

**Albemarle County Planning Commission**  
**June 19, 2018**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, June 19, 2018, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair, Julian Bivins, Jennie More, Daphne Spain, Bruce Dotson and Bill Palmer, UVA representative. Absent was Karen Firehock and Pam Riley, Vice-Chair.

Other officials present were David Hannah, Natural Resources Manager; Andrew Knuppel, Planner; Tim Padalino, Senior Planner, Bill Fritz, Manager of Special Projects; 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.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

**Public Hearing Items.**

a. **ZMA201700010 Boar's Head Connector Road (Sign # 53)**

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller TAX MAP/PARCEL: 059D2-01-00-01500  
LOCATION: 200 Wellington Dr., Charlottesville, VA 22903 PROPOSAL: Amend ZMA200400015 to construct a permanent vehicular and pedestrian connection between the Boar's Head Sports Club and the adjoining Birdwood property. PETITION: Amend the approved application plan from ZMA200400015 to allow for the construction and permanent, unrestricted use of a new private street and associated pedestrian infrastructure, which would establish interparcel connectivity between this 12.1-acre subject property and the adjoining 544-acre Birdwood property (TMP #07500-00-00-06300). ZONING: HC Highway Commercial – commercial and service uses by right, and residential by special use permit (15 units per acre). OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): AIRPORT IMPACT AREA and STEEP SLOPES – MANAGED. PROFFERS: Yes COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Neighborhood Mixed Use Center in Neighborhood 6 of the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods, which allows for a mixture of residential uses (up to 18 units/acre); office, retail, and service uses primarily to serve nearby residential areas; and places of worship, schools, and public and institutional uses. (Tim Padalino)

b. **SP-2017-00032 UVA Outdoor Tennis Facility (Sign #57)**

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller TAX MAP/PARCEL(S): 07500-00-00-06300  
LOCATION: 410 Golf Course Dr., Charlottesville, VA 22903 PROPOSAL: Amend SP201700023 to allow for the construction of a new outdoor tennis facility for use by the University of Virginia men's and women's varsity tennis teams, as well as the expansion of the existing Birdwood Golf Course to consist of a new short course containing six (6) holes, on the Birdwood property. Proposal also includes a request to allow for unrestricted, permanent vehicular use of a new private street to establish interparcel connectivity with the adjoining Boar's Head Sports Club property (TMP #059D2-01-00-01500). PETITION: Swim, golf, tennis, or similar athletic facilities under Section 13.2.2.4 of the zoning ordinance. No

new dwellings proposed on this 544-acre parcel. ZONING: R1 Residential, which allows residential use by right (1 unit per acre). OVERLAY DISTRICT(S): ENTRANCE CORRIDOR, AIRPORT IMPACT AREA, and STEEP SLOPES – MANAGED and – PRESERVED. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Institutional, which allows for schools, libraries, parks, major utilities, hospitals, universities, colleges, ancillary facilities, and undeveloped publicly owned property; and Parks and Green Systems, which allows for parks, playgrounds, play fields, greenways, trails, paths, recreational facilities and equipment, plazas, outdoor sitting areas, natural areas, and preservation of stream buffers, floodplains, and steep slopes adjacent to rivers and streams in Neighborhood 6 of the Southern and Western Urban Neighborhoods. (Tim Padalino)

Tim Padalino presented a PowerPoint presentation to summarize the staff report for the Commission's consideration. He said the presentation for these applications were mixed with the zoning map amendment (ZMA) and the special use permit (SP) since the location maps are similar and other information there is a lot of overlap and he would attempt to provide some summary level information and leave lots of space for questions and answers.

The applicant is the University of Virginia Foundation. Looking at a location map for these two applications, the ZMA-2017-10 would be at the Boar's Head Sports Club property identified as tax map 59D2-1, parcel 15 and the special use permit for the Birdwood property is shown as tax map/parcel 75-63. There are two proposal and two different subject properties and in fact, the special use permit application involves a special exception request for an outdoor lighting waiver so there is actually three applications with three separate votes before you tonight.

Looking quickly at the existing zoning, the Birdwood parcel, 75-63, is an R-1 Residential and the Boar's Head Sports Club property is zoned Highway Commercial (HC) as is the rest of the Boar's Head Inn. The future Land Use Map, as contained in the Comprehensive Plan, the Boar's Head Sports Club property is currently identified as a Center and is designated on the future Land Use Map as a Neighborhood Mixed Use Center. All of the areas under consideration for this special use permit amendment request at the Birdwood property are identified for Institutional future land uses.

Just as a point of information, you are aware that the University of Virginia Foundation and the University are undertaking an Area B Study for the Birdwood property and just wanted to point out on the map from the Comprehensive Plan that the Boar's Head Sports Club property is actually not in Area B. That is just a minor point or observation.

Regarding the ZMA request, this is the Boar's Head Connector Road and it would be an amendment to the existing ZMA-2004-15, which established the Highway Commercial zoning to allow for the Boar's Head Sports Club. This proposal would amend that existing ZMA plan to incorporate the permanent location and unrestricted use of the connector road. As you are aware the temporary connector road has been approved, is under construction, and this would be a request to use it in an unrestricted permanent fashion to connect the existing Berwick Road alignment on Boar's Head properties with the existing alignment of the Golf Course Drive private street on the Birdwood property.

Mr. Padalino said the proffer statement that was submitted in conjunction with this application; the first proffer would be development of the property in general accord with this application plan. It also highlights the potential conversion of existing tennis courts to parking, just kind of a potential future opportunity there and it highlights a possible future service drive or interparcel

connection that would be between the rear of the Sports Club and the rear of the proposed UVA Tennis Facility on the Birdwood Property. The first proffer, as submitted, would be the development in general accord with that ZMA plan. The second proffer is quite lengthy and it identifies the permissible uses of the property. It is consistent with the existing proffer statement established with the previous ZMA approved in 2005. Proffer 3 has been satisfied in full but it is included in their proffer statement just as a way of carrying that forward for historical accuracy. The fourth proffer would be the event management plan and to operate and use the property in conjunction with that event management plan that would have to be approved by the Zoning Administrator.

Mr. Padalino said a note about the proffers in keeping with other ZMA's staff believe that it would be appropriate for the owner to formally make a commitment to provide their proportional share of the cost of future transportation improvements that may be determined by VDOT and the County to be appropriate at the US 250/Ivy Road intersection based on the amount of traffic contributed from the development to that intersection that would require improvements. There has been a lot of communications with the applicants on that issue in the last two weeks and my understanding is they have recently made a verbal commitment to modify the proffer statement in accordance with that concern of staff and provide some type of pro-rata commitment to provide for their proportion of their traffic and transportation impacts. However, any such commitment would need to be finalized prior to the public hearing with the Board of Supervisors, and we certainly can circle back to that issue and talk about that in more detail if necessary or if interested.

Staff has analyzed and evaluated this proposal pursuant to Section 33.6.b of the Zoning Ordinance and that includes 13 factors for consideration and we identified several factors, which are favorable to this request.

1. The proposal would establish a permanent, unrestricted vehicular connection between the Birdwood property and Boar's Head properties, as specifically called for in the Master Plan.
2. The proposal would provide pedestrian interparcel connectivity (sidewalks and crosswalks), which is also called for in the Master Plan.
3. The proposed permanent connector road would improve transportation management during events at Boar's Head properties; would increase safety for people at Boar's Head and surrounding neighborhoods by establishing a second point of ingress and egress, and thereby improving emergency response; and would allow vehicles to travel between Boar's Head properties and Birdwood without using U.S. 250 / Ivy Road.

Staff have identified the following factors, which are unfavorable to this request:

1. The permanent, unrestricted use of the connector road could potentially create negative impacts on nearby residential properties from new traffic patterns and increased traffic levels on Berwick Road and Golf Course Drive; however, this will be partially mitigated through adherence to the Landscaping and Screening Exhibit requirements established by the Board of Supervisors in a Special Exception approved on April 4, 2018. (This is for condition #3 in particular.)
2. There is no formal commitment to provide a proportionate share of the cost of a traffic signal or other transportation improvements if or when warranted.

Staff recommend approval of the ZMA proposal provided that the owner/applicant make technical changes noted in the report, specifically just changing a date in the proffer statements;

and further modifying the proffers to include a commitment for the proportionate share of the cost of transportation improvements.

Mr. Andrew Gast-Bray said that he would just like to make a note this may sound like it is more contentious than it is; it is just very difficult to define pro-rata of a given transportation improvement when we do not know what a given future transportation improvement would be when that would be enacted and what that pro-rata share would be at that time, etc. He said it is not that there has not been good dialogue on that, it is just a sticky issue to ensure that a fair representation in addressing that future need that we do not have. He said the only alternative up to this point would have been to say we would have to take the worst-case scenario and have them set that on the side. He said the applicant has as you have seen in an earlier traffic analysis demonstrated that there is a really good chance that there won't be any requirement whatsoever because their current modeling is showing there is no need at this time, for instance, for a traffic light. He said but that is a modeling and not the reality, they had agreed to a warrant analysis over two years to demonstrate to see how the modeling turns out because there are many factors that could go into that. He said we have come to some sort of an agreement but just have not agreed to terms on that particular item.

Ms. Spain asked how much a traffic signal at that location would cost, how many zeros.

Mr. Padalino said he spoke with Kevin McDermott, our Transportation Principal Planner, this morning and he used a half a million dollars as just a very general estimate and he noted that it depends on the type of traffic signal and other site-specific factors. Mr. Padalino said he would have thought that would be on the high end of a cost estimate.

Mr. Keller asked how much a roundabout would cost, and Mr. Padalino replied that they had also talked about that briefly and he thinks that this was just off the cuff he mentioned something between 5 and 10 million dollars. He said the pro-rata formulas for these types of costs are vastly different depending on the type of improvements so the percentage of the development's traffic would be far less for something like a traffic circle versus their proportion of a traffic signal.

Mr. Keller invited other questions for staff. Hearing no none, Mr. Keller opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to address the Commission.

Valerie Long, representative for the applicant the UVA Foundation, said joining me tonight is Elise Cruz with the Foundation and my colleague Ashley Davies, our land use planner. She said it is very exciting to be here tonight on this joint application since we have been working very hard on it over the past year and so. She said we are comfortable and agreeable to the idea of kind of taking the time out between the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to fine tune those conditions. She said we can talk about the proffers as well and were happy to do that and just focus tonight on the other issues, and believed we have addressed all of them to staff's concern.

Ms. Long said a summary of our request involves the permanent connector road as you may remember the temporary road was approved recently for use during the World Squash Championships that will take place in July. She said that was a three-week span when it can be used, but after that, it cannot be used. She said the hope is that the road will actually be constructed and we could maybe get this SP approved in time so that it would just stay open and provide the benefits from day one.

Ms. Long said second is the new Outdoor UVA Tennis Facility, would have a maximum of 12 courts and we have a lighting waiver request associated with that, which she will speak to briefly. Finally, the addition of a Par 3 Course. She said this application is follow-up to a number of other investments that the Foundation has made in the Birdwood and Boar's Head Sports Club property just in the last few years. She said there were indoor tennis courts added back in the 2005 range and then a squash facility was added; they are actually adding onto the squash facility now, which enabled them to attract the world squash championships. She said a year or two ago we obtained approval for the indoor golf practice facility and the Foundation has approval to renovate the entire Birdwood Golf Course consistent with some industry standards. She said in trying to attract more golfers we are renovating it; they have engaged Davis Love, a professional golfer, who has prepared a wonderful plan and actually consolidates the boundaries of the course somewhat trying to make the course faster, less daunting for beginners, and attract new players. She said another component of that is the proposed Par 3 Course, which is a shorter course with only six holes, that would be in addition to the 18 hole standard course that is there now even after renovation. She said it is going to be a great addition to the facility.

Ms. Long said the Foundation had a number of community meetings and they actually now host them with all the surrounding neighborhoods on essentially a monthly basis. She said every once in a while they have deviations where they don't have it but generally speaking it is once a month, standing time and a certain day of the month. She pointed out a list of the recent dates that they hosted. She said we already the Comprehensive Plan designation for Birdwood being Institutional. She said the exhibits in the presentation are all in their packet and again was happy to elaborate on any of them. She pointed out we have individual plans and exhibits that address each of the proposals as well as a rendering of how the connector road would look if you entered the Birdwood Golf Course and continue down Golf View Drive. She said you would have just passed the new Indoor Golf Practice Facility on the left and if you curve to the left you would go to the Golf Club House and if you turn to the right, you can see the roof of the existing Sports Club Facility. She said that it is a short span but provides a critical connection.

Ms. Long said the only reason we actually needed a rezoning was the Sports Club has different zoning than the golf course. The Sports Club is zoned Highway Commercial and the Golf Course is zoned R-1, Residential so we have a special use permit to amend the existing special use permit for swim, golf and tennis facility on the Birdwood property. However, because a small segment of the connector road is located right on the edge of the Sports Club's parcel and in order for this to be permitted to be permanently used we also had to provide an amendment to the Sports Club zoning plan. Therefore, it is kind of a small technicality but she just wanted to explain that we are not proposing to rezone or change the use at the Sports Club merely to have the ability for the portion of the connector road to be permanent. She noted the same exhibit that approved the temporary connector road had lots of pedestrian and bicycle facilities that will all be required with the approvals. Next, is the proposed layout for the new tennis facility, the squash segment of the Sports Club, the indoor tennis and the area for hard surface tennis courts with where the connector road connects.

Ms. Long said this is a conceptual plan and it is continuing to go through revision and refinement with the new University tennis coaches and the new Athletic Director. She pointed out the latest iteration shows the concept to have the courts be lower into the ground and provides the exhibition court concept that we think will be very exciting. She noted the approved concept plan that would control the Indoor Golf Practice Facility; we are not proposing any

changes to it but because it is all part of the golf course, we are just codifying all of those prior approvals in this one. Finally, this is the plan that attaches officially to the Sports Club property because of the location of the connector road there on the edge.

Ms. Long said we also have a lighting waiver request because the tennis facility would be used for the UVA Tennis Team and there is the idea that in the future they may want to have some matches televised. She said in order to do that there are specific industry requirements for lighting for television so we have asked for the ability to have special lighting taller mast poles than would normally be allowed to be used when those matches are being televised. She said the good news is the technology with LED lighting has dramatically improved in recent years and she has a few exhibits to show. She noted the old outdated lights that have lots of spillover and light pollution, which have been improved dramatically, and now today the technology that is available today provides the lighting needed for televised matches without creating any spillover of lighting or light pollution. She pointed in the exhibit they were trying to show the height of the light poles and the sunken design of the match courts compared to the proposed tennis pavilion building compared to the existing Sports Club Building. She said it is at a lower ground elevation so even though the poles are taller than normally would be allowed they because you are starting at a lower point and the technology for full cut-off lighting we think that we will meet all of the goals and objectives providing the necessary lighting for television without creating any adverse impacts.

Ms. Long pointed out all of the parking options that the two facilities have that the Foundation controls; they do a great job managing today a variety of events at their properties often on the same day or the same weekends. She said that because they have so many spaces they have shared parking because those who use the office buildings during the week and daytime do not need those spaces in the weekends when they have events. Ms. Long said she would be happy to go into this more and likewise we can talk more about our special event management plan and traffic issues. However, as Mr. Gast-Bray indicated our current traffic study confirms that when you add the tennis facility and the relatively few additional trips for the Par 3 Course even when you factor in the proposed permanent nature of the connector road it does not trigger the need for any additional signals at Golf Course Drive, the access road to Birdwood. Ms. Long said she was happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Keller invited public comment.

Mike McCorry, resident of Ednam Village Street, said he was part of the Board of Ednam Village and Gay Stillwell is a member of the Board. He said only being a community member there for approximately six months that we are well aware of the village and its relationship with Boar's Head; it is excellent and anything that they do appears to enhance our community and make it a very wonderful place to live. As one person here knows he was very concerned yesterday about light pollution on the new lights if it affects Ednam Village. He said we have been assured that it will not have a major impact but thinks we have to address that more as they follow-up and build the tennis courts. Therefore, we are concerned about that for one issue. He said the second issue has been discussed at past meetings is how much traffic is going to go through that access road. If we put a light out in front someday is the traffic going to go streaming down there and we have basically a mini 250 right near some of the houses at Ednam Village and he believes there is a solution to that but does not know what it is. He said that is a second concern. He said the residents of Ednam Village have known about those two concerns for the last couple of months in working with the Foundation to solve that particular issue. He said something came up tonight that we were not aware of and that is parking and if he understood

staff's presentation two or more of the tennis courts right across the street from the Village are going to be turned into parking lots. He said if that is true, we really have to talk about that because that could really be a blight on the Village itself. He said that he would be happy to answer questions.

There being no further public comment, Mr. Keller invited the applicant back up for rebuttal.

Ms. Long said that with respect to the connector road the Foundation is obviously very sensitive to ensuring that there are no adverse impact to the residents of Ednam Village or any of the other surrounding neighborhoods there. She said we think that the design of the road and the speed limit and the elements of that road design as well as its location is not going to be a 55 mile per hour road; it is a connector road through private property. She said the road is on the Comprehensive Plan and always has been contemplated. She said when assisting the Foundation in 2004/2005 with the rezoning of the Sports Club to add the existing indoor tennis courts it was actually a request at that time, but the Foundation was not ready for it yet. She said the time is now since it has been on the Comprehensive Plan for a long time. She said we think it really will provide an immense number of benefits for all the reasons that staff noted in the staff report that it provides additional emergency access for those neighborhoods; it disburses traffic during events and reduces vehicle trips on Route 250. She said it will be many benefits and she knows the Foundation will continue to work with the residents of all the neighborhoods there to ensure that it will not have an adverse impact.

Ms. Long said with regard to the new parking on the Sports Club property there are four clay courts here, four clay courts here and four hard surface courts here. She said it is a potential to consider converting those hard courts into a parking lot in the future because they are going to have up to 12 new hard courts here and she just wants to ensure that they are going to have enough parking. She pointed out they are going to have additional parking here for the golf course parking lot that is rarely full and can be slightly added onto. She noted they could rearrange those spaces and stripes to add more spaces. They are also proposing to add a road that would provide some additional spaces as well, but they just want to ensure that they have the additional parking that is available. She said they would obviously be working with the residents to ensure that there is sufficient landscaping around the area if they did go that route to ensure that it is appropriately screened; they would require that for their own standards as well. She pointed out it is not a definite but we have asked for that flexibility to be able to make that change since it is something that has been on their master plan for a long time to have that flexibility and would be happy to discuss that further.

Mr. Keller invited questions for the applicant.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was a gate that can control and if she could speak a little bit about when it might be put into use and where is it.

Ms. Long replied that the reason for the gate was that as it is currently approved it is only for temporary use for a three-week span late July through early August when the World Squash Championships are here. Therefore, the condition of approval for that special use permit amendment says you have to have a gate put up so that when it is not during those three weeks you can close it off and people will not use it. She noted that it was in that general location and we hope to not actually need it because if we can get the special use permit approved it will be a moot point. With that being said, Ms. Long said they might want to use it so that during every

once in a while during a big event if they want to steer people one way or the other they can do that. However, she did not think that would be needed.

Mr. Bivins said since we are talking about internal roads he was wondering whether the Fox Haven Farm that sits at the bottom of all of this at some point if we are going to have a conversation of connecting that property to the Club and some of the work that is taking place now at Birdwood. He asked if that is an Area B conversation or are we just going to have a piece of that come before us at some other point.

Ms. Long replied that is a good question and thinks Mr. Gast-Bray will echo my comment, it is not only an appropriate Area B conversation; it is an Area B conversation we are having with Mr. Gast-Bray and others on the staff. She said as you may know we are moving forward with an Area B Plan; it is essentially a small area plan for Birdwood and one of the many things we are looking at is what types of connections might be appropriate. She said maybe it was just trails and paths, maybe it is some future connections, but we do not know and it is definitely something that we have been discussing.

Ms. Spain asked if you have an estimate of the number of televised events.

Ms. Long replied that she did not know but did not think it was very many. She introduced Elise Cruz who is with the UVA Foundation and has been more involved in those specifics.

Elise Cruz, with the UVA Foundation, said she had the pleasure of speaking with Mr. McCorry yesterday on the phone about the lights and the number of televised events would be very few. She said that right now we are working with the UVA varsity tennis coaches and staff from athletics to determine what their needs are for the programming of the tennis facility and their answer to the question of how often you have night events whether it is practices or any sort of game and they said right now none. She said they do not plan to have very many events at night because it just does not work out with how they do their practices, games and everything. She said every other tennis facility that is in D1 that is somewhat high level has lights but most do not use them. She said the specific lights are required by ESPN and the ACC Network if they were to televise that event; it seems like most of the tennis games, if not all of them, would happen during the daytime. She said we do not know how often they would be used, but we do know that UVA would like to have the flexibility to use them perhaps if they were practicing at dusk. She pointed out the nice thing about those lights is they are fully adjustable so the lights don't have to be up at 100 percent all of the time and could have them at a lower lumen level just to provide enough light that you might need for that game.

Ms. Spain said right now you are saying there are none, but there could be a couple of dozen a year.

Ms. Cruz replied that she was sure because they don't have lights now that is probably why they don't have some night events and it is also just a preference of the coaches and the students to perhaps have their practices in the afternoon after classes are done and before dinner time as well as evening activities. However, that may change over time but depending on the priorities they may decide to just install the posts and infrastructure for those lights; they may be installed at a later day when fundraising may line up to pay for those lights. She said that is something we want to ask now just so we have the flexibility to install them if that is the route that they decide to go.

Ms. More asked how many courts would be lowered.

Ms. Long replied that at the most it would be two, but at this time there is only likely to be one and Ms. Cruz could answer the question better.

Ms. Cruz replied that the concept shown was not of this plan; this is a image of a different facility but the same type of idea for the sunken court; this is not what the UVA facility would look like and just an example.

Ms. More said that something like this would be where it was televised and that would be with the need for the lighting.

Ms. Cruz said the bank of six courts on the southern side would be the ones that would be the lit courts where any televised matches may occur. She said the majority of matches will happen on those courts and the coach's vision for what we call the sunken court is actually more for practice and intimate experience for the player to be focused on their game and be able to be in a more enclosed environment with less distractions to focus on different specific aspects of improving their game. She said the nice thing about those courts being lit and where they are is that is the lowest point on the site, so again more screening for the residents of Ednam Village and Ednam Forest. She said Fred Missel our Director of Design and Development he has actually gone to our neighbors here in Ednam Forest, they are the very first house and he stood there with them and looked over to see where this might be that was his first concern is we want to make sure if these lights are on they are not glaring our neighbors faces. However, they have many tall trees and just the orientation of the site no one is concerned about those lights being on. She said again the lights are full cut-off as well so there is no light pollution up or to the side and are just going exactly where they need to be, of course we don't want to install any more lights than we need because they are very expensive.

Ms. More said in our packet it talks about a possible future service drive and another interparcel connection and asked where that is on the larger map. She commented that on a larger map that gives us a bigger idea of all of this she did not see where you were showing residential properties.

Ms. Cruz pointed out the section for parking labeled C would be the interparcel connection and would cross from the Boars Head parcel into the Birdwood parcel. She said these are all shown as options and the only one that we have definitely decided to build is B that is shown as the Squash Expansion being constructed right now. She said A, as Valerie mentioned, is just a possibility and it may not even be that orientation or that size of a parking lot; this is something we are looking into to redesign and make the Birdwood Golf Course Club House parking more efficient but C is just when we get to the site plan stage of a plan for the site plan for the tennis that will something that will be discussed at that point. Ms. Cruz pointed out Berwick Drive, the UVA Foundation Office, Boar's Head Sports Club, the Inn and Restaurant, Ednam, Ednam Village, Ednam Forest and then Bellair.

Mr. Dotson said my question builds on Commissioner More's question, I think it would be very useful as this goes to the Board to have an additional diagram that more clearly treats the project not as an island and to see Ednam Village and residential properties to know what the relationship and distance that he would be looking. He said my concern would not be light being cast in my backyard; it is too far away but simply the visibility of this well lite activity and is it far enough away, does the building block all of it or a little. He said that diagram would be

very helpful to understanding what is going on. He said the second question is with Berwick in it does not look like a road that was designed to be a collector or an arterial and you are not proposing that it is either of those. He said it feels almost like a driveway through a property and there are a lot of side frictions with at least currently out of parking along it. He said in the traffic study he could not find a place that gave an idea of how much traffic is on Berwick now and how much would be on it in the future to see what the difference is. He said those are my two concerns – the visibility of the lighting and just wanting to understand Berwick and its new role.

Ms. Long said thank you for your comments Mr. Dotson I agree with your suggestion on the lighting waiver exhibit and will do just that. She said we tried to measure using the GIS maps and other maps the distance how far is the nearest residence to the closest point of the tennis courts and we roughly measured the closest house which is about 750' from this area and similarly the closest home in Ednam Village is also about 750'. She said the Ednam Village homes that are at a higher elevation because the topography does drop off a bit as you move away from that area, but we will certainly have an exhibit that shows that more thoroughly. She said with regard to Berwick Road I can't cite the specifics either but generally speaking what the traffic study looked at was how many trips the proposed tennis facilities and the new Par3 golf course would add and the outcome was that it would actually add very few trips particularly they are not peak hour trips since people are not playing golf at rush hour or traveling to and from golf as much or tennis. Therefore, their off-peak trips it was 273 trips or so per day on average and that is over a 24 hour period and so the number of additional trips from those uses was relatively small and then when you factor in the connector road that shifts things a little bit. She said that on the one hand you would have perhaps more cars coming along Berwick and using the connector road to get to the golf course particularly residents of Ednam Village who right now have to go out on 250 and come in here. She said yes, those would have more trips along Berwick from those residents but the good news is it will be offset by reduced trips on 250. She said likewise Ednam Village residents already are using Berwick because that is their only means of ingress and egress to and from their neighborhood and Route 250 but with the connector road potentially they will decide to use the connector road and Golf Course Drive instead which would in theory reduce the number of trips on Berwick. She said there are a lot of assumptions and expectations but it is difficult to model until that is open, which is why as Mr. Gast-Bray indicated we thought it appropriate to agree to conduct follow-up traffic studies after the road is opened on a permanent basis to understand what really is happening, how is Berwick, the connector road and the intersections handling the additional traffic. She said it is more about disbursement of traffic and changing traffic patterns than it is about additional trips. She said there are additional trips but we think the bigger uncertainty is how will people react and respond to this change and we think it will be overall good because it will disburse traffic in multiple directions.

Mr. Dotson said it was mentioned in the staff report that service vehicles might now come in on the Golf Drive and go to Berwick and he assumed now they come in Edman to Berwick.

Ms. Long replied that is exactly right and we think there will be many benefits some will depend on where you are coming from and going.

Mr. Keller commented that it seems with GPS routing it is going to be fascinating to see as we get more and more real time routing for everyday events instead of trips because many people are going to be arriving from east to west which is going to mean turning across the row of traffic where there is not a light. He said you have pointed out all the configurations that might add to

that so it is going to be interesting to see kind of congestion might or might not occur there. He asked have you explored telescoping poles.

Ms. Long replied no, and she was speculating since she did not know if the technology exists for the type of fixtures required for televised sports.

Mr. Keller pointed out he had experience with the Musco lighting from Iowa that has done the NASCAR Races and they bring temporary lighting into places that do not have lighting. He said they have done NFL games in Europe and around the world for temporary lighting. He said there are two alternatives that at least would be nice to have mentioned at the next level at the Supervisors and one is the availability of temporary sports lighting if it really is not going to be often and it might include a significant savings of the Foundation in the short term. He said the other one is the telescoping poles that is used in Europe when they are adjacent to neighborhoods.

Ms. Long replied that the architects that we have been working with who have been advising on those issues we could certainly ask them those questions.

Mr. Keller said the bottom line is what was suggested by Mr. Dotson for a section of the design would be most helpful to see that relative location and scaled distance both horizontal and vertical.

Mr. Bivins said the traffic report did not say we would add a light or control entrance at Golf Course Drive but the conversation was to remove the one that is near the Inn so there would not be three – the Farmington Drive one, the Inn one and then put another at Golf Course Drive but remove one most likely the one at the Inn and put one there.

Ms. Long replied that he was generally correct although at this point nothing has been decided. She said part of what makes it more challenging is that VDOT is in the middle of a Corridor Study of that actual span and maybe all of 250. She said among other things they are looking at how we can improve traffic generally along 250 in that area and even further west towards Crozet and the one thing they have said is we do not want more lights. She said before we finished our traffic study there were comments like well if you trigger a need for a signal at Golf Course Drive we would probably make you remove the one at Ednam first. She said we were hesitate to propose that because that would be an adjustment for folks, but the good news at least now the traffic study says you don't need another signal. She said our study did evaluate at VDOT's request three different scenarios – one is exactly the way things are now, two was what if you had a signal at both and three was what if you flip the signals. She said we looked at all of those to just demonstrate depending on the scenario that VDOT wanted what are the impacts on the level of service at each of those intersections. She said for what it is worth the good news is that the traffic study says regardless of what scenario occurs the levels of service at each of those intersections is maintained as it is today. She said so again we are not proposing to change the signals, VDOT may make that decision in the future, we are not encouraging it so a lot of it is just unknown and Mr. Gast-Bray may want to add onto that.

Mr. Keller pointed out that there is another lane because there is the lane that goes directly to the Birdwood House.

Ms. Long replied that is correct although that would as you may have seen in the conditions have very limited access just for the residents of that road and I believe the longest term the Foundation is looking to perhaps eliminate that point of access and integrate it with Golf Course Drive.

Mr. Keller noted that is part of the significance of the layout of that historic resource so even if it was closed off most likely that lane needs to remain.

Ms. Long pointed out they have good historical preservationists and landscape architects looking at those issues.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Mr. Keller closed the public hearing to bring the matter before the Commission for discussion and action. He invited questions for staff.

Mr. Spain said in Attachment H in the special use permit application there is mention of footcandles and several months ago, Ms. Brumfield gave a presentation about updating standards to incorporate LED measures as opposed to the footcandles. She asked is this something that we will be addressing in the future.

Mr. Gast-Bray replied that it is definitely something we want to address in the many performance standards being revisited but it is currently not programmed and he did not believe we have a date for you as to when we will be addressing it. He said yes, it is planned to be done.

Ms. More said she appreciates in staff's report that you make specific reference to the S&W Master Plan and give page numbers. She said it was a good example of master planning for this specific area and is giving you very specific guidance, which you have passed on to us. Therefore, it is not a vision but is very clear and specific for this area the need for the connection and then the other areas of importance that you have outlined and that is very helpful and speaks a lot to the importance of master planning. She thanked staff for that and make that comment.

Mr. Bivins said my hope with this if it is in fact approved to go to a permanent connector road that knowing the two communities that are there that people are going to appreciate that now they can do all kind of recreation pieces from Ednam Forest and Ednam Village that is going to allow biking, dog walking, stroller pushing and all the things that go along with that. He said in the creation of that connector that it actually facilitates that kind of multi-modal use there and otherwise, speaking with Commissioner Dotson it will look like a driveway. He said you have an opportunity to set the characteristic of the Inn and the golf course in a way that he thinks is important as opposed to just a connector and hopes you are thinking it is more than a connector and in fact a way for people to move and enjoy that beautiful piece of property in ways that they don't do now.

Mr. Keller asked for a motion.

Mr. Blair noted there would be three items being a special use permit, a zoning map amendment and a special exception.

Mr. Keller asked if that included the tennis facility, and Mr. Blair replied that the special exception is for the tennis facility.

Mr. Keller said technically we need to reopen the public hearing and say that the public hearing is for b. as well since he read a. but not b.

Mr. Blair said it would be advisable.

Mr. Keller opened the public hearing and noted that besides item a., which was the Boar's Head Connector, there was b. SP-2017-00032 UVA Outdoor Tennis Facility. He asked if there was anybody from the applicant that cares to speak or anyone from the public who cares to speak. Hearing none, Mr. Keller closed the public hearing to bring the matters before the Commission for discussion and action. He requested that the first action be on the zoning map amendment.

Ms. More said for the zoning map amendment for the connector road it says recommended changes from staff and asked are we to take the handout about the cost share language change in condition #9 highlighted.

Mr. Blair noted that was for the special use permit.

Mr. Keller pointed out we have page 11 from the document, page 15 from the other document and then the 2 pages from the other.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of ZMA-2017-00010 Boar's Head Connector Road with recommended changes from staff.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited staff to clarify.

Mr. Padalino replied that was correct for the motion that the recommendation from staff for the zoning map amendment did include some commentary provided that the date, for example, was changed and the technical changes were made. He said we could recommend that for approval if the language about providing a commitment for the proportionate share of traffic for that whole issue were included in the proffer. He said so there was some recommended commentary from staff for the zoning map amendment (ZMA) separate from that handout which was for the special use permit (SP).

Ms. More agreed to add to the motion with recommended changes from staff for the zoning map amendment (ZMA).

Mr. Blair replied that was correct.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0. (Firehock, Riley absent)

Mr. Keller asked for a motion for the next item.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of SP-2017-00032 UVA Outdoor Tennis Facility permanent connector road and Birdwood Golf Course addition with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion.

Mr. Dotson asked if the motion included the modification.

Ms. More said it was including the modification in the handout from staff for #9, and Mr. Blair said yes, that was correct.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0. (Firehock, Riley absent)

Mr. Keller asked for a motion for the special exception.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of the requested special exception for an Outdoor Lighting Waiver for the reasons outlined in the staff report and with the conditions outlined in the staff report.

Mr. Keller asked if we want to add to that those recommendations that came from us or would staff just include those in moving that forward and Mr. Padalino replied yes, that was correct.

Ms. Spain seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller invited further discussion. Hearing none, he asked for a roll call.

The motion passed by a vote of 5:0. (Firehock, Riley absent)

Mr. Keller said the recommendation would be forwarded to the Board of Supervisors to a date to be determined. He said this would go to the Supervisors in a timely manner as we talked about previously to expedite it so not to have this temporary and be a final piece from the beginning. He said that was the goal and so from our vantage point we hope that will happen. Mr. Keller thanked staff and the applicant. He thanked staff for trying to put this very complex three-piece component in front of us in a way that we could understand.

**The Planning Commission recessed at 7:50 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 7:56 p.m.**