

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
Final Minutes February 15, 2022**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, February 15, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Karen Firehock, Chair; Corey Clayborne, Vice-Chair; Julian Bivins; Fred Missel; Daniel Bailey; Luis Carrazana; and Jennie More.

Members absent: None.

Other officials present were Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Kevin McDermott; Scott Clark; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Ms. Firehock said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." She said opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting were posted at www.albemarle.org/community/county-calendar when available.

Ms. Shaffer called the roll.

Ms. Firehock established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Firehock said there was one item on the agenda—the approval of the minutes from January 18, 2022 and February 1, 2022.

Mr. Clayborne moved to adopt the consent agenda. Mr. Bivins **seconded** the motion, which carried unanimously (7-0).

Public Hearing

ZMA202000005 Old Dominion Village

Mr. Kevin McDermott, Planning Manager, said the subject property of the rezoning application, ZMA202000005 Old Dominion Village, was located in the White Hall District. He said 23.68 acres within the Crozet development area were proposed to be rezoned from Rural Area to the Neighborhood Model District. He said a community meeting was held for the project on July 29, 2020. He explained the community meeting was held separately from the regular Crozet CAC meeting because the CAC was in the midst of a master plan update and did not have space in its schedule. He said the CAC discussed the project on August 12, 2020.

Mr. McDermott said the subject parcels were marked in yellow on the location map. He said the green line indicated the boundary of the Crozet development area. He noted a part of one of the parcels was outside of the development area. He said Route 240/Three Notched Road ran along the south of the property and extended east to Route 250 and west to downtown Crozet. He noted Music Today, and Star Hill were located near the site. He said the railway ran south of the property, and Stonegate Village was located southeast of the site.

Mr. McDermott said one of the parcels had a single residential development, and the other parcel was the location of Old Dominion Veterinary Office. He said the site was mostly open fields and various trees. He said there was a 100-year flood plain across the northern portion of the parcels by Parrott Creek, and he noted there was a WPO buffer associated with the creek. He said Emerson Commons was a Planned Residential District near the site. He said the area south of the parcels was zoned for light-industrial use, and the ACME Visible Records site was located across Route 240 from the parcels.

Mr. McDermott said steep slopes were identified on the property. He noted that on the image, the critical slopes were marked in orange in the rural area and the preserved slopes were marked in green in the development area. He said both parcels were marked in white because they were zoned rural area and were in the entrance corridor overlay.

Mr. McDermott said there were three recommended land uses for the parcels from the Comprehensive Plan. He said neighborhood density residential uses permitted densities of three to six units per acre and small-scale neighborhood commercial development. He said middle density residential uses permitted densities of six to twelve units per acre and neighborhood-scale commercial development. He noted middle density was referred to as urban density in the previous comprehensive plan. He explained green systems uses were areas that provided ecosystem services, including recreational services. He said the northern portion of the parcels were recommended for green systems use.

Mr. McDermott said the code of development included all the permitted uses and development standards for the proposal. He explained block one was designated for commercial uses of 3,000 to 5,000 square feet. He said the veterinary office was over 3,000 square feet, and the developer proposed the office would remain on the site. He noted the parking for the office would be moved to the side of the structure.

Mr. McDermott said blocks two through four included the areas northwest of the commercial area and were identified in the Comprehensive Plan as middle density residential. He said the proposal recommended single family attached units in the form of townhomes for blocks two through four. He explained blocks five through 10 were proposed for single family attached units and single family detached residential units. He said there would be a maximum of 110 residential units, and the gross density for the two parcels was about 4.65 units per acre. He said the developer proffered 20 affordable units which was 18% to 21% of the units depending on whether the developer constructed the minimum or maximum number of units.

Mr. McDermott said the developer proffered 57% of the space for greenspace and amenity areas. He said the dark green area marked on the image was designated greenspace and fell within the WPO buffer. He said the applicant proposed the entire marked area be dedicated? to the County. He said the amenity areas could include recreational space, tree buffers, tot lots, and pedestrian paths. He said the green area marked in the center was proposed for a water retention pound.

He said there were two tot lots recommended, and there was an additional amenity area on the southern boundary of the parcels which would include tree buffers or a dog park.

Mr. McDermott said staff did not require a transportation impact analysis (TIA) because the trip generation for the development was projected to be about 795 trips per day. He noted TIAs were not typically required for developments with less than 1,000 expected trips per day. He said internal public roads with sidewalks and buffer strips were recommended. He explained the internal roads would have two travel lanes with six-foot buffers and five-foot sidewalks on both sides. He said the developer agreed to construct a six-foot bike lane, a six-foot planting strip, and a five-foot sidewalk along the frontage of Route 240. He said turn lanes would be required by VDOT at the site planning stage if necessary, and cash proffers were offered to offset impacts.

Mr. McDermott noted there were planned nearby transportation improvements. He said the Route 250/Route 240 intersection was in design and proposed to be reconstructed as a roundabout. He said construction was slated to begin between 2023 and 2024 which coincided with the expected opening of the proposed development. He said a new road connection was proposed to connect Park Ridge Drive and Crozet Drive. He said the connection would relieve traffic pressure on Route 240.

Mr. McDermott said the student calculator provided by Albemarle County Public Schools (ACPS) was used to identify how many students would be generated by the development. He explained the development would enroll 22 students at Crozet Elementary School, 11 students at Henley Middle School, and 17 students at Western Albemarle High School. He said Crozet Elementary School was completing an expansion. He said the elementary school was projected to remain under capacity for 10 years even considering the school zone redistricting. He said Henley Middle School was projected to remain under capacity for the same timeframe. He said Western Albemarle High School was projected to reach capacity within five years. He reiterated that the developed proposed cash proffers to offset impacts.

Mr. McDermott said a special exception to Chapter 18 section 5.1.11(b) was required for the development. He explained that the code section required any commercial kennel, veterinary service, office, or hospital, animal hospital, or animal shelter with soundproof confinements shall have no structure located closer than 200 feet to any agricultural or residential property line. He said the applicant proposed to revise the buffer to 50 feet.

Mr. McDermott said a noise study conducted on the veterinary office found the noise level would not exceed an average of 55 a-weighted decibels at 50 feet. He explained the code section required the noise level to remain under an average of 55 a-weighted decibels. He noted barking could be heard at 40 feet, but it was not the primary noise generator in the area, and he explained the veterinary office did not typically board animals. He said the development would be built around the veterinary office, so any potential purchasers would be aware of the use.

Mr. McDermott said the applicant proffered 20 affordable housing units for rent or sale. He said the housing specialist had reviewed the proffer and there were no objections. He said the applicant had proffered to dedicate the amenity areas to the future HOA. He said 7.8 acres across the northern portion of the parcels was proffered for the greenway area. He said the developer agreed to construct a public recreation trail in the area, and they would collaborate with the Parks and Recreation Department to ensure the site and design met department standards. He said cash contributions of \$3,000 per single-family detached unit and \$2,500 per single-family attached

unit were proffered. He said the contribution could total \$283,000 if the developer built to the maximum density.

Mr. McDermott said staff identified recommended revisions to the application plan that had not been addressed. He said the applicant had decided to move to the Planning Commission stage, so staff's comments had been forwarded to the developer. He said staff recommended that the code of development allow for a wooded buffer along Route 240. He said the buffer should include a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs as determined by the ARB. He said staff recommended the addition of sound attenuation measures surrounding the veterinary office to tamper down potential sound impacts to the residential area.

Mr. McDermott noted the developer had separate plans for grading and steep slopes. He said staff wanted the plans to be combined to confirm there would be no grading of the steep slopes. He said in the proffer statement, staff wanted the developer to correct proffer 1C to state, "For-Rent Affordable Dwelling Units." He said the applicant would be required to gain Board approval to construct a proposed private pump station for the sewage line and to amend the ACSA jurisdictional area. He said the ACSA jurisdictional area was supposed to align with the development areas according to the Comprehensive Plan, so the Board was expected to approve adjusting the jurisdictional area.

Mr. McDermott said the applicant had previously proposed to connect to an existing private pump station and line associated with Emmerson Commons. He said staff had identified that the agreement that would have allowed the connection was no longer valid, and the ACSA stated they did not want a private user to connect to another private line. He explained a connection directly to the public sewer line had to be identified at the site planning stage. He said the nearest public line was located to the west of the development across another parcel. He said the developer would have to attain the required easements associated with the sewer pipe and identify the connection in order to get site plan approval.

Mr. McDermott said the developer had identified an easement for a gas line located underneath the parcels. He said the gas line was owned by Columbia Gas, and he noted the company had no objection to the proposed development. He said the developer would have to continue to coordinate the easement through the site plan stage.

Mr. McDermott said staff had identified six favorable factors for the request. He said the proposal was consistent with the Crozet Master Plan and with the applicable neighborhood model principles. He said the proposal dedicated 7.8 acres surrounding Parrott Creek to the County and reserved the adjacent areas as amenity areas. He said the proposal provided pedestrian and bike facilities along Three Notched Road and along its internal network.

Mr. McDermott said the developer proffered up to \$283,000 to the County to mitigate impacts to schools or transportation, and 20 affordable development units were proffered—exceeding the required 15%. He said staff did not find any factors unfavorable to the request. He continued that staff recommended approval of ZMA202000005 and the associated special exception, SE202200010, provided that the recommended revisions identified in the staff report were made prior to the Board of Supervisors hearing. He said there were recommended motions available.

Mr. Carrazana mentioned the roundabout proposed for the intersection of Route 240 and Route 250 was scheduled to be completed between 2023 and 2024. He asked if funds were available in the CIP for the project.

Mr. McDermott said the project was entirely funded by the VDOT Highway Safety Improvement Program and the state's six-year improvement plan.

Mr. Carrazana asked if there had been other improvements identified for Route 240 from the intersection to downtown Crozet.

Mr. McDermott said there were not any additional projects along Route 240 with associated funding. He said there were recommended improvements in the Crozet Master Plan, including additional bike and pedestrian connections, evaluations for the Crozet Avenue and Three Notched Road intersection, and better connections across the railroad. He reiterated that there were funded projects to connect Park Ridge Drive to the downtown development area of Crozet. He explained the project was funded through a joint agreement with the County, developer, and state. He noted there were additional proposed improvements to the downtown area. He said the transportation improvements were expected to provide relief to Route 240 because they provided alternate travel ways to downtown Crozet.

Mr. Bivins asked if the developer had indicated whether they would construct a turn lane if required to by VDOT.

Mr. McDermott said the developer did not need to agree to such a condition because a turn lane would be required if it was identified as necessary as part of the access permit.

Mr. Bivins asked if the turn lane would be in addition to the one already present on the road.

Mr. McDermott said right and left turn lanes would be evaluated, and the applicant had identified another entrance on Route 240. He said any of the locations could potentially require a turn lane.

Mr. Bivins asked if the 5,000 square foot limitation for the block one commercial space included the commercial space that was already present.

Mr. McDermott said there was a total maximum of 5,000 square feet. He explained that if the developer wanted to construct 5,000 square feet of commercial space, the existing building would have to be removed, or a 2,000 square foot structure would have to be added.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. McDermott to clarify whether the veterinary office space was included in the total square footage.

Mr. McDermott said the veterinary office was included.

Mr. Bivins said there was not much space for development because there was a building height limit of one story.

Mr. McDermott said the height limitation was two stories in the code of development.

Mr. Bivins asked if the County would be responsible for maintaining the greenway area if it accepted the dedication from the developer.

Mr. McDermott responded that the County would be responsible for maintenance. He said Parks and Recreation had worked with the developer regarding the dedication. He said the trail was not initially included in the application plan, and Parks and Recreation had requested the addition so that it would not be responsible for constructing the trail.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was an elevation issue that prevented internal road connections between Altair and Antares roads.

Mr. McDermott said he could not speak to why the connection was not made. He said staff worked with the applicant on the street network. He said the applicant initially proposed private streets, and when they were switched to public streets, the connection was removed. He said the Board wanted public streets. He assumed the design standards prevented the connection.

Mr. Bivins said there was an old sidewalk of 10 feet on the other side of Park View. He asked if it would be difficult for the applicant to connect that section of sidewalk.

Mr. McDermott said he was aware of the gap. He explained there was one parcel on the westside of Park View that did not have sidewalk. He said the proposal would not be difficult, but easements and right-of-way would likely be required and could cause issues. He said the County appreciated cash proffers because the County was in a better position as a public body to acquire the necessary property to construct the sidewalk.

Mr. Clayborne asked how the County staff assessed whether a cash proffer was fair and reasonable.

Mr. McDermott said a cash proffer had to be proposed by the applicant and had to be a fair and reasonable proffer for the development. He said staff considered the impact of the development and whether the funding could address any improvements to mitigate the impacts. He explained what was fair and reasonable was different for each project because different roads had different constraints and required differing improvements.

Mr. McDermott said there were no significant transportation issues identified in the immediate surrounding area. He mentioned the intersection issues and improvements of Three Notched Road and Crozet Avenue, and Route 250 and Route 240. He said the applicant had determined the cash proffer themselves because they believed it was fair and reasonable and offset the impacts to the road. He said developments like the Albemarle Business Campus (ABC) proffered \$500,000. He noted that development was larger and located on a busier road.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the proffer money could be used for schools.

Mr. McDermott said the money could be used for schools—there was not a specified use identified.

Mr. Clayborne said he was trying to determine if the proffer was reasonable. He asked if the project added 40 pupils, was there a way to determine if the proffer covered the cost of teaching 40 additional pupils.

Ms. More asked if the special exception requested to reduce the buffer to 50 feet from the structure to a lot line.

Mr. McDermott said Ms. More was correct.

Ms. More said it would be helpful to see where the 200-foot boundary would be on a map. She assumed that not allowing the special exception would have a large impact on the development. She said she wanted to see a visualization of where the 200-foot boundary would be compared to the 50-foot boundary.

Mr. McDermott said he did not have a 200-foot boundary measured. He said in the noise report, Attachment 7A, the locations of the sound measurements 40 feet from the structure were indicated. He said he could display a GIS map to show a 200-foot buffer around the existing structure.

Ms. More said she would like to hear more justification for the special exception. She said she read the report and the attachments, and she wanted more information from the applicant regarding the reason for the special exception. She asked if the percentage dedicated to greenspace included the amenity areas.

Mr. McDermott said the green areas and amenity areas combined totaled 57% of the development site.

Ms. More said a portion of the area was the WPO buffer, 100-year flood plains, and critical and preserved slopes. She asked what percentage of the 57% was constrained land.

Mr. McDermott said the 7.8 acres dedicated to the County included the entire WPO buffer. He said the steep slope areas were separate and located in the northeast quadrant of the development.

Ms. More said amenity area two was where the critical and preserved slopes were located

Mr. McDermott said the critical and preserved slopes were partly in amenity area two and in the dedicated greenspace.

Ms. More said she was worried about disturbance of the slopes due to the function of the amenity area. She said the staff recommendation to overlay the grading plan with the steep slopes was helpful.

Mr. McDermott said he could display the 200-foot buffer around the veterinary office. He said the developer had indicated that if the special exception were not approved, it would be detrimental to the development because a significant portion of the residential area fell within the 200-foot buffer zone.

Mr. McDermott displayed a Google Earth map. He said the circle on the map represented the 200-foot buffer surrounding the veterinary hospital. He noted that the buffer extended to Three Notched Road and crossed into the other parcel of the development. He displayed a section of

the application plan. He said the buffer would extend to Antares Road and to Altair Road, so the development would lose parts of blocks two and four, and portions of block nine.

Mr. Bailey said the special use permit for the veterinary clinic was granted on October 5, 1988 with conditions. He said there was a sound study, and part of the applicant's narrative had been there was limited overnight boarding at the veterinary hospital. He asked if there were conditions that limited animal boarding. He asked if the veterinary hospital could be prevented from expanding kennel operations.

Mr. McDermott said he believed the conditions in the special use permit did not limit kennel use and were related to administrative items. He said if the proposal were approved, the special use permit would no longer be applicable to the property because it would be zoned for the use by-right. He said if there were additional conditions imposed, they would have to be part of the code of development approved for the property.

Mr. Bailey asked if the proposal were approved, could the veterinary clinic add kennel operations and expand within the existing footprint by-right.

Mr. McDermott said the table of uses in the code of development allowed for veterinary offices and hospitals.

Mr. Bart Svoboda, Zoning Administrator, said he did not typically make determinations on the fly. He said veterinary hospitals generally had overnight stay for recovery. He explained the ordinance addressed noise attenuation from such uses. He explained the purpose of the buffer distance was to mitigate noise. He said technology had changed to contain and mitigate noise within the building. He said if the sound ordinance was met, then other conditions were not needed. He said a similar question had been brought up for a veterinary office near the Forest Lakes area.

Mr. Svoboda said the use and noise ordinance were not in effect in the 1980s and 1990s, and there were ways to mitigate the uses and concerns that in the past could not be done. He said stormwater was a similar example—there used to be several conditions applied to projects regarding runoff before stormwater regulations had been adopted. He anticipated there would be some overnight stay for recovery incidental and accessory to the animal hospital use.

Mr. Bailey said part of the narrative was the hospital already existed and people knew what they were buying or renting. He said he wanted to know the chances of the use and noise level changing from what was expected.

Mr. McDermott added that the conditions of the original special use permit stated the building was limited to 3,000 square feet, and the kennel use was approved in conjunction with the veterinary use and shall not be operated independently. He explained the veterinary hospital could not have a standalone kennel—it had to be associated with the veterinary use. He said the conditions were not proposed in the code of development from the applicant.

Ms. Firehock asked if the Planning Commission could impose such a condition for approval.

Mr. Andy Herrick, County Attorney, asked if Ms. Firehock meant a condition on rezoning or the use.

Ms. Firehock responded she meant a condition to keep in the code of development the prior condition that the kennel use would be in conjunction with the veterinary use.

Mr. Herrick said that if it were part of the code of development, it could be part of the Commission's recommendation.

Mr. McDermott said the condition would have to be added to the code of development. He said the Commission could request that the developer add the condition to the code of the development and approve it as one of the issues needing to be addressed prior to the Board's decision.

Mr. Missel asked whether the trail system for the greenway would be self-contained or connect to a larger trail network.

Mr. McDermott said the plan was only conceptual at the moment, but the trail would extend from the corner of the entrance of the development on Park View, along the greenway area, and extend to the edge of the property. He said a second trail would connect to the street network in the amenity area. He said the applicant dedicated an easement for the trail for public use. He said the trail was entirely within the two parcels, but there was potential for future connections.

Mr. Missel asked if the ARB would determine the width of the wooded buffer along Route 240.

Mr. McDermott said the width was already determined in the application plan. He believed it was a 20-foot buffer.

Mr. Missel asked if parking would be off-street or if there was any on-street parking.

Mr. McDermott responded that there would be no on-street parking. He noted there were two or three small, separated parking areas for guests, and other parking would be in private driveways or garages.

Mr. Missel noted the CAC had a conflict during its July 29, 2020 meeting. He asked if the CAC had discussed the project at the August 12, 2020 meeting.

Mr. McDermott said the separate meeting on July 29 was announced to the CAC and many members attended. He explained the lead planner for the project attended the August 12 CAC meeting and provided a brief description of the project and received comments.

Mr. Missel asked if there were recommendations from the August 12 meeting.

Mr. McDermott said he went through the CAC minutes and there were no additional concerns brought up not already covered by the other meetings.

Ms. Firehock asked for more information regarding the type of trail proposed for the greenway area.

Mr. McDermott said the trail would be similar to the Appalachian Trail. He explained a Class B trail was in the trail standards and included natural surfaces and would be three to four feet wide.

Ms. Firehock opened the public hearing to the applicant.

Mr. Katorah Roell said the applicant had ensured the trail would be at the edge of the buffer, avoid the critical slopes, and avoid the 100-year flood plain. He said the applicant had worked with Parks and Recreation and engineers on the trail plan. He said the road did not connect internally because the applicant wanted to preserve the slopes and natural growth in the area. He said the greenspace in the central area was the front yard of the original house and select trees in the area had been planted by the original owner's mother.

Ms. Firehock asked if the applicant had a formal presentation.

Mr. Roell said Mr. Martin Schulman was going to present.

Mr. Schulman said he had provided historical and contextual information for the parcels. He said the purpose of the residential development was to support the employment hub. He noted that the development supported many objectives of the master plan. He said he had been a part of four five-year plans, and he had served in the County for 40 years as a veterinarian and on development groups, including a Route 250 task force.

Mr. Schulman said the Commission identified potential noise issues surrounding the veterinary hospital. He explained he attended a national conference in Washington D.C. in 1988 where he selected an architect to build the veterinary hospital. He explained he chose a firm that had built over 250 veterinary hospitals around the world. He said the insulation and soundproofing measures used in the structure of the building were up to Wisconsin standards. He said the building met the noise requirements from 40 feet away, and the noise study was conducted by an independent engineer.

Mr. Schulman said his personal interest and commitment had been for a continuous greenway trail. He said his approach to veterinary practice and work on development boards has been collaborative. He said he wanted to see the dedication of green space become a continuous trail extending east toward the Beaver Creek dam region and west to the downtown area. He said it had been a feature and priority to minimize the impact to the Emerson Commons community. He noted Emerson Commons was surrounded by both a visual and noise buffer.

Mr. Carrazana said the kennel was an odd function to have as a center piece of a new village. He said the space could be used for other amenities central to the community. He asked if the applicant had considered relocating the kennel and using the space for amenities or other developments. He said the area was constrained by the existing facility.

Mr. Schulman said the neighboring property to the west was recently rezoned to allow a minimum of 20,000 square feet of commercial space. He said the property was within 150 to 200 yards of the parcel and noted there was plenty of opportunity for commercial space. He said due to the rezoning, the owners had determined there was not a significant need for commercial space because they had not increased the retail square footage. He said the owners had constructed a car wash.

Mr. Schulman said the role of veterinary medicine within communities had only expanded. He said there was no interest for an expanded kennel at the site. He said the veterinary hospital, which took over when he retired two years ago, had expanded the veterinary staff from a solo

practice to three or four veterinarians. He explained veterinary practices saw a 30% increase in visits and demand over the pandemic.

Mr. Carrazana assumed Mr. Schulman was indicating there was no other scenario where the veterinary practice could be relocated and to open up opportunities in the center of the development. He said the growth would funnel traffic into the center of the new village. He said it was an odd function to have as a centerpiece and moving the vet would stop outside traffic from entering the village as well as open up opportunities.

Ms. Firehock said Mr. Carrazana had an interesting suggestion. She said there could be changes made before appearing before the Board, but the changes would not be made immediately.

Ms. More noted there was guest parking. She said there was no street parking, and there was concern about parking from emails she had received. She asked if guests would be able to use the parking at the veterinary office as guest spaces.

Mr. Roell said there was front street parking near the dog park, basin, and pedestrian bridge. He said the site plan had been changed to include another guest parking lot.

Ms. More asked if people could park at the veterinary offices.

Mr. Roell said Mr. Schulman would have to negotiate the parking with the veterinary hospital. He said other uses had been suggested for the veterinary site in the case the veterinary hospital vacated. He said VDOT did not approve further on-street parallel parking, and the developer was limited in the parking it could provide.

Ms. More asked if the applicant could provide the number of proposed parking spaces.

Mr. Roell said there were probably 25 spots. He said parking along the frontage and dog park was removed. He said the developer would approach the suggestion to allow parking at the veterinary hospital. He said it could be a condition added to the code of development along with limited kennel use. He said the frontage along Route 240 was designated to be 20 feet or greater, and the trees had to meet ARB guidelines. He explained a portion of the property to the east was in the growth area. He said the single-family homes would be isolated from the rest of the development aside from a pedestrian connection. He said the applicant had spent two years working on the proposal with staff.

Ms. Firehock said the applicant would have the opportunity to respond after comments from the public.

Mr. Missel asked if Columbia Gas had issues with roads, curbs, and gutters being constructed on top of their easement.

Mr. Roell said the applicant had determined the depth of the gas line every 50 feet along the length of the line. He said the road profile was designed to follow the gas line through the grade—the reason why the road was not flat and followed the topography.

Mr. Missel asked if the pump station on the current plans was no longer planned.

Mr. Roell said the pump station would still remain at the lowest point—either near Route 240 or at the back of the property. He said several discussions had been held with the service authority, and there were several different avenues to approach the station. He said if there were ways for VDOT to permit the applicant to build the section of missing frontage sidewalk, they would be happy to do so.

Mr. Missel asked if the applicant foresaw either option or location for sanitary sewer impacting the code of development.

Mr. Roell said the applicant did not.

Mr. Bivins asked if the structure in Z104 was a sidewalk.

Mr. Roell said the structure was a pedestrian bridge so as not to disturb any slopes.

Mr. Clayborne asked if the applicant could explain the role of the HOA and an estimated price range.

Mr. Roell said there was not an estimated price impact. He said the public roads were maintained by VDOT, unlike private roads. He said property owners were responsible for maintenance of individual lots, and the impacts to HOA cost requirements would be minimal, other than maintaining open spaces and playgrounds.

Ms. Firehock said she hoped the HOA would maintain the stormwater facilities. She opened up the hearing for public comment.

Mr. James Gammon said his address was 802 Stargazer Lane, Crozet, Virginia, 22932. He said he was affiliated with the Emerson Commons community. He said he was in favor of more housing in the area. He said as proposed, the project was claiming to be environmentally conscious while failing to take into account the lived experience of future residents. He said the type of high-density design—rows of townhomes with single car garages—typically ended up being unpleasant places to live. He said there were problems inherent to the design because developers prioritized maximizing profits at the expense of future residents and neighbors.

Mr. Gammon said severe parking problems were guaranteed with the proposal. He said there was not enough parking. He noted many of the greenspaces were on the periphery in areas with a steep grade. He said dedicating the greenspace to the County was a meaningless gesture because the developer did not have to maintain the property and the land was of little use. He said the residents would not use the greenspace.

Mr. Gammon said he regularly used a decibel meter. He said a study that suggested noise would regularly stay below 55 a-weighted decibels at 50 feet was not reliable. He said the study did not alleviate concerns about noise from the veterinary hospital. He said putting the residential development within a 200-foot circle was not good for lived experiences. He said he could imagine a situation where the veterinary office would regularly call a towing company and a bad relationship among the neighbors would develop.

Ms. Robin Bernhard said she lived at 827 Stargazer Lane, Crozet, Virginia. She said she was affiliated with Emerson Commons. She said she moved to Crozet from Charlottesville because

she saw Crozet as a satellite community. She said she was excited to see the development happening in the area. She said she wanted to see development that would maintain and preserve Crozet's rural sensibility. She said she was concerned about the traffic generated by the development. She said she had lived in Crozet for two years, and she had found problems with rush hour traffic on Three Notched Road, Route 250, and Interstate 64. She noted traffic was backed up during rush hour to Beaver Creek Park.

Ms. Bernhard said she was concerned about the environmental impact of 200 additional vehicles—which would generate 900 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions annually. She said the additional cars would impact wildlife and increase light pollution. She said studies had shown unused parking potential in Crozet.

Ms. Bernhard said the benefits for high density developments occurred when the developments were near high-volume transportation options with room for traffic flow. She said she did not know where the traffic from the proposal would go. She said she was concerned and upset by the development of Old Trail and Crozet Park. She said she did not go to the park anymore because it had become ugly and suburbanized. She said there were no longer trees, and she missed the trees. She said the trees protected people from climate change.

Mr. Joe Abraham said he lived at 829 Stargazer Lane. He said he was a member of the Crozet community and Emmerson Commons. He said he favored livable high-density developments and the preservation of greenspace and the rural atmosphere of the area. He said some of his concerns had been addressed.

Mr. Abraham said he was concerned about the management of increased traffic flow, specifically left turns in and out of the neighborhood and increased traffic at the corner of Park View. He said the development would increase traffic by 800 trips per day which implied 800 vehicles turning in and out of the development. He said there was no traffic flow pattern indicated in the proposal, and the proposal did not indicate where the new turning lanes would be placed or if there would be a traffic signal. He requested the developers supply the details of a traffic ingress and egress plan that addressed the concerns.

Mr. Abraham said he was concerned about site safety during construction and occupancy. He said the gas line was not mentioned in the proposal he had reviewed. He said people should be aware of the risk with natural gas. He noted the grading plan did not show the steep slopes overlay, so it was not readily apparent how drainage and erosion would impact the site and stream. He said the details must be worked out and presented before the plan could be properly evaluated.

Mr. Abraham said it was necessary future developments plan and build for future resilience due to climate change. He said developments should include increased storm water capacity and drought tolerant planting. He said energy costs would be highly variable, and standards for new buildings should maximize homeowner savings and comfort and minimize energy use. He continued that construction should follow environmentally friendly building standards and use environmentally friendly building materials. He said electric vehicle charging should be made available for each dwelling unit.

Mr. Wade Davenport said he lived at 827 Stargazer Lane. He said he supported the greenspace and the idea of a connected trail proposed by the applicant. He said he supported the use of tree

buffers. He said increased traffic from the development would worsen congestion in Crozet. He said recreation spaces should be built into the structure so that people drove less. He suggested shuttle services to retail and recreation locations could be used to reduce traffic. He said he believed the traffic impacts would lessen if the units were decreased to a maximum of 50.

Mr. Davenport said the roundabout at Route 250 and Route 240 was planned prior to the community, so the roundabout might not handle the increased traffic from the development. He said there was no consideration given to how the housing design could reduce needed energy resource for heating and cooling. He said the housing units could be physically aligned for better energy efficiency in the future.

Mr. Colin Dirkin said he was a resident of Crozet. He said the notion of kennel boarding should be considered. He said parking was an issue. He said he had lived in a neighborhood with a driveway and garage layout, and people used the garage for storage and parked on the street. He said a similar situation could happen in the development. He said parking should be reexamined.

Mr. Michael Monaco said he lived at 810 Stargazer Lane and was associated with Emmerson Commons. He said he had concerns about block 3 in the plan. He noted the block abutted the 100-year flood plain and stream buffer, and the driveways of the houses in the block were on top of the gas line easement. He said he was unsure how construction could be completed in the area.

Mr. Monaco said he was unimpressed with the land proffer to the County because the land appeared to be undevelopable. He said he wanted to see block 3 reduced or eliminated. He mentioned he lived in a designated affordable unit that he purchased a few years ago. He said affordable housing did not have to be crammed, and development did not have to be maximized for there to be affordable housing. He said more affordable housing could just be proffered and built.

Mr. Amyas Player said he lived at 5029 Passyunk Drive in Crozet. He said he had lived in the area since 2005. He said he was opposed to any further development in the area. He said he deliberately bought his home outside of the proposed growth development area. He said since then, Emmerson Commons had been developed through a rezoning process. He said any further development would exacerbate existing problems related to traffic, housing density, and the impact on the agrarian nature of the area.

Mr. Player said the green area would be to the detriment of others in the development. He asked where outside visitors to the green area would park. He said the green area would bring additional traffic, foot traffic, pollution, noise pollution, and water quality. He noted the applicant desired to preserve the trees around the original homestead. He said there was no desire to preserve the trees lining Park View Avenue when Emmerson Commons was developed. He said was contradictory to preserve some trees over others. He said there was a disconnect between the planning stage and construction, and there were more attractive proposals for Emmerson Commons than what was constructed.

Ms. Cara Mayo said she lived at 858 Stargazer Lane. She said the back of her home faced the veterinary hospital. She said she could hear kennel noise from her home with the windows open, and she had complained about the kennel noise. She said she did not understand how people

living 50 feet away would not hear noise. She said the kennel noise started in the evening and extended to the morning. She said she had similar concerns related to traffic density and the gas line.

Mr. Trace Carter said he and his wife, Lauren, lived at 801 Stargazer Lane. He said he appreciated Mr. Player's perspective. He said the dedication of the green space and the preservation of rhododendrons were superficial promises from the developer. He said there was an ever-growing list of issues with the development, and he noted the Commission itself said the developer needed to revise the plan. He said there had been many concerns raised about all parts of the plan. He said the school redistricting plan for the area accounted for 9 additional students at the elementary school level from the development, but the development documents stated 22 additional students. He said it was not true that Crozet Elementary and Henley Middle would remain under capacity for 10 years—he said the figures needed review.

Ms. Gammon introduced herself as Rebecca Gammon and stated that she lived at 802 Stargazer Lane in Crozet, in the Emerson Commons neighborhood. She said that she would begin by saying that she somewhat expected to see and was glad to see some high-density housing being proposed for this area because it was needed in the area and also was wonderful to see that the developer was prioritizing more affordable homes than the bare minimum required. She said she had some concerns that were shared by some of the other Crozet residents in the meeting. She said the first was the Columbia Gas distribution line that ran through the neighborhood. She said she understood that localities could not count on a disaster happening with these distribution lines, otherwise no one would live within 150 feet of them. She said it seemed that with new housing, they could do better with meeting the bare minimum requirement, which seemed to be a 25-foot setback given the 50-foot easement. She said even the American Petroleum Institute recommended that for hazardous liquids like natural gas there should be a 50-foot setback from the middle of the pipeline or distribution line such as this one was.

Ms. Gammon said she thought these homes being so close to them would naturally have less value. She said she hated to be dark, but she wondered if that meant that those would be the affordable houses in block three. She asked if that was so, then what would that say about how the County valued one of their vulnerable populations? She said she wanted to comment that she was shocked to hear that all of the street parking was removed due to VDOT mandating it. She said this meant that the parking configuration being proposed was a wish or a dream. She said she thought that anyone that had lived in a townhouse neighborhood where there was a small one car garage and a narrow driveway directly behind that garage knew that no one actually parked in the garage because it was not practical. She said usually in those neighborhoods, there was one car parked in the garage, and one car jockeying for space on the street somewhere. She said she had a few friends live in densely packed neighborhoods like this, and it can be very hard as an owner or as a guest to find street parking. She said she was very concerned that they were talking about practically one space per household.

Mr. Bowen introduced himself as Daniel Bowen and said he lived at 856 Stargazer Lane in Emerson Commons. He said it was mentioned earlier that this development plan was brought through consideration with the Crozet Master Plan with the CCAC, and it was muddled and unclear as to whether the CAC had a chance to weigh in on what was going on with this plan. He said a couple of their guiding principles that were stated in the master plan he had concerns with. He said one of them was conservation, which talked about preserving natural resources in an integrated network of parks and gathering spaces, trails, and natural areas, which highlighted the

trail mentioned in this plan that seemed to be self-contained and it was not planned out how it would connect to the other towns. He said the sidewalk, which also was mentioned earlier, was a glaring omission to how people who lived in this new potential residence would just be able to walk to downtown Crozet. He said that lack of a sidewalk was a problem for the folks at Emerson Commons as it was currently, because there were a lot of cars there. He said alluding to that traffic issue, 800 more cars coming in and out and a bus station where children would be waiting to get on the bus in the morning and off in the afternoon.

Mr. Bowen said it sounded like the way the trail was proposed suggested the appearance of complying with the guiding principles, as if to kind of mislead the County planners, because the site may not be able to accommodate this kind of trail, which was fine, but it would be beneficial for the proposal to be honest and transparent about that site's limitation. He said the other guiding principle was implementation, provide strategic and timely support for community partnerships, local economic development, policy changes, and capital investments. He said this again highlighted the fact that they bypassed the CCAC, or at least it was unclear as to what they would weigh in on. He said when he spoke to someone who attended those meetings, there was no indication that this had been brought before them. He said he had planned to talk about some things related to the gas pipeline that was already addressed. He said there were traffic concerns everywhere from the 250 intersections up to 240, and even farther down to 29. He said if they looked at the VDOT records, there was already an indication of problems starting in 2018, and now four years later without fixing any of those problems they were adding 800 more connecting to Charlottesville. He said he did not think that was clearly there.

Ms. Firehock asked if there were any more speakers.

Ms. Shaffer said she did not see anyone with their hand up, so there were no more speakers.

Ms. Firehock said she would now close the public comment and let the applicant make any additional remarks.

Mr. Schulman said they were all neighbors in a neighborhood and he appreciated the different perspectives. He said the concerns about the gas line and easements and a potential disaster, he did not believe it was more than six or seven years ago that Columbia Gas replaced the entire gas line as it came across the entire property. He said it was not a 50-year-old gas line and was only five or six years old. He said he believed they put it in at a greater depth than it had been. He said the idea that there had been any idea to place affordable units closer to the gas line than other was speculative and was not based on the plan at all. He said 80% or 90% of the commentaries had been close neighbors across the creek at Emerson Commons, and there were some common threads. He said one of these was adequate on-street parking, which they attempted to provide. He said they had four resubmissions and were guided by Planning and VDOT to remove those. He said he would like for the applicant to address the opportunity for parking at each unit, which he understood would accommodate two cars, one in the garage and one just outside of the garage in the driveway, in addition to the appropriate number of guest parking units available based on the number of housing units. He said the idea that this would be a destination, such as Mr. Player's concern of additional parking to happen in order for people to access the nearby greenway trail was not in the plan. He said the plan was a ten- to twenty-year plan to have connectivity to downtown to reservoir as additional requests came before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to extend this trail. He said this would not be a trail likely used by anyone other than those walking the trail from contiguous properties. He said

if the Commission would like any of the outstanding comments not addressed just for time limitations, he would be happy to address those. He asked Mr. Llewellyn if they had two parking opportunities per unit.

Mr. Llewellyn said a lot of these issues brought up were based on the site plan. He said many of them would get resolved at that stage if they could work with VDOT. He said he was a proponent of more parking at the site. He said it was not the easiest thing, at this early stage of "bubble plan" zoning that talked about density and general location, road layout, green space, and non-disturbance of critical slope. He said they made an effort to make as much headway with that and tension at a very rough stage for master planning and a zoning bubble. He said details of a site plan would take another year or year and a half to go through staff, Planning, Engineering, and VDOT. He said many of these issues would be addressed at that time. He said he would ask that any conditions they had concern within regard to kenneling for the clinic or the site in general to be added to their conditions of approval and they would be glad to address them.

Ms. Firehock closed the matter for public comment and brought it back before the Commission.

Ms. More said she would like to hear more from people in whatever order they would like to do that in. She said one thing she wanted to add was the talk about the community meeting and the CCAC's input, and she wanted to reassure people that there was not a missed step. She said there was potentially a missed opportunity when they could not host a community meeting at a CAC, which sometimes did happen. She said she had to go back and watch the community meeting because it had been a long time, even though she attended. She said she thought a lot of the issues they were hearing were things that needed to get worked out because they were important things and following the steps and stages of when they did get worked out and showed a lot of the things, they were hearing were site plan issues. She said the other point that was important was that a lot of times with the community, with the staff it was so new that sometimes community members were frustrated because there was not enough detailed information to answer their questions yet at that stage. She said the community meeting was valuable, but it oftentimes with this first look, people were anxious and wanted to learn more, yet there were not these details that emerged as the process took place. She said the community meeting was in itself not as helpful to community members as they would like it to be.

Ms. Firehock said she could not understand what Ms. More said about the special exception.

Ms. More said that [inaudible] special exception.

Ms. Firehock said okay.

Ms. More said she really wanted to hear from people about where they were on the special exception, because that was a pretty important piece of this project and one that she had dealt with.

Ms. Firehock asked the other Commissioners about the special exception request to have the distance reduced to 50 feet from the edge of this structure to the adjacent property line.

Mr. Carrazana said that it was certainly one of the issues in front of them that he was struggling with the most. He said that was mainly because it was asking them to allow for a function that he believed was misplaced within this development. He said the 200 feet were there for a reason, so

given the function of that facility and the creation of a buffer around the facility, there was an incompatibility with the fact that they were now taking that facility and making it the centerpiece for something that was requiring a 200-foot buffer. He said he was struggling with the idea of reducing that, but the function did not go away, it was just reducing the buffer to allow development closer into something that really wanted that buffer. He said it was truly incompatible with the center of the village or development. He said he struggled with this and agreed with some of Commissioner More's sentiments, which was why he asked the question, and the answer he received was that they had never considered any scenario where they would potentially redevelop veterinary clinic somewhere else, perhaps in the perimeter. He said he thought it was a missed opportunity with what else could be happening in the center of that development.

Mr. Bivins said that he would offer that, no matter what they did with the piece of property and with the condition of the setback, one of the other conditions should be that there should be no commercial boarding. He said there was a difference between that and kennels, so no commercial boarding would be allowed in order to establish there was no separate activity other than the care of domestic animals. He said he was certainly not in support of a 50-foot buffer and was unsure if there was some area in between. He said they had been aware of lots of animal clinics that sat on the fringes or next to houses in the development area. He said he was in complete agreement with his colleagues that it was a convenience that the veterinary clinic was being left there, and while it was not necessarily the ideal place, it was not for him to say at this point. He said that because of that, he wanted to put in the prohibition about commercial boarding as a condition, wherever that may be in the code of development. He said that realizing that if they did not give them the exception, they would be cutting out two and a half blocks, which was an unfortunate thing, because this probably was a way for the development to solve that in a way that worked for them to preserve their blocks and to move that function somewhere else on the property. He said that one piece for him was huge. He said he would also like to see some conversation about connecting the sidewalk across Park View up to that one piece of property. He said he was unsure if that were the County's duty to consider or if the applicant could find a way to facilitate that so it would be a means of walking and connecting that property to the downtown from that location.

Ms. Firehock said that was noted. She said they would not lose track of that point about developing that connection but wanted to stick with question of the 50-foot exception request. She said she would hold her comments until the other Commissioners spoke.

Mr. Missel said that as the new member, he was still focused on what their duties were as a Planning Commission, so he felt pretty confident that under the heading of promoting the orderly development of Albemarle County and its environment, that this was addressing the issue of compatibility of uses, and in his opinion, the compatibility of this use was in contradiction to a very densely developed residential area. He said that while that had been said, he was in agreement with the other Commissioners that there needed to be some mitigating factors. He said he was leading towards some sort of a compromise but had a few questions that would be related to that. He said the first was that there had been a sound study completed, and whether it was certified sound study or not was a question by one of the public commentators early in the meeting, so he would be curious to know whether it was. He said that the question of whether the developer had considered other mitigating factors, or that the County could consider other mitigating factors such as sound buffers was mentioned in the application. He said that his other question was about developer disclosure and buyer awareness. He said it would be no secret that this was an existing use and would be a kennel. He said he was in agreement with prohibiting commercial boarding, but he supposed the balance was that there were people knowingly living near this use, and

whether it became a developer issue and an inability to sell the lots, or if they were imposing an expanded buffer on that. He said he was split between these two ideas.

Mr. Bailey said he appreciated some of the aspects of thinking about the transition of the higher density and the residential and some of the elements that looked at providing green spaces. He said he found himself similarly conflicted about the questions around the veterinary clinic and the sound, but the point had been well addressed by Mr. Carrazana's comment about this being designed as a village, and having that to bring people together, and that retail space to fill, but for better or for worse, what existed there was something that he did not know if it was in spirit with what the retail and commercial components of the form factor they were trying to deliver. He said he appreciated the idea of reducing the setback, but they were finding themselves in the same place they had been for so long about transitioning to this middle density and providing these village type elements in these different areas and adopting more of these neighborhood principles.

Mr. Bailey said he was really on the fence, and there would have to be something in addition to the original kenneling compromise to strike a balance and understand the options that existed within the property to relocate the kennel to a different area that was more ingress and egress to the commercial road that this abuts. He said he was not recommending tearing down a building, but there were options to repurpose a building for a community center or other things within the plan, and that was the issue he found himself trying to reconcile. He said when Mr. McDermott presented, he had even more trouble trying to reconcile it with the site plans they were given and understand where the parking was and was not and getting a really clear picture about what was and what was not being addressed, even in this conceptual phase.

Ms. More said that when she spoke earlier, her AirPods were not in use so she apologized if it was difficult to hear her. She said she wanted to add another part of why she was conflicted about the special exception was that when she thought of that use and its somewhat odd function, it related to where she wanted to see amenities, and instead there was this piece, so it was not only the special exception, it was more of the design overall that she felt was causing other spaces that could be more central to be thrown out to the sides, which gave the appearance that they were not well thought out.

Mr. Clayborne said he was opposed to the special exception because to him it did not make much sense. He said particularly with acoustics, it was one thing to do a study, but where the rubber meets the road in the construction of it and how it really panned out was a different matter. He said he was struggling to visualize this piece particularly when reading the code of development and that was the only block that was one to two stories and was surrounded by three stories, and it was clear that the vet was what was driving this entire thing. He said to him, it was very difficult with no graphics when trying to think about how the verticality of the architectural spaces played out with the project. He said they had received site plans that were detailed to a fine degree, even including the slope of the sidewalk and how it drained, but there was nothing about the verticality of the project, and he found that very problematic. He said that was more of a side comment and knew the applicant could not do anything about it now, but perhaps it was something the Commission could work on in the future about how to make that more of a requirement. He said even at this stage, there should be some kind of concept to show what things would look like and including the vertical expectation for those buildings there.

Mr. Bivins said he was looking at the code of development and at table 1 on page 1, and in some ways, the vet office was going to be one of the quieter activities that would be taking place there,

because there were several options for schools, an option for a group home, an option for a farmer's market there. He said he believed what they were talking about was the potential evening noise, because the vet's office would probably not have the kind of daytime hour noise. He said those other uses could potentially have more activity and additional noises than the vet would have during the day, so he wanted them to think about it in those terms.

Ms. Firehock said she found their noise study to be compelling. She said she also found it humorous when they talked about how the dogs were too quiet and they had to get the dogs excited so their barking could be measured. She said she grew up in a different environment than a rural subdivision; she grew up in cities where veterinarians were located in neighborhoods, and you walked to the vet with your dog. She said she found the idea of having a veterinarian that people in that community could walk to was a nice amenity. She said if it would be designed from scratch and was truly a blank slate without the vet building existing in the middle, she certainly would not put the vet office in the middle of it either. She said she would want to have some kind of visibility meeting from the road and not encourage the traffic to come from outside and circulate inside the development to access this business. She said she said it was not the best centerpiece for this development as a commercial use. She said that this probably was presented by the developer because they did not want to go through the expense of demolishing a building and building a new one.

Ms. Firehock said the amenity space on the edge with the idea of walking in the stream valley and experiencing a quiet getaway to nature was not a cop-out and was a nice amenity. She said it would also be really nice to have a central park in the middle or a clubhouse that was more enjoyable for everyone to use most of the time, but that could also generate its own set of noises. She said she did not have a big conclusion to offer at this point, because she was not as concerned about the noise, especially if they added a clause that any kenneling of animals had to be related to them being patients at the veterinarian and not just commercial kenneling for people on vacation, she believed they could take care of that. She said she was not that concerned about the noise coming from them in the evening, because she imagined they would be closed in at night.

Ms. Firehock said she was not sure about the comment they heard from a neighbor here who said they heard noise in the evening as to what time that noise was heard. She said she believe it could be addressed, but she agreed that it was an odd layout that was driven by the fact that there was an existing building there, and that building had not been related to them as being particularly historical or a significant structure that needed to be maintained. She said she believed the question at hand was if they held out for a better design and higher quality community layout than was before them tonight, because it seemed an odd reason why they would be reducing these setbacks to allow for the blocks to be placed where they were, because essentially the veterinary office building was in the wrong place. She said the question about the sidewalk remained, but the sidewalk would not necessarily be that important if people were not in the mood to permit the special exception because without that there would be no development here.

Ms. More said she was not bothered by the numbers presented. She said she was a bit concerned about block three. She said she felt like there were things that could happen with this that in her mind could make it more ready to go before the Board of Supervisors. She said if they were going to talk about the special exception, there did not seem consensus on making a recommendation for approval. She said what she thought she heard was that maybe instead of 50 feet it was 100 feet. She said maybe there were some things they could recommend in the code of development

to make people more comfortable if they said the kennel use was tied to the vet or if there was no commercial boarding use. She said she did not know if that would pass forward or go as a denial, but they could say there were some things that would make it something they would approve, or if they were in the position tonight to say yes, but only if it says these things. She said the applicant seemed to be saying yes and to go ahead and put conditions on it, but she did not know if the applicant would agree to those things.

Ms. Firehock said that it seemed the applicant said if they had to make the buffer conform either to their existing code or to a larger distance, like 100 feet, they would not be able to build the development as proposed. She said she had no way to evaluate that.

Ms. More said she was struggling with that and was in a place where she would recommend denial. She said she also respected and appreciated there were some things that could help them get to a place where they could work on something, but she felt that could be worked out prior to the Board, or it could be worked out and then they would see it again later, but that was not her decision, so she was struggling with whether to recommend denial for the special exceptions, and the conversations had been heard that there were things they believed could be looked at that could work, but maybe not the 50 feet.

Ms. Firehock said this was always the problem; they were not looking at a proforma for this development, and they had no way of knowing what their margin was. She said they said if they could not get this exception then it was dead in the water and they could not build it. She said they had no way to evaluate that, and because it was true that they had met their code in what they had provided this evening, but a wise person may go further and spend a little more on the design to lay out some of the structures to give more for them to work with in order to evaluate these claims that they would not be able to build this. She said she did not think the Commission was against seeing housing in this area, and it did meet the goals of the master plan to have infill.

Mr. Carrazana said related to what she just said, it was hard for them to make these recommendations and deciding on numbers when it was arbitrary because they did not really know. He said he made a statement earlier about a missed opportunity, and to elaborate on that, if they saw more information, then they could determine if it were a development that could be approved. He said there were a lot of positives here from an affordable housing standpoint to some of the green amenities that were being provided. He said he agreed with Commissioner Firehock that they could build on some of those areas but providing some amenities in those areas was a positive. He said the missed opportunity was really thinking broader about what this could be. He said of course, if this were by right or another type of use, he would not have an issue, but there was a nighttime function that could potentially generate noise. He said schools and a farmer's market, besides being focused during the daytime, would also be amenities that the community members would use. He said a vet office would potentially be used, but he did not know how many and some of them may have veterinarians they already used. He said he was not convinced that that use was something that was conducive for that location, and the request for the buffer to be taken away was not fathomable to him.

Ms. Firehock said it sounded like there was not a lot of support for the special exception. She said one option was to see if the applicant were interested in a deferral, because it was not a question that nothing would happen at this site, but perhaps not in the current configuration.

Mr. Missel said he had one question about the code of development which Mr. Bivins had mentioned earlier. He said under "B" for soundproof compliance, "no structure shall be located closer than 200 feet to any agricultural or residential lot line. He asked if it was correct that was the one they were asking about being waived. He asked if the remaining three were still in place in that section.

Ms. Firehock said that was right.

Mr. Missel said he wanted to make sure he was clear on that. He said those other three seemed to be a substantial amount of mitigating factors.

Ms. Firehock asked what mitigating factors he was referring to.

Mr. Missel said he was referring to deciding whether the buffer could be 100 feet or 150 feet in order to help with the site continuation and disturbance. He said it seemed to him that A, C, and D in place were the mitigating factors to some of the impacts that they may see from the kennel noise.

Ms. More said it was important to remember the noise ordinance was another protective measure. She said that was not enough to convince her to let it be 50 feet, and she agreed they did not need to throw out arbitrary numbers. She said there were protections in the case there were noises louder than what people hoped to be.

Ms. Firehock said that 200-foot buffer was based on prior to a noise ordinance being in place, so they basically enforced it with distance. She said now they had a noise ordinance and they also had testimonial from the vet who constructed the building that it was constructed with advanced soundproofing at the time, so as a result, that particular structure was designed precisely to attenuate noise in closer quarters. She said their job was to help foster developments of lasting quality that helped meet their values as a community for communal space and gathering. She said this use in the middle of the development was intended for a particular business and not as a community space, and those community spaces were on the peripheral. She said obviously people who bought property there would be well aware of that, and not everyone wanted to live on the commons, either. She said some people would rather escape into the trail by themselves. She said she was not as troubled as the other Commissioners seemed to be about the vet in the center. She said while she would not design this development from the get-go, and she would probably move the vet to the outer edge. She said this was what was before them, and they did not have the ability to redesign it on the fly because it was not their purview.

Mr. Bivins said he did not want to forget that there may be dogs in perhaps a quarter of the houses there. He said even if the vet were going away, there would still be dogs barking, and those homes would not be influenced by people saying their dog was barking, because there would be little oversight that would occur, as opposed to a business that had to comply with the various zoning ordinances that would cover this activity. He said he was talking himself into a place where he was more satisfied with it now, because this was one instance of commercial activity that could take place there, and he was much more disappointed that there was only room for perhaps one other commercial activity in there. He said that was a decision of the applicant. He said if this went away and they left it at 200 feet, it would not solve the problem of dogs barking.

Mr. Bailey said that if he understood the ordinance in the code of development, it was listed as 55 DBA was not to be exceeded, and the staff's listed noise study had five different periods where it exceeded 55 in those areas, so he was trying to square those two things. He said that information could be found on page 3 of the sound level measurement results. He said he wanted to make sure they did not only go against the noise ordinance, but also creating unintended consequences of adjusting this and approving something that already possibly has this noise violation at 50 feet.

Mr. Svoboda said that measurement was taken at the property line, which was the receiving zone. He said with any other noise, the receiving zone in a rural residential area was 60 decibels during the day and 55 decibels at night. He said it was a little bit tighter on the kennel with the supplemental regulations or with that 55 at the property line. He said he did not remember from the study where they took the readings at 55 feet, but it was at the property line. He said they were right outside of the building at 10 or 25 feet and were reading 55 decibels, then he would not know the answer to that, and they would have to do a study. He said usually, but not always, the farther away a noise was heard from, the more it dissipated. He said they would want to make sure the reading was correct, but to be clear, in rural residential areas, any noise was not supposed to exceed 55 decibels at night and 60 decibels during the day. He said the average conversation was about 65 decibels. He said the conversation at the property line would be louder than 55 decibels they were seeing in this particular regulation. He said he hoped that helped.

Mr. Bailey said absolutely. He said that if he interpreted it correctly, the report stated the measurement of locations were approximately 40 feet from the façade, so not quite on the proposed property line.

Mr. Svoboda said yes.

Ms. Firehock said that if they were found to be in violation, which involved calling the County to come out to use the sound meter, they would then have to take some mitigation actions, which would include additional soundproofing or not letting dogs board over night or whatever mitigation measures they took. She said they had that ability in place to mitigate that, and the barking dogs could be moved or not be boarded overnight, and that was an easily solvable problem because there were options.

Ms. Firehock asked if she could make an exception to let Mr. Llewellyn make a comment he needed to share with them, although they usually did not go back to the applicant at this time.

Mr. Llewellyn said the general noise level on 240 and being in proximity to the commercial area meant there was general background noise that was also picked up in that sound test beyond dogs in the building. He said it was not a boarding kennel, he said it was simply for healing dogs on a per-night basis. He said he lived in Ivy Farms on 6.5 acres and could step out of his back door and hear dogs barking across the property and could hear a Charlottesville band on Friday nights. He said there were general noises that occurred in neighborhoods, and hearing dogs barking in a neighborhood where a lot of people lived with dogs meant it was easy to hear a lot of dogs barking, and it may not only be from the kennel. He said he would be happy to mitigate anything that was directly related to the dogs, and he was sure that Dr. Schulman, the owner of the building, would be happy to comply.

Ms. More said she did not want to recommend approval for the special exception, but if another Supervisor wanted to make the recommendation to approve with some of the conditions, they

had discussed this evening, they should. She said that left the rezoning in general, because a lot of their discussion centered around the location of the vet in the center, which caused the need for the special exception. She said she looked at the general rezoning much more favorably, but it did not mean much without the special exception, so it was difficult to work with. She said in that conversation was also the piece about the sidewalk, and she wanted to make the suggestion about sharing the parking because it was also an issue. She hoped there would be future conversations about these other items that had not been discussed thoroughly.

Ms. Firehock reiterated that Commissioner More was not disposed to grant the exception for the distance to the vet, and she thought they may be able to do some more creative arrangements with parking. She said as the applicant said they had not gotten down into that fine of grain of detail. She said when she was with the Charlottesville Planning Commission, they did work out such an arrangement with a business that was open from 8:30 to 5 PM and a condo that shared the parking in the evenings. She said those things could be worked out between uses, but they must get permission first and put it into the application before it went to the Board. She said to table the discussion of the distance to the vet, because she thought it was possible that it may not be correct that they could not build this at all with the vet office and distance where it was. She asked if anyone had any opinions, they wanted to share about whether the density change was acceptable in terms of what was proposed to be built there.

Mr. Carrazana said there were a lot of positives, as he had mentioned earlier, and he did not think the density was inappropriate. He said it was hard to begin to understand the massing of that, as Mr. Clayborne had said. He said he had some concerns about it in general, but he thought the density was appropriate. He said he knew there were planned and funded improvements in the intersection, and that was a huge deal, because he knew that intersection had problems with accidents. He said however, the two roads that came into Crozet, the 240 and Crozet Avenue, were not being approved in terms of pedestrians and bicycles, and they continued to dump more and more traffic into those. He said Mr. McDermott could appreciate that TIAs were helpful, but they were limited by this fact that if it was not 1000, they were not doing one. He said they could have three or four different developments all with 800, and even though there were 3200 vehicles, there was not a TIA completed. He said that was the challenge of whether the TIAs were giving a big picture view of what was happening.

Mr. Carrazana said he agreed with the density and thought it was appropriate, and wanted to keep these broader issues in mind, which was how they dealt with these two main roads that fed into Crozet. He said they were not thinking about them holistically at this point, and they only had little bits and pieces. He said he did not know how much Park Ridge would actually reduce the traffic along this area, because it mostly was traffic coming out on 240. He said he wanted to mention that it was a concern of his because they heard that from the community as well. He said otherwise, the mitigation factors that the County and Mr. McDermott had proposed were appropriate. He said he believed those four or five that were listed there would have to be included in that proposal.

Ms. Firehock said she believed they had heard everyone's perspective on whether the setback was appropriate and whether the sound could be appropriately attenuated with their current ordinances. She said she did not hear many objections to the density as proposed, but there was some clamoring about the massing and design detail. She said she would caution all developers to bring that kind of detail to the Planning Commission, although it was not currently required, because it made it very difficult for them to favorably understand what they were trying to propose.

She said that may be addressed with future changes to their zoning code, because they were consistently in this quandary. She asked if anyone felt prepared to make a motion to approve the rezoning and not the special exception.

Ms. More said she assumed they were separate motions.

Ms. Firehock said yes.

Ms. More said she was prepared to make a motion for approval of the rezoning. She said Mr. McDermott discussed the recommendations that were to be picked up. She said it was not ready to go to the Board, but it was not her job to say so. She said if she could see more detail, it could gain her support. She said if others wanted to make a motion for the special exception, they could, but she would not.

Ms. Firehock asked if there were two separate motions.

Mr. Herrick said that was correct. He said that there were two separate votes. He said that if the Commission wished to approve the rezoning, but disapprove the special exception, the Commission might consider a motion to approve the rezoning with both the conditions stated in the staff report and the condition that the setback from the veterinarian's office be 200 feet, to ensure that there was not a contradiction between the code of development on a recommended zoning map amendment and a special exception request that the Planning Commission was not inclined to recommend.

Ms. Firehock said she was unsure of what the thoughts were on the special exception other than Ms. More's.

Mr. Missel said he was initially not in support of the special exception but reviewing the mitigating factors and being reminded of the current ordinance that was in place, he was in favor of the special exception.

Mr. Carrazana said he was not in support of the special exception. He said there was more that could be done, and he did not believe they were seeing a development that was appropriate currently, and the special exception would only facilitate it.

Ms. Firehock said it would continue to facilitate something that did not make sense.

Mr. Bailey said he was not in support of the special exception but was in support of the density and rezoning component.

Ms. Firehock said that she believed Ms. More had expressed that same sentiment, so she would not ask for her comments again.

Mr. Clayborne said he was in the same predicament as Mr. Carrazana.

Mr. Bivins said he would support the special exception.

Ms. Firehock said she would support it as well. She said that would be four in support and three not in support. She said she would prefer if they reached consensus, but she thought they had

discussed this strange problem without actually knowing the truth as to whether the granting of the special exception did or did not make this development viable.

Mr. Missel said he believed it was three members in support and four not in support.

Ms. Firehock said she forgot to mark Ms. More's vote. She said thus they did not have enough support for the special exception request to be granted. She said that left them only with recommending the rezoning and not granting the special exemption request. She asked if anyone was prepared to make a motion. She asked for the recommendations from staff to be displayed again on the screen.

Ms. More said that she was prepared to make a motion. She said that she would want to do so with the conditions in the staff report. She said she did not fully understand Mr. Herrick's explanation. She said it was important to specify that the special exception was separate from the rezoning, but she did not want to say that they wanted a 200-foot buffer, so she did not know how to make clear what they were saying without including things that were not part of their discussion. She asked if Mr. Herrick had any suggestions for language.

Mr. Herrick said that if the general consensus of the Commission was to approve the rezoning but with certain conditions or adaptations to the code of development, he'd suggest the second paragraph displayed, but to add to that paragraph the additional conditions that they would like to see added to the code of development, whether that be a prohibition on overnight boarding (as Mr. Bivins had suggested) or that there be a certain distance of setback to the veterinary office (as others had suggested). That would be up to whoever was making the motion to recommend that the Commission add additional conditions to the code of development.

Ms. More moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of ZMA202000005, Old Dominion Village, for the reasons stated in the staff report, provided that the recommended revisions, identified in the staff report, are made to the application prior to the Board of Supervisors public hearing, and that there was an addition to the code of development that there was no commercial boarding at the veterinary clinic, and that the veterinary clinic was not connected to any kennel use.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion.

Ms. Firehock said she was wondering about the term "commercial boarding." She said perhaps they could word it to say, "overnight boarding not related to veterinary care."

Mr. Bivins said that was fine. He said if they did what the code of development had currently, they were saying that needed to be 200 feet away from the boardings.

Ms. Firehock said that it was not granted a special exception.

Mr. Bivins said the special exception was separate. He said currently, the code of development said the vet had to be 200 feet away from anything.

Mr. Herrick said that the code of development was citing what the County code provided. He said that the County code provided those additional restrictions.

Mr. Bivins said that was right. He said if they adopted this ZMA, the code was embedded in the code of development. He said if they adopted this, they would be sending forward that language and that ordinance, and if they did not adopt that other one, it was between them and staff to figure out whatever they wanted to present to the Board of Supervisors. He said he thought they were in a good place and could deal with these separately and without any problem.

Mr. Herrick clarified that Ms. Firehock had made some suggested language to substitute “commercial boarding,” He did not know if that was formally adopted as part of Ms. More’s motion, although Mr. Bivins appeared to assent to that.

Ms. More said yes.

Ms. Firehock said that was a friendly amendment accepted by both motioner and co-motioner. She asked for the roll to be called with that amendment.

The **motion** carried unanimously (7-0).

She said there was a question that remained about the special exception to reduce the 200-foot buffer to 50 feet around the veterinary clinic.

Ms. More moved the Planning Commission recommend denial of the special exception.

Mr. Carrazana seconded the motion.

Ms. More said she hoped as this moved forward, some of the suggestions people had could make a big difference in making it work.

Ms. Firehock said she did not think people were against having a veterinary clinic in this area, and the layout was problematic and seemed a matter of convenience rather than design. She asked for the roll to be called.

The **motion** carried 4-3, with Ms. Firehock, Mr. Missel, and Mr. Bivins dissenting.

Ms. Firehock stated, with Mr. Missel and Mr. Bivins reiterating this in their rationale, that the layout was problematic, and this seemed to be more a matter of convenience than good design.

Ms. Firehock said this would now move to the Board of Supervisors. She said they were satisfied with the densities provided but wanted to see more detail on massing and design but left that up to the applicant’s discretion. She said they imposed a number of conditions, and the Commission did not vote to accept the special exception. She hoped the applicant had taken all the comments to heart and would continue to work with the neighboring development that had voiced concerns about what was going on.

Recess

The Commission recessed its meeting at 8:09 p.m. and reconvened at 8:12 p.m.

Public Hearing

SP202100016 CVEC Cash's Corner Substation

Mr. Clark said he was presenting a special use permit request for an existing substation. He said the proposal was to upgrade the substation by slightly expanding the equipment pad and adding equipment for 25 kilovolt distribution. He said the location map shown on the slide was an area on Gordonsville Road in the northeastern portion of the County. He said as shown, the substation was located about 1,800 feet away from Gordonsville Road in the Cash's Corner area. He said this was an existing, nonconforming use; it was a substation that predated the zoning ordinance requirement for special use permits for these utility facilities. He said it currently converted power from the transmission lines of the site to 12 kilovolts for local distribution. He said there was a use for a gas pipeline station in Louisa County on this same circuit that would need an upgrade to 25 kilovolt distribution in order to cover its improved operation, and this would require some of the additional equipment to this site and within the one-acre square that was this parcel, the pad for equipment would increase by 13,104 square feet to 35,300 square feet. He said this required a special use permit to bring the use into compliance, but there were no parking or entrance changes, so it did not require a new site plan if approved. He said it would be subject to County approval of stormwater plan and a grading plan for the expanded pad.

Mr. Clark showed a view of the site from Gordonsville Road. He said it was about 1,800 feet away from Gordonsville Road and the existing equipment went as tall as 70 feet. He said the new proposed equipment would be about 40 feet, which is lower than what was there now. He showed an aerial image to show what was on the site. He noted that there was a Dominion substation adjacent to this site, but the special use permit only applied to the site highlighted in blue on the screen, parcel 45-C. He said there were also a few small trees on the southwest side of the parcel, which was where the pad would expand. He said the access was a gravel access road that let out to the public road. He showed another aerial image showing the conceptual plan. He said shown in gray was the existing pad, and also shown was the 63-foot expansion for the pad, which included the area where the new equipment due to the step-down from the transmission lines to the 25-kilovolt distribution.

Mr. Clark said he would briefly summarize the impacts of this proposal. He said the character of the existing use would not change and the proposed additions would be lower than the existing equipment, so the visual impact would not be significant. He continued that there would be County stormwater oversight for the impacts of the expansion of the pad. He said since there were basically two one-acre substations there already and this was just an expansion of one of those sites, staff did not feel the expansion would change the character of the surrounding area, which was largely agricultural. He said the electrical distribution was compatible with permitted uses in the district.

Mr. Clark said in summary, the one favorable factor was that the proposed upgrade met the utility's need for upgrading electricity distribution without creating significant new impacts on the rural area. He said staff identified no unfavorable factors. He said that staff recommended approval with one condition, which referred to the layout shown on the conceptual plan he showed earlier. He said he would now take any questions, and said the applicant was ready to answer questions as well during the hearing.

Ms. Firehock asked if anyone had any questions before they heard from the applicant.

Mr. Bivins asked to see the overhead image of the site again. He said that the two pads would basically be the same now. He said it appeared that the CVEC path was a little smaller than the Dominion path, so now they would be the same width. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Clark said that was correct.

Mr. Bivins said he understood all they were doing with this addition was squaring up the site and the plan. He asked if it was correct that this was for a natural gas company in Louisa.

Mr. Clark said that was what necessitated the upgrade to 25 kilovolt distribution. He said that happened to be the first use that came along first that needed an upgrade to this long-existing distribution system.

Ms. Firehock said she did not see anyone else who had questions, so she asked for the applicant to address the Board.

Mr. Ward introduced himself as Chuck Ward, the manager of engineering services at Central Virginia Electric Co-Op. He said the gas compressor station was an existing station called the "Boswell gas station." He said it was located approximately seven circuit miles from the substation, but from the substation to the site would be around three to four miles. He said there was a set of railroad tracks it would have to cross because it was to the east of the tracks. He said they were upgrading their facility by reinstalling a 1,250-horsepower motor, and the starting of that motor would cause a certain amount of flicker. He said it was similar to a heat pump starting in a house and causing the lights to flicker, but this motor was of a much larger scale, so it could cause more flicker. He said in order to minimize and keep the flicker within the allowable limits, and to keep the noticeable flicker down for the consumers around there, the substation must be upgraded, and part of the upgrade was to convert it to 25 kV. He said that would keep the flickering to the limits required and should be of very little notice to nearby neighbors. He said all of the property that was shown on the maps was currently owned by CVEC, and it was just expanding the fence on their own property, so they did not need to purchase any additional property.

Ms. Firehock asked if that was the conclusion of his comments.

Mr. Ward said yes, and if anyone had any questions, he would be happy to answer them.

Ms. Firehock said she did not see anyone who had questions. She said it was a pretty straightforward application with straightforward comments. She said she would now open the public hearing to members of the public.

There were no speakers, so Ms. Firehock closed the public hearing.

Ms. Firehock asked the Board if there were any comments or if anyone was prepared to make a motion.

Mr. Bivins said as a good neighbor to the county east of them, he was in favor of this, because he would certainly not want Louisa not to get a new business if they said no to this expansion of the particular lot.

Ms. Firehock said she believed they had clients in their own County.

Mr. Clayborne moved the Planning Commission recommend approval of SP202100016 CVEC Cash's Corner Substation with the condition listed in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Missel and passed unanimously (7-0).

Committee Reports

Mr. Missel said he attended the Village of Rivanna CAC last week. He said those people were concerned about continuing growth in their area and were in the process of looking at the master plan and amending the language of the master plan. He said they got through about two pages of it and agreed there would be work into the rest of the year. He said they had a formal vote to not change the boundaries of Glenmore.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Rapp why the Village of Rivanna had a CAC.

Mr. Rapp said he was not sure the exact history behind the formation of that CAC.

Mr. Herrick said that to his understanding, every part of a development area had a CAC, including the Village of Rivanna. He said that each CAC was supposed to shape growth within its separate development area.

Mr. Missel said he wanted to mention that he was told it had been disbanded but then reformed recently.

Ms. Firehock said she did not even know they had disbanded.

Ms. More asked if the CAC was on their own taking up the master plan.

Mr. Rapp said staff spoke and was still on the comprehensive plan and the ordinance as they all knew and were taking their attention from a long-range planning standpoint for the next several years.

Ms. More said that people give the Crozet CAC a hard time. She said that at the last meeting, Ms. Firehock said that she attended a CAC meeting where people asked what was helpful for the Planning Commission, and Ms. Firehock mentioned voting. She said they should make it clear to community members that there was nothing about a vote that was binding but was more like what Ms. Firehock suggested to that CAC in that it was helpful when staff could say how many people felt a certain way. She said the Crozet CAC had a rambunctious time with the master plan review they just went through, but she believed some Board members did not like that a vote was taken, but she still believed it was intended to be helpful and show a breakdown of opinions after the review of the topic.

Ms. Firehock said it was certainly in the purview of any CAC to vote if they had a certain disposition or desire for something from the County. She said it also was in the County's purview to say they were not able to get to them at that point in time and perhaps would in a year or two. She said she did not want to discuss the differences between the comprehensive plan and the master plan at this moment.

Mr. Clayborne said he attended the 29 North CAC meeting on February 10. He said that meeting was predominantly about the North Fork UVA Discovery Park. He said there was a proposal to rezone a portion of the North Fork to a neighborhood model district to accommodate residential zoning. He said it was an economic vitality tool in its sense, and he wanted to make the Commission aware it would be brought up to them at some point. He said there was a range of 200 - 1,400 residences, so it was a large-scale project, and he expected there would be a presentation brought before this body at some point.

Ms. Firehock asked Mr. Clayborne to clarify if it was from UVA or the UVA Foundation.

Mr. Clayborne said it was from the UVA Foundation.

Report on BOS Meeting February 2, 2022

Mr. Rapp said the Board endorsed the Rivanna River Corridor plan after a much condensed and graphic presentation, as was suggested by the Planning Commission and others. He said he was glad to see that go well. He said as they were in the middle of updating the comprehensive plan, they were endorsing these studies and plans in order to fold them into their updates so there would not need to be multiple simultaneous comprehensive plan updates. He said the Board also approved the rezoning for the Avon Street residential project that came before the Commission several months ago, which consisted of a mixture of multi-family and townhome developments.

Old Business/New Business

Ms. Firehock said that this evening, they quickly reviewed and took care of the application for the expansion for VCEC's electrical pad. She said that application and some of the other applications they had related to power, such plans to make poles more durable so they withstood bad weather. She said these projects struck her as things that might be able to be handled more effectively by simply creating some design and building parameters for them, and then if those were met, then the projects could proceed.

Ms. Firehock said they had a similar problem when they used to get applications for drive-thru windows. She said while some people wanted to review each application, they all seemed to be proforma, so they approved them. She said staff created standards for what should be done with drive-thru window design, and it no longer had to take up precious Planning Commission time. She said that may be something to work on in the future to create criteria for the poles and substations, so that maybe the applicant would not even need to come before them. She said it was taking up everyone's time, and in her experience, there was not disagreement about the need for power lines. She said perhaps staff could work on this as they continued their work on the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Rapp said it was something they could work on. He said they had already identified some of those and said tonight the only other thing he heard as a topic among staff internally was that when they received these rezoning applications and special use permits, what type of materials would be most helpful and what material should be required so that they had an emphasis on better design and better building form. He said recently they had been getting more technical documents that did not give the flavor of what the proposed development was and to highlight those features to best inform the public and staff in order to make the appropriate decisions and

get the best development they could for Albemarle County. He said that would be a focus in their ordinance revisions as well.

Ms. Firehock said she agreed and that was a great point. She said as they did more infill development, whether it was in Crozet or the growth ring around Charlottesville, they would end up with more difficult sites and things being put into tighter spaces, which inherently led to more conflicts. She said the building massing, design, setbacks, how things would be arranged, and how traffic would flow through a site required there to be better information given so that they could avoid those conflict. She said if that meant it took extra care and time to make proposals to develop Albemarle County, then so be it, because they all wanted a quality community.

Ms. Firehock asked if there was any further old business or new business. She then asked if there were any items for follow-up.

Mr. Carrazana said he wondered if there was a follow-up on the committee responsibilities. He said he knew there was an email sent out but did not know if there was a follow-up on that.

Ms. Firehock said she appreciated that, because it was on her list. She said she only heard back from a few people about the issues they would like to work on. She said people mentioned multiple topics, so if everyone could send three or four issues, if there was an issue that two of them wanted to attend that the work group was talking about, that was fine, because it did not constitute a meeting of the Planning Commission if two of them went. She said she would compile a final list and send it back out once she received everyone's comments. She said they hopefully would then have excellent, high-quality communication between staff and the work group, because she was still not sure how they were addressing things. She said she only heard from one or two people about the schedule where they met every other week. She said she supposed most people were not travelling, but she knew professional conferences were beginning to happen again, and she had a few of those coming up. She said if anyone had any of those to please send them to her so she could finalize the absentee list as well as the topic list.

Adjournment

At 9:40 p.m., the Commission adjourned to March 1, 2022, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

(Recorded by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards; transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 03/15/2022

Initials: CSS