

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
Final Minutes Regular Meeting June 13, 2023**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, June 13, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Corey Clayborne, Chair; Julian Bivins; Luis Carrazana; Karen Firehock; Nathan Moore; Lonnie Murray.

Members absent: Fred Missel, Vice-Chair.

Other officials present were: Kevin McDermott, Interim Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Alberic Karina-Plun, Planner, Bill Fritz and Rebecca Ragsdale.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Clayborne called the meeting to order.

Mr. Karina-Plun called the roll.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Clayborne said this item was for matters not currently scheduled for a public hearing, so if there was anything that was not on the public agenda for this evening that a member of the public would wish to speak to, now would be the time. He said he saw no one approach the podium.

Neil Williamson stated that he represented the Free Enterprise Forum. He asked how many of them had a cell phone, and how many of them had two. He asked how important their connectivity was to them every day, and how many of them could name just one place in Albemarle County where that cell phone did not work just right. He said that the poorly-named dead zones were the indirect result of Albemarle County's outdated wireless technology ordinance. He said that tonight, they held a work session focused on updating the zoning text to reflect today's technological demands. He said that the consultant's report on the County's condition was very approachable and featured clear descriptions that even a liberal arts major could follow.

Mr. Williamson said that the report called out private industry and Albemarle's rule regarding wireless infrastructure, and he quoted that the County as a public entity could work to foster public-private partnerships to provide this much-needed public resource, but ultimately was not responsible for proposing, situating, designing, or building new personal wireless service facilities. He said that interestingly, the existing wireless policy itself dated back to about 1998, which was the same year that Google was founded, long before it was a verb.

Mr. Williamson asked how their use of wireless technology had changed in the last 27 years. He said that this antiquated policy really did not consider wireless technology as an infrastructure item, but as a luxury. He said that today, Albemarle County businesses, residents, relied on cellular service for their business operations, communications, and perhaps most importantly,

safety. He said that the answer to the primary question in the consultant's report was does the County desire to improve network coverage and capacity.

Mr. Williamson said that if they believed in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of the citizenry, the answer had to be yes. He said that these recommendations would not solve all of the problems, but if Albemarle County embraced the changes proposed in the consultant's report, the Free Enterprise Forum believed that private investment in the new technology would follow, and perhaps they no longer would have to ask if they could be heard on the phone.

Tom Olivier stated that he lived in the Samuel Miller District. He said that the Code of Virginia, Article 3, said the local Planning Commission shall prepare and recommend a comprehensive plan, and the code did not say the planning staff and consultants would develop a comprehensive plan. He said that he had taken part in past County comprehensive plan updates beginning in the early 1990s, and he recalled work sessions decades ago in which chapter updates began with Commissioners reviewing existing chapters page by page, discussing areas in need of revision and conferring with attending planning staff on possible revisions.

Mr. Olivier said that at these sessions, the public often was allowed to offer views on existing texts and propose revisions. He said that he believed that the symbioses evident then between the Commission, staff, and public were key to the appearance of much enlightened thinking in County plans in the 1990s and early 2000s. He said that today, they lived in a world marred by worsening ecological crises led by human-caused climate change. He said that climate scientists warned that they must mend their ways and rapidly transform modern human societies if they were to survive climate threats.

Mr. Olivier said that analyses and documents produced so far by the AC44 team showed little recognition of the scale of ecological crises they now face, or how existing policies contributed to their woes. He said that they were on course to develop a new comprehensive plan that could not guide them through the disrupted environmental conditions projected for the next 20 years.

Mr. Olivier said that they needed an immediate overhaul of the current comprehensive plan update process, and they needed a process that once again drew again on intellectual resources offered by the Planning Commission, and planning staff, and engaged, knowledgeable members of the public. He said that they were most likely to achieve this with the Planning Commission holding the reins on the remainder of the update process, in keeping with past County practice and the spirit and letter of Virginia law. He asked that they consider his comments in their discussion of comprehensive planning later this evening.

Lori Schweller stated that she was an attorney with Williams Mullen. She stated that she would like to express her support for the suggestions made in the consultant's memorandum regarding the wireless zoning text amendment. She said that these were reasonable modifications that would make a big difference in the quality of wireless service experienced in the County. She said that her colleague Valerie Long and she had probably obtained approval for at least 75 of the roughly 150 macro sites in the County, so she brought these comments based on their experience with the existing zoning ordinance.

Ms. Schweller said that first, in the past five years, every site that they had applied for was a company with a special exception for an antennae standoff, and those were always approved. She said that that was a change that can't really be noticed from the ground that would make a

lot of difference to service-provided avoidance areas. She said that in the 2015 ordinance amendment discussion, that was one of the first things that the industry highlighted was how avoidance areas held them back from providing the service they needed.

Ms. Schweller said that the staff did not relax its careful scrutiny of any sites, whether they were in the avoidance area or not, but it converted a tier 2 facility to a tier 3, which meant a special use permit, community meetings, public hearings at the Planning Commission and Board, were necessary, so eventually those sites may be approved, but they took a lot longer. She said that a recent case in point was a site in Greenwood where they started with a tier 2 style facility, but over the course of two years, they had so much debate that they ended up with a different facility that she thought some on the Commission and Board thought was not as preferred as the original site.

Ms. Schweller said that these barriers were counter-productive to providing the level of service they wanted in the County, and the suggested changes could make it financially viable for wireless providers to make needed investments. She said to keep in mind that developing the due diligence of construction costs of a 100-foot monopole was not that different from a 130-foot monopole, but they got so much better service according to what the consultants had shown in the propagation map in the memorandum with 130-foot, as an example.

Ms. Schweller said that being able to construct that 130 feet and serve more customers gave the carriers a much greater return on investment, so they had that additional infrastructure investment in the County. She thanked the Planning Commission for holding the work session, and they hoped to have one or more roundtable discussions with the industry so they could provide more information as they thought about these ideas going forward.

John Foster stated that he lived in the Batesville Historic District in Albemarle County. He said that he was extremely concerned by the memo the County consultants had written recommending almost 500 additional cell towers throughout Albemarle County. He said that it was as if Verizon and AT&T crafted these recommendations specifically for their interests.

Mr. Foster said that he was confident that Albemarle County planning staff and elected officials heard the displeasure surrounding proposed cell towers in Batesville and Greenwood communities over the past few years. He said that community consensus in each case was decidedly opposed to new cell towers. He said that while he understood the desire for improvement in cell coverage throughout the County, the current level of coverage did not constitute an urgent public safety concern.

Mr. Foster said that instead of relaxing the current regulations, the County should maintain the requirement for a maximum tower height no taller than 10 feet taller than the tallest or nearest tree, maintain the requirement for tree screening, require a setback of at least 1000 feet from any additional historic district, contributing structure to a historic district, or structure listed in the National Register of Historic Places, require a setback of three times the tower's height for any occupied structure, and two times the tip height from any parcel line. He said that he appreciated Albemarle County's efforts to protect the scenic and historic resources through many of its policies, and hoped the Planning Commission would take this opportunity to improve its cell tower siting regulations to reduce the visual impact that future cell towers would have on Albemarle County.

Laura Good stated that she was a resident of the White Hall District. She said that she was speaking in regard to the proposed wireless changes. She said that since this was the first time the consultant was communicating with the Planning Commission, she would wait to be more specific about their concerns, but she represented a group of neighbors on Pea Ridge in White Hall. She said that for context, in 2017, a cell tower was built basically in their back yards without proper notice, they were kept in the dark about the process, and it was too late.

Ms. Good said that their supervisor even said it was a perfect storm of lack of notification, lack of consideration for the immunocompromised family that lived right next to the cell tower, and other things that they tried to address but ran out of time to do so. She said that they were concerned that the report's recommendation of existing towers to be increased up to 30 feet because it would severely impact their views, property values, health, and quality of life, and it severely contradicted the goals of the Albemarle County comprehensive plan. She said that they recognized the desire for personal wireless service, but this need was not universal. She said that their area had recently gotten high-speed fiberoptic in the ground, which meant that they did not have to rely on cell service solely for many internet-related communications.

Ms. Good said that the current cell tower in the middle of the neighborhood was full of families, agriculture, mountains, and historic views. She said that many of them moved to this area for health reasons and to raise their children, and they could not choose which airways they breathed and were subject to and which ones they were not, but the County could. She said that it appeared as if the County was giving preference to the wireless companies and not to the health and welfare of its residents.

Ms. Good said that Albemarle County was once considered at the forefront of keeping its scenic and historic character safe from corporate interests, and they asked the County to listen to its residents and use caution in this manner. She said that they respectfully urged the Commission to listen to all of the potential negative effects, and she and her neighbors would like to somehow be involved in the process and would like to thank Bill Fritz for starting the process which they hoped the be a part of.

Jeff Woodbury stated that he lived on Burchs Creek Road in the Batesville Historic District. He said that he did not want to be present, but he was because there was a 90-foot-tall cell tower that was going to be built 90 feet away from his property line, about 120 feet off of his front porch. He said that when he saw that they were going to consider changing or revisiting the guidelines, he was surprised to find out that the recommendation was to lessen them, and he felt like they should be going in the opposite direction.

Mr. Woodbury said that like his neighbor John Foster said, they should think about the people who were going to have to live in the shadow of these towers and were not necessarily the property owner. He said that never in his wildest dreams did he think there was even a possibility of a cell tower being put 90 feet off of his property line and that he was going to have to play games in his front yard under the shadow of this tower. He said that he lived in a historic district in a rural area, and he did not live there because he liked to upload stuff to TikTok.

Mr. Woodbury said that he liked the scenic beauty, and it was where they had been for a long time. He said that they owned the two houses next door that his family lived in, and the fact that all of them were getting affected by this had been a huge deal for his family for the past year and was something they never saw coming. He said that he hoped they would give as much consideration to the taxpayers and property owners in Albemarle County that might not be

working for cell phone companies, and that they remember the County was special for a reason, and they must keep it in mind going forward.

Ryan Woodbury stated that she lived in the Historic District of Batesville, and her home would be 120 feet from the imminent Miller School cell tower. She said that they had probably heard by now that the Department of Historic Resources ruled in favor of Verizon during the 106 review, determining that the Miller School tower would have no adverse impact on the Batesville Historic District despite unanimous community objection, and even the Miller School sided with the community and requested Verizon to move the tower to a less intrusive location, but Verizon said no.

Ms. Woodbury said that she was pointing this out because despite their best efforts and the clear negative effect this tower would have on their community, Verizon did not care. She said that all that it would take to make Batesville feel better about this situation would be to move the planned tower off of the road and 100 more feet into the woods, and that was all, but Verizon said no. She said that no one was allowed to access the proprietary coverage maps that supposedly supported their reasons for saying no.

Ms. Woodbury said that it was up to the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission to protect rural Albemarle and to look out for everyone's best interests. She said that connectivity was not the only thing that mattered to residents, and the setback regulations and height restrictions needed to be stronger with regards to residential neighborhoods, historic districts, and property lines that were near neighboring homes or businesses.

Ms. Woodbury said that every tower should be thoughtfully and individually considered by the surrounding community. She said that individual landowners should not be allowed to lease their land to providers with complete disregard for the neighbors. She said that all of the property values along Burchs Creek Road, where she lived, would be diminished because of this tower, while Miller School was not affected in the least. She asked the Planning Commission to do more to protect them and strengthen their regulations.

Work Session

ZTA202300002 Personal Wireless Service Facilities

Mr. Bill Fritz stated that the consultant, Susan, worked with CityScape and the Berkley Group to prepare the presentation and information for the Planning Commission. He said that feedback was requested on the information so that next steps could be determined.

Ms. Susan Rabold, with CityScape Consultants, stated that their company exclusively worked with local governments and did not work for a service provider or tower owner, and did not provide site acquisition for the wireless industry, did not build sites, did not own a subscription service for people to subscribe to, and only worked for local entities on wireless telecommunications. She said that they had been hired to provide an engineering analysis for the County through the Berkley Group, and their project included the preliminary research of all wireless equipment, and assessment of all physical sites for antennae locations, recorded data, and then mapped it all out. She said that they provided a project initiation meeting that discussed the scope of the project, took comments from that meeting, and finalized the inventory catalog, which was a document that provided images of each site.

Ms. Rabold said that the data they collected accompanied the maps they had prepared. She said that they were at the engineering, mapping, and analysis piece of their scope of services, which was what she would present on at this meeting, and from comments that arose from today's discussion, if they warranted text changes then that would occur at that later date, and they would put together those recommendations when they come out, or they would just finalize the analysis and provide it back to the Commission.

Ms. Rabold said that the wireless communications project they were currently working on was specific to cell phones and was not regarding broadband cable services. She said that first generation wireless had devices such as bag phones, which transitioned to 2G service for high frequency service providers, which transitioned to 3G, which brought on a new type of handset, and 4G now was where the industry is, 4G LTE moving into 5G.

Ms. Rabold said that the 1G, 2G, and 3G platforms had been retired, so those networks that were built in that range were no longer provided, however, the industry did use that base platform for 4G, so they did not have to rebuild structure but just changed the antennae, hardware, and software in order to transition to 4G. She said that the handsets had multi-app uses, so in order for those smart devices to work, they needed more structure than what was needed in 1G, 2G, and 3G wireless, which was why they would continue to see the need for more infrastructure going forward; those devices required more antennae to operate and function for optimal services.

Ms. Rabold stated that 76% of travelers said that they relied on their mobile phone for travel and getting directions, 85% of photos taken in 2017 were captured on a smartphone, the past three years had seen 330% growth in health and fitness apps, 49% of U.S. households had removed their landline phone and were using wireless only, and a large majority of calls made from 911 were being made from handheld devices. She said that for seamless connectivity, they needed to have the antennae for these handsets mounted above tree lines, ridge lines, and rooftops.

Ms. Rabold said that the more types of items between the antennae and the handset or between the antennae and handoff, the more degradation there was to the system. She said that the antennae needed to be elevated above the structures in order to optimize their propagation pattern. She said that originally, there were macro-cells mounted on towers or bay stations, and as the urban areas begin to spread out into the County, there were smaller wireless facilities noted.

Ms. Rabold said that in Charlottesville, there was no observation of small wireless, but she expected they would begin to see the deployment of small wireless, and that the small wireless network would move out of Charlottesville into some of the surrounding areas in Albemarle County, and those small wireless facilities were used to help densify the network. She said that the range of propagation pattern from their macro cell was much farther than a small wireless facility. She said that small wireless facilities were 350 feet to at most .25 mile without any topographic barriers to that signal. She said that going forward, they would see a combination of macro and small (wireless Facilities) in those more densely populated areas.

Ms. Rabold displayed photographs of the different types of cell towers assessed in the study, with corresponding site numbers and levels of concealment, including base stations that served as locations for future antennae, small wireless facilities, and location of antennae types and classifications of sites analyzed.

Ms. Rabold said that provided were five infrastructure maps, the first being infrastructure by inventory structure type, so there were 164 towers and 25 base stations. She said that the inventory antenna type identified that there were 147 macro cell facilities, 17 were broadcast-only facilities, 3 public safety facilities, 4 public safety facilities that had macro-cells on them, zero small wireless facilities, and 18 others, including microwave or other unidentified types of antennae. She said that on these maps, they had the Albemarle County boundary and another surrounding boundary that was a 1-mile perimeter in which they tried to include wireless facilities so as to not distort the propagation pattern.

Ms. Rabold said that there were 150 personal wireless facilities, with one currently proposed and under review, and three that were approved but not yet built. She said that there were 161 on private property, using public property for 14 of them, including County-owned, school-owned properties. She said that there were none in the right-of-way, and 14 were within the utility easement. She said that with regard to design type, there were seven structures that were completely concealed, 102 semi-concealed, and 80 that were non-concealed.

Ms. Rabold said that they provided simulated propagation coverage maps and did not claim to provide exact propagation patterns because that information could only be provided by the actual service provider. She said that their goal was not to focus on where the service was great, but where the coverage was not, and to address the question of if they wanted to fill that area, and if that answer was yes, they had suggestions for the Commission's consideration. She said that they used a standard antenna model for their propagation standard, using an average mounting elevation.

Ms. Rabold said that if a site were approved for example, 100 feet, they would go down to 80 because typically, they had equipment in the range from the top down to the bottom, and if they were to focus on the very top of the mounting antennae, they would not have an accurate read for any of the equipment below that, so they dropped down.

Ms. Rabold said that they also considered the topography and clutter, with clutter referring to trees, types of trees, ridge lines, and buildings. She said that the clutter they purchase for this area included building structure type, such as concrete versus wood, and that was all built into the clutter model because it was very important with regards to how the signal could actually get into a building to provide in-building coverage.

Ms. Rabold said that the first map displayed was a simulation showing predicted coverage from every wireless facility in the County, assuming that every service provider was at each location. She said that this was done as a starting point so that if they were able to have co-location at every facility, they could see what the best built-out model would look like. She said that the yellow color represented cell coverage strong enough to get inside a building, the green color showed an average coverage which was not necessarily going to be in a building depending on the structure type, but definitely would have strong enough coverage to operate inside a vehicle.

Ms. Rabold said that the blue area represented coverage outdoors, with potential coverage indoors, but definitely would have it (coverage) outdoors when standing in the right location. She said that any area without coloration from any of those signals represent dead zones or gaps in coverage. She said that they knew from the assessments that not every service provider was on each of those sites, so the next series of maps shown were theoretical coverage prediction maps by individual providers, showing how some providers had larger footprints than others.

Ms. Rabold said that the five service providers were AT&T, Dish Wireless, T-Mobile, Verizon, and U.S. Cellular. She said that all five service providers were allowed through federal telecommunications app to provide service in their area. She said that it was encouraged for them to look at the smallest footprint, because they needed to have the same access as the provider who had the greatest footprint. She said that a part of their analyses was to look at their current development standards and see what impact they had on the propagation pattern.

Ms. Rabold said that reviewing the 2015 comprehensive plan, she found 10 goals and objectives for siting personal wireless service facilities made into public policy. She said that she then looked into the County Code, and as was referenced by some of the speakers, there were tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 development standards. She said that all service providers could go into a tier 1 or tier 2 by right, and through the special use process for tier 3, except in the Monticello Historic District.

Mr. Clayborne asked what defined the separate tiers.

Ms. Rabold said that the tier 1 facility included the comprehensive plan guidelines of being disguised to minimize visibility and to utilize existing structures where possible. She said that these were located entirely inside an existing building or attached onto an existing structure, in a camouflaged building addition like a faux dormer. She said that it could include replacement of a wood pole with a metal pole not exceeding a 30-foot base and 18-foot top.

Ms. Rabold said that a tier 2 facility supported the three goals of being mounted close to the supporting structure, limited in size to be in keeping with the characteristics of the area, and that they did not interfere with the skyline when looking up at the facility, and they needed to be a treetop facility as well as outside of the avoidance area. She said that a treetop facility was a personal wireless facility that was on a structure that was not more than 10 feet higher than the tallest tree within 25 feet of the proposed facility.

Ms. Rabold said that the avoidance areas included the mountain protection areas, where personal wireless facilities had to not be in the skyline, which were notated on the map in pink. She said that the other avoidance areas included the agricultural and forestal districts, which were represented in yellow. She said that the historic districts were avoidance areas, and they had been identified in a lighter pink color, and along the scenic highways and byways, they had a 200-foot area to be preserved, shown in the white areas along the rights-of-way.

Ms. Rabold said that tier 3 facilities included service facilities that were neither tier 1 nor tier 2, and in the last seven years they had had eight approved. She said that the County Code development standards for all tiers included that the number of antennae arrays were not allowed to exceed three, the size of the antennae were not allowed to exceed 1,400 square inches, the projection of the antennae from the structure it attached to in no case shall the farthest point of the back of the antennae be more than the facility, and the color needed to match the facility or building.

Ms. Rabold said that the deployment pattern based on those policies was affected by the avoidance areas because the total avoidance area was 48% of the total area of the County, and including the Shenandoah National Park, it was more than 51% of the County in an avoidance area.

Ms. Firehock said that Ms. Rabold had stated that this information was based on policy, but it was also based on the market, so some areas shown in pink were also lightly populated, so if they were to promote southern Albemarle for cell towers, she did not know that there would be a rush of cell towers being installed there. She reiterated that it was not only policy but also population density to make these economically viable.

Ms. Rabold said that was correct. She stated that the treetop policy provided the visually hidden facilities, but the challenge of the treetop from an engineering perspective was that the propagation pattern could not travel as far because the antenna was lower, the trees would continue to grow, and even 10 feet below the elevation of the antenna provided a canopy because they had to be 10 feet above the canopy, but even if it were 10 feet below when first constructed, still absorbed and reduced the propagation signal from that antenna. She said that what was seen in the field was that there were multiple antennae on multiple individual poles on sites, because the poles that were lower were not conducive to having co-location, so each service provider used their own pole.

Ms. Rabold said that the ordinance had a standard of not exceeding three antennae per array, and the challenge with this from an engineering perspective was that in the late 1990s, when 1G was deploying, the service providers only operated in the low megahertz frequency. She said that second generation deployed high frequency at 1500 megahertz, and service providers offered either low or high frequency, and with 3G wireless, providers operated in both frequencies.

Ms. Rabold said that now, those service providers needed another set of antenna arrays to operate in the low and the high, so no longer did they just need three antennae, they started to need six antennae, and some of them transitioning into 4G operated in the low and mid-bands in one set of arrays and then 5G was in a second set of arrays. She said that there was a need on these single tenant poles for them to occupy two sets of antennae around that pole, so they eliminated any possibility of offering a co-location because the lower antenna array was typically right at the tree line. She said that 124 of the 142 personal wireless service facilities were single tenant facilities due to these conditions.

Ms. Rabold said that another challenge from an engineering perspective that the industry had was that they used remote radio units to boost the signal and help with capacity on sites. She said that ideally, those remote radio units were as close to the antenna as possible to maximize the boost from that remote radio unit onto the antenna they could get. She said that they had to make a decision to choose between two sets of antenna arrays or one set of arrays and one set of remote radio units, so a lot of sites had placed remote radio units on the ground, but this estimated (reduced) the potential signal by 30%.

Ms. Rabold said that another development standard of the County was that the antenna size could not exceed 1,400 square inches. She displayed an example of a JMA 4G LTE antenna, an 8-port antenna that could accommodate more bands of spectrum, which may allow the number of antennae required. She said that they could not dictate how many antennae could be used because that was a business decision, but if a provider wanted to provide this antenna, it exceeded the 1,400 square foot dimension by 20 square inches. She said that as one of the speakers mentioned, they would have to request a special exception to use this type of antenna.

Ms. Rabold said that the projection of the antenna at a maximum of 18 inches from the back of the antenna created a slim line look to the facility, as shown in site A07. She said that it was definitely less visual and met the comprehensive plan policy objectives. She said that there was an engineering challenge to this because this type of configuration limited the number of antennae and remote radio units that can fit around a tower.

Ms. Rabold said that antenna standoff mounts and platform mounts allowed the service provider to install an optimal antenna and remote radio unit configuration to serve a larger geographic area in treetops, and this type of antenna projection required a variance from the code. She said that this type of configuration also optimized the use of being able to add both antennae and the remote radio units at the same level.

Mr. Carrazana asked if the image on the right of the slide was an example of the six-antenna facility.

Ms. Rabold said that was correct.

Mr. Carrazana asked if that was the preferred number they were carrying.

Ms. Rabold said that it was a standard they had been seeing for a couple of years since they deployed 5G. She said that in addition to the mapping they did, they had dozens of clients around the U.S. that they did site reviews for, as a lot of them did not have planning staff to do the reviews, and that was a standard configuration that they had seen across the country.

Mr. Carrazana asked if these were both equal in terms of the arrays and antennae, but with different configurations.

Ms. Rabold said that was correct. She said that on this antenna configuration, they had a total of six antennae stacked and mounted close. She said that they had remote radio units either at the top, right next to, or right behind the antennae. She said that with regards to the monopole height being 10 feet or less above the tallest tree within 25 feet, the propagation pattern on some of these sites was really small.

Ms. Rabold said that in the image on the left of the screen, the 26-foot antenna mounted was providing coverage to a very small area in the shopping center and commercial district. She said that in the image on the right, the powerline had a number of advantages, including height and location in an easement. She said that a third point was that while it may look like a great solution, the high-tension wires in utility easements were not everywhere but in specific lines, so they could not only use them as the alternative to antennae being placed there.

Ms. Rabold said that the majority of Albemarle County was low-density rural residential, with less than 350 people per square mile. She said that they had the smallest area population identified in this pale-yellow area on the map, with no more than 50 people per square mile based on census data. She said that the more densely populated areas were in darker shades, and the area in the center was where there were up to 250 people per square mile.

Ms. Rabold said that to the point Ms. Firehock brought up, most antennae were located in the more densely populated areas, or along the major corridors. She said that there were 81 facilities with single tenants, five with two, and those sites were typically below 100 feet. She said that they estimated that if all providers were going to improve coverage in most of the

County and continued with this deployment pattern, it would take about 125 poles per provider to cover the area, or about 625 poles in total.

Ms. Rabold clarified that if it was ever communicated through anything that they wrote previously saying that they recommended 500 poles, that was not true. She said that they were saying in this analysis that if they continued this development pattern and provided access to all providers, that was the number of poles it would take under the current pattern to provide more complete coverage. She said that it was not recommended one way or another what was done, but the information was provided.

Mr. Carrazana asked if there were a few multi-tenant poles.

Ms. Rabold said yes, there were a few multiple provider poles.

Mr. Carrazana asked what limited the poles from all being for multiple providers.

Ms. Rabold said that the height limit prevented many of them from being a multiple tenant pole. She said there were very few with multiple tenants, and it was a result of the treetop canopy restrictions. She said that the question posed to the Commission was does the County want to increase coverage across the County for providers and provide increased capacity. She said that if the answer was yes, there were options provided. She apologized that in the written information the use of the word "recommendations" rather than the word "options" and for any confusion that may have caused the public.

Ms. Rabold said that one option to increase the network coverage and performance of existing facilities by up to 30% a day would be to increase tower heights from 10 feet to 30 feet above the tallest treetop within 25 feet of the tower and to allow standoff mounts for antennae and remote radio units. She said that other options to improve coverage included to allow for new towers to be constructed up to 30 feet above the tree canopy, because if they wanted to encourage co-location, they must have more height, so they could limit the number of poles by increasing the height.

Mr. Moore asked if the signal propagation being based on the height in a large degree, and with co-location being so helpful for fewer overall poles, if there was any consideration of going 40 or 50 feet above.

Ms. Rabold said they did not consider it, but they could if requested. She said that another suggestion would be to modify the number of antennae around each array to increase the size of the antenna to more than 1,400 square inches, and that would allow for beam tilt and increase of projections. She said that another option would be if they built more facilities for emergency management equipment to be plan and have wireless facility options for co-location on those facilities, because it was likely that improving public safety in any geographic area of the County would coincide with where industry needed coverage. She said that other suggestions were to alter the avoidance areas, and to pre-design tier 2 facilities for concealed towers so that they would not all have to be special use permits in each case of a new facility.

Ms. Rabold said that the questions posed to the Planning Commission regarding the analysis were if they agreed that historic districts or agricultural forestal districts or mountain protection areas should be eliminated as avoidance areas to expand the areas where tier II applications

may be made, if they agreed that the standards for number of arrays, antenna size, and standoff should be increased, if they agreed that the dimensions for width of towers should be increased.

Ms. Rabold stated that the other questions were if they agreed that the tier II standard should be increased from 10 feet to some other height above the reference tree, if they agreed that the distance from the reference tree should be increased, and if they agreed that a tower meeting concealment standard allowed as a tier 2 tower regardless of distance to a reference tree.

Ms. Rabold said that not all concealed poles were equal, so for example, the tower on site 003 would only have one tenant because that type of pole promoted the flush-mount antenna, whereas the faux tree allowed for yard arms provided they were painted and covered in an antenna sock or had 3M faux branches applied to the antennae.

Mr. Bivins said that Ms. Rabold mentioned one way to increase coverage was to enhance the height on the existing poles. He asked if there was a sense of the engineering requirements to achieve that and if it was an accessible solution.

Ms. Rabold said that not all of the poles would be able to be increased in height without replacing the entire pole, because some were made out of wood and could not be extended, some were tapered significantly to the top, so those would not be conducive (to height increase). She said that they had some straight-aligned poles that may look like they have an attachment added to them, but many would be replacements. She said it was unclear as to how achievable this was for the industry.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the public safety officials, including fire, police, and emergency services gave input about having problems in areas due to certain factors.

Ms. Rabold said that they had not yet gotten to that point.

Mr. Fritz said that they were coordinating with them as part of this (study), and while they did not have any specific comments, they were part of the process of the broadband office and them to make sure they were aware of this effort, but those were distinctly different exercises being worked on. He said that they did not try to analyze what the emergency coverage was and were focused on wireless.

Mr. Clayborne said that it would be helpful to know for master planning how they saw issues.

Mr. Fritz said that they would engage them.

Mr. Clayborne said okay. He said that Ms. Rabold made a comment about needing 600 poles roughly to get equal access to all five providers. He asked if that number was extreme.

Ms. Rabold said yes. She said that the practicality would be a challenge, because they would have to find property owners who would be willing to have all those facilities throughout the area. She said that the industry likely would not do that because of the economic viability of the sites in the more rural areas. She said that increasing the heights would allow them to get a broader area covered. She said that the 625 was not promoted but given as information per their engineer.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there were maintenance concerns associated with the increases in height.

Ms. Rabold said no.

Mr. Clayborne asked if heights were unlimited in that sense.

Ms. Rabold said yes.

Mr. Carrazana asked if there were FAA regulations.

Ms. Rabold said there was. She said that anything over 199 feet had to go through FAA approval and had to be lit. She said that with regards to the question, can you go taller than that, they could.

Mr. Carrazana said that he did not see anything in the information provided regarding setbacks and the impacts on neighbors. He asked if there was some analysis and evaluation on certain types of facilities and the distance from neighbors.

Mr. Fritz said that they did not ask them to look at those setbacks. He said that they were trying to get the Commission's feedback in order to determine what to do with that information. He said that they would go back to bring forward the information related to making the adjustments by right and the impacts on adjacent properties or not. He said that they had not asked for that.

Mr. Carrazana said that it was definitely part of the equation here and was a part of the deliberations of the Commission (Planning Commission).

Mr. Murray asked if they did not increase the height but increased the number of arrays and antenna size, what the coverage increase would be from that.

Ms. Rabold said that it was not as much, but some would be gained. She said that she would have to refer to the engineer of the project.

Mr. Murray said that he would like to know what the coverage increase would be from making all the changes that did not involve raising the height. He said that it would be useful to know that approximate percentage.

Mr. Moore stated that the co-location essentially was not tenable if they did not increase the height, because they used the entire 10 feet for a set of arrays, and anything below that would be blocked by trees, and the frequencies used open air to transmit, so co-location below the tree line was undesirable.

Mr. Clayborne said that the questions asked of the Commission were related to three topics, which were avoidance areas, physical properties of the pole itself, and setbacks and visual impacts. He asked if there were any other topics to be discussed.

Mr. Carrazana said that impacts to neighbors were part of this discussion, both visual and physical such as if the structure were to fall.

Mr. Fritz said that the likelihood of failure was very low, and one of the things that was a factor they considered from time to time was ice fall as it built up on the tower and then came down in chunks.

Mr. Murray said that the first question was referencing mountain tops. He said that when this policy was created, it was before they had a biodiversity action plan, and they were not considering biodiversity as an aspect of this. He said that mountaintops were very consistent biological areas because they were cooler and tended to be refuges from warming temperatures, and as they considered a climate action plan, they would do a great disservice to biodiversity to cover mountaintops with antennae.

Mr. Murray said that he was particularly not in favor of the mountain top changing that policy. He said that he understood that part of the deal of living in the rural area was that there was less service, and he accepted that. He said that the primary use of the rural area was to support conservation and agriculture, not residential use.

Mr. Clayborne said that some were forced to live in rural areas because the developed area was not affordable, so there was an equity standpoint that must be addressed, but he agreed in general.

Mr. Murray said that part of the reason he himself lived in the rural area was because he could afford it, so he understood Mr. Clayborne's point.

Mr. Moore said that when they limited themselves to only half the County that they could put a tower in, it put them in a constrained future of cell service. He said that in cases of emergency and public safety in the rural areas, cell towers were necessary, and that was why he was very in favor of better and broader coverage of cell service. He said that the towers on Carter's Mountain were grandfathered in, and it impacted the viewshed. He said that he was in favor of exploring some ways to put towers in those spaces to get proper coverage in the County. He said that his answer to the first question of if the County desired better coverage and capacity in some of these zones was yes.

Mr. Fritz said that the avoidance areas were not prohibited areas, but had an extra layer of regulation. He said that the number was about 40% of the sites was actually in avoidance areas. He asked Mr. Moore if that changed his opinion on any of his comments.

Mr. Moore said that he was still learning things about how many layers went into that. He said that on the whole, a goal he brought to this was solid and robust infrastructure for things like cellular service.

Ms. Firehock said that in terms of avoidance areas, she did not have a problem with agricultural and forestal districts having towers, because a tower was not a use that interfered with someone running their tractors or having their sheep grazing, and even in areas where active timber use was going on, there were other things working around there all the time and it would be the landowner's choice to put the tower on their farm. She said that it was not a great concern to her. She said that mountain protection areas did concern her, because it was actually a sense of landscape and extremely visible. She said that with historic districts, she could go either way, because that was a large swathe of the County and depended on the individual sites and the viewsheds.

Mr. Carrazana said that it did depend. He said that there were considerations as to how a tier 2 application impacted a historic district and where it was located. He said that viewsheds were particularly important in the rural area and entry corridors, so perhaps they could allow them, but they are not the same as being put in an area that was not restricted. He said that they should still carry some requirements in where they were located. He said that some areas may be perfectly fine, and they may be the majority, but there were some that would not be, so there should still be some review and criteria put on those.

Mr. Bivins said that most of his comments would be about retro-fitting. He said that if they had a pole and could get it higher to increase the dispersion of the signal without having to put another pole up, he would always be in support of that. He said that he had no tolerance for historic properties being given different treatment in this fashion.

Mr. Bivins said that he had issues with what they were saying about the areas that were not wealthy parts of the community, for example in regards to the swathe of land south of Route 20 and above Scottsville, there was a host of working class people who used their cell phones to get to work and communicate with their family, so he was not opposed to the agricultural and forestal districts having towers. He said that the real question was if they pushed this to be by right. He asked if there would be overlays for entrance corridors, so tier 2 facilities would have to go through review.

Mr. Fritz said that it depended on how the regulations were written. He said that if they thought they should be exempted from review, they could be exempted from review.

Mr. Bivins said that if they were to modify the agricultural and forestal districts, he would like to ensure that if it were in an entrance corridor, they would not be able to opt out of that review.

Mr. Clayborne asked if there was information available regarding similar areas.

Mr. Fritz said that he had talked to a lot of other jurisdictions on a fairly regular basis about this topic, and some jurisdictions had taken the approach of being hands-off in terms of regulation, and there were some jurisdictions that had very few regulations but still did not have any coverage, and there were some jurisdictions that have defended themselves in court over denials. He said that the Albemarle County Ordinance was and is one of the most detailed and restrictive ordinances around.

Mr. Clayborne said that the potential legal exposure was important to be studied as well.

Mr. Fritz said that they would always track that and see how it applied with the Telecommunications Act and State Code.

Mr. Bivins said that in Rappahannock County, they had made a decision that they did not need cell towers for certain lot sizes, and going from Middleburg to Paris, Virginia, they had made decisions close to places of high activity, but not so much of a concern where it was just rolling hills. He said that part of that was that the homeowners of the grand estates were not interested in having a cell tower on their property, so there was some market avoidance there.

Ms. Firehock said that a public comment was that a number of them had access to fiber through grants, so those residents did have use of their cell phones through that subsidized grant and

was being installed in multiple parts of the County. She said that it was not covering every area, but she did not want the public to think there were whole areas with no cell coverage.

Mr. Bivins said that the spotty cell service was an issue off of Hydraulic Road as well, and was not contained to only certain parts of the County. He said that they had great coverage along transportation lines, but what they did not have good coverage for was where people had migrated and built small communities. He said that he hoped that they would try to align the policy and desire to what the reality was where people lived and what may come in the next 15 years for the policy.

Ms. Firehock said that in her area of the County, she had no cell service between Scottsville and the boundary of the City of Charlottesville.

Mr. Moore said that he did not understand the idea that people living in rural areas should expect and accept limited cell phone coverage when they had the technology to support that and seeing it (cell towers) occasionally did not bother him.

Mr. Murray said that it was not that they should not have it, but it was not the necessity that people thought it was. He said that as they expanded more services to these rural areas, it must be acknowledged that part of the reason it was affordable to live there was because of the lack of services, so people did not want to buy a house there because of the lack of services. He said that providing those services meant that the home prices would go up, and the demand to live in those areas went up, and they stopped being affordable places to live.

Mr. Carrazana said that there was other technology, and the towers were not the only way people were getting service. He said that there were other providers that could provide broadband. He said that moving onto the physical characteristics, he was unopposed to raising the height if it meant that they could avoid having more and more poles. He said that they should determine the optimal width of the pole, as well as its location in relation to entry corridors and viewsheds, so that the extra 20 to 30 feet could effectively provide more coverage without being intrusive. He said that there was a lot of latitude that they could begin to consider, and a lot of it had to do with keeping some viewsheds and corridors in mind.

Mr. Murray said that he did not care as much if someone had a cell tower in the middle of their farm field, but if it was right next to someone else's house on the other side of the field, that was a different issue, or if it was placed in a sensitive ecological area, the location did matter.

Mr. Carrazana said that it was important to consider setbacks and the effects on neighbors who may not want them. He said that considering setbacks and more height and width, as well as more units and devices on it, they must consider the impacts on neighbors.

Mr. Moore said that he agreed that increasing the allowance slightly so that they could push more out with fewer antennae made a lot of sense and having the distance to have more radio units and not have the signal loss from the coaxial cable going up also made sense. He said that the design to be slightly wider to accommodate the rest would also be beneficial.

Mr. Bivins said that he agreed with the array size. He said that technology moved on, so they must decide how to have ordinances that kept track with technology. He said that as they were introduced to the presentation this evening, they saw the timeline of cellular device progression, so they should also have the nimbleness to have their ordinances in terms of public safety and

economic development be able to support this and the vision for the County. He said that he would like to explore being able to give greater emphasis to allowing co-location and if it put it into tier 1 or tier 2.

Ms. Firehock said that she could approve it being above the tree line at a maximum of 20 feet. She said that it was strange how their ordinance had the reference tree, because if a pole were installed at a site where 10-year-old trees had been planted, the reference tree would be very short. She said that they should investigate how high the tallest reference tree was likely to grow. She said that they also should allow the arrays to project out farther, because they received many requests for adjustments of six inches to be made to the antennae on the poles.

Ms. Firehock said that she would like to see encouragement of co-location, and an incentive may prove useful in order to achieve several arrays. She said that it was mentioned by the consultant that a specific type of cell antennae was 20 inches too large, so they should fix that description to accommodate it. She said that in regard to the tapering of the pole, the width was not noticeable at such a height, and in regard to concealment, the brown painted pole did not always blend with the sky, so she advocated for a silver pole which blended better.

Ms. Firehock said that the faux trees were not good solutions, because the fake boughs blew away in the wind, and she was unsure of who was responsible for sticking more plastic branches back on the fake tree, but apparently no one did, because even at the Department of Forestry in the County those poles were missing many branches and looked terrible. She said that she had seen in Massachusetts that in lines of pine trees, the fake pine tree was much taller, so it would be better off as a silver pole in order to look less absurd. She said that they should not consider the fake trees, and she was in support of co-locating the services of existing facilities rather than disturbing many more areas across the County.

Mr. Moore said that he agreed with Mr. Carrazana's mention of the setbacks. He said that he agreed that if they had towers, they should work well and cover the space that they could. He said that he was sympathetic to what the public had said about having a large tower nearby was not ideal, so setbacks and formulating ways to make this work better for people was important to consider.

Mr. Clayborne said that less towers was better than more towers, the height was acceptable, but location mattered. He said that it would not be a blanket policy and there must be some checks and balances regarding setbacks and visuals. He asked if there was any data relating to the cell towers' effects on property values. He said that the issue came up at almost every public hearing, and he would like to know if there was any data that tracked it.

Mr. Fritz said that based on the information he had, there was nothing that gave a direct correlation between the towers and property values.

Mr. Bivins said that these begin as a public-private partnership, so he would like Commissioners, staff and Supervisors to give consideration to the Patricia Ann Byron Park. He said that these were places that the County had identified as amenities, and the County should ensure that if it was a location designated for people to go, that if something went wrong, they should call and be able to get help there.

Ms. Firehock said that she did not necessarily believe every park should have cell service, and it was not a reason to have cell service there. She said that there were many arguments one

could make, such as getting away from the sounds of someone talking on a cell phone when going down a trail.

Mr. Clayborne asked if Mr. Fritz had sufficient information from the Commission.

Mr. Fritz said yes. He said that they were not sure what they were going to do next in terms of public outreach, but once the public outreach effort was completed, there would be public hearings with both the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. He said that this presentation would be put online along with mapping information so people could view the information better. He said that they were maintaining that site.

Mr. Murray said that it would be helpful if the draft ordinance came back to the Commission before being released to the public.

Mr. Fritz said that they may prepare concepts as they talked with the public to begin crafting what may not be in the actual ordinance, and they would refine it more and more throughout the process, but they must give information to get feedback on.

Recess

Mr. Clayborne called for a seven-minute recess.

Public Hearing

SP202200032 The Miller School of Albemarle

Ms. Rebecca Ragsdale, Planner, stated that the property was over 1,000 acres and had frontage on Miller School Road, Dick Woods Road, Birches Creek Road, and Pounding Creek Road. She said that the primary entrances were not changing. She said the site was zoned RA, and it was surrounded by RA-zoned property.

Ms. Ragsdale said that there were a number of surrounding conservation easements, and the site itself was under easement. She said the site was adjacent to the Batesville Historic District. She said that the Mechums River bisected the property along with Miller Branch and some tributary streams. She noted the majority of the site was forested, and there were critical slopes.

Ms. Ragsdale said that the campus was oriented north-to-south, and campus envelopes were identified in the conservation easement. She said the school was established in 1878, and it was registered with three identified significant structures—Old Main, Caton Hall, and the Headmaster's House. She said the use predated zoning, so it had been operating as a legally non-conforming use.

Ms. Ragsdale said there were 230 enrolled students, including day students and boarding students. She said that the request included increasing enrollment up to 500 students. She said the plan had been reviewed by staff, and no objections were presented.

Ms. Ragsdale noted that there were no safety concerns related to the request, and the applicant provided trip generation information that was reviewed by VDOT and the transportation planning staff. She said that the campus area was interior to the site, and they requested to perform

expansions in areas that had already been disturbed. She said they did not expect any detriment or change of character to the abutting properties.

Ms. Ragsdale said that there were no additions proposed to historic resources. She said the plan had been reviewed by the historic preservation staff and representatives from the Virginia Department of Historic Resources. She said that the project would bring the site into compliance with the zoning ordinance. She said that the project met many of the recommendations in the comprehensive plan with regard to conservation and historic resources. She said that staff recommended approval with three conditions, and she was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Mike Drude, Head of the Miller School, said that they provided a student-centered educational approach with hands-on, project-based learning experiences. He said that they had developed a growth plan for the next several years. He said that the special use permit would provide more opportunities for students and teachers.

Mr. Daniel Hyer, consultant for the Miller School, said they were seeking to bring the campus into compliance with the zoning ordinance. He said that they would perform renovations on the girls dormitory building, and they would work to strengthen pedestrian corridors. He said they would further delineate vehicular corridors. He said the first new construction project would be to build a boys' dormitory, and once the structure was complete, the boys would relocate from the Old Main building.

Mr. Hyer said that Old Main would be renovated to restore it to only classroom uses. He said that as the school enrollment increased, more dormitories and recreational facilities would be constructed. He said the proposed work fell within the building envelopes of the conservation easement. He said that they performed a safety analysis on the roadway reviewing accident data. He said that all but two accidents were single-vehicle accidents which occurred at night. He said that no left- or right-turn lanes were justified.

Mr. Murray suggested converting a grass depression by the entrance into a biofilter.

Mr. Hyer said that stormwater quantity would be handled by Lily Pond, but stormwater filtering could be addressed by other filters.

Ms. Firehock suggested incorporating the stormwater management infrastructure into the curriculum.

Mr. Clayborne noted that there were no speakers wishing to make public comment. He closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarification about how the school would be brought into compliance with the ordinance if they were still issuing a special use permit.

Mr. Herrick responded that the current configuration of the school was a legal non-conforming use, but in order to expand the use, a special use permit was required.

Mr. Bivins asked how the special use permit would make the use conform.

Ms. Ragsdale responded that the use would no longer be a non-conforming use because it had been issued a special use permit.

Mr. Herrick said that the use would comply with the current County standards, when before it was not required to comply as a non-conforming use. He said that moving forward (if approved), there would be no distinction between the old school and new school construction.

Ms. Firehock moved to recommend approval of SP202200032 with the conditions as presented by staff at the meeting and for the reasons stated in the staff report. Mr. Murray seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6:0).

Committee Reports

Mr. Bivins reported that he attended a Places29 Hydraulic CAC meeting, and he recommended that [Mr. Gregg Harper, Env Serv 02:36:40] provide a presentation to the Commission regarding macro-level stormwater management.

Mr. Clayborne directed staff to include the matter under New Business at a later meeting.

Mr. Murray said he attended a community meeting about the Oak Bluff announcement in Crozet. He noted there were concerns of the residents related to the development and proposed density. He said there were concerns about the infrastructure and traffic in the area.

Mr. Carrazana reported that he attended an AC44 meeting at Murray Elementary, and there was a lot of discussion about Crozet and the Oak Bluff development. He said the event was well attended and well-staffed. He noted that the growth of Crozet was a theme of the discussion.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: June 7, 2023

Mr. McDermott responded that Board meeting had one public hearing for the Misty Mountain campground special use permit. He said that following the meeting with the Commission, the applicant made several changes to the application, including fencing plans and the location of the bathhouse. He said the special use permit passed on a 3-2 vote, and one supervisor was absent. He said that there were concerns about the existing campsites in the flood plain and the impacts to neighbors. He said the Board held a work session on solar power and received comments from the Commission. He said that a solar ordinance was being researched and drafted.

Mr. Clayborne asked how the Board responded to the Commission's comments and whether the Board made any significant decisions.

Mr. McDermott responded that the Board did not make any significant decisions related to solar power, and the comments from the Commission were presented in a report.

Ms. Firehock asked if there was an estimated timeline for when they would review a solar ordinance.

Mr. McDermott said that he did not know, but he would provide a follow-up.

Mr. Murray said he received an email about the water protection ordinance and asked whether there was information about when a review of the ordinance would come before the Commission.

Mr. McDermott said he did not have a timeline, but he could provide a follow-up.

New Business/Old Business

AC44 Update

Mr. McDermott said that the final of four public hearings on the toolkits was held, and they received good feedback. He said they were assembling the information for review. He said that the open-house chat kits were available. He said they collaborated with the working group to assess various activity centers in the County, and that information would be collected in a month or so. He said that they hoped to present the information to the Commission by the next work session at the second meeting in July. He said they would present the feedback they had received to date.

Mr. Clayborne said that there were opportunities to further divide the topics into more focused work sessions.

Ms. Firehock expressed displeasure regarding the level of vetting for the topics before they were opened to the public. She said that some topics required a fuller discussion from the Commission before public input was requested. She said that the criteria for expanding the growth areas were vague, poorly worded, and required a more robust conversation from the Commission. She said that the Chair assured her there would be more dialogue regarding the topics. She said that staff had informed her there would be more two-on-two meetings, which also raised concerns. She said that she wanted to hold the remainder of the conversations in a public meeting, so she would no longer participate in the two-on-two conversations regarding the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Bivins said that the Commission needed to hold rigorous discussions, but there were times when those discussions should not happen in public to allow a more robust and open conversation.

Ms. Firehock said she would like to hold more work sessions to explore ideas and opinions. She said that there were many topics she had discussed with single Commissioners that she wanted to discuss with the whole Commission. She said that the Commission should provide more input before topics were released to wider audiences.

Mr. Murray expressed concerns that there was a draft proposal to expand the growth areas that had not been approved by the Commission. He said that the Commission could have provided valuable input before it was released.

Mr. Clayborne said that there appeared to be consensus among the Commissioners. He said that they should review the schedule and consider holding more work sessions. He said they would consider the scope of the work sessions and make sure they appropriately accommodated the agenda. He said that they were making the proper adjustments to the schedule.

Southern Albemarle Convenience Center

Ms. Firehock announced that on June 22, the Southern Albemarle Convenience Center would be opening at 10 a.m.

Items for Follow-Up

There were none.

Adjournment

At 9:05 p.m., the Commission adjourned to June 27, 2023, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m.



Kevin McDermott, Director of Planning

(Recorded by Alberic Karina-Plun, Community Development Planner; transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 07/11/2023
Initials: VG