

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
DRAFT Minutes August 6, 2019**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, August 6, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Lane Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Tim Keller, Chair; Julian Bivins; Daphne Spain, Vice-Chair; Jennie More; Pam Riley; Bruce Dotson; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: Karen Firehock.

Other officials present were David Benish, Interim Director of Planning; Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission; and Andy Herrick.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Keller called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Public Hearing Items

ZMA201000018 Crozet Square (Barnes Lumber)

Mr. Keller asked for the staff report.

Mr. David Benish said that the proposal was to rezone approximately 6.24 acres from HI Heavy Industry and C-1 Commercial to DCD Downtown Crozet District. He presented an outline of the property, noting that it shows more than what was being rezoned and that it shows the full size of the Barnes Lumber property which was the location for the full interconnection of the Main Street roadway.

Mr. Benish highlighted some of the major points about the area. He said that there was a county-initiated rezoning of the Downtown Crozet area to DCD in 2008, and that the Barnes Lumber property was intended to be part of this rezoning. Mr. Benish said that Barnes Lumber was actively operating at the time, but the owner declined to participate in the rezoning at that time due to concerns with the potential impacts and implications to his business. He said that the business subsequently ceased to operate in 2011, and the county received the first application for the entire property in 2010 (which was a different applicant than the one proposing the new rezoning). Mr. Benish said that the applicant deferred their request and subsequently, the current applicant purchased the property in 2014. He said that in 2017, the applicant modified the proposal from a proposal on the entire site to the 6.24-acre parcel, and that the applicant had been working with the community and the county to develop concepts that implement the vision of the Crozet Master Plan since the purchase of the property in 2014.

Mr. Benish said that also relevant to this proposal was that the Board of Supervisors approved a development agreement (performance agreement) that provides for some commitments to improvements and construction of a public plaza and roadway network. He said that the roadway network (referred to as "Main Street" in the Master Plan and as "primary street" in the application plan) had received revenue-sharing funding, Virginia State funding, and was

currently under design.

Mr. Benish said that since 2014, the applicant had a number of public engagement processes and a high level of interaction with the community in various forms, which had included updates with the CCAC (Crozet Community Advisory Committee) and ongoing work with the Downtown Crozet Initiative group.

Mr. Benish said that in terms of the Comprehensive Plan recommendations for the area, the land use designations were Downtown (which calls for a mixed-use development promoting commercial employment, office uses, and residential uses) and Mixed-Use Research and Development Flex and Commercial designation (a subset of the Downtown district located on a portion of the property, which makes up a small portion of Phase I). He said that the Downtown area was designated as the highest priority area, or most central area, identified in the Master Plan.

Mr. Benish said that the Master Plan also calls for the construction of a civic green and plaza in the Downtown area and the construction of Main Street. He indicated to the street on the map.

Mr. Benish said that the vision for the Crozet area emphasizes the Downtown area, which was envisioned to be a vibrant place for shops and housing, with [inaudible], parks and open spaces being key features and amenities, as it would be the largest and most important center downtown.

Mr. Benish said that the DCD district being requested for rezoning was an elementary form of a form-based type district but did possess elements that dictate the physical form of development and arrangement of the uses. He said that the DCD was intended to implement both the Neighborhood Model principles and the specific goals for the Downtown area to be a vibrant, urban downtown area.

Mr. Benish said that the presence of a DCD rezoning district, with its form elements, eliminates the need for a code of development typically seen with a rezoning. He said that it also lessens the need for a detailed application plan. Mr. Benish noted that guidelines for the DCD district were attached to the commissioners' reports.

Mr. Benish presented a graphic of the development proposal, with the Phase I development of the entire Barnes Lumber site shown in yellow. He said that the concept at this point in time was to have 58,000 square feet of retail; a hotel of approximately 40,000 square feet; about 29,000 square feet of office; and potentially 52 residential units. Mr. Benish said that the future phases, which were not subject at present time to the Commission's review, were also presented in the slides and provides an indication of what the size may be.

Mr. Benish presented a conceptual layout of the development and said that under the DCD district, there isn't a need at present time to focus on the detail of the building orientation and massing as it was provided by the DCD district. He said that the layout gives a sense of what the applicant was looking at in terms of a block and building form, and that it was generally consistent with what the DCD would require. Mr. Benish indicated to the plaza located in the center, which was approximately 25,000-30,000 square feet in the rendering and could be confirmed by the applicant.

Mr. Benish said that regarding the major elements of the development agreement, the

agreement calls for the construction of the Main Street roadway, in cooperation and coordination of the county. He explained that this roadway would be from the existing Library Avenue eastward to the existing road network. Mr. Benish said that the project calls for the developer to contribute \$2 million, or the locality's match for the revenue sharing project request, noting that VDOT funds the other portion of this. He said that the county was managing the project and will be responsible for certain aspects of the plaza design that bleeds into the road, such as the crosswalk features and other design elements. Mr. Benish said that otherwise, the road was part of the VDOT system and will be maintained by VDOT.

Mr. Benish said that the civic plaza was the other major component that was identified in the development agreement, and a private developer was the construction contractor for this. He said that the developer was requiring a \$1.6 million loan to construct the project and was responsible for the site plan for the plaza. Mr. Benish indicated on a slide to the county's contributions and noted the matching share of contributions. He said that the project will ultimately be dedicated to the county and will either be operated by the county through contract with another entity, or directly by the county.

Mr. Benish said that the applicant was proffering the application plan and makes a commitment under the rezoning to construction the civic green and roadway network. He said that the applicant also, through a proffer, was offering to undertake a fund a Central Crozet transportation study to evaluate needs for further improvements in the downtown area and to contribute funding towards improvements identified in the study.

Mr. Benish presented the proffered application plan and noted that it was a simple block plan. He said that the DCD requirements would dictate the form of the development, but that the plan did identify the civic plaza and road network being constructed.

Mr. Benish said that staff had found the proposal to be consistent with many elements of the Master Plan and was helping to construct a number of the features and infrastructure elements that were important to Downtown. He noted there will be traffic impacts and impacts to intersections along Crozet Avenue, including Jarman's Gap Road, Library Avenue, and Three Notched Road; however, the overall network improvements being provided through the development, such as the interconnection of the roadway and the funding of the traffic study, were important elements that will address transportation issues downtown in the longer term. Mr. Benish said that he could discuss traffic impacts in more detail after the presentation, if necessary.

Mr. Benish said that there was potentially a school impact if the 52 apartment units were developed; however, staff feels those impacts were minimal, with about 6 elementary school units. He said that Crozet Elementary School was over capacity, but the impact from the potential level of development proposed was relatively limited. He noted that as the next phase of development occurs, if there was an expectation for a higher level of residential development, school impacts will be considered at that time.

Mr. Benish said that affordable housing, which was typically sought after in a rezoning proposal, had not been offered in this particular 6.24-acre portion of the proposal. He noted that no other properties rezoned to DCD were subject to the cash proffer policy and at the time of the county-initiated rezoning, this property would have been rezoned to DCD and would not at that time been subject to the affordable housing policy. Mr. Benish said that staff had concluded that to subject this property to the policy would put the property and its owner at a competitive

disadvantage to other DCD-zoned properties in the area.

Mr. Benish acknowledged there may be an additional demand and pressure for parking in the greater Downtown area from the development of this site, which was an ongoing issue now. He said that while parking will be provided for the development, the continued growth and popularity of the Downtown area would continue to generate the parking issue. Mr. Benish said that the development agreement did call for the county to initiate a parking study as part of the Crozet Master Plan update, which was in the process of beginning at present time. He said that over the next year, the county will be undertaking a study of parking needs downtown.

Mr. Benish said that regarding the environmental and historic resources, the site was within the Crozet Historic District and there were no contributing structures in this area. He said that the applicant was working with the community and staff on design guidelines for the site, noting that a portion of the site was within the Entrance Corridor and will be subject to ARB review. Mr. Benish said that there were also efforts underway to work on overall design guidelines in conjunction with the community and county staff.

Mr. Benish said that there had been an initial assessment of soil contamination in the area, and the county had received a grant to further assess these issues and potential remediation. He said that the developer had contributed the match for this grant.

Mr. Benish said that factors favorable were listed in the staff report and that the plan was consistent with the recommendations in the Comp Plan. He said that it was in a priority area where the county was encouraging development to take place. Mr. Benish said that there were a number of improvements to infrastructure in the area that staff feels will address some of the traffic implications generated from the development.

Mr. Benish said that factors unfavorable were traffic impacts and existing conditions there now that were continuing to degrade. He said that there was a potential impact to Crozet Elementary School. Mr. Benish said that the parking issue may continue to grow in the area.

Mr. Benish said that based on the favorable factors, staff recommends approval of the proposal. He offered to answer any questions from the Commission.

Ms. Spain asked if another example of a DCD could be provided.

Mr. Benish said that the DCD district was only in the Crozet Downtown area. He said that the building with the barbecue adjacent to and across from the library (Piedmont Place) was a building that was built under DCD zoning.

Ms. Spain asked if there was another DCD in the county.

Mr. Benish said that no, and that Downtown Crozet District was specifically identified and developed for the downtown area. He said that what they were considering for Rio-29 would be a similar exercise that would be creating another form-based code zoning district much like the county did for Crozet. Mr. Benish said that the DCD was currently the only example of this form of zoning at this time.

Ms. Spain asked if it might be something that Scottsville or other areas could follow.

Mr. Benish said that yes, this was possible. He said that what staff was investigating for the major priority areas and center areas might be this type of district, moving forward, which was what was being undertaken currently in the 29/Rio Road area.

Mr. Keller asked if there were other questions for staff. Hearing none, he opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Frank Stoner, a principal with local development firm Milestone Partners and with Crozet New Town Associates (the property owner), thanked staff for their work as they had been meeting weekly for a year to assemble the development agreement and work through the issues relating to the redevelopment of the property. He said that they were in the fifth year of planning the project and last came to the Planning Commission in June 2014 and at that time, they were seeking rezoning for the entire property. Mr. Stoner said that after the meeting that year, they reevaluated the project and realized that the key to making it work was for the Crozet community and the county to embrace, own, and support it in a vibrant and consistent matter. He noted that small town economics were challenging, and Crozet was a growth area with a growing population. Mr. Stoner said that the applicant stepped back and reevaluated the zoning application at that time and engaged in a number of public meetings and conversations about where the project should go.

Mr. Stoner said that the proposal as currently presented was a result of four years of meetings and that the applicant was proud of it. He said that this was an important step in getting the rezoning of Phase I done but was certainly not the last step in the process. Mr. Stoner said that the applicant will be back for more meetings as the buildings get proposed and constructed.

Mr. Stoner said that the applicant was excited that both the county and VDOT had chosen to partner on the project, and that it was a sign of how important the project is. He said that the applicant understands this importance and was committed to getting it right.

Mr. Stoner said that given the comprehensive nature of the staff report, he did not have a formal presentation to give, but offered to answer any questions for the Commission.

Mr. Bivins asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak. Hearing no comments from the public, he turned the meeting over to Mr. Keller.

Mr. Keller asked the applicant to come back to answer questions from the Commission.

Mr. Dotson asked about the long public involvement process the applicant went through. He asked if the applicant felt that based on the fact there was no one from the public present in opposition of the proposal, if this indicates there was consensus achieved, and what the result of their last meeting had been in terms of agreement.

Mr. Stoner said that he last met with CCAC in June, just before the board met to consider the development agreement. He said that his impression was that it went very well. Mr. Stoner said that the community had been watching this evolve for quite some time, and that there were signs posted in Downtown Crozet with the conceptual diagram on them. He said that he believes that the public was ready for something to happen, and that they have done a good job in engaging the community. Mr. Stoner said that he just attended a DCI meeting that day to provide an update on the project. He said that they and CCAC meet on a monthly basis, and that Ms. More was active in monitoring those activities.

Mr. Dotson said that perhaps in the discussion, Ms. More could discuss this from a citizen's perspective.

Ms. More asked for clarification on the timing of the improvements on the square, which she acknowledged was not the applicant's project. She said that this was part of the NIFI funding that the community chose to push into a project that needed improvements, and that there were existing businesses along the square. Ms. More said that it was not just a matter of reconfiguring the traffic there, but there were drainage problems, and it was a bigger job than just changing the way that traffic flows. She said that part of what makes sense with the applicant's project was that this would connect to Oak Street and the proposed Main Street. Ms. More asked what the applicant could say about timing in regard to how the reconfiguration of the square would happen, and with Oak Street and Main Street.

Mr. Stoner said that the project had a technical committee that meets every other week to discuss the coordination issues between the square improvements, the applicant's road improvements, and the plaza as they were all interconnected. He said that the timing on the square looks like it may be slightly ahead of where the applicant is, primarily due to the fact that they will need to obtain some waivers from VDOT for their road design. Mr. Stoner said that the intent would be to ideally have those improvements constructed concurrently, as there were utility connections and drainage issues. He said that Kimley-Horn was the engineer for the county's project and Timmons was the engineer for the applicant, and that they have been in constant contact over design elements of the square and the plaza. Mr. Stoner said that the exact timing was unknown and was contingent upon VDOT approval (the timing of which was also unknown).

Ms. More said that she believes the community appreciates the way the project was being approached, as there was a need to create a transition and flow from the older space that needs roads improvements into a newer space that makes sense. She said that this was something the community had been a sensitivity on the applicant's part as far as determining how to locate existing, older family businesses into a new space with an architecture that makes sense. Ms. More said that the way the plaza will look and operate had been a major part of the community's engagement, and what makes sense financially. She said that regarding the roads, it makes sense to tie in the timing of the square and that this did cause a delay.

Mr. Stoner said that this may or may not cause a delay, and hopefully they would know more about the timing in about 30-45 days. He said that their "30%" plans have been submitted to VDOT, and that a number of items have been identified. Mr. Stoner said that there was a meeting scheduled for the following week in Culpeper with county staff to discuss the issues and ensure that VDOT truly understands what the project was trying to achieve.

Mr. Benish noted that there were some technical issues about where utilities were located (communications, wires, stormwater) that tie the two projects together, and that there would likely be coordination of how they were constructed.

Mr. Stoner said that the county will manage both projects, which would aid with coordination.

Mr. Bivins expressed his hope that the applicant was allowed to build the roadway as designed.

Mr. Stoner said that they were pushing for a grade crossing, as Crozet needs one.

Mr. Bivins said that he hoped this would be built.

Mr. Bivins also addressed a note about affordable housing – that although it was not included in Phase I, he was sensitive to the fact that under the Board of Supervisors' strategic plan for revitalizing aging urban neighborhoods, the contention in Crozet with all its new citizens was causing some discomfort with the people who have been living there. Mr. Bivins asked, if it was at all possible, for the applicant to consider creating residential spaces for some of the existing residents to be able to relocate into a place that they have fond memories of. He acknowledged this wouldn't be a part of Phase I, but expressed hope that in future phases, there would be housing options for these individuals. Mr. Bivins said that a whole group of people at Mountainside, for instance, were now being displaced, and that consideration should be made as to how to keep it vibrant as it was an example of an aging, urban neighborhood.

Mr. Stoner said that their residential focus would be in Phase II, and this will require either a Special Use Permit from the county, or perhaps a change to the DCD district. He said that he believes this would be an appropriate place for a variety of housing types and values that were hopefully affordable.

Ms. Riley asked if there was a timeframe for the dedication of the plaza from the developer to the county.

Mr. Stoner said that if all goes well, they were considering starting the construction of roads sometime into Q2 of 2020. He said that construction of the plaza would start before the end of 2020 and would take a year to develop, along with the two buildings on the west side of the plaza, which were the highest priority buildings. Mr. Stoner said that the county's estimates and the consultant's estimates from UNICAP would suggest that the loan for the plaza will likely be repaid in 5-7 years, based on a fairly modest growth projection. He said that this could happen faster, but 5-7 years was the best guess and at that point, the county would take full ownership of the plaza.

Mr. Carrazana noted the mention of Phase II being when the residential development would take place. He asked if Phase I was not intended to be a mixed-use development.

Mr. Stoner said that it was intended to be mixed-use, but the focus was more on retail and commercial, as the site was located in the heart of downtown. He said that logistics of residential were more challenging in this environment and that the applicant would still like to build some units in Phase I, but that it isn't a primary focus. Mr. Stoner said that Crozet needs residential rooftops and apartments without easy walking distance of Downtown. He said that he sees them as a critical feature in order for Downtown to be successful, but there was tension between the community desiring a central core with retail, office, and employment. Mr. Stoner said that mixing all these components together, at least in Phase I, will be challenging. He said that Piedmont Place, for instance, had been built residential with most of it being leased for commercial, as the demand for commercial was so high. Mr. Stoner said that he anticipates between 30-50 residential units in the first phase, but the logistics of creating affordable housing in that environment were very challenging. He said that residential in Phase II would allow them more to work with.

For clarification, Mr. Carrazana said that there were still some opportunities for residential in Phase I.

Mr. Stoner said that yes, and that he fully expects residential to be built in Phase I.

Mr. Benish said that this was a use that was by-right within DCD, so future owners will have that option.

Mr. Keller asked if Mr. Stoner could reflect on the process and the significant transportation component that plays through it, including the Main Street concept slowing down traffic and the connectors. He said that in the last several weeks, there have been people from Route 250 East and from Rio Road who have voiced significant concerns about when projects come forth and yet, this proposal would have significant impacts beyond the subject area that were reflected in the staff report and there were no objections being voiced from the public. Mr. Keller asked if this was due to the length of time of the process, or how the process had been handled, and what the Commission could learn from this.

Mr. Stoner said that Crozet had significant transportation challenges, and that VDOT was concerned about how they were going to solve the longer-term transportation problems and less concerned about how many vehicles will be arriving to intersections on opening day. He said that the entire network needs to be reevaluated, and there needs to be significant improvements made over the next 10 years. Mr. Stoner said that the applicant had agreed to fund a transportation study that looks at the longer-term problems and proposes solutions to the problems that hopefully VDOT and the county would work on as the project develops. He said that one of the things that was perhaps relieving some of the pressure was that the connector road will facilitate traffic from the eastern neighborhoods that currently have to take a different, route either out on Route 240 or down Park Road. Mr. Stoner said that with the connector, these people can come directly downtown. He said that while traffic was being added to the street, they were likely taking traffic off of Route 240, which relieves pressure at the intersection of Route 240 and Crozet Avenue.

Mr. Stoner said that traffic was a complicated puzzle in the area and more than anything, people want a transportation network in Crozet that works, and that this was the first step. He said that the original Master Plan called for a divided avenue from Downtown to the eastern neighborhoods, and what the community decided they wanted was an integrated network of streets Downtown. Mr. Stoner said that there was a disconnect that this will help to alleviate, but it will be important overtime to connect the network they were building to the great network. He said that people have to have other ways to get around, and the biggest problem in the area was there was only one way to get where one needs to go.

Mr. Benish added that as Mr. McDermott had pointed out, the analysis contained in the report was based on a 2016 study that assessed the impacts of the development without the connector. He said that what was lacking currently was an analysis of the network that would provide the connection to Hilltop Drive. Mr. Benish said that what staff had assessed as impacts isn't based on a true understanding of what happens when the interconnection was made. He said that staff feels there could be potential benefit because of the eastern access that vehicles will now have to the road system back to Route 240. Mr. Benish said that the future study would look at the impact of the connector.

Mr. Keller closed the public hearing and moved forward to discussion and action by the Commission.

Ms. Spain expressed her concern that they were talking about some of the same issues they did with Southwood in terms of community engagement, affordable housing (although there was none in the proposal), traffic and the difficulties that will emerge. She noted that public transit to this area hadn't been addressed. Ms. Spain said that the county seems to be supporting this project with very little challenge in a way in which Southwood was not ultimately supported. She acknowledged that the commissioners individually try to be fair and try to do the best thing, but that with the juxtaposition of this application with Southwood and with Belvedere Boulevard in terms of traffic impacts, and in terms of who benefits versus who loses, she finds it frustrating to be in the decision-making position due to having to reconcile these. Ms. Spain said that she had no issues with the project and that she would vote for it, but that it was difficult for her to reconcile the ideas.

Ms. Riley said that the proposal seems to be consistent with the Comp Plan and Master Plan and appears to be well planned. She expressed her appreciation of Ms. Spain's comments and wished that every area had the amount of time the community had taken to attend a redevelopment proposal. Ms. Riley appreciated that while it had been noted there will be increased traffic, there did seem to be a solution as was described by the applicant, which was encouraging to her.

Mr. Bivins said that under factors unfavorable in the staff report, it stated the rezoning request would potentially add more students to Cale Elementary.

Mr. Benish said that this was a mistake, and it should read Crozet Elementary.

Mr. Bivins said that as he had lived in the area for several years, the Barnes Lumber area was an area that he had walked to and it seemed like a place that was "wanting to happen." He said that he was thrilled that it would happen, and again expressed his hope that the applicant would get a crossover, whether it was a grade or something else. Mr. Bivins said that during a time when Crozet had experienced an incredible movement new of people to the area, he knows that there was a sense of displacement among the Crozetians. He said that as with the Southwood project, that when new development comes into a place that was an icon across many generations, he hoped that the applicant would be sensitive to determining how to invite the Crozetians in who have been there for many generations and ensure they don't feel as if they were being displaced from a location that they have a deep connection to. Mr. Bivins said that while he was supportive of this, he feels there had been a different kind of embracing of the community that may be helpful here. He said that perhaps as this and as Southwood develop, they will become two icons of how revitalization was done right and not in contention with each other, but in concert with each other.

Ms. More addressed the traffic issue, and that having the Crozet transportation study was an important step forward. She said that she believes the community was frustrated with current traffic conditions, not assuming any impacts on what the proposed development may or may not produce. Ms. More said that she also believes the community was longing for a comprehensive look at real solutions rather than band-aid fixes that create other issues. She said that taking the time to give the issues a hard look and coming up with solutions was something the community appreciate. Ms. More said that specifically, the intersections on Crozet Avenue that experience a great amount of backup and pressure during peak hours have been acknowledged to be existing conditions. She said that while the intersections aren't currently failing, there was a great deal of pressure on them, and some of the turns don't operate correctly, causing drivers to sit for a long period of time. Ms. More added that during peak times, the only way to get out

often times was for someone to nicely let you out.

Ms. More said that living and driving in the area, her bigger concern was impacts affecting those intersections such as the 126 apartments going in very close to Downtown. Ms. More said that while this was a good thing, as it creates walkable dwellings Downtown, the 126 apartments plus 200 or more units breaking ground at Pleasant Green will cause the intersections to experience potential failure before Barnes Lumber will generate traffic that would create impacts. She expressed hope that with the study and other measures, the county can come up with solutions before getting to that point. Ms. More said that it's important to realize that these were projects that don't come before the Planning Commission because they were dense, by-right projects. She said that they were seeing more and more in applications sections where traffic was a problem, and it was becoming a serious, more frequent issue. Ms. More said that while she wanted to acknowledge this, the applicant was taking on the initiative to come up with solutions and recognizing the issue, and that while traffic was an issue they were already have and the project would add to it, it was important to acknowledge the effort.

Ms. More said that as far as Ms. Spain's comment about having more mass transit, that will be a conversation they will have moving forward. She said that they do have the autonomous Tony shuttle that had launched to move people around the community, and also Crozet Connect, which was about getting people from Crozet to Charlottesville. Ms. More said that these were two important things happening in Crozet to alleviate traffic concerns.

Ms. More said that regarding parking, which was listed as an unfavorable factor, that it was always a topic of conversation in Crozet. She said that Downtown Crozet had always been a balancing and sharing between businesses. Ms. More said that parking for Piedmont Place had been successful, and a lot of overflow for it occurs on the applicant's property. She said that when Phase I develops, it was recognized that this was where many people park to patronize businesses at Piedmont Place. Ms. More said that the applicant had always had parking at the forefront of discussion over the years, and the community had been listening for creative solutions as it was something that must continue to be discussed. She said that perhaps in Phase I, parking was pushed into the next space, but that it was going to catch up with them eventually. Ms. More said that with Piedmont Place, patrons park in the library's lot, and then library patrons don't have anywhere to park. She said that this was an ongoing conversation the parking takes very seriously, and a bigger solution will have to be created going forward.

Ms. More pointed out that in 2014, she was present at the Planning Commission meeting as a citizen and spoke against the original applicant's vision for the property because it was a residential focus. She said that the DCD supports a secondary residential focus, so she (as well as others in the community) was not supportive of the previous application's vision. Ms. More said that she wished many of those members from the public who had previously come out to speak had attended the current meeting. She said that the Commission looked at the old application unfavorably, and the applicant went to deferral, explained his thoughts, and revisited ideas with the community. Ms. More said that she had been worried the applicant would not come back, but she had been pleased with the way the applicant had engaged the community and was happy with the phased approach, as it was a critical part of the way Downtown develops. She said that this was one of the core principles in the Crozet Master Plan that Downtown was the most important center. Ms. More noted that looking at the map, there was not much more that can be developed, and that the subject property was a big part in developing what they have, as the way it develops was critical. She said that the overall engagement had been impressive, and she noted that members of the public have been

supportive. Ms. More said that she supports the project, and that perhaps engagement was the reason why there was not a crowd present from the public.

Mr. Dotson echoed Ms. Spain's thought process. He said that he had hoped there would be members of the public present to help him understand the project from the point of view of the people who live there. Mr. Dotson said that he didn't anticipate it would necessarily be people turning out because they oppose something. He said that he had been in hearings where the neighbors presented the proposal because they had achieved consensus and were able to answer questions as to why they could accept impacts, how they worked out issues, etc. Mr. Dotson said that this community involvement gives credibility to a proposal when the public sticks with it. He said that in some ways, he was disappointed in this.

Mr. Dotson said that he was surprised, given the number of unknowns, that there hasn't been concerned expressed about those. He said that for instance, the Crozet Central transportation study hasn't been done yet, but the staff report said that it would positive to have the answers. Mr. Dotson said that studies on parking and the market will be done, but they haven't been done yet. He said that architectural designs will be developed, and street and plaza designs were being worked on, but haven't been finalized. Mr. Dotson said that there were a number of loose ends and perhaps what was being found was that the county was turning a corner in that more development was perhaps going to have development agreements or participation agreements involved, which was not something the Commission was used to thinking about and sequencing at a detailed level. He said that maybe it was not the Commission's business to be deeply involved in those concerns but at the same time, it's been a package of the ZMA plus the performance agreement that was the total project. Mr. Dotson said that he didn't believe the Commission was well prepared at this point to judge performance agreements but that he would discuss this later.

Mr. Dotson said that similarly to Southwood, he believes the project was good, it requires a leap of faith, there was risk involved, and the risk was acceptable. He said that for these reasons, he was prepared to support the project.

Ms. More expressed her appreciation of Mr. Dotson's comments and noted that there was still work to be done. She said that because of the way the zoning was written for the DCD, there was more reassurance than one might think as the DCD prescribes what was supposed to happen there. Ms. More said that they had struggled with the idea that in the Master Plan, originally there was a sweeping road across the property that was drawn when the property was identified as being important to Crozet continuing to be a vibrant place where people come to walk, bike, and work. She said that what happened with the community was engaged was the creation of a gridded network. Ms. More said that there was contention between what the Master Plan showed versus the community's desire, and that there was some flexibility in this. She said that the reason why some of the specifics haven't been shown was because of what the DCD did and did not allow, and that changes to this in the future (such as a residential focus) would happen per a Special Use Permit.

Ms. More said that she feels comfortable moving forward and that there was likely more certainty about the plaza that was being shown, as this was not what the Commission was being asked to rule on. She said that she had seen some specific designs and that there was a fair amount of certainty about how the plaza will actualize itself, and that going through great detail in the Commission meeting was not what the applicant was asked to do but should do, though the applicant would be capable of doing so if asked.

Mr. Keller said that echoing Mr. Bivins point (and in some ways, responding to Ms. Spain), discussing performance agreements would more appropriately fall under New Business. He said that he feels that there was new partnership with Economic Development and UVA, and that both this project and Southwood would stand as models the county can be proud of. Mr. Keller said that Mr. Dotson's four points were well taken, and he concurs on them.

Ms. More added that the nature of this performance agreement was different than that which the county had with Southwood and said that she thinks it was a great example of something she hopes the county moves towards in the future, and was a good opportunity for the county to invest in. She said that this was a smaller-scale example that could be done on a larger scale in the future, and perhaps to try out a public-private partnership. Ms. More acknowledged that she expressed frustration before – not directed at Southwood, but about seeing applications with failing intersections and yet the Commission was asked to approve more residential units. She said that there was great amount of money that the county didn't match that goes away each year, and on this project, the developer was matching the county's dollars and the VDOT dollars will actualize a critical road that the community needs. Ms. More said that the community knows this was happening and it's an important part of the creativity in making the project move forward.

Ms. More moved to recommend approval of ZMA201000018 Crozet Square (Barnes Lumber) Phase I, with proffers, for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Mr. Bivins seconded the motion.

Mr. Keller asked if there was any further discussion.

The motion was carried by a vote of 6:0 (with Ms. Firehock being absent).

Mr. Keller thanked staff, the applicant, and the community members who were involved in the project.