Work Session

ZMA--2015-8 Adelaide Work Session - Planning Commission Recommendation

In a PowerPoint presentation Ms. Yaniglos summarized the proposal for ZMA-2015-8 Adelaide for a request to rezone parcels from R1-Residential zoning district to R6-Residential for a maximum of 93 residential units. No vote is being requested on the rezoning tonight. The work session is to ask the questions that were outlined in the staff report and get some feedback from the Planning Commission on those questions.

Work Session:
1. **Location**
2. **Proposal**
3. **Background**
4. **Questions and Analysis**

1. **Location - Vicinity Map:**
- The proposal consists of two parcels located to the north of 250W and adjacent to Cory Farms subdivision.
- There are currently 3 residences on the property, 2 access off of Rt. 250 W and 1 has access off of Brownsville Road.
- There is a stream and steep slopes along the western property line
- The parcels are located approximately 1/3 of a mile west of Liberty Hall, Clover Lawn and the Blue Ridge Shopping Center where Harris Teeter is located.

2. **Proffered Plan:**
- The applicant is proposing to rezone the parcels from R1 Residential which is 1 unit per acre to R6 Residential at a density of up to 6 units per acre with a maximum of 93 units.
- The proffered plan shows the street network and open space but does not show the types of units or the lots

Architectural Review Board Plan Submittal:
- However, the applicant did submit a plan for Architectural Review Board review which shows more detail.
- This plan is also the plan that the applicant has presented to the community and shows that the proposed unit types will solely be attached.

3. **Background:**
- Rezoning application submitted on December 7, 2015
- Community meeting with the Crozet Community Advisory Committee (CCAC) on December 16, 2015
- Second CCAC meeting on January 20, 2016
- Cory Farms Homeowner's Association (HOA) meeting on January 27, 2016
- Review comments from staff were given on January 29, 2016.

From the community meetings and staff comments, the applicant determined that a work session was needed with the Planning Commission prior to resubmitting the proposal to get some feedback and direction.

Questions summarized from the staff report:
1. How should the potential density for the development be calculated? What land should be available for calculating the density? Is strict adherence to the area shown on the Master Plan for Neighborhood Density and Greenspace required or should the area available for development be calculated using more recent County GIS mapping technology that better depicts the environmental features and includes the Route 250 buffer that is shown in the master plan?
2. Does the Crozet Master Plan mandate that these parcels be developed at the low end of the density range because the parcels are near the boundary of the Crozet Development Area?

Does that mandate that the low end of the density range be pursued? Or would development at the upper end of the range be possible provided that the proposal address the Neighborhood Model principles and mitigate associated impacts?

3. Should the proposed development consist of mainly single family residential units as designated within the Master Plan? If so, what percentage of the units should be single family residential?

Question 1:
How should potential density for development be calculated?
-The map on the right is the Master Plan. The dark green areas shown on the Plan were intended to represent the environmental features, critical slopes, the stream buffer and the Rt. 250 buffer.
- The map on the left is the current County GIS data that contains more accurate representation of the environmental features. The red/orange color is the current map of the stream buffer. The lighter green is the preserved slopes on the property. (See PowerPoint presentation.)

Combined Map: GIS data overlaid with Crozet Master Plan
- This map shows the combined Master Plan and GIS Data. The stream as mapped with the current data that we have in our County GIS the stream has shifted and so has the buffer in accordance.
- The critical slopes that were actually shown in the Master Plan are about the same. They were not completely captured in the green area. The difference between the two is about 5 units.
- If the intent of the Plan was to preserve the environmental areas, staff's opinion is that the more accurate data should be used to calculate density while preserving those environmental features as well as the buffer along 250.

Question 2:
Does the Crozet Master Plan mandate that these parcels be developed at the low end of the density range?
- Crozet Master Plan designates these parcels as Neighborhood Density Residential with a range in density from 3 to 6 units per acre.
- There have been concerns and suggestions by the community members that the low end of the density range should be used because the parcels are located near the edge of the Development area, and in doing that would be in keeping with the continuum of intensity of uses as illustrated in the Plan.
- Also the language in the plan states that development around center should progressively become more residential, less mixed use and less dense, and that Clover Lawn was designated as an important mixed use center.
- While density decreases away from Clover Lawn, staff does not agree that density was necessarily intended to be at the low end of the density range at this location. This is because the areas of very low density were designated on the Crozet Master Plan in a different color than that for Neighborhood Density Residential. As shown in the staff report these were shown as light yellow with black stripes.
- Community members have expressed their belief that a rezoning in this area should not occur at all and cited the section of the Plan that states that development along the Route 250 W corridor should not be approved.
- However, this section of the Plan was referencing the area near the Route 250/64 Interchange. When the Master Plan was being adopted and under review there was a question at the time as to whether or not to expand the development areas to include this area. However, the community recommended that not be so this section of the Plan was intended to give direction on future development in that area.
- There was also concern with the maximum density in regards to the maximum population in Crozet in that developing these parcels at the maximum density may cause the maximum density in Crozet to be exceeded.
- However, there have recently been several large parcels approved by-right at a much lower density than what is designated within the Crozet Master Plan.
- Westlake Hills and a portion of Foothill Crossing are two nearby examples which consist of approximately 213 acres and are being developed at a density of approximately one unit/acre. The

master plan recommends that it is the Neighborhood Density Residential, again, designation of 3 to 6 units per acre.

Just to summarize:

- The Crozet Master Plan designates these parcels as Neighborhood Density Residential with a range of 3 to 6 units per acres.
- Staff does not believe that the Plan mandates the lower end of the density range
- Staff believes that due to other parcels developing at a by-right density of approximately 1 unit per acre, that if these parcels are developed at the high end of the density range, the maximum population for Crozet will not be exceeded.
- Staff believes that if the impacts of the development, compatibility of building type, and the Neighborhood Model principles are appropriately addressed, staff would support development at the higher end of the density range, which could also help provide balance with the nearby by-right development that is occurring well below the recommended density range in the Master Plan.

Question 3:

Should the proposed development consist of mainly single family residential units? If so, what percentage?

- These parcels are designated in the Master Plan as Neighborhood Density Residential which is described as: "primarily single-family detached with some single-family attached/townhouses…"
- Staff recommends that at least 50% of the units should be provided as single-family detached units as this has been the practice for other developments where the term primarily has been used to describe a recommended housing type.

Questions and Recommendation:

Staff acknowledges that there are many concerns about the potential impact of this development including traffic and schools. However, these will be reviewed and discussed during a future public hearing on the proposal and really the purpose of this work session is to get input on the questions as outlined.

To summarize the questions:

1. **What land area should be used to calculate potential density?**
   - Staff believes the recently mapped County GIS environmental features including the Route 250 buffer should be used to calculate that density.
2. **Does the location of the parcels near the boundary of the Crozet Development Area mandate that the low end of the density range be pursued?**
   - Staff believes the Master Plan does not mandate the lower end of the density range and would support development at the higher end of the range if impacts are mitigated.
3. **Should the proposed development consist of mainly single family residential units and if so, what percentage?**
   - Staff believes that the proposal should contain a minimum of 50% single-family detached units.

The Planning Commission is asked to affirm these conclusions or provide guidance needed to help the applicant prepare his next submittal of the proposal.

Commissioner Keller thanked staff for the analysis of a very complicated set of issues that the Commission would be discussion from this point. He invited questions for staff.

Commissioner Spain said she was confused about the seeming discrepancy between the answers to question 2 and 3. If staff would support the higher end of the density how do you reconcile that with at least 50% single-family detached homes?

Ms. Yaniglos replied that the R6 zoning district allows for cluster development and the applicant could potentially cluster the units to get the higher R6 single-family detached units.

Opening for Public Comment

Applicant Presentation:

Kyle Redinger, representative for the applicant, thanked the county staff, in particular Ms. Yaniglos, for all the hard work that has gone into this application. It certainly has been an interesting process that he is relatively new to. He presented a PowerPoint presentation and noted he did not want to reiterate everything Ms. Yaniglos said, but just wanted to start with sort of the big picture and how they go to the design that they submitted to the ARB.

- Albemarle County is a desireable place to live with great schools in the Crozet area. But, what is happening is they are developing in an increasingly expensive and exclusive community, especially in Crozet. However, when you look at master planning process he thinks the Neighborhood Model creates an affordable and diverse community through the application of density. Without that density, especially in Crozet, we will continue to price people out of the area. Finally, we have heard a lot of comments from the community about how this should not be rezoned and not developed. He would like to reiterate that it is part of the master plan and Crozet is a designated growth area.

- Adelaide is a combination of three things. The first and most important is compliance with the master plan in building within the designated growth areas. Second, there is a function of the market for the types of housing that we want to build. Third, there is a need to create affordable options not just from a policy perspective, but from median wage earners in Albemarle County. Adelaide is a mixed income community that implements the master plan and creates a diverse and affordable housing types for hard working families of Albemarle County.

- Ms. Yaniglos summarized our public formal meetings very well, but there have been also multiple meetings through pre-applications with county staff, conversations on the phone over email with county staff, and with various stakeholders in the community. We want to build a community that appeals to a universal design buyer. So that means it has to be walkable and liveable for people to age gracefully in place. By complying with the master plan we want to protect the environmental features, and more importantly the rural area associated with Albemarle County. We do want to build affordable homes for new residents in the changing demographic as our county aging.

- The plan proposes all attached units. They would like to call out the villas, which he would go into later in more detail. We have proposed a design that allows us to shield some of the community from 250 and setback off of the road. This not only increases pedestrian safety but makes the community fit nicely into the master planning process. We preserve critical slopes as we have mentioned before. We are creating a walkable neighborhood community. We are also putting a walking trail on the front that will be pedestrian connections. They do have a mix of units. First are 14 affordable policy driven units, which are included in the R6 calculation. So if we take R6 times the affordable area and as part of that R6 we have developed 14 affordable units that are required by policy. We have mix of townhome units. Finally, the 40' wide villas that are attached mainly in duplex form. He would not reiterate all of staff's points; however, we agree that a more accurate assessment should be used to calculate the buildable area and to calculate the density and the intent it is my understanding as well is to preserve those protected areas in the master plan.

- Regarding question 2, he would like to call out that staff would support this so long as we comply with the Neighborhood Model. He thinks it is important to note that there are approximately 200 or so acres of property that has gone by-right in the Crozet area. It is important for the Planning Commission to discuss today why is that and why aren't we building the rezonings through the Crozet Master Plan. Also, why are we well below the recommended density range in the master plan?

- Also, important to call out because he did not think Ms. Yaniglos touched on all of these, there is a designation that exists in the master plan for lower density. It was not used for this site. Adelaide is about a third of a mile from a designated center, which is a Clover Lawn and Harris Teeter center. As he mentioned before and Ms. Yaniglos called out West Lakes Hills and Foot Hill Crossing ended up being by-right developments so you lost 213 acres of what would have been a rezoning opportunity based on the master plan. He thinks the last thing Ms. Yaniglos did not mention from her report is that by denying or not supporting rezonings on the higher end of density this puts more pressure onto

boundaries outside of the master plan boundaries, and this is not keeping with the comprehensive plan.

- These are market driven points for me. So about 55% of new housing demand in Albemarle County is for profit under $400,000. Crozet median home prices are rising above $400,000. If you split it between new homes and resales, new home median home prices is $550,000 well out of the range of most families in Albemarle County. Adelaide does help achieve a sub $400,000 price point and it does that through higher density. It is important to note if you start asking around about where people live you will find that working class families are increasingly living in surrounding counties and usually the answer you get is for affordability reasons. He thinks an interesting stat is that about 50% of county staff don't live in Charlottesville or Albemarle County. He thinks that is a question we need to be asking our community is why are people not living here who work here and provide services to our community.

- Finally, they are pursuing a real solution with a community partner for 14 proffered affordable units. If you talk to Ron White in the affordable housing group you will find that we are achieving our affordable unit goals through policy. There is a variety of reasons why that doesn't work. So they have gone out and taken an extra step to try to make sure this can happen and provide housing for people in need. He would also like to note because Crozet is a growth area we spend millions of dollars and countless hours of time in meetings on making a commitment to Crozet as part of the growth areas. Some of the real projects that we have seen are the Crozet Library, Downtown Streetscape, various sidewalk projects and road improvement. Finally, when we say R6 this is important to note that this is only for the buildable area. The total parcel only gets about 4.6 units per acres and that is including our affordable unit proffer.

- Question 3 is where we deviate from staff's recommendation. Staff recommends a minimum of 50% single-family detached units. So what we have proposed on the outer edges of the plan is a villa, which is an attached 40' wide home and so has about an 80' wide floorplan. It is an attractive unit; highly desirable in Albemarle County, and fits nicely into the Neighborhood Model design for a denser community. It allows us to do things inside the home that appeal to a buyer that wants to age in place. We can get a garage and a first floor master bedroom, kitchen and livable space on the bottom floor. That is very important for older buyers. The side yards and back yards that we are giving it give the units private outdoor spaces in a field of a single-family detached unit. Finally, there is precedent for rezonings where you saw 100% attached units in the Neighborhood Model, and Out of Bounds is one of those examples.

- The key points to reiterate is the master plan most importantly combined with market needs and affordability create the Adelaide project. Lots of money and time has been spent on Crozet as a growth area, but it is not being achieved as mentioned by the county staff. We agree with staff on the developable area calculation and density recommendations and we respectfully deviate from staff based on the rezoning precedent and a desirable fit of what we think is a market driven product, which is the villa home.

Commissioner Firehock invited public comment.

Public comment received from the following persons:

- John Savage, present primarily as a member of the Crozet Community Advisory Committee (CCAC), said this issue came before the CCAC last week and he will applaud Mr. Redinger since he has been open and available at all times to come and present his plans. It has been done with a lot of transparency. He read the Crozet Community Committee ("CCAC") Summary Comments on Proposed Adelaide Project Rezoning dated February 17, 2016 that expressed concerns regarding traffic safety along this specific part of Route 250, proposed density is inconsistent with other developments on this part of Route 250, proposed density is inconsistent with other development on this part of Route 250 and not encouraged by the Crozet Master Plan, encourage development with single-family detached homes at this location in accordance with the Crozet Master Plan and recommend denying this rezoning request. (Copy on file with the written minutes in the office of the

clerk) He pointed out having lived in Cory Farms for 12 years he was very familiar to this area because it was intermediately adjacent to that and he was aware of the traffic problems that would be compounded by the proposed development.

- Virginia Herring spoke in support of the proposal due to Ms. Herring's extraordinary circumstances and the high taxes she had paid since the death of her husband. Her understanding was this subdivision is going to be mostly compiled of older people and common sense tells her that these older people are not going to cause a traffic problem and there are not going to be that many children in this subdivision to create problems in the schools. She did not understand why Cory Farm residents were against this small division going in and did not think it would bring their property values go down.
- Tom Loach, Crozet resident, noted the Crozet Master Plan from the beginning protects Route 250 as a Scenic Byway. In the staff report it says the center is the most intense development while the middle and edges around the center become progressively more residential and less mixed use and less dense. That is what they are talking about here. As you go out from the center of Downtown or the center of Clover Lawn density should decrease and the color is a recommendation and not a regulation. This is a protection of Route 250 and that whole corridor. In the last five years the area from Clover Lawn down to Western Albemarle has averaged one accident a month with two pedestrian deaths. There is a traffic safety issue along this corridor. He said that all their developments that have come into Crozet other than by right have had 15 percent affordable housing. As far as affordability and all the other issues that have been raised he thinks the community has answered those over and over again. He felt the CCAC's recommendation not to rezone this is appropriate.
- Marcia Joseph, resident of Albemarle County, explained a conversation she had with a traffic engineer, Jack Kelsey, a couple of weeks ago. One of the things we talked about was the fact that he has designed and the bids are out for a sidewalk that will connect Cory Farms to Clover Lawn. The bids are coming in right now and so this will happen within this year. The other thing he is working on is a roundabout that will be at the entrance to Harris Teeter. There are so many improvements that have gone on in Crozet Downtown including sidewalks and the library. The Citizens of Albemarle County have made significant financial investment in the Crozet Development Area to make it an attractive place to live, promote walkability and to protect environmentally sensitive area. All have been done to comply with the comprehensive plan that encourages residential growth in development areas. The plan acknowledges that growth will occur and its goal is to direct the commercial and residential growth into the development area. Strategy 1A in the comp plan on page 3.7 says to continue to encourage the approval of development proposals in the development areas as a designated location for new residential, commercial, industrial mixed use of development Only approve new development proposals in the rural area that are supported by rural area goals, objectives, and strategies. Strategy 1B on page 3.8 regarding promoting development areas as the most desirable place for growth, continue to fund capital improvements and infrastructure, and provide a higher level of service to the development areas as we have in Crozet. Strategy 5A on page 8.30 to provide ongoing education to the public on the relationship in the Development Areas and efforts to prevent sprawl. Please consider the time and energy and funds that have been directed to the Crozet Development Area to make Crozet such an attractive place and think favorably upon this rezoning request for R6 density.
- Mike Marshall, past Crozet Community Advisory Council President, said he was actively involved in the creation of the Crozet Master Plan. He thinks it is ironic that Harris Teeter is called a center because it is a piece of stale of zoning which if we had not had it there we would have never put it there. The center of Crozet is Downtown Crozet. If you look at what happened in 2010 to the public's reaction to the master plan as it has been implemented since 2004 what they wanted was the concentration of density would be in Downtown with the density trailing off to a lower density. The idea is that Downtown Crozet is where the people go and they are not out on the highway. The Crozet Master Plan has two main lessons in it. We don't want 250 to become like 29 and Pantops; but, we do want Downtown Crozet to become more like Downtown Charlottesville. There is not another route to go around Crozet and 250 has to be preserved as uncongested as possible for it to continue to serve as the way you get around where the density really happens in the future, which is in Downtown with apartments that are affordable.

- Dan Rosensweig, city resident and representative for Habitat for Humanity of Greater Charlottesville, said he was not present to take a stand on the intensity of land use because that is a question for the Commission and Board of Supervisors. Mr. Redinger was kind enough to not identify Habitat as the perspective partner in this partner and he appreciates that if this got contentious. However, he was stepping forward to say if it does past we would be happy to participate as the builder of the 14 affordable units and actually bring mixed income to the neighborhood. Over and above that when he looks at the comprehensive plan he does see if you extrapolate the numbers from the 2013 update there seems to be a shortage of about 8,000 affordable units in the county. So anywhere there is development, again if it is an appropriate land use and if it is passed we are talking about potentially being a partner in this deal.
- David Stoner, Acting Chair Crozet Community Advisory Committee, said since John Savage gave the CCAC's comments he would give his personal comments. He agreed with what Mr. Loach just said. The comment about there are a lot of other by-right developments that have been done in the Crozet growth area and therefore that could be a reason this should be developed at a higher end of the density range. Again, just because by-right have been done elsewhere he did not think is the reason to justify higher density at the wrong spot. He agreed with the need for affordable housing in the county; but, if affordable housing needs to be dense it should be built in locations suitable for that needed density. For the reasons stated he did not think that density is appropriate for this stretch of 250. The master plan talks about this area as primarily single-family detached with some single-family attached and he thinks primarily should be 70 or 80. **(Attachment A – Crozet Community Advisory Committee ("CCAC") Summary Comments on Proposed Adelaide Project Rezoning dated February 17, 2016 submitted by David A. Stoner, Acting Chair Crozet Community Advisory Committee)**
- Timothy O'Loughlin, resident of Cory Farm, spoke against the proposal because the proposal is a significant departure from the master plan for many of the reasons that were discussed earlier such as what the proposed color coding designation and proposed street areas mean, etc. He took the master plan at its word when he purchased his property and decided where to live in the community. He feels the project is isolated and not walkable and pointed out the infrastructure projects referred to were not approved or funded. However, if he is mistaken he apologizes. At this time none of that is funded or approved. This project would be walkable to nowhere as it stands right now. The proposal is very dense and this tries to create a center where it does not exist at Clover Lawn. The pictures, site plans and descriptions shown in the comprehensive plan reflect almost all single family homes, and once again why one would expect that is what would be built on this parcel. He distributed pictures to point out the safety concerns surrounding the proposed entrance.
- Michael Salerno, resident of Cory Farm, said they have started a petition that has 47 signature that all echo these issues over the density of the area. This would be a high population density of about 50 percent more residences on approximately a third of the acreage. He agreed with the points raised pertaining to the traffic concerns. According to the traffic survey from Mr. Redinger 9,100 trips happen on 250 on this stretch of road while only 5,300 are on 240. That is one of the reasons that the thought has been having more growth along 240. If you look carefully in the report between 8 and 9 a.m. there 844 cars that pass by this location, and between 4:45 and 5:45 p.m. about 1,000 cars. Their traffic survey actually says it is going to add about another 782 trips per week. Unless there is something restricted there you don't really know exactly what the population mix is going to be adding more on to the already strained infrastructure. They are strongly against having a high density development with non-detached in this unit. This is not a very walkable area as it is not due to the ditches.
- Morgan Butler, with Southern Environmental Law Center, asked to provide some thought on question 1 in the staff report which is stated as what land should be available for development in calculating potential density. More specifically the question seems to boil down to how to treat areas that are designated as green space on the master plan but which do not actually contain environmental features such as steep slopes or stream buffers. Staff seems to be recommending that the areas in Springhill that were designated as green space but which do not include environmental features should be considered available for development as used to calculate density. Our concern with this interpretation is that there are significant areas throughout Crozet that were intentionally as green space in the master plan even though they do not contain environmental features. Indeed, when you look at the Parks and Green System Plan the category of green space that contains environmental

features is entirely separate from a different category of green space labeled other open space. The master plan goes on to explain that the other open space category consists of properties that are to be preserved that are not part of the environmental systems, but rather meet other goals of the master plan such as providing visual buffers, breaking up the appearance of continuous development and mitigating storm water runoff. In other words, there is a whole category of green space labeled other open space that was deemed important for preservation even though it does not contain few buffers, steep slopes or floodplains. To be clear there is just a small amount of it in this proposal, but there is a significant amount of it in other areas in Crozet. They are concerned that the approach that staff is suggesting in Springhill would mean that this other open space designation is essentially meaningless and that land designated as such should be considered available for development when the county is analyzing a proposed rezoning unless it also contains environmental features. That does not seem to have been the intent of the master plan and so he wanted to flag it tonight.

There being no further public comment, Commissioner Firehock invited applicant rebuttal.

Mr. Redinger said he appreciates all the colorful comments the public has provided in this project; but, he would like to reiterate a few things.

- Today they are not talking about traffic impact, but he acknowledges that when you have three major schools and a shopping center along a stretch of highway you do generate a lot of trips combined with people who are passing through. Our traffic study, which we have published, says there will be minimal impact on the traffic in the area and we are working very closely with VDOT and planners to design a safe and accessible way to access our community.
- On the points with regards to what area to measure he appreciates Mr. Butler's points and understands where he is coming from. He would argue that if you had a yellow area over a critical slope are you going to accept that as okay for development. He would say that the priority here should be using the best tools we have available to measure what a critical slope or what a protected buffer is and use that to calculate density because that was the intent.
- On the question of by right versus rezoning, he made a small list of all the things you don't get with by-right. One is affordability and the second you don't get a protective buffer along 250 and you don't get neighborhood design. We have been working very closely with Parks and Rec, and you won't get a trail dedication which we have proposed and discussed with Dan Mahon. There are a lot of other things that the community won't achieve as they continue to deny these projects and not support rezonings. He would further stress that it is rare to hear of a project being supported for rezoning in Crozet. This is why most of these projects end up by right because there is a very vocal minority from Crozet that does not want change.
- The issues of Downtown Center, he agrees that the center of Crozet is the most important center. But, it is important to note that it does not have the capacity to put in a Harris Teeter for a major commercial center like 250 does. There is more capacity based on traffic intersections, the road sizing, and the other axillary roads that allow us to do more along 250.
- Finally, the comment that 250 is not where people are and something that we need protect. We know that there are at least 9,000 people crossing 250 everyday. That is a lot more than Downtown. That indicates that 250 is an important place to develop given its access to a major and more important artery than 240 in the Downtown Crozet intersection.

Commissioner Keller thanked Mr. Redinger and invited questions from Commissioners.

Commissioner Lafferty said it seems that you have not hardly used the master plan. It says that the majority predominately single-family housing and you don't have any single-family housing in there.

Mr. Redinger replied that is correct and the deviation for that is on building a better product that is more affordable for people and more driven by market demands and things that people want than necessarily what the plan exactly specifies. Furthermore, that is why brought we brought this to this group to get input in the process to see what the opinion is of the Planning Commission on the type of product that we are proposing.

Commissioner Lafferty said he will believe that you are building a better product when you get other builders up here and say my product is inferior to theirs. The master plan is there as the guidance and there are two principles that are in the master plan that you are not adhering to.

Mr. Redinger replied on the builder comment, he understands what you're saying, but he spends a lot of time talking to builders and when he first visited the site he brought Craig Builders over and he has talked to every other builder in town about what the product they like to build and resoundingly people say this villa product is doing well right now. It hits a price point that is important for buyers and it also hits an aging in place type of buyer. So those two things make it very attractive. He thinks that is the deviation that where he disagrees with staff respectfully and he wants more input from people on the Planning Commission as to the interpretation of that.

Commissioner Firehock said she actually believes that we need a diversity of housing types because people have different needs in different stages in their life and they do need to have options besides single-family housing. She does not actually believe that just because Cory Farms is developed a certain way next door that necessitates that the proposal should just mimic Cory Farms. That said, in keeping with this diversity thing since this is a work session so this is just to work out ideas and brainstorm; it is not necessarily to vote you up or down, that she would actually like to challenge the applicant to try to go back to the drawing board and squeeze out a few more, handful, or bunch of single-family housing. One of the challenges was that my brother when he was younger lived at the townhouse developments that are all over northern Virginia and eventually they had to move to go find that single-family product. She loves duplexes and townhouses and thinks we need more of that product. However, she suggested that the applicant really try to work on their model and to try to fit some single-family housing in. The other thing is she knows you are talking about trail connections and walkability, but she was also sympathetic because she did not want to walk on 250 either. She suggested that the Mr. Redinger think about whether they could squeeze in some more pocket green space within the development. It is really nice if you are looking at affordability and people with young kids in starting families want their child to be able to play somewhere without having literally the whole family walk on the trail and go to the park. If you could find a way just to make it more interesting she thinks your product will also be more successful. She actually is in support of more density at the site.

Mr. Redinger replied that he liked challenges so he will would work on it.

Commissioner Keller suggested the Commission take the three questions one at time and let that outline the discussion. They would start off with question 1 and he invited comment.

Question 1 – how should potential density for development be calculated.

Commissioner Lafferty said he thinks it should be a combination of the best information we have, but with the overlay of what we desire as green space.

Commissioner Firehock agreed since she thinks the hybrid approach makes sense because yes, we have the better buffer engineered and the steep slope calculations more refined. But, that does not mean that people did not intend for there to be more of a buffer going down that, especially on the stream buffer line where it just sort of stops in the new version.

Commissioner Lafferty said they certainly would be amendable to somebody that came in and said we did an on ground survey and find that the stream is not where you are showing it on your maps, can we change it. He thinks they would say sure if you have a valid survey we will do that. Our whole point is to protect those natural resource and so taking the best information we can, but with the desire of the green space or the recreation, trails or things like that.

Commissioner Dotson agreed with what has been said so far, and Commissioner Spain agreed.

Commissioner Keller asked if that was considered enough direction on question 1.

Commissioner More noted they were talking about a bigger issue where we need to be consistent in the way that we look at all developments and not just this one.

Commissioner Firehock pointed out what we are saying is to use the newly calculated information, but to not then automatically throw out areas that have been colored in green because perhaps there were other intentions in terms of the screening or buffering.

Commissioner More said it was a bigger question to suppress.

Commissioner Lafferty agreed for development, not just this development.

Commissioner Keller suggested thinking about this whole issue of the mapping that we have had some questions about in a couple of other projects as a topic of discussion in the four special meetings.

Ms. Yaniglos asked just to be clear that the environmental features updated should be used along with the 250 buffer as outlined in the report; or, are you saying that the additional green space should also be used.

Commissioner Lafferty suggested that it be a combination of the two.

Ms. Yaniglos said so basically it is the yellow that is shown on the map, and so the green area that is not a part of the buffer would be taken out of the density calculation.

Commissioner Keller noted that all the Commissioner agreed.

Commissioner Dotson asked does it make sense to go to question 3 and then come back to question 2.

Commissioner Keller replied yes, it does and asked for comment on question 3.

Question 3: Should the proposed development consist of mainly single-family residential units? If so, what percentage?

Mr. Kamptner suggested that the word detached should be included since that is what they are looking at.

Ms. Yaniglos agreed that it should be single-family detached units.

Commissioner Firehock asked to comment on it quickly. She was really bothered by the word "primarily" being just a simple majority because she does a lot of voting work in her private life and that does not seem to be a majority since primarily is not 51% out of 100%.

Mr. Kamptner said he pulled up a bunch of definitions after the comment was made that they view it as 80%. The definition is for the most part chiefly, mainly, mostly and principally. If you are talking about a group of 5, then it is clear that 51% is going to be easily primarily when you are talking about just a pool of 2. However, you still meet the definition because it is mostly.

Commissioner Lafferty said that was right if you have 5 and there are 3 different ones and 3 different types so red, green and blue, and there are 2 blues, then the 2 blues are the primary.

Mr. Kamptner agreed.

Commissioner Lafferty said but they are not a simple majority.

Commissioner Firehock said it depends on depends on the total.

Mr. Kamptner replied no, but if the red was 51% and the two blues combined totaled 49, it is primarily red.

Commissioner More said but if you have 93 and you are showing none, then you certainly aren't meeting what is described in the master plan.

Mr. Kamptner pointed out the bottom line is the way staff has been applying the word primarily is consistent with what they are supposed to do. If the word is not defined staff applies a dictionary definition which in the context is reasonable. He thinks what they have done has been reasonable at this point.

Ms. Echols explained when going through the comprehensive plan work for the Woolen Mills site and how we were really trying to figure out what the mix of residential and non-residential was that how we came down on those numbers. However, that does not mean that the Commission has to use it because it is guidance. The comprehensive plan and the master plan is guidance. From staff's perspective there is a need to gain a little better compatibility with the Cory Farm property, but the grid design is the most important feature. Staff believes there needs to be single-family detached in here and looking at more than what they have provided to date would be direction to go. She did not know that the Commission has to settle in on 50, 80, 90 or whatever it might be. But, what has been provided is zero. So staff needs to know the Commission believes that at least one-half need to be done if not more than one-half.

Commissioner More suggested having at least one-half or preferably more single-family with the concept that you are trying to be compatible with existing surroundings; and, with the concept that if we are to accept Harris Teeter and Clover Lawn as a commercial center; then it should become less dense as you move away from that; or, if we are going to accept preferably Downtown Crozet as a center, then you become less dense as you move away from that. Maybe she is jumping back to #2, but it put it at the very high end of density, which is not what was intended by the master plan based on those concepts. So she would say to have it showing no single-family detached homes in this area is a misstep.

Commissioner Dotson said he wondered if that was a point of agreement around the table that showing no single-family is a misstep.

Commissioner Lafferty agreed.

Commissioner Firehock added in terms of buffering and providing more of a transition where those single-family homes might be located, again she is not looking at topography right now so it is not an intelligent comment, at least maybe next to Cory Farms, so that you ease the transition for the neighbors who are on the other side.

Commissioner Keller said as a designer he has to be the outlier here since he really disagree with almost everything that he has heard. The discussion of transportation issues begins to sway him in the other direction. However, just from a design standpoint he did not see why developments that are next to each other need to have an edge that fits together in a certain way as long as there is the pedestrian bicycle movement among them. If we think of any city that has developed over time there are neighborhoods that might be higher density development with detached residential areas next to them and little commercial nodes like we have here with the Harris Teeter in the strip mall across 250 from it. From his vantage point he thinks that the stronger argument is that there is master plan that says that there should be a decreasing density on the edge. That is where he can have common ground with all of you. But, he thinks of places in Portland, Oregon because of the land use regulation where there is a high rise building on one side of the road and there is farm land on the other side. He personally does not have to see this kind of transition.

Commissioner More asked to respond to that point. From a design standpoint she agrees and think there are places in Crozet and other places where that is very appropriate and it does not all have to flow in some certain way and there can be a mixture of densities. But, when you are looking at the concept of where this particular piece of property is located that is where the issue is for me. It is not necessarily about the property next door or the fact that it is green space on the other side. However, it is because of its location on the boundary of the master plan. What the master plan tells us is that is something that we have consistently tried to avoid as having density on 250 from the commercial center to be clear that was

a by right development and not something that was an intention of Crozet as far as development was to have Harris Teeter or Clover Lawn develop out there. But, she does agree with Mr. Keller's statement that there is a place for neighborhoods to mix and they don't necessarily all have to match up to one another. She just thinks this one is not in the correct spot because of other considerations.

Commissioner Keller noted that he just wanted the opportunity to have that say, and Mr. Dotson you can go back and he can then pretty much agree. He just thinks that the point needed to be represented.

Commissioner Dotson said what he was thinking was we are saying to the developer and staff to try out some possibilities that are different than what you have got. Maybe it is 50% of the dwelling units, but maybe it is 50% of the land area.

Commissioner Lafferty said he thinks they should be sensitive and aware of form and compatibility of neighborhoods, and Commissioner Keller agreed.

Ms. Echols asked if there was consensus that they need to do more with the single-family and that showing no single-family detached is a misstep. Therefore, they need to be doing some different design that brings in more single-family since it may affect density and the number of units that they are able to provide.

Commissioner More commented that the master plan indicates that it can be, but it does not say that it should be. So she thinks maybe a little more discussion about safety on the road could happen, but we have discussed other reasons why it is saying that it should come in at the lower end of the density range. Part of that question that is not up there on the screen that is on here talks about the impacts of the development. So she would like to take the opportunity to point out that one person spoke about the roundabout and improvements at the Harris Teeter and Clover Lawn happening very soon, and she would say that statement hugely inaccurate. We worked hard for months and months just to get the suicide lane restriped to give dedicated turn lanes to that strip. She knows that project is in a conceptual phase, but to say that it is happening very soon is not an accurate statement in my opinion based on all the research she has done and her discussions with Ann Mallek. That speaks to a lot of the safety concerns that already exist without this density being put onto 250.

Mr. Benish pointed out that he did not remember the exact details; however, there is funding for that project. The county applied for and received revenue sharing funding for two projects that are batched together, this project and one other project. But, 3.5 million are set aside for those two projects. So there is funding and the project is under design. Until the project design is complete we don't know what the full amount of the funding is and whether there may be short fails. That is the best he can tell you from afar. However, it is a project that is in design and monies have been set aside for it to some extent. But, when it is ready to be constructed he was not sure since the final design has not been completed.

Commissioner Spain said she would like to speak to the safety issue that has come up so many times. Mr. Loach mentioned that there has been two deaths in five years and one accident a month. She thinks before you can really evaluate this safety level you need to compare those statistics with other stretches of road with comparable traffic. It may turn out that the resident's perception of the dangerous part of the road is not as accurate as they may feel. If they think that way they are going to think that way, but it might be useful to gather statistics from other parts of the county.

Commissioner Keller noted that was going to speak to roundabouts from a design standpoint since he loves roundabouts as a way to deal with congestion and clogging of arteries. From a design standpoint, they are extremely difficult for the pedestrian and pedestrian movement from one side to another, including bicycles. It could very well be a great solution to one set of issues, but it could exasperate another set of issues. Again, this is such a complex piece. He applauds everyone for coming and weighing in and trying to assist the developer. He also applauds the applicant in trying to respond to the comprehensive plan.

Commissioner Lafferty said since we have slipped off topic a little bit he asked to ask Dan Rosensweig what affordable housing is defined as price wise and what he would consider an entry level of affordable housing.

Dan Rosensweig addressed Mr. Lafferty's questions regarding what he would consider an entry level of affordable housing.

Ms. Echols said she knew the Commission wants to wrap up, but actually she wanted to make a comment about the traffic and the traffic impacts. What we have said in the staff report has to do with the need to mitigate those traffic impacts. The density whether it is at the low or the high end of the range the applicant has got to demonstrate that he has mitigated the impacts. So the idea is that the traffic and those impacts will be considered a little bit later and definitely would be part of this consideration. However, good design and mitigating the impacts are what we are saying are the most important features of how you do Neighborhood Model type of development. The density, whether it is the higher or the lower end of the range, we will be looking at those mitigation of impacts, just not right now.

Commissioner Firehock asked to reiterate, like a broken record, that we've went down the three question pathway, but she just wants to throw back in as staff is writing up what they think they heard the Commission say. She did say that I would like the developer to try to incorporate more green space, pocket park types of situations, community gathering space within the development itself. We are losing a tremendous amount of green resources to develop this site, and so I wanted to create a sustainable livable enjoyable community that people will not move out of as soon they get a little more money. I would like to create a more stable community and having usable green space is part of that. So I don't think anyone here disagrees with me on that topic. So I would like to throw that back on the list.

Commissioner Dotson said he might just piggyback on it that he thinks there are several places in the staff analysis and the applicant statement that we have seen where there is talk about trails, walkways, connections and so forth. It is not a fault that it has not be shown very clearly yet where that happens; but, when it comes back I think that is going to be very important so that this does not look like a little island like a miniature Australia sitting there. He would like some bridges and other things to connect it.

Ms. Echols asked if the Commission answered the second question.

Commissioner Lafferty noted that it was in between; but, it is not mandated one way or the other.

Commissioner Riley said she would step up and say even though she does not think it mandates that it be at the longer end of the range of density she thinks we need to send the communication that we would like to see something between the high end and the low end. She would like see a few scenarios for grading and more single-family detached housing, and Commissioner Keller agreed that was his interpretation as well.

Commissioner More agreed that it does not mandate it; but would say what they are looking at based on the master plan that it should be the low end of density.

Ms. Yaniglos pointed out as a point of clarification the R6 designation does allow for smaller lots and like Ms. Firehock mentioned you could do a smaller house, single-family detached unit; but, you could still have a 6 unit per acre development. She asked for clarification because what she is hearing is in the middle. She asked if it is 4 to 5 units per acre because the applicant really needs that clarification. Is he looking for 3 units per acre or 5 or 6 units per acre?

Commissioner More noted at 93 units the applicant stated that he was coming in 4 point something units per acre.

Ms. Yaniglos pointed out the applicant was stating the gross density and not the net density, which is how staff calculates density in this case for rezoning. The applicant was specifically talking about including the

green space areas in that density calculation so 93 units would be a 6 unit per acre with just the yellow area as designated for development.

Commissioner Firehock said she thinks good design solves a lot of problems and so was not prepared to say the perfect density at this point. However, she did not have a problem with density. When people talk about problems with density they are really talking about problems with traffic, they have perceptions of more crime, they have perceptions of safety problems, and many other issues related to around density. But, nevertheless, she would rather see the developer try to do some creative design and come back to the Commission since she was not prepared to give staff the magic number.

Commissioner More agreed that there is not a magic number. However, she thinks they are talking about the scenic byway, entrance corridor and there has been a consistent effort not to just pick on this one development to keep density and development off of 250. Mr. Loach spoke about the efforts to pull Old Trail's Downtown Center off of 250. It is not about this one project; but, when there are opportunities to get off of 250 and away from the boundary line that has been consistently the view of the Crozet community.

Ms. Echols noted staff is hearing two different perspectives here and they need to get the guidance from the Commission as a whole. It does not provide good guidance if the Commission does not have either some kind of consensus or majority feeling one way or the other about this. She suggested that the Commission look at that just a little more closely as a group to provide guidance that would be better for the applicant.

Commissioner Keller asked to make a comment and question maybe the premise that we all have been working on that we might want to think about in this next year about how the density is counted by staff. He thinks from a good design standpoint it is not the density in the undeveloped area, but it is the density of the whole of a parcel that really gives freedom in the design. That is why he is having difficulty in this given the rules that we operate under and the Commission needs to give staff an answer for this. But, beyond this he thinks we might want to talk about that some more, especially given the kind of parcels that there are in greater Crozet.

Mr. Benish reiterated what we have heard: The Commission wants a mix of single-family detached infused; and, direction was given to use the comprehensive plan map that is a little more conservative in the amount of area that is going to result in the net density. That is guidance that staff needed to get from the Commission. It sounds like the form in the quality of development is more paramount than whether it is at the low or high end and unless the Commissioners can come to a clear consensus on a number that is the direction that the applicant can take forward. If the Commission does think that they can give us some consensus as we prefer to be on the low end or the high end or give staff anything more definitive other than to work on the form, address the open space characteristics, address the public spaces, and a healthy mix of single-family detached and then see what that product results in as we move forward.

Commissioner Keller asked Ms. More to take a shot at a lower number if she so desired.

Commissioner More replied that she did not know that we are being asked to pick a number. However, we have given feedback that we are interested to see what kinds of concepts can be come up with regarding some creative planning that may make for something that transitions better from the adjacent property that might make more sense in that space. But, the question about the master plan my interpretation of other aspects of the master plan would call for it to come in on the lower end. She was not going to give a number. However, if the question is high end of low end it should come in at the low end. She is very open to creative concepts that may speak to some of the issues that are at hand. She thinks there are a lot of ways that the property could be developed and address some of these issues and still allow for some of the benefits that it could provide to the community. However, to answer the question she thinks the master plan speaks to other areas that say it should come in at the low end.

Commissioner Lafferty agreed that the master plan is clear on the fringes that the density should go down. There is some question about where is the center, which he thinks is where the library and The

Square is. That has always been the definition and can't be moved to Harris Teeter, Jarmon's Gap or wherever. This is the way the master plan is designed, which makes this parcel on the fringe. So it should be of a lesser density. He can't come up with a number; but, it should be lesser than as you go interior closer to the town center.

Commissioner Dotson said he thinks staff has probably got all the direction they are going to get. He asked to make one sort of heretical observation, the problem is Cory Farm is too lower density. If that were higher density then as this tapered off as you went further away it might be in the 3 to 6 range.

Commissioner Lafferty noted that compatibility is important.

Commissioner Keller thanked everyone for their comments.

The meeting moved to the next agenda item.

New Business

Mr. Keller invited committee reports.

- Ms. Firehock deferred to fellow Commissioner to give the report on the Southern Albemarle Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

- Ms. Riley reported the following:
  - Southern and Western CAC at this point are going to remain together. The committee met, elected officers and will be meeting next month.
  - She attended the Historic Preservation Meeting yesterday and two items were discussed: Cool Springs/Dawson Farm and as a committee putting together a list of all the properties in the county that have at any point in time served as a tavern.

- Ms. Spain reported the following:
  - Places29 North Committee meeting scheduled for last week was cancelled because of snow. The next meeting will be in March.
  - Last night Mr. Keller and I attended the Pantops Community Advisory Committee and there two issues. There will be a public safety station built on Pantops. It won't yet have a firetruck, but it will have an EMS crew. That is being built on land donated by the Worrell Company. The other main point of business had to do with the pedestrian bridge across 250. Diane Berlin, who is the chair of the committee for the walkability on Pantops gave an update about where things stand, and there will be a working session on March 19 at Broadus Church. Members of the committee are expected to attend the meeting. There were a few comments from the public and the meeting adjourned after two hours.

- Mr. Lafferty reported that Places29 Hydraulic Road Committee met and discussed the projects ongoing that included the sidewalks along Garth Road Extended on the south side of it trying to get a path for people who walk to town from the store on the other side of Georgetown Drive and the improvements going on there. They spent a lot of time of covering budget projections and expenses going up.

- Ms. Firehock said she sent the Commissioners a request for some topics for discussions. Nevertheless, she only heard from Commissioner Riley and asked for input from other Commissioners. Staff is planning on coming back to us about affordable housing. She thinks they wanted to try to add more structure to that conversation. Other potential items were proffers and economic development. They are going to try to set up four different in depth discussion and the point is not have it as something that comes up in the middle of someone's site plan, but rather something we could have a deliberative conversation, invite experts to come and talk with us and come up with a list of questions we would like to tackle during the session. If anyone has thoughts, please send them