

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes February 1, 2022**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, February 1, 2022 at 6:00 p.m.

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

Members absent: Daniel Bailey.

Other officials present were Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; Jodie Filardo; Bart Svoboda; Rachel Falkenstein; Tori Kanellopoulos; Lea Brumfield; Francis MacCall; Rebecca Ragsdale; Margaret Maliszewski; 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. She said there would be further instruction for public comment during public hearings.

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 an item on the Consent Agenda to approve the minutes from January 11, 2022.

Mr. Missel **moved** that the Commission adopt the Consent Agenda. Mr. Bivins **seconded** the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

New Business—Albemarle County 2044: Comprehensive Plan Update

Ms. Rachel Falkenstein, Planning Manager of the Planning Division, said that the Comprehensive Plan was a guiding document for growth, development, and investment in the County. She said the Comprehensive Plan was used to guide decisions related to infrastructure, funding, policy, programs, and review of development applications. She said the Comprehensive Plan outlined a vision for a 20-year outlook. She noted that public updates were required by state code, and the state code provided that the Comprehensive Plan be reviewed and updated if needed every 5 years.

Ms. Falkenstein said that the Comprehensive Plan was last reviewed in 2015. She said that the County had added 4,000 dwelling units since the 2015 review had been completed, and the median household income and home values continued to rise. She said that data from the County's equity profile showed the growth had not been experienced evenly across the County, and quality of life outcomes differed based on where individuals lived.

Ms. Falkenstein said that a variety of new policies and plans had been adopted since 2015, including plans for affordable housing, economic development, climate action planning, and the creation of the Office of Equity and Inclusion. She noted those priorities had not been included in the Comprehensive Plan. She said the Comprehensive Plan update was an opportunity to include recent work from the community and better understand the diverse experiences of community members. She explained that on November 3, 2021, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution of intent for staff to begin updating the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Falkenstein said there were 3 overarching project goals for the update. She said the first goal was to update the plan content to reflect recent County-wide strategic initiatives including climate action planning, economic development, and multi-modal transportation planning. She said the second goal was to ensure equity was integrated into the engagement process of the update and into the final plan content. She said the third goal was to improve the plan usability. She explained that the Comprehensive Plan document was lengthy, and the County wanted to streamline the document with clear priorities and measurable goals and metrics.

Ms. Falkenstein said that the update process would be broken down into 4 phases. She explained that Phase 1 would cover the County-wide growth management policies. She said Phase 2 would examine overarching policies. She noted that in the current Comprehensive Plan, those were referred to as goal statements. She said Phase 3 would examine the strategies and action steps for the update. She said Phase 4 would examine prioritization of the various topics and the final plan adoption. She explained the final plan adoption would go through a public hearing process with the Commission and the Board.

Ms. Falkenstein said a key part of long-range planning was a robust engagement process and plan for community input. She said the County wanted to conduct outreach and collaborate with community members that had not historically been represented in the process. She said the County wanted to implement a transparent community engagement and decision-making process. She said the County wanted to be clear about how community input was received and used in the process. She said the County wanted to provide consistent and varied opportunities for community input throughout the update process.

Ms. Falkenstein said that there were 4 areas of engagement for the Comprehensive Plan update—County staff, a working group consisting of community members, broad public engagement, and legislative review. She explained the Commission would vote whether to recommend approval to the Board, then the Board would make the final decision regarding adoption.

Ms. Falkenstein said the working group was a new approach. She said the County had announced an open call for members of the community who would be interested in participating in the working group. She said the role of the working group was to consist of community members who would provide input to County staff on draft materials related to the Comprehensive Plan update. She said the materials would include outreach, proposed engagement formats, and plan recommendations. She said the working group would also support plan engagement and outreach

efforts by disseminating information to their networks. She said that the County hoped to have a diverse demography of people on the working group so that they reach a broad variety of community members.

Ms. Falkenstein said that monthly meetings were anticipated for the working group, and there would be work done in advance to those meetings. She said it was anticipated that people would be in the working group who did not have a background in planning concepts, so training would be provided to ensure the process was understood and to encourage engagement with the content. She said members would also participate in and observe other public meetings related to the project. She said the time commitment for members was expected to be 10 hours a month. She said people from a wide variety of backgrounds were welcome, and no prior volunteer experience was required.

Ms. Falkenstein said there was an open application process for membership on the working group. She explained the application would be open for 1 month, from January 31 to February 28. She said there would be a project team to conduct outreach and spread the word across the County using available media and public outreach resources. She explained that staff would select the working group using a scoring framework in early March. She said staff would select members with the goal of including a diversity of perspectives and experiences.

Ms. Falkenstein said the Board had supported the concept of compensating working group members. She said members would be compensated for their time at a rate equivalent to the County's minimum wage—approximately \$15 an hour. She explained the working group would be compensated in order to integrate equity and inclusion into the planning process. She said the County wanted to ensure people who typically did not have time to volunteer would be compensated to account for their time. She said the expected labor and time commitment was higher than typical volunteer committees. She said compensating members was seen as a best practice locally and across the nation. She noted that groups associated with UVA and the health department compensated community members who participated in those processes.

Ms. Falkenstein said the working group would not begin meeting until the end of March. She mentioned that the Commission could have a liaison role in the working group, similar to other committees and groups in the County, in order to communicate between the Commission and the working group. She noted there would be written monthly summaries of the working group meetings by staff.

Ms. Tori Kanellopoulos, Senior Planner, said Phase 1 of the Comprehensive Plan update was called "Planning for Growth." She said growth management policy would be reviewed, evaluated, and updated through the lenses of equity and climate action. She continued by stating that options for updating the policy would be identified based on best practices and capacity projections for residential and business growth. She said Phase 1 would align the vision and values in the Comprehensive Plan with the County's values.

Ms. Kanellopoulos said the level of detail that would be included throughout the Comprehensive Plan would be identified in Phase 1. She said that a capacity analysis was in progress for residential and economic development in the development areas. She explained that the purpose of the analysis was to estimate the capacity of the development areas compared to the expected demand and future growth within the 20-year scope of the Comprehensive Plan. She said existing land uses would be reviewed, and a land use build out analysis would be conducted for residential, retail, office, and industrial uses in the development areas. She stated that market absorption

forecasts would be factored in to estimate the market-supported annual absorption rates for the land uses.

Ms. Kanellopoulos reiterated that the engagement approach included County staff, the working group, public engagement, and legislative review. She said the schedule displayed was intended to show the main engagement opportunities for each group involved. She noted that the working group application was released on February 1 and would be available until February 28. She said once the application closed, staff would begin the selection process. She said the background report for Phase 1 was being drafted, and it was focused on growth management.

Ms. Kanellopoulos explained once the working group was selected and the background report was completed, community workshops and working group meetings focused on growth management and policy options would take place along with 2 work sessions before the Commission and a final work session before the Board. She said staff would provide monthly written updates to the Commission and the Board as well.

Ms. Kanellopoulos announced the website for the Comprehensive Plan update had launched, and it was accessible at <<https://engage.albemarle.org/ac44>>. She explained that the website provided an overview of the Comprehensive Plan update, and it had a sign-up option to receive updates. She said community members could apply to the working group through the website, and engagement opportunities would be continually added to the website, such as pop-ups, meetings, surveys, and other activities. She said there was one question for discussion—whether the Commission was interested in appointing a liaison to serve on the AC44 working group. She said that if a decision were made, the appointment could occur at a later date.

Ms. Firehock said that a liaison with the AC44 working group was a great idea. She said she would like to defer the appointment to a later meeting. She asked if there was an anticipated meeting schedule for the working group.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that staff wanted to wait until the working group was selected so that members could be polled for the best meeting times. She said staff wanted to remain flexible. She said if a commissioner were in the group, then the Commission's schedule would be considered. She said the first meeting was anticipated to occur at the end of March.

Ms. Firehock asked how the relationship between the working group and Commission was envisioned. She wanted to know if the working group would provide the Commission with recommendations or if the Commission would be able to provide the working group with topics and projects to consider.

Ms. Falkenstein said the working group was initially intended to provide feedback to staff recommendations which would then be incorporated into the recommendations staff brought forward to the Commission. She said she was open to feedback if there was a desire for the Commission to be able to submit ideas for the working group to consider.

Ms. Firehock said it was important that the working group understand its role. She said there had been various committees where its role was not made clear to the members.

Mr. Bivins said that a streamlined process was good for everyone involved. He said he hoped staff would reduce the use of jargon in the Comprehensive Plan so that it was more accessible. He suggested that staff have a central database where all the materials, documents, and

information related to the Comprehensive Plan update would be stored. He said he noticed that people use the language of the Comprehensive Plan to create different narratives. He noted while those narratives could not be prevented, the language used in the Comprehensive Plan could limit the range of possible narratives.

Mr. Clayborne asked how many people would be selected for the working group.

Ms. Falkenstein responded that staff was considering a range of 8 to 12 people but wanted to remain flexible in case more applicants stood out. She said the project budget had to be considered because members would be compensated.

Mr. Clayborne said that the other arm of community engagement was also important. He suggested that staff conduct outreach where people spend their time, such as at the grocery store or gym. He said many people did not have dependable internet or the ability to come to meetings in person.

Mr. Missel asked if the parts of the Comprehensive Plan process to be streamlined had been identified or if the working group would identify those areas.

Ms. Falkenstein answered that staff had some ideas as to where to streamline the process, but there was not a list of specific areas. She said the level of detail to be considered in the plan would be decided in Phase 1. As an example, she explained that the level of detail would determine if the Comprehensive Plan should address recommendations for specific streams or establish a policy specific to stream health.

Mr. Missel suggested staff consider ways the process could be streamlined from an applicant's perspective. He asked if the capacity analysis considered the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority (RWSA), along with other infrastructure needs, and the schools.

Ms. Kanellopoulos responded that those groups would be included. She explained there was an internal focus group of interdepartmental leaders, and external groups, such as RWSA, would be included.

Mr. Missel asked if there were lessons learned from the 2015 process that should be carried into the upcoming process. He wanted to know if there were points of interest from the 2015 process.

Ms. Falkenstein said she was not best suited to answer that question. She said she started working with the County as the 2015 Comprehensive Plan was adopted. She said she would look for information to answer Mr. Missel's question.

Mr. Carrazana echoed Mr. Missel's questions about lessons from the 2015 process. He suggested that staff reach out to the community members and County government members who were involved in the 2015 process to gain their insight. He noted that the 2015 Comprehensive Plan was not well integrated with traffic, infrastructure, and schools. He agreed that there should be a Commission liaison for the AC44 working group. He suggested that there be dialogue at key moments between staff, the Commission, and the working group in order to be more productive.

Mr. Bivins said it would be helpful to have a work session on the limits of the County's operational and budgetary authority. He explained the County's authority and capabilities were different from the City's authority and capabilities, so the scope of the County's abilities should be explained to people participating in the process.

Mr. Herrick said Mr. Bivins was correct. He noted that there were different land use authorities for counties and cities. He said the differences were fewer compared to the taxing authority. He said a presentation could be given to the Commission on the scope of the County's authority.

Mr. Missel said clean air did not have jurisdictional boundaries. He said other jurisdictions could help inform a cohesive climate action plan that was regional.

Ms. Falkenstein responded to Mr. Carrazana's comment regarding the Commission's involvement in the process. She said there were 2 work sessions before the Commission planned for the beginning and end of each phase of the process. She reiterated that Phase 1 would include information about best practices, the capacity analysis, and potential options to consider for growth management. She said the feedback from the Commission would be brought to the working group, reviewed, and then brought back before the Commission. She noted a similar process would apply for the other phases.

Ms. Firehock said she had been told in prior conversations with staff that the Comprehensive Plan was too big, and staff would be moving forward with a different organizing approach. She said she wanted more information on how the plan would be structured. She asked if the structure of the plan would be discussed at a later phase.

Mr. Rapp explained that the Comprehensive Plan update process began with the capacity analysis, which would address Mr. Missel's concerns regarding infrastructure. He explained Phase 2 would address the framework for the plan—how was the plan composed, what was the level of detail, and what would the components address. He stated that Phase 3 would address the body material of the plan, such as land use maps, transportation plans, and housing plans. He said the process was step-by-step so that the different working bodies remained on the same schedule.

Ms. Firehock said she joined the Commission after the 2015 Comprehensive Plan was largely completed and did not work on its contents. She said her impression was that a number of working groups worked on a number of chapters simultaneously, which was why there were areas in conflict. She said the new process was good.

New Business—Additional Items from Committee Members

Ms. Firehock read a written statement.

Ms. Firehock **moved** to censure Ms. Jennie More for speech that was unprofessional and not in keeping with conduct expected of members of this body. Commissioner Clayborne seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously (5-0-1). Ms. More abstained from the vote.

Ms. Firehock said there was no process in place for reviewing the conduct of a member or enforcing a censure. She recommended that Ms. Price, Chair of the Board of Supervisors, engage in a process to create and adopt a code of conduct for members of appointed and elected positions in Albemarle County so that there was a written and agreed up standard for

communications and conduct and a process in place for when the code was violated. She said she felt it was important to bring the issue forward even though there was no established process.

Old Business—Follow-up Discussion re: Revised Meeting Dates for the 2022 Calendar Year

Ms. Firehock said the new proposed meeting dates came by a suggestion from staff to meet twice a month with the second meeting including a work session. She noted the work session would be held from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. followed by a break from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. followed by the regular meeting.

Mr. Rapp added that if adopted, the new meeting schedule would begin in April.

Ms. Firehock emphasized that the same number of public hearings would be held.

Mr. Bivins asked for clarification about the structure of the meeting. He asked if the work sessions would be held on the same day as the regular meetings.

Ms. Firehock said Mr. Bivins was correct.

Mr. Bivins cautioned having meetings at 4 p.m. once they were back in-person because it was difficult to navigate the roads at that time.

Mr. Rapp said that if the meeting schedule did not work, the Commission could always revert the schedule changes.

Mr. Bivins said he supported the proposed changes to the schedule. He cautioned that the traffic would make meeting times inconsistent once the Commission returned to in-person meetings. He said access would not be as easy as it was through virtual meetings.

Ms. Firehock noted 1 hour might not be enough time for the work session. She said the Commission had to adopt a meeting schedule, even if it were later amended. She said the meetings could be held earlier in the day.

Mr. Bivins said he supported the changes. He said the times would change and new challenges would arise.

Mr. Carrazana echoed Mr. Bivins concerns about travel time.

Mr. Bivins **moved** to adopt the proposed revised schedule for the 2022 calendar year, beginning in April. Mr. Carrazana **seconded** the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Ms. Firehock asked commissioners to continue to send in future meeting schedules, especially given the schedule change.

ZMA202100012 Skyline Ridge Apartments

Ms. Firehock said the applicant requested a deferral to March 1 in order to complete additional work on the site plan to address staff concerns.

Mr. Bivins **moved** to approve the applicant's requested deferral to March 1. Mr. Missel **seconded** the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

ZTA202100004 Zoning Text Amendment to Homestay Zoning Regulations

Ms. Lea Brumfield said new regulations were adopted to create the homestay use. She explained the homestay use combined accessory tourist lodging and rural area bed and breakfasts, and it included regulations to keep the impacts to surrounding parcels negligible.

Ms. Brumfield explained that in June 2020, staff came before the Board with proposed changes to the regulations and provided an update to the compliance program for homestays previously unregistered with no zoning permits. She said staff was directed to make additional changes to further the compliance work. She said in August 2021, staff came before the Board and was directed to begin updates to the homestay regulations. She said in October 2021, a resolution of intent was approved to bring the zoning text amendment forward.

Ms. Brumfield said the public purpose of the amendment was to provide consistency to the ordinance with regards to eligibility, language, and structure. She said staff was looking to reduce the amount of time spent of special exceptions related to setbacks for homestays. She said the purpose was in line with the County goals of reducing resources on unnecessary projects and providing clarity to the public along with the Comprehensive Plan goal of preservation of rural land.

Ms. Brumfield said that the resolution of intent was displayed. She said the resolution was adopted on October 6, and the aims were to reduce homestay setback requirements in the rural area and to codify the standard conditions of approval which required screening of parcels.

Ms. Brumfield said that the first proposed change in the ordinance related to clarity of the language. She said the changes were not substantive and would create better application of the existing regulations. She said two terms were added to the ordinance—"hosted" and "unhosted" stays. She explained that "unhosted" stay replaced the previously used term "whole-house rental," meaning the owner or approved resident manager was not on the parcel during the home stay and not immediately responsive. She explained a "hosted" stay meant the property owner or manager was present on the parcel and available as a host to the guest. She said the terms were increasing in standard use, and they were used by the American Planning Association (APA), and other municipalities.

Ms. Brumfield said the amendment proposed to reorganize the ordinance to make the format user friendly and to clarify the subject of the regulations and the parcel size requirements. She said the special exceptions would be included along with the regulations rather than in a separate section in order to clarify which regulations were waived by specific special exceptions.

Ms. Brumfield said changes were proposed to clarify points that caused confusion. She noted items such as how and when to present residency documentation, what kinds of documents were appropriate, whether a homestay host can leave the property to go to the grocery store, and what

kind of owner can reside on a parcel. She explained it was recommended that an individual owner of a homestay parcel must reside on a parcel unless a resident manager were approved. She said the change was not substantive but was rather clarifying how the County already interpreted the ordinance.

Ms. Brumfield said the second type of change proposed in the zoning text amendment was reducing the required number of setback yards for homestays on rural area parcels that were 5 or more acres. She explained the minimum yard setback was 125 feet from structures on all sides. She said it was recommended to change the ordinance to require primary structure setbacks, which in the rural area was 75 feet from the front, 25 feet from the sides, and 35 feet from the rear.

Ms. Brumfield said the proposed ordinance would require screening for all parcels that would have previously required a special exception, so any parcel where the setback was less than 125 feet in the rural area over 5 acres would require screening as if there was a special exception process. She said the screening was not codified and not a requirement, but it had been consistently applied to every special exception to reduce the setbacks for homestays in large rural area parcels. She said the screening was recommended to be consistent with section 32.7.9.7, which regulated site plans for commercial use and the language was currently used in the conditions of approval for all the special exceptions approved under current regulations.

Ms. Brumfield said the changes would greatly reduce staff and Board review time. She said it was estimated that special exceptions would take 20 to 30 hours of work per exception, and for the straightforward ones, 15 hours. She said primary structure setbacks were required for smaller parcels and residential district parcels, and it was consistent with regulations for major home occupations. She explained that major home occupations had more leeway in the use of the structures that were subject to the setbacks, and they were permitted by-right and were staff approved.

Ms. Brumfield said the last change in the amendment was to create consistent eligibility requirements to apply for a special exception for resident manager. She said all resident managers had to be approved by the Board for homestays, and only property owners of smaller rural area parcels and residential district parcels can apply for a special exception for resident manager—larger rural area parcels were not eligible for the special exception. She said one of the consequences of the regulation was that larger farms where a parcel may be occupied by a farm manager were not eligible to apply for a homestay use.

Ms. Brumfield said the County had been alerted of a homestay on two adjacent parcels. She said the property owner lived on one parcel fulltime, and on the other parcel was occupied fulltime by the farm manager. She explained that due to regulations, the owner could not apply for a homestay because the farm manager could not serve as a resident manager. She said that there were numerous inquiries for homestays on larger parcels.

Ms. Brumfield said it was proposed that all property owners could request a special exception for a resident manager instead of occupying the property. She said the larger rural properties were often distant from and unlikely to impact the surrounding parcels. She said the changes did not open up the ability for resident managers to be permitted by-right—a special exception was still required along with notification to neighbors, a review of the application for proof of residency, and a Board final decision. She continued by stating that prior zoning violations, neighbor concerns, and other red flags in the review process would be considered, and a resident manager

would still be required to reside on the parcel. She said vacation rentals were not a possibility. She said staff recommended approval of the draft zoning ordinance.

Mr. Bivins noted there was a difference in the ordinance between the use of an accessory structure and the use of an accessory structure built prior to 2019. He asked what was the reason for the distinction.

Ms. Brumfield responded that the distinction was intended to reduce new development in the rural area, which was consistent with the co-occupation regulations. She explained that a residential district parcel had to go through additional steps to get accessory structure use whereas if an accessory structure already existed in the rural area, it could be used for co-occupations or homestays. She noted that if an applicant wanted to build a new structure, they needed a special exception.

Mr. Bivins said that the staff report stated large commercial and transit lodge operations were contrary to the Comprehensive Plan goals for the rural area. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan supported uses for agricultural tourism and crossroad communities. He said he wanted a conversation about the County's goal to limit economic development to 4 types of properties—Clifton, Keswick Hall, Boar's Head Inn, and Albemarle House. He noted the activity ongoing in western Albemarle with tourism. He questioned if it made sense to encourage hotel or resort style lodging near agricultural tourism and crossroad communities. He asked what would prevent an applicant from becoming a bed and breakfast to avoid the hassle of homestay regulations.

Ms. Brumfield said a bed and breakfast was not a permitted use in the rural area. She said there were state regulations regarding registry enrollment, but that did not permit the use. She said the registry was in a separate section of the ordinance which referred to the state code. explained that an applicant was exempted from the registry requirements if they were registered as a bed and breakfast with the local health department, but they could not register with the health department unless a use was approved. She said there were bed and breakfasts in the County with approval under prior regulations that had 10 rooms. She said any new bed and breakfast would fall under the homestay regulations, which was the controlling ordinance.

Mr. Bivins said that he would like a further discussion regarding the acceptable land uses in the rural areas. He said the County was not facilitating economic activity and agricultural tourism in the rural areas. He said he did not want to build more houses, he wanted to keep money flowing into the community.

Mr. Rapp said that with the Comprehensive Plan update approaching, work had begun with the Economic Development Department which would address some of Mr. Bivins' concerns.

Ms. Firehock echoed Mr. Bivins' comments. She said there were no speakers signed up for public comment. She said she would go further than some of the proposed changes. She agreed that there should be increased tourism to the County. She noted the Board had previously prevented tourism focused developments. She said the County was missing an opportunity to provide lodging.

Mr. Missel noted that tourist lodging helped to absorb traffic and keep trips off the road. He said such considerations should be included in the traffic plan.

Mr. Bivins **moved** to recommend approval of ZTA 2021-04, Homestay Update, as outlined in Attachment 3 of the staff report. Mr. Missel **seconded** the motion. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Committee Reports

Mr. Missel reported that the 5th and Avon Street Community Advisory Committee (CAC) met on January 20. He said he was not able to attend. He said he was told the conversation related to onboarding and starting the year. He said the Village of Rivanna CAC was meeting on February 7.

Ms. Firehock said she had attended the 5th and Avon Street CAC. She said the CAC held officer elections. She reported that the most substantive topic of discussion focused on the importance of whether CACs should vote on whether to recommend a site plan or application. She said she told the CAC that the Commission received copies of the discussion, but if the CAC felt strong enough to vote, it was helpful because it was easier to interpret the intent of the CAC.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: January 19, 2022

Mr. Rapp said the Board held a public hearing on January 19 for a special use permit for the S.L. Williamson Replacement Asphalt Plant. He said the Board unanimously voted to approve the permit. He noted that there was a work session on the schedule for February 8, but he did not have a specific topic for discussion. He asked if there had to be a motion every time a work session was canceled.

Mr. Herrick explained that as long as there were no items scheduled for the meeting, when the meeting was closed, the Commission can adjourn to February 15 instead of February 8.

Items for Follow-Up

There were none.

Mr. Bivins asked how the Commission should consider the suggestion that a commissioner join the Comprehensive Plan update working group.

Ms. Firehock said she believed it was a good idea. She said commissioners should consider nominations, and she would confer with Mr. Clayborne.

Mr. Bivins asked if commissioners could be part of the working group for only part of the process and later change roles with another commissioner.

Ms. Firehock said she liked Mr. Bivins' suggestion. She said commissioners should let her know if they were interested in participating in the working group and for what phases and topics.

Mr. Rapp said he can send an email with the current chapters and topics of the Comprehensive Plan as a starting point.

Ms. Firehock moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Clayborne seconded the motion.

Adjournment

At 7:35 p.m., the Commission adjourned to February 15, 2022, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



Charles Rapp, Deputy Director of Operations

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 02/15/2022
Initials: CSS