

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
October 31, 2017**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, October 31, 2017, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Room #241, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Daphne Spain; Pam Riley; Mac Lafferty, Karen Firehock; Vice-Chair; Bruce Dotson; and Bill Palmer, UVA representative. Absent was Jennie More. Ms. Firehock arrived at 6:08 p.m.

Other officials present were J.T. Newberry, Senior Planner; Elaine Echols, Chief of Planning; Tim Padalino, Senior Planner; Andrew Gast-Bray, Assistant Director of Community Development/Director of Planning; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission; and John Blair, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Keller, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Regular Item.

a. 2016 PC Annual Report

Review and adopt Planning Commission Annual Report for 2016

Mr. Keller pointed out that there has been a suggestion that we move the Annual Report to the third item and go ahead with our next public hearing and asked if everyone was okay with that.

The Planning Commission unanimously agreed to move the annual report review to last on the agenda.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item, 2016 PC Annual Report.

Regular Item.

a. 2016 PC Annual Report

Review and adopt Planning Commission Annual Report for 2016

Ms. Echols noted the Commission received a general overview and PowerPoint presentation on the 2016 PC Annual Report several weeks ago. She said tonight's meeting is to look at the report in its new format, make any changes that are needed before it is forwarded to the Board of Supervisors. She noted the Commission looked at it and liked the concept of performance measurements and she is hopeful that there will not be need to modify anything in a major way so that we can forward the 2016 PC Annual Report on to the Board. Ms. Echols suggested if we are going to look at different or more enhanced measurements, we could do that within the context of next year's annual report. However, there may be things in the report that the Commission believes are incorrectly stated or need greater clarification and she would be glad to try to answer or clarify any questions.

Ms. Echols asked the Commission to point out those things that need any major corrections and asked that minor corrections be given to staff. She thanked Commissioner Spain for offering to give those to me in advance as she had requested. Since she was, the only one Ms. Echols said she decided that it might make more sense for us to wait until after this meeting and then get everybody's written comments.

Ms. Echols said she did not know how the Commission wants to go through this because the first part are just the basics that tell us what you did and hopefully you are okay with that.

Mr. Keller asked Ms. Echols just to take them through what she thinks are logical sections and see if there are comments and then move to the next section.

Ms. Echols agreed and noted the first section is the Natural Resources and we talked about wooden stream buffers and air quality there. This section may be the hardest to deal with and measure any kind of impacts not because there are not ways to assess it, but the measurement tools that we have available have not been used consistently over time. She explained that is why it is limited and we have limited impact on air quality, but we still like to report what is going on.

Mr. Keller asked to jump in to set Ms. Firehock up the way he imagined that Ginny More would if she was here because there has been a lot of discussion over the last several months about stream buffers in Albemarle County and that transition from forestry uses to developing uses. Therefore, he wondered if we might have just a discussion not necessarily for you to change this report, but how we might accomplish reporting on this in a more comprehensive manner in the future. With that, Mr. Keller turned it to Ms. Firehock.

Ms. Firehock said specifically on stream buffers it is kind of a softball one for me. She said because we have a high resolution for land cover of the County and a good map, what we could do is clip the 100' along the streams and compare that now with next time we run the land cover map again probably in a couple of years. It is a simple GIS calculation to see if they have increased or decreased. You could even break it up by urban ring or watershed and it would not take much work. Ms. Firehock said she knows someone on your GIS staff who is quite competent in doing that.

Ms. Echols replied that she thinks we can; however, this time for this comparison, it was apples and oranges and we did not feel very comfortable with it. However, for next time we can.

Ms. Firehock said you have to use the same precision of land cover maps so we have just moved to a more precise one so it will be between this one and the next one. We are also about to embark on more of an education campaign, if she understands correctly, for tree and buffers. We are not doing anything particularly to actively promote the event right now and we do not have the ability to enforce them. She pointed out we are not out monitoring what everyone is doing with their stream buffer especially in the rural areas.

Mr. Gast-Bray said this is a discussion he very much wants to have with the Commission, and we want to integrate this into next year's report with this kind of thinking. He suggested if they could jot down your thoughts as we go forward on metrics that we could be looking at that since it was certainly something we had to kind of say let's call a day to get a report out this year comparing apples to apples based on where we started. But, he welcomes those ideas in the future and we will have a discussion later perhaps in the new year as we set up for next year's report. However, he thinks at this time we are really trying to ask if this report that we have was

close to being able to at least be sent forth or are there real things that we need to change in this report given where we came from.

Mr. Keller said we know the Supervisors are interested in this because of the tasking they have done to staff. He asked how about in the comments section maybe an asterisk at the end with a sentence or two that states what Mr. Gast-Bray has just said that is setting it up for the next year.

Ms. Echols noted that she could do that.

Mr. Keller pointed out we have a number of citizens that are quite interested in this topic.

Ms. Spain said the air quality measure she thought perhaps should be deleted along with unemployment and averaging the wages because there is not much control that the county has over those. So if the point is to show how our management, interventions, policies and such have failed to create certain outcomes it seems that we should limit the variables to the ones that we actually have some influence over.

Mr. Lafferty said no, he would think you would want to keep that and he thinks it is monitored by the one air quality monitor that we have near Albemarle High School. He said we would want to make sure that we stay in compliance of most of the pollution that is coming from the west since it was a good monitor.

Ms. Echols said she leaves that to the Commission as a whole to advise staff on whether to keep it or not. She will say that there are not many tools that we have on air quality other than this one and we recognize that we do not have control. She pointed out it was important to the Planning Commission before and if it is still important to the Planning Commission; we can keep it; if it is not, please advise us.

Mr. Keller asked Ms. Spain about the delineates between the ones the county actually has regulations that could effect and ones that could have state or national with a little square box on each one. That way it could remain in because citizens are interested but it would be clear through some sort of coding or asterisks that it was somewhere out of our control.

Ms. Spain noted that she thinks that would only have to be those three variables that she mentioned the air quality, the average annual wages and unemployment. She said those two are subject to national and regional trends.

Ms. Firehock noted regarding air quality that the number one cause of air pollution in this area most likely are individual vehicles. She said we have the Ohio Valley winds bringing things down, but if we can more compact development patterns and reduce, for example, the amount of idling buses and service vehicles it can help. She noted that Charlottesville changed their ordinance, but she did not know the state of ours, that you cannot have idling tour buses and things like that; you have to cut them off. She pointed out there are things you could do. She said it was correct that large scale is harder to control, but the more we have public transportation expanded, the more compact development, the alternative forms of transportation we have some ability to affect that even if it is small. She agreed that it is largely out of our control but there are things the county can do to limit vehicle emissions.

Ms. Spain noted that would support Commissioner Keller's suggestion that there be some tag on those variables that we have the least control over.

Mr. Lafferty said it is a measure of economic development. He said he would see this as a document that could be used in the economic development showing that the air quality is good and then we will only have a few days in six years that it exceeded the level that it should and that the average wages seem to be going up.

Mr. Gast-Bray said he liked the suggestion and perhaps we can consider this sort of our starting point baseline just to show us where we are even though we have relatively little impact perhaps directly. Mr. Gast-Bray encouraged some of this feedback in the future since we are looking at what can we detect and are there more meaningful things that we can have an impact or detect in a more meaningful way than we are doing now. He said he did not have the answers today but does encourage that feedback so he thanked you for that in and above what we might actually change in the report this time. Thank you.

Mr. Keller asked if there were other comments on these two issues.

Ms. Echols said we would get to the other ones just to confirm that - the Natural Resources and if we are good with the disclaimer that the coding that identifies that and then if we can just bring that back up when we get to the Economic Development so she can note that on those pages. She said she was glad to know which ones they were.

Mr. Keller asked staff to go to the Historic Resources.

Ms. Echols asked if we are good on these particular ones for the Historic Resources. She said we really did not have any good cultural and scenic measurement tools, but the ones that we could keep track of is how often there are new designations and what the demolitions are.

Mr. Keller noted for scenic you have scenic byways, scenic rivers, scenic streams and Entrance Corridor review. Therefore, there are three other criteria that you could look at to consider measurements. He said he thinks this is such a leap forward from what we had before that he would be comfortable with us suggesting things that we would like to see added to this in the next year's version so that you don't have to go back and rewrite this one.

Mr. Dotson said that would be his question, too, and asked is what you are looking for now sort of permission, support to go ahead and submit this to the board.

Ms. Echols replied yes.

Mr. Dotson said rather than going through each of 25 or so goal areas rather maybe ask if there are objections.

Ms. Echols asked to do that by section, first historic resources, are there any changes we need to do for tonight.

Mr. Keller replied not until we get a Historic Preservation Ordinance that a lot of us would like to see discussion about.

Ms. Echols noted the Economic Development disclaimer as Commissioner Spain said and the next is rural areas.

Ms. Riley asked to go back to unemployment and just wanted to make sure you said we are not

removing that we are just indicating that it is something that we are not setting at a local level, the wage level for an example.

Ms. Spain pointed out staff skipped tourism. She noted that staff asked for some alternative measures. Ms. Spain said for the future she thinks the number of hotels and the lodging tax revenue might be indicators to be added to that section.

Ms. Echols asked if in terms of this report is there anything different about these we need to capture for now. Hearing no none, Ms. Echols said they would be moving on to the rural areas. She asked if there are any changes that need to be made to what we have provided for you, which is timber, grapes, new lots, new dwellings, ag/forest district and conservation easements.

Mr. Keller said he was interested in grapes being pulled out a subset because in the agricultural senses there is fruits categories that has grown dramatically in our area after going down for many years in the Nelson/Albemarle area and it is starting to go back up. Even if we were to just talk about the distilleries and the cideries, we know that is important. He asked if hops were considered a fruit.

Ms. Echols noted hops are considered a grain.

Mr. Keller said they were hearing about the growth of hops and the varieties that are being created for the Virginia climate then one might in the future want to look at that. He said those are direct correlations between these high growth industries that we want to seek keeping the rural areas viable. Mr. Keller said so again – for the future. Mr. Keller asked when the agricultural census is done again in Virginia.

Ms. Echols replied that it was done every five years and it was done in 2012 so it is being done this year and we will not get the information until next year. The information on grape production actually comes through the state; it is a different source of information and we think we are accurate. That is why we did not use the census of agriculture but when we get the next one we can certainly look and see what has changed between the last census of agriculture and when it is coming up.

Ms. Firehock replied yes in the senses of agriculture as the number of farms and the size of farm, which you are saying you do not think that is accurate enough to report.

Ms. Echols replied what she was saying was for grape production and fruits.

Ms. Firehock suggested reporting on the number of farms and the average size is a useful indicator.

Mr. Keller suggested that it be reported in every fifth year in one of the annual reports or have it in the appendix.

Ms. Firehock pointed out she used that information a lot when she is looking at how counties are evolving in my work. In addition, she wondered about grazing because we have many beef cattle, sheep and actually have a lot more beef cattle than we use to. She said in the last 20 years that it seems to be expanding. She pointed out that eating local is cool now and there are many farmer's markets supplying beef.

Mr. Keller said it would be interesting to look at some point in the future these are all things that

we are going to be looking at and talking about in the future. Therefore, you might be decreasing the car emissions and increasing the animal emissions.

Ms. Firehock asked can we include grazing.

Ms. Echols said for next time we can relook at what the agriculture census has and what else the state has that they can give us on particularly agricultural activities. So the answer is yes, whenever we can get data we can always report that.

Ms. Firehock noted that there was also a lot of hay production, too.

Mr. Keller suggested in the different types of forestry that is reported in the agricultural senses but also in the mapping, which Ms. Firehock is talking about. So, again, without trying to create work just looking and seeing what is how there it seems to be the forestry that is in that state between being viable forestry in its transition to a development that seems to be where much of the friction in our county is so it would be interesting to understand forestry better.

Ms. Firehock noted that you could potentially track the change in timberlands that are actively timbered. She said you could also take the soils for crops, it is available free from USDA; we can map it in ten minutes and then look at change over time. Again, this is not for helping you get this report out to the Board in a hurry. However, for next time Ms. Firehock said there is many data that we could do very easily because it would be a simple calculation of how much of that agr soil has not gone under development as in cannot now be used for agriculture.

Mr. Keller said this is not about making more work. He said this is about whether there are data sets that would be useful in helping us understand some of these transitions that are in some cases viewed as positive and some cases viewed as negative and often depending on which population criteria you are using may be viewed by part of our population positively and the other negatively and vice-versa. He said that is why this data is quite helpful to have. However, again, not for this year.

Ms. Echols said the Natural Heritage Committee that is working on the Biodiversity Action Plan is also going to be collecting some of this so it may be collected by someone else and then can be shared with the Commission. She pointed out they are looking at that from habitat fragmentation standpoints.

Ms. Riley said this is just a comment about some of these categories in how there might be additional representation which is you have in the agricultural/forestall district conservation easements, the 2014/2016 numbers and then add the percentage increase or decrease which would be useful information. Ms. Riley said what they are saying is just try to get at a way to represent the land uses in the rural areas and what land uses are potentially increasing or decreasing in addition to production numbers of specific things.

Mr. Keller noted that they might start seeing decreasing numbers because the Supervisors are not interested in seeing parcels without development rights being added to the Agri/Forestal districts. So in this last round there were some that were not added that in the past may have been added. There are a lot of interesting changes and so in these first time benchmarks that we do this year over the next several we might really need to have a fair number of notations that set that parameter for why things may be changing. He said it may be viewed as a positive by increasing the numbers of acres, but if it is decreasing and there is a rationale for why it is decreasing, it might actually mean it is a stronger regulation because of that.

Mr. Dotson said he had an overall comment as we are going through the indicators that might for that future meeting that might happen in January or so he thinks it might be useful because Andrew in his cover memo talked about the difficulty and time consumption sometimes. He pointed out here we are adding things, which might make it easier or they might consume more time. He said it occurs to me if we said which of the indicators (the two dozen or so) sort of rate them as to not much difficulty, medium and high difficulty in terms of time consumption. Then we would know that. Secondly, the time frequency of data such as agricultural census every five years, population census every ten years and then sort them by those we are doing well on and we should look at the indicators and make sure we really are doing well. If we are, we don't need to spend as much time talking about those and those that are in the middle or negative maybe we need better indicators. Then the Commission and staff could talk about setting priorities on additional measures, additional staff time ways to streamline this and maybe that would be a good way to talk about this two dozen sets of indicators when we have sort of a strategic lens on it.

Mr. Keller suggested comparing that to the Comprehensive Plan priorities from the Planning Commission so that each time we have to look at CIP that would be interesting if you could actually begin to make these entire documents dovetail.

Ms. Echols moved to development areas.

Mr. Dotson said the question is there any problem with sending this forward as is.

Hearing none, Ms. Echols said they would move on to housing.

Ms. Spain noted there was a wording issue here that should be corrected under variety of housing types. The indicators should be the percentage of all of the units constructed that are single-family attached townhouse or condominium. The point is that these percentages add to 100 going down the line. Therefore, it is confusing to say percentage of single-family detached constructed since that is not really, what you are saying. She said you are saying of all units constructed what percent are single-family. Ms. Spain said so if you clarify that she thinks that is easier to understand. The senior housing and the proffered and built affordable units there is a text repeat 9.5.a is the same one under senior housing. Ms. Spain pointed out it was the proffered and built that needed to be something else.

Ms. Echols noted she would have to get the updated number of units and plug it in here. Ms. Echols moved on to multi-modal.

Ms. Spain said on multi-modal objective 10.3 there is something missing, and Ms. Echols agreed.

Ms. Spain said also we should remember with the American Community Survey these estimates that 83% and 84% could just be a margin of error issue and she did not know if staff wants to make a note about that. Ms. Spain suggested that could easily be interpreted as being stable as well as mixed or no progress.

Ms. Echols noted moving on to sidewalk and bicycle lanes.

Ms. Spain suggested data are.

Mr. Lafferty said under bicycle lane where you have bike lanes, is that a dedicated bike lane.

Ms. Echols replied yes. She said next is Park & Rec, Greenways, Blueways and Green Systems.

Ms. Spain noted the first indicator should be private parks.

Ms. Firehock suggested there be a target set for greenways.

Ms. Echols said they would want the Parks and Rec people here to answer that.

Ms. Echols said the next is Community Facilities, County building energy used, recycling.

Mr. Dotson said the school facilities needs to go over to the next page.

Ms. Firehock asked how we track the recycling – is it the volumes at the Rivanna Facility.

Ms. Echols replied yes, it is volumes and the Solid Waste Authority provides that to us.

Ms. Firehock said she knows they have done periodic surveys there, at least at the one in town she uses, where they can keep up to date with the percentages of county and city resident.

Ms. Echols said it may be volumes and weights and she will check and get it noted as to what the unit measurement is. She pointed out it looks like it is tons as the recycling unit measurement.

Ms. Firehock noted that she was just curious where all that stuff is coming from.

Ms. Echols said the next page was schools. That is something she thinks the Commission has met with the school board and we know that the school division is working diligently on this particular issue. She asked them to provide input on what we are into on the annual report; so they have reviewed this and have given me words that they would prefer that we use.

Ms. Echols said next is public water usage and police response times.

Ms. Spain said under the comment for public water usage, although overall water consumption increased do you want to say due to population growth or due to increased number of connections. She was assuming that is what it is but it might not be clear to some people.

Ms. Riley asked to go back to housing particularly in follow up to the transient lodging discussion and she does not know if this is a goal in the Comprehensive Plan or not but under variety of housing types we are not making any distinction between ownership or rental. She said at some point that she thinks we really need to be mindful of how much rental housing stock we have versus ownership. Therefore, for the future she thinks as another indicator perhaps we might do well to look at the ratio as well.

Ms. Spain pointed out the housing tables were for the development area and she did not think you could split it between developments and rural and so that would have to be one of those indicators for the entire county homeownership.

Ms. Echols agreed that it probably would have to be.

Mr. Lafferty said under parks and recreation you should put something in about the development of the Rivanna River because there is talk about putting in a boat landing now under the new bridge. He pointed out we also have the canoe recreation facilities.

Ms. Echols said that maybe for the future we would put public park facilities and not just Private Park.

Ms. Firehock said that is something we could then easier measure is the percentage of county residents that are within so many miles of a regional park. She said that for the urban ring you could do walking distance to a pocket park or open space or greenway trail.

Ms. Echols noted that would be for the future.

Mr. Keller said there are interesting pieces where these fit together. He said there is a public health component where the greenways and the ownership cycles that could be looked at in one way as rental versus ownership – but he was not so concerned about that as the relationship between the trails and where people are living. He said we have very interesting national data that there is a correlation between access to trails and health. So that one it seems would not be difficult to do and if one wanted to look at disparities then if you have the concentrations where there was owner occupied and not and if they had the same time to trails then that would tell you one thing. Then if they did not have the same times to trails as opposed to look at trend of health of citizens in the area that interesting study between the Center of Disease Control and the Design Community that came out of the Atlanta Olympics are still kind of a base line that we have to look at. He suggested looking at some of the indicators from the studies that were done then and seeing if there might be something in here that would allow one to go from some of the data they are already collecting to this next potential improvement and things the public infrastructure does to improve health.

Mr. Lafferty noted there is a relationship between how close the trails are and the value of the houses.

Ms. Firehock suggested getting a UVA class to do the tracking study.

Ms. Echols said when they revisit indicators in the new year between what Andrew has to offer about some indicators and what Mr. Dotson has to offer about making sure we know how much time, intensity and difficulty there is in getting and comparing that information we can give that to you and have a better assessment of exactly what it is you want for the future.

Ms. Echols noted next is Police Response Times.

Ms. Firehock said they were talking about the margin of error, so we have been looking at the rural area response from 2011 to 2016; it changes 3%. She asked if that is an absolute statistic or is there a margin of error of 5% or do we know. Since it is such a small change Ms. Firehock said she was not sure it is actually an improvement.

Mr. Lafferty pointed out we are changing the way police are handling things instead of roaming all around the county having districts located so we might see a bigger change.

Ms. Firehock noted they have not seen an improvement in Samuel Miller, but the police are trying as hard as they can but do not have enough coverage.

Mr. Dotson said that he thought it was accurate and precise even though it might not be significant.

Ms. Spain said so there is no margin in that.

Ms. Firehock asked if that could be broken down by district.

Ms. Echols pointed out the police provides regular reporting to the County Executive's Office and we are just reflecting the information that they give us. She suggested this might be something the Economic Development will be keeping track of as well as the Housing Department. She said staff expects that there will be other groups who are putting together more detailed and comprehensive statistics that would be available.

Mr. Blair asked to jump in to say that he knows at least in year's past they have the Blue Ridge and the Jefferson Districts; they also have zones within those districts so that is probably where you get down and drill down to more intensive and granular data for the county. He said he does not know how those zones would relate to development versus rural areas.

Ms. Firehock noted that was for another time.

Ms. Echols noted next is Fire Rescue on the last page before getting into the capacity analysis. Hearing no comments, Ms. Echols said they would move on to the population and the capacity analysis. This is largely the set of calculations that were done for the Comprehensive Plan when there was a discussion on enlarging the development areas to accommodate future residential growth and whether or not it was an appropriate thing to do with the Comprehensive Plan update. Ms. Echols said the conclusion was that there was sufficient area but it should be monitored regularly. In the meantime, the Weldon Cooper Center has created different population projections that made it difficult to compare apples to apples like where we were last time to where we are this time. But, this analysis she thinks speaks for itself in terms of what the conclusions are that we need to be mindful of density but we also have opportunities for redevelopment that may give us the ability to accommodate future populations and that redevelopment was not incorporated into this study. She said we also know that all new development will not take place in the development areas. However, if it did this is what the capacity would provide for.

Mr. Dotson asked what is the horizon of our Comprehensive Plan – it was approved in 2015 – but we have been working on it for a long time and normally Comprehensive Plans are 20 years. He asked was it 2030 or 2035.

Ms. Echols replied that 2035 is probably the number, but she does not know what our future will bring and if we will want to be doing anything more quickly than that if there is a need for comprehensive updates.

Mr. Dotson said the reason he asked the question is he thinks these charts are great and are clear as they can be on a complicated topic. He said it might be useful because the question is what is the capacity in our Comprehensive Plan to somehow distinguish between those things that come in years beyond what our Comprehensive Plan addresses. For instance, it could be that there is adequate land for housing within the time frame of our Comprehensive Plan, maybe 2035, but maybe by 2040 it starts to get thin so the last two columns might be considered the future years then kind of an advanced look. He asked if that made sense and explained that it

begins to build an agenda of things that we look at as we go forward. So if there was some way to maybe shade the last two columns and indicate in a line that this is the time horizon of the adopted plan. He said his other question is when you have assessed the holding capacity under zoning how do you get a low and a high.

Ms. Echols replied what we use for a low and a high is what the maximum of the zoning district would allow without density bonuses and the high is with density bonuses.

Mr. Dotson said it is with and without bonuses, and Ms. Echols agreed.

Mr. Dotson noted that was probably in a footnote.

Ms. Echols replied that it should be. She explained that part of the reason that we did it that way is that we have heard from a number of people that the development community will maximize everything they can and we would not want to put the low number in there and have it not be enough. Therefore, there are different ways this can be done and that was the way we chose to do it. We also looked at percentages in mixed-use districts and what percentage we thought would be residential and then did the same thing with the densities for zoning. For example, all the commercial districts allow residential by special use permit. So we had a percentage we thought X percent of these districts the area could be devoted to residential so it is pretty low.

Mr. Dotson said so it is a good honest effort to come up with capacity.

Ms. Firehock agreed under our current zoning, but she has not read all of the tiny footnotes but if there could be in that in the future there is a lot more room for density beyond what we have in our current zoning.

Ms. Echols said right, and that is what you see on the Comprehensive Plan page and when you turn it over you see the zoning page. She pointed out we have both of those for Comprehensive Plan and Zoning where we have done that comparison so you can see what the capacity is under each.

Mr. Dotson noted that it was easy to miss the word zoning and Comp Plan and maybe put it in bold.

Ms. Echols agreed that was a very good idea.

Ms. Echols said the other thing that plays into this is the fact when a master plan is updated it could affect what the capacity is for that particular development area. Therefore, we just have to be mindful of that in the future.

Ms. Riley said when staff previously stated this does not account for in the zoning scenario redevelopment. She said redevelopment is a catch phrase for a number of things. She said it might be good to describe the subsets of what redevelopment means. It could mean rezoning, update to a master plan or maybe you did not mean redevelopment that way.

Ms. Echols replied that redevelopment is intended to reflect a parcel that is already developed, which is then reused for a different purpose or for a greater intensity. For example, the Fashion Square Mall, if in the future a residential development were added to it we would call that a redevelopment. Staff was just looking at this study Greenfield. Although Greenfield may be a

piece of a larger parcel, it is vacant, we could say okay you have a 30 acre parcel and one acre has a house on it. Therefore, we would break that off and the remaining land we would look at its developability and give you the gross and the net.

Ms. Riley said the redevelopment of those areas that we expect to have high density and residential could very much change these projections.

Ms. Echols agreed. She noted the Places29 Small Area Plan may very well change how we do a capacity analysis. As we get them in the master plans, we can tweak them. Ms. Echols noted that was a very good point.

Ms. Spain said under the Comprehensive Plan indicators of progress, the first table, would it be possible to put in the column for progress the timespan so that we have lost wooded stream buffers between 2009 and 2013. She said the dates are all in the rest of the report but if you have them in a summary table the reader can see that #1 they are not all standardized and not all by the same year. Ms. Spain asked if that is in the new version.

Ms. Echols asked Ms. Spain to start again.

Ms. Spain said for each indicator put the timeframe under the progress column so lack of progress on stream buffers 2009 – 2013; Progress to air quality 2011 – 2016; Historic Properties 2015 – 2016 because she found myself wondering what those years were and if they were standardized years or not. Then you could put in the title indicators of progress for selected years. Ms. Spain said on page Page 1 and 2 where it says you are giving the report for membership and activity during 2012 and probably should be 2016 right under the first page of the report.

Ms. Echols thanked Ms. Spain and asked for her written comments.

Mr. Lafferty agreed with Mr. Keller that it was a great report. He said staff has been doing some polishing but he can see that it took some time to put it together and he thinks in the future it will be easier because you know where the data sets are.

Ms. Echols noted that staff certainly hopes so and thanked him.

Mr. Dotson said he made this comment to staff back in September when they first gave us this, he thinks it might be useful and warranted to enter this in the VAPA Professional Projects Award Category, not that it is perfect, but he would almost think enter last year's along with this as a sort of before and after so that other communities could see the steps of progress and in the explanation it could even include some of the things we have said tonight about how to improve it so that we are really talking about a planning process and not that this is a perfect document. Mr. Dotson said there are a number of people sitting here tonight who would submit one of the two required letters of support.

Ms. Echols thanked him very much on behalf of Andrew Neupal as well who worked very diligently on this with staff.

Mr. Keller said as we move forward in the more intense years of the Comprehensive Plan he thinks next year forward in our five-year cycle the question is rhetorical to think about and let's not answer now, but you obviously have used the Comprehensive Plan as the form giver to this and that is why he thinks we are all excited to see that. Having gone through that process Mr.

Keller said he would be interested in hearing having gone through this process and having developed this document how it is going to affect the way you want to present the Comprehensive Plan in how that form will involve in light of this experience. He said he was looking forward to it.

Ms. Echols said that she did need an affirmative motion from the Planning Commission to pass this on to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dotson moved to adopt and forward the 2016 Planning Commission Annual Report to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Lafferty seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously by a vote of 6:0. (More absent)