules for public hearing.



Ms. Kelsey Schlein, Planner with Shimp Engineering, said she represented WS4 LLC, the owner of TMP78-73A7, and Suburban Capital, the applicant for the special use permit amendment request. She said she was accompanied by Mr. Doug Ellis of WS4 and Suburban Capital, and Justin Shimp, the civil engineer for the project.

Ms. Schlein said the project had a frontage along Route 250 West towards the City and east towards Shadwell. She reviewed the timeline for the proposal. She said ARB applications typically ran concurrently with the site development plan process. She said the first round of comments from staff indicated issues with the scope of site improvements and the scale of the building. She said the ARB review could have been delayed until the site plan process, but the applicant felt it was critical to demonstrate the site could be developed in a manner consistent with ARB guidelines.

Ms. Schlein said an initial site plan was submitted in May 2021 to provide a more detailed grading and landscaping plan, and a preliminary ARB application was submitted in the fall of 2021. She said the applicant received feedback from the ARB and the design team worked to address the raised concerns. She said since the January 11, 2022, Planning Commission meeting, the application had received preliminary ARB approval and was much further along in the site planning stage than was typical at the rezoning stage.

Ms. Schlein said the timeline started with a community meeting at the CAC meeting in January 2021, then the applicant worked on ARB rounds of review culminating in preliminary ARB approval in February 2022. She said the applicant had reported to the Pantops CAC before the Planning Commission meeting to update the community on the application.

Ms. Schlein said the border of the Rivanna Ridge PDMC was originally approved in 1998 and amended in 2002, and a portion was amended in 2018 to permit the Point Church. She said the master plan district had developed over 20 years. She said the site fits in with the overall context of the PDMC. She explained a portion of the PDMC was rezoned to Highway Commercial in 2003, concurrent with the special use permit for the auto superstore site, to permit outdoor storage, sales, and displayed vehicles in the entrance corridor.

Ms. Schlein said a portion of the property was imagined for a hotel with the original approval in 1998, but in 2002, the plan was amended, and there were currently two office buildings on the site. She said there was now market interest to develop a hotel at the location. She said the property was in the community mix use designation of the Pantops master plan, and the proposal was consistent with the uses designated in the master plan.

Ms. Schlein said the application was tricky as evidenced in the details of the staff report. She said a landscape easement was established for the benefit of the SunTrust property and its drive through which was visible from the entrance corridor. She noted that the landscape easement would remain, and supplemental plantings would be planted to replace any plants removed during construction. She said the proposed planting had been reviewed by the ARB.

Ms. Schlein said the tree conservation area in the middle of the site was proposed as a condition of the 2002 ZMA and would be removed with the current ZMA application. She said the easement was established for the benefit of the outdoor storage, sale, and display of vehicles. She said the original intention for the tree conservation easement was to break up the corridor. She said the ARB regulations exemplified how trees and buildings could exist in the entrance corridor in a cohesive manner. She said not much landscaping remained in the areas.

Ms. Schlein said the concept design had been updated after the Planning Commission hearing. She said the retaining walls would be updated to support more plantings at the front of the site, additional shrubs would be planted at the bottom of the walls, and trees would be planted at the front of the site. She noted the rezoning application did not indicate the offsite planting in the adjacent property which was under common ownership with the hotel property. She explained the easement had not been secured but would likely be a requirement for the site plan and ARB approval.

Ms. Schlein said the landscaping plan was submitted to the ARB in December. She said it had not been reviewed by the ARB by the January 11 Planning Commission hearing. She continued that the plan had been reviewed and the applicant received preliminary ARB approval. She said the sidewalk connection issue was brought up during the January 2021 CAC meeting. She said the applicant had explored the sidewalk options. She noted there was no existing easement, so an easement would have to be secured from the adjacent property owners for access and for grading.

Ms. Schlein said there was a 20-foot grade change from the end of the current access easement and the subject property. She said grading and stairs would be required to make the connection. She said the applicant had been unable to achieve agreeable terms with the adjacent property owners. She said there were pedestrian connections along Route 250, so pedestrians could access the Rivanna Ridge shopping center and the shops along Hansen Road. She noted the back of the property was undeveloped and reserved for a future road connection.

Ms. Schlein said the applicant received feedback from the ARB, and the displayed renderings were based on that feedback. She brought up the SMART SCALE project. She said the project was funded and the development phase was slated to begin in 2026. She said the entrance was proposed to be a right-in and a right-out turn. She said the median would further restrict possible traffic movements.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley noted there was a sidewalk along Route 250 that reached the SunTrust building. She said there was a strip of land between the sidewalk and road. She said people questioned the safety of walking the sidewalk along Route 250. She said the applicant had trouble gaining access easements. She noted there would not be ADA access. She asked if the applicant had considered enlarging the sidewalk from the hotel on Hansen Road.

Ms. Schlein said the idea to widen the sidewalks to make them ADA compliant had not been brought up. She said the short answer was that it was a new idea to provide off-site sidewalk improvements.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley noted the connection to SunTrust and that there would be 20 feet of stairs.

Ms. Schlein said the sidewalk connection would have to make up a 20-foot height difference, and the sidewalk construction would require a grading easement. She said the process involved working with adjacent properties.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said it would be easier to improve the sidewalk from the hotel to the corner of Hansen Road.

Mr. Justin Shimp, Engineer, said he had worked on the site plan. He said the right-of-way was close to the sidewalk, so the sidewalk could not be widened without going into the SunTrust property. He said when the project was constructed, there was no room to accommodate a wider sidewalk. He said there was no right-of-way to widen the sidewalk.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked Mr. Shimp how wide he envisioned widening the sidewalk. She said a five-foot widening might be impossible, but a foot would be possible.

Mr. Shimp said the right-of-way line was placed one foot behind the sidewalk, and because the turn lane was built at the time of the development of the project, the practice then was to place the new right-of-way line one foot behind the sidewalk. He noted the sidewalk was close to the road. He said he did not know if it could be widened without the consent of the neighboring property.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the SunTrust owners had been consulted.

Mr. Shimp said they had not been asked about widening the sidewalk. He said the owner had been difficult when the applicant requested to be able to move through the property. He said a foot was difficult from a grading standpoint. He said it would be easy to build but the applicant did not have a right-of-way, and the property owners were uncooperative.

Mr. Andrews noted the number of impermeable surfaces, and he noted the site plan approval involved evaluating drainage. He noted there was a drainage easement. He said he was concerned regarding the stormwater management. He said he was concerned regarding traffic until the median was placed. He agreed connectivity would be nice.

Mr. Shimp said if the applicant submitted a site plan prior to the installation of the median, VDOT would require the applicant to show the "pork chop" to prevent left turns entering and exiting the property.

Ms. McKeel said her questions regarding connectivity and the sidewalks had been answered.

Ms. Mallek said the PDMC was the zoning of record, so the only elements the Board was addressing were the two small items and not the overall use. She suggested the applicant work harder to make the pedestrian connections. She noted that years ago there was a hotel project on Route 29 North, and the applicant made arrangements to connect the property by sidewalk to Hillsdale to provide access to restaurants and stores. She commented that the steep slopes on this site seemed to be a shelving down the hill, which was going to be challenging.

Ms. Price noted there were no speakers signed up for public comment.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley said the connectivity had been considered at the Pantops CAC meetings because it wanted connectivity to the back of the property, but that was unfeasible. She said the SunTrust location had been chosen to evaluate for a pedestrian connection. She noted the hotel was an extended stay hotel. She said people would be going to the restaurants, the retail services, the grocery stores and shopping center, so she was bothered that there was no effort to ease pedestrian access to the surrounding amenities. She said there was a sidewalk on Hansen Road. She said she wanted a commitment from the applicant to solve the connectivity problem.

Mr. Shimp said the applicant could not commit to whether another property owner would provide an easement for the sidewalk. He said the owner had reached out to the SunTrust owners in writing, and there had been contact with the attorneys, but the SunTrust owner was not willing to entertain the proposal. He explained the turn lane on Route 250 started at the hotel site, so the sidewalk was not adjacent to the main flow of traffic.

Mr. Shimp said at 5 o'clock and 6 o'clock, the road was busy, but there were times with less traffic. He said if the applicant could get an easement to build stairs and sidewalks, it would make the project better. He said the applicant could not make a commitment because the decision was not theirs to make. He said the sidewalk would have to be addressed in the future.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley asked if the applicant would continue to reach out to adjacent property owners to try to gain the easements to construct the sidewalk.

Mr. Shimp said the applicant could commit to reach out to the property owners again and see if they changed their position, but he could not guarantee the applicant would be successful.

Ms. Mallek asked if a ramp sidewalk had been considered to address the grade change at the back of the property.

Mr. Shimp said the terrain of the rear of the property was challenging. He said the applicant wanted to have vehicle access, which was impossible. He said retaining walls could be built. He said people would likely choose to walk along Route 250 because the route at the south of the property was not convenient to access amenities.

Ms. Mallek said she had not considered the issue in depth. She wanted to know if the applicant had considered the option.

Ms. Price gave the applicant five minutes for rebuttal.

Mr. Shimp ceded the time to the Board.

Ms. Price closed the hearing to the public.

Ms. McKeel asked if it was appropriate to combine the public hearing items into one hearing.

Mr. Kamptner said it was an acceptable process.

Ms. Price said it made sense to hold them together.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley hoped that during the ARB process, the project would fit in with the neighborhood and be a high-quality hotel. She asked for the applicant to respond.

Mr. Shimp said the site was expensive dirt to buy and expensive dirt to develop. He said anything built would be of an expensive nature because it needed to attract the rents, and if it did not attract the rents, it would not be able to afford the development. He said the development would be built to a quality to attract tenants who would pay the rents.

Mr. Andrews said he had seen the site and there were lovely views, and he understood the appeal.

Ms. Price said revisions were being made with regard to the turn lanes. She said the topography was difficult, but the proposal was consistent with other developments along the corridor. She said she supported the proposal.

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** that the Board adopt the Resolution (Attachment J) to approve the special use permit, SP202100010, Auto Superstore SP Amendment, with the conditions as stated.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Gallaway.

---

**RESOLUTION TO APPROVE  
SP202100010 AUTO SUPERSTORE SP AMENDMENT**

**WHEREAS**, upon consideration of the staff report prepared for SP 202100010 Auto Superstore SP Amendment and the attachments thereto, including staff's supporting analysis, the information presented at the public hearing, any comments received, and all of the factors relevant to the special use permit in Albemarle County Code §§ 18-24.1, 18-30.6.3(a)(2)(b) and 18-33.8(A), the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the proposed special use (as amended) would:

1. not be a substantial detriment to adjacent parcels;
2. not change the character of the adjacent parcels and the nearby area;
3. be in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, the Highway Commercial zoning district and the Entrance Corridor Overlay District, with the uses permitted by right in the Highway Commercial zoning district, and with the public health, safety, and general welfare (including equity); and
4. be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby approves SP 202100010 Auto Superstore SP Amendment, subject to the conditions attached hereto.

\* \* \*

**SP202100010 AUTO SUPERSTORE SP AMENDMENT  
CONDITIONS**

- 1) Vehicles shall not be elevated.
- 2) Vehicles shall be displayed only in the areas indicated for display shown on the plan.
- 3) The use shall not commence until a Certificate of Appropriateness is issued by the ARB, including landscape and lighting plans.
- 4) Provide screening trees to the south and west of the proposed parking area to reduce the impact of the loss of trees and to soften the appearance of the expanse of proposed pavement.
- 5) Provide the planting bed with the seven (7) Eastern Red Cedars in the central portion of the parking area as shown on the Minor Site Plan Amendment (SDP 02-34) dated March 8, 2002, revised November 4, 2002.
- 6) Provide screening trees that will grow to a height that will sufficiently screen the proposed parking area. This will require a wider planting area, which will necessitate the removal of most, if not all, of the eleven (11) display parking spaces in the first row.

---

Ms. LaPisto-Kirtley **moved** that the Board adopt the Ordinance (Attachment I) to approve the zoning map amendment ZMA202000013, Overlook Hotel: Pantops PDMC Amendment.

Mr. Andrews **seconded** the motion. Roll was called and the motion carried by the following recorded vote:

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Gallaway.

---

**ORDINANCE NO. 22-A(4)  
ZMA 2020-00013 OVERLOOK HOTEL: PANTOPS PDMC**

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE ZONING MAP  
FOR TAX PARCEL 07800-00-00-073A7**

**BE IT ORDAINED** by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that upon consideration of the transmittal summary and staff report prepared for ZMA 2020-00013 and their attachments, including the application plan last revised on February 21, 2022 and the project narrative last revised on February 21, 2022, the information presented at the public hearing, any comments received, the material and relevant factors in Virginia Code § 15.2-2284 and County Code §§ 18-20A.1 and 18-33.6, and for the purposes of public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practices, the Board hereby approves ZMA 2020-00013 with the application plan and project narrative, each last revised on February 21, 2022.

---

Agenda Item No. 18. **Public Hearing: Virginia Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).** To review the County's intention to apply for Federal funds from the Virginia Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Albemarle County proposes to utilize the requested funds to carry out the following activities for the CDBG program: Approximately \$1.3 million dollars to support the construction of 25 affordable single-family attached and/or detached residential housing units, and the installation of sidewalks and paved walkways in Village 2 of the Southwood Redevelopment Project. All interested citizens are urged to attend to express their views and comments on the County's proposed applications.

The Executive Summary forwarded to the Board states that the Virginia Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is a federally funded grant program administered by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). Since 1982, the DHCD has provided funding to eligible units of local government (in non-entitlement communities only) for projects that address critical community needs, including housing, infrastructure, and economic development. Albemarle County has received numerous grants in previous years to support housing and community improvement initiatives. The CDBG application process requires that two local public hearings be conducted. The first public hearing was held on March 2, 2022, at which time information was provided on eligible activities that may be funded by a CDBG grant, the amount of funding estimated to be available, past activities undertaken with CDBG funds, and the process for applying for funding. The purpose of this public hearing is to provide information on the proposed project application and to accept public comment on the application.

Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville (Habitat) is requesting the County submit a CDBG application for Village 2 of the Southwood Redevelopment Project. In 2021, the County received a CDBG award for Village 1 of the Southwood project in the amount of \$1,000,000 to support the construction of five single-family attached and detached homes, as well as the design and construction of a pocket park honoring the history of the Monacan Indian Nation on the project site. Village 2 work will include the construction of 25 single-family attached and detached homes to be purchased and occupied by low- and moderate-income households currently residing in the Southwood Mobile Home Village, as well as the

construction of 1,860 linear feet (LF) of concrete sidewalks and 1,360 LF of asphalt walkway. The amount of grant funding requested is \$1,300,000 which includes \$1,225,000 in project funding, and \$75,000 to cover the costs of grant administration. The grant application (Attachment A) provides a breakdown of the proposed project budget.

There is no budgetary impact unless and until an application is made and a grant is awarded, at which time the Board will be asked to appropriate the funding. Community Development staff will work in partnership with the Department of Finance & Budget to administer the grant. CDBG projects include various levels of funding to offset administrative costs by awarding such funds based on performance. The budget submitted with the application will include a performance-based budget for administration.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) approving the County's submission of the CDBG application for Village 2 of the Southwood Redevelopment Project (Attachment B) and authorizing the County Executive to execute the application package, as well as any supporting or related contracts or documents required to obtain or accept this grant, and to take any further action required for this application.

---

Ms. Stacy Pethia, Housing Policy Manager, said the CDBG was a competitive application process. She said there was a potential application for Village II of the Southwood redevelopment project. She explained that the CDBG was a federally funded program administered by the Virginia Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD).

Ms. Pethia said CDBG provided funding for projects that met three national objectives: activities benefitted low- and moderate-income persons; households or individuals with income below 80% of the area median income; activities aided in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight, such as the Southwood community; and activities were designed to meet community needs having a particular urgency, such as the Premiere Circle Project.

Ms. Pethia said CDBG required two public hearings. She explained the first public hearing was held on March 1, 2022, and was intended to inform the public of the available funds. She explained the second hearing was to discuss a potential CDBG application. She explained funding for CDBG programs came in calendar years, so in calendar year 2022, DHCD had made over \$9.7 million available for grants, and the County was eligible to apply for up to \$1.5 million of those dollars.

Ms. Pethia said staff worked with Habitat for Humanity to draft a grant application, and the draft was included in the agenda packet. She said the application requested no more than \$1.3 million. She said the application was geared towards the construction of concrete sidewalks, multi-use paths, and 25 single family homes in Village II.

Ms. Pethia explained staff and Habitat representatives met with DHCD representatives on March 11. She said based on the discussions, the application had been altered. She said the overall funding amount would remain \$1.3 million, but DHCD requested the multi-use path be removed from the application and the money be redirected to single-family homes.

Ms. Pethia said DHCD requested the number of homes be dropped to 8 or 9 to pay for complete construction instead of the partial construction of 25 homes. She said the construction of 1,800 linear feet of concrete sidewalks would service a total of 157 persons in Village II, 85 of whom would be of low and moderate income, and the construction of up to 9 single family detached homes which would serve 85 low to moderate income persons. She said the application included a \$75,000 request for administrative fees.

Ms. Price opened the hearing to the public. She noted there were no speakers signed up for comment. She closed the hearing to the public.

Ms. McKeel **moved** the Board adopt the attached Resolution (Attachment B) approving the County's submission of the CDBG application for Village II of the Southwood Redevelopment Project (Attachment B) and authorizing the County Executive to execute the application package, as well as any supporting or related contracts or documents required to obtain or accept this grant, and to take any further action required for this application.

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

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

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: Mr. Gallaway.

Ms. McKeel noted that Mr. Gallaway supported the project.

---

## RESOLUTION

**WHEREAS**, the County of Albemarle is committed to ensuring that safe, decent, affordable, and accessible housing is available for all residents, and to improving the livability of all neighborhoods; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Albemarle has recognized the redevelopment of the Southwood Mobile Home Park as a strategic priority; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Albemarle executed a public/private partnership agreement with the Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville (Habitat) in July 2019 to provide resources to Habitat to assist with redevelopment initiatives; and

**WHEREAS**, after holding public hearings on March 2, 2022 and March 16, 2022, the County wishes to apply for up to \$1,350,000 in Virginia Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to support the construction of 25 affordable residential housing units, and sidewalks and paved walkways in Village 2 of the Southwood Redevelopment Project; and

**WHEREAS**, the projected benefits of the Project are improved living conditions for 25 low- and moderate-income households currently residing in the Southwood Mobile Home Village.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Albemarle County Board of Supervisors hereby endorses the County's submission of the CDBG grant application for Village 2 of the Southwood Redevelopment Project, and authorizes the County Executive to execute the application and any required certifications and assurances, as well as any supporting or related contracts or documents required to obtain or accept this grant, and to take any further action required for this application.

---

Agenda Item No. 19. From the Board: Committee Reports and Matters Not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. McKeel noted the Board discussed during the first March meeting the possible options for remapping the magisterial districts. She said there were three options provided, and at the time of the meeting, the Board came to consensus for Option 1. She said the item would come before the Board the following Wednesday. She asked for further discussion regarding Option 1 and Option 2 the following week.

Mr. Andrews said the Solid Waste Alternatives Advisory Committee (SWAAC) met. He said it received a report on composting in the schools, and recycling, and they looked for further data. He said the GBB (Gershman, Brickner & Bratton, Inc.) report study was reviewed on hauling fees and on what was being hauled and where. He said more could be learned about what was being hauled in terms of solid waste and recycling.

Ms. McKeel said the Board often discussed connectivity. She said the particular application was an amendment of existing infrastructure, but during the discussions on the Comprehensive Plan, she wanted the Board to consider connectivity. She said the community struggled with idea of connectivity. She said connectivity was important. She said the Comprehensive Plan discussion would be an opportunity to formalize or strengthen the connectivity guidelines.

Mr. Kamptner said the Comprehensive Plan was the right time for the discussion.

Ms. Mallek said RWSA was planning to ensure funding was happening for long term infrastructure. She said RWSA work was important. She said it was important to have ordinances for the new phases of lighting for businesses, construction, and infrastructure.

Ms. Price noted there was a Village of Rivanna Community Advisory Committee meeting. She said the CAC worked on revisions to the master plan. She said Mr. Kevin McDermott gave a presentation on roadway improvements taking place on Route 250 West to alleviate traffic congestion. She noted that Route 250 remained a major item of interest for residents. She said congestion was still an issue and residents wanted to see work done to improve traffic flow. She said Mr. McDermott explained the improvements were under consideration.

---

Agenda Item No. 20. Adjourn to March 17, 2022, 8:00 a.m., electronic meeting pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16).

At 7:16 p.m., the Board adjourned its meeting to March 17, 2022 at 8:00 a.m., which would be an electronic meeting held pursuant to Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." Information on how to participate in the meeting will be posted on the Albemarle County website Board of Supervisors homepage.

---

Chair

Approved by Board
Date 11/01/2023
Initials CKB