

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes June 22, 2021**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, June 22, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Julian Bivins, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Rick Randolph; Daniel Bailey; Corey Clayborne; Jennie More; Tim Keller; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: none.

Other officials present were Rachel Falkenstein; Michaela Accardi; Charles Rapp, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Bivins said the meeting was being held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(16), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster." He said opportunities for the public to access and participate in the electronic meeting will be posted at www.albemarle.org on the Community County Calendar when available.

After Ms. Shaffer called the roll, Mr. Bivins established a quorum.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

There were none.

Consent Agenda

There was no consent agenda.

Work Session

CPA202100001 Crozet Master Plan: Implementation and Draft Plan Review

Ms. Rachel Falkenstein, Senior Planner, said the purpose of this meeting was to receive Commission feedback and recommendations on the implementation projects and their prioritization, as well as a full draft of the master plan. She said they would facilitate a discussion with three questions for the Commission: the first being focused on the implementation content, and the second two on the full draft. She said these questions would be shared again when it is time for the Commission's discussion.

Ms. Falkenstein said the agenda for the evening entailed the discussion being broken into two topics: the first being the implementation and project prioritization, starting with a presentation and then pausing for discussion, sharing the question at that time; and the same being done for the full plan review, with a presentation and a pause for discussion.

Ms. Falkenstein said she would start with an overview of the process and content of the implementation projects. She said there were several implementation engagement opportunities with the community over the past several weeks. She said an online questionnaire was live for

about two weeks, where there were 105 participants that weighed in. She said staff also held pop-up events where they took the County van and went out to the community to try to reach people who were on their way to different spots in Crozet, with these events being held over two days. She said there was a live virtual information session that was held one evening, which was also recorded and made available later for reference. She said there was also a Crozet CAC meeting on June 9.

Ms. Falkenstein said the slide on the screen provided a summary of the general feedback heard. She said the left side of the screen showed some of the online feedback that was received. She said there was a questionnaire online, where staff asked community members to rank the implementation projects, which were broken into four categories: capital projects at over \$3 million, capital projects under \$3 million, planning projects, and policy projects. She said the top-ranking capital project from the online feedback was Eastern Avenue. She said the top-ranking capital project less than \$3 million was the High Street improvements downtown. She said the top-ranking planning project was the Crozet Shared Use Path Feasibility Study, and the top-ranking policy project was a residential zoning update to enhance resource preservation.

Ms. Falkenstein said she would share some general themes staff heard, both online and from the conversations that were had with community members. She said the need for infrastructure improvements has been one staff has heard throughout the planning process, which came up again, and is especially related to transportation. She said community members are very focused on the need for improvements related to traffic downtown and on Route 250. She said staff also heard about the need for bike-ped connectivity, especially within Eastern Crozet, which currently feels cutoff from other portions of Crozet and needs better connectivity. She said there was a focus on walkability and bike-ability downtown, especially related to sidewalks in the older neighborhoods near downtown.

Ms. Falkenstein said staff heard about trail connections, with the top project being a desire to upgrade the Crozet Connector Trail to meet a more accessible shared use path standard. She said lastly, Eastern Avenue was the top project, and this continues to be a topic that comes up frequently. She said a new theme staff heard in this round of engagement is that this would also provide bike-ped connections. She said it is not just for vehicular connectivity, but for those who wish to ride bikes or walk to points south, such as Harris Teeter, and Eastern Avenue would provide that opportunity.

Ms. Falkenstein said there was a Crozet CAC meeting on June 9. She said throughout the process, staff has been using the CAC to share early drafts of content and to vet some topics. She said the CAC is helpful for that lens because many, if not all, of its members have been involved throughout the entire process, and so they can help staff filter some of the content.

Ms. Falkenstein said the CAC shared a couple of things, with one being the need for a last big engagement push on the draft master plan. She said the CAC offered to help with some of that engagement, so they will be helping staff spread the word at their upcoming July 4th event. She said there were themes related to the implementation content, with the first being prioritizing sidewalk projects. She said there was discussion about which of the high-priority sidewalk projects should be the top priority. She said based on the CAC's discussion, they felt that the eastern portion of Park Road, connecting a sidewalk from the eastern neighborhoods into Crozet Park, was the top priority, with the second priority being a Hill Top Street sidewalk that would connect people from the park over to downtown.

Ms. Falkenstein said the CAC also shared their desire for Western Park and Eastern Avenue to continue to be top priorities, and the project for a shared use path along Three Notched Road to be a high priority project. She said this relates to providing connectivity to the eastern neighborhoods.

Ms. Falkenstein said she would go into the content of the draft chapter that staff shared. She said they have broken the projects into two categories: catalysts and future projects. She said the catalyst projects are intended to reflect the community's top priority projects within the master plan. She said they have a timeline associated with them of 0 to 10 years for completion or for substantial progress to be made. She said catalysts include three types of projects: planning, policy, and capital projects. She said some of them are phased as part of a larger project, such as Western park.

Ms. Falkenstein said the order of the catalyst projects listed is intended to reflect the community's priorities; however, these are not necessarily in order of completion, due to a couple of factors. She said one factor is that projects that are more complex will take longer to complete. She said some of the projects, such as transportation projects, are associated with state timelines when there are grants to help fund and support the projects.

Ms. Falkenstein said page 6 of the Implementation chapter shows a list of catalyst projects, also seen on the table on the slide. She said seven of the catalyst projects are capital projects, which would involve capital investment on infrastructure such as roads or sidewalks, or community amenities such as parks and trails. She said four are planning projects, which would involve a future planning study, engagement, or design effort. She said four are policy projects, which would involve the update or creation of [inaudible] policy or regulation.

Ms. Falkenstein said there is also a map of the catalyst projects, shown on page 8 of the Implementation chapter. She said these are the projects that have a specific geography associated with them. She said some of them, such as policy projects, do not have geographies as they would apply to the whole Development Area. She pointed on the slide to Eastern Avenue, noting this was the top project, shown as 1C. She said another important project that was discussed was the Crozet Connector Trail upgrade, shown on the map as 2A. She said the shared use path for the Crozet Avenue Feasibility Study is shown as Project 2B.

Ms. Falkenstein said she did not plan to go through each of the projects in detail, but they are provided on pages 11-17 of the draft Implementation chapter. She said staff will be available for project-specific questions if the Commission has those during the discussion.

Ms. Falkenstein said the next category of projects within the Implementation chapter are future projects, which are expected to be completed within the 10- to 20-year horizon of planned adoption. She said these include planning, policy, and capital projects. She said some are additional phases of catalyst projects, such as Western Park. She noted that the timeline could be expedited if funding or resources become available, or if opportunities arise for community partnerships or if a development adjacent to a catalyst project would occur, they could see the timeline set up.

Ms. Falkenstein said there is also a list of future projects, provided on pages 18-19 of the draft master plan Implementation chapter. She said in these, there are 17 capital projects and six planning projects. She said as shown on the slide, these are in priority order but would not necessarily reflect the order of completion. She said rather, this is to show what the community

thought were the top priorities of the future projects. She said Western Park is placed as the top of this list because it has been such a high priority for the community. She said based on some conversations staff has had with Parks and Recreation staff, it could be possible that Phase 2 or Phases 2 and 3 could be completed in less than 10 years if funding becomes available for that project.

Ms. Falkenstein said there is a map of future projects, found on page 20 of the Implementation chapter, and that she would highlight a few of these. She said the Lickinghole Creek Trail is shown as Project 2B and noted that the solid-lined portions of the trail are already completed and in place, but there are some key segments that have yet to be completed (shown as dotted lines). She said this was a high priority. She said the Downtown Neighborhoods Culture and Resources Study, Project 2A, is a high-priority of the community to help identify opportunities to provide historic preservation for some of the downtown neighborhoods.

Ms. Falkenstein said a new road type that has not been done in previous master plans is a rural shared road to provide bicycle connectivity to rural amenities. She said these are being recommended for Jarmans Gap (5B) and Railroad Avenue and Mint Springs (5A). She reiterated that she would not be going through all projects but would answer any questions later from the Commission.

Ms. Falkenstein said the last category of projects is Ongoing Projects, and these were the recommendations from the Land Use, Transportation, and Conservation chapters that do not call for a specific capital project or specific ordinance or policy update. She said these would often be done as part of an ongoing County process or project such as a rezoning review. She said other projects that are identified as ongoing are those that are dependent on factors outside of the County's control for timing, with one being the parking recommendations associated with downtown, where the project would be expected to occur concurrently with development downtown. She said a list of ongoing projects is provided on page 37 of the implementation chapter.

Ms. Falkenstein said this concluded her presentation and that she would display the question for the implementation content, which was, "Do the identified Catalyst Projects support the plan's Guiding Principles and the County's Comprehensive Plan? Do you have any suggested changes to the list of Catalyst and Future Implementation Projects?" She opened the work session to discussion and questions.

Mr. Bivins expressed that the presentation was very easy to follow.

Mr. Clayborne said his question was about funding. He asked if any of the federal monies coming into the state to local governments was eligible for capital improvement projects.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that she was not aware that it was, although she could not speak to this immediately and would have to research before getting back to the Commission with a response. She said she had not heard of this but could look into it further.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Falkenstein what she would like to hear from the Commissioners.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that she wanted to hear general feedback and if the Commissioners believe the list of projects make sense when taking into consideration the plan's guiding principles and goals.

Mr. Keller said he believed this was clearly articulated and delineated. He said he was able to read the plan clearly and that it was nice to read. He said he would reiterate the point he made the last time. He said he still thinks that with the number of historic resources that give the flavor of the small town of Crozet, the architectural survey and the infill study that considers how this could work, as well as the possibility of Architectural Review Board coverage for the historic resource zones, should not be in 10 years out. He said he realizes something could move it up, but he thinks that it needs to be the highest priority if they want to be able to maintain the character of this quaint, small-town core before it is eradicated due to development.

Mr. Bivins asked if they would be coming back to this point again.

Mr. Keller replied yes, adding that if they are to comment about the priority list, this would move it from the second priority to the first priority.

Ms. Firehock said she wanted to echo Mr. Keller's points that they certainly raised the bar for master plans with this Crozet Master Plan. She said she thinks it was very well done. She said she wanted to note what she believes are a couple of important County policies that will be critical to enact to make it possible to realize some of the key elements of the plan. She said there are three things, with the first being echoing the historic preservation. She said the County needs a strong preservation ordinance, even just to have something that requires permits for teardown of historic structures. She said she does not see how they can preserve the historic character of Crozet without that tool.

Ms. Firehock said the second item she wanted to note is that they will be working on a new Zoning Ordinance for the County and as part of that effort, they also need much better landscaping standards. She said when she looks at the opportunities for new pathways and sees Photoshopped trees and trees shown on illustrations to make green connections to the community possible, it's important that they have good standards for street trees. She said they do not have those and if they want to have a viable, walkable community into the future, she thinks this is very important. She also pointed out that not all of the illustrations of the streets showed bike lanes, and she thinks it is important to make sure that those are clear.

Ms. Firehock said her last point was the need for an updated lighting ordinance. She said she knew they were there to talk that evening about the Crozet Master Plan, but there are some countywide policies that she thinks are essential for helping to realize some of these visions of the Crozet plan.

Mr. Randolph said he would start by saying that he thinks what Ms. Falkenstein sent out to the Commission was a quantum leap in terms of details, thoroughness, and specificity from any master plan the County has ever done before. He said Ms. Falkenstein and her team (including Ms. Michaela Accardi) deserve a great amount of credit for having developed something that he feels will be award winning in planning circles.

Mr. Randolph said his second point to make, in terms of Question 2, is that he thinks this master plan is not just consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan, but he thinks it dramatically updates the plan. He said it brings it into much more of a contemporary planning vernacular in terms of the dimensions that the master plan that should be looking at that the previous master plan did not look at to the degree of focus and detail.

Mr. Randolph said he also wanted to compliment Ms. Falkenstein on the way she put together the prioritization. He said the project keys (by color and symbol) is a fantastic way for people to access the plan.

Mr. Randolph said the only question was about how page 5 of the implementation plan indicates cost estimates, and there are ranges with dollar bills to the left of them. He said it does not provide any criteria for why a single dollar is \$500,000 and below and why, for example, it is not \$650,000. He said he would ask why the double dollar bill is for \$500,000 to \$300,000 rather than \$400,000. He said this did not need to be explained to him, but he thinks it will be useful for the public to have some kind of explanation on the cost estimates when they look at the way staff evaluated the projects by cost figures and how those figures were chosen.

Mr. Randolph said he had many comments about catalyst projects, but he did not think this was the time to go into the details on that and that he would wait until after the public comment portion. He said he thinks the layout of the implementation phase, however, is superb.

Mr. Bivins asked the Commissioners if they wanted to move into public comment next for implementation and then come back later for the other piece.

Ms. More said she had a question and that she did not have much feedback for this section. She said when Ms. Falkenstein went through the future projects in the draft, it talks in the beginning about what this means in the 10- to 20-year timeframe. She said she did not hear Ms. Falkenstein say this in the review, but she understood that Ms. Falkenstein was saying that there is no rule that something cannot happen sooner. She asked if the future projects' timeframe was indeed 10-20 years.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that this was correct.

Ms. More said her comments would be brief. She said when she looks at this list and sees the Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing Survey and Recommendations, and the project under it which is the Downtown Architectural and Cultural Resource Study, it struck her as odd that they were on this list that is 10-20 years away when there has been so much conversation and work on the affordable housing topic.

Ms. More said it seemed odd to her to wait 10 or even 20 years to do, and perhaps she was misunderstanding what this means. She said it is not just the inventory, but she worries that this is a very long time to wait to look at both of those projects, which have been a major part of this review and their conversation in general. She said she feels it is something that should probably happen sooner than later. She said perhaps she misunderstood what the affordable housing survey is, but she thinks if they wait that long, much of the naturally occurring affordable housing that is in the areas she is familiar with will potentially be gone, and they will not be able to study it. She said if the study is meant to help inform them, she would want to see it happening sooner than 10-20 years.

Ms. More said the same was true for the Downtown Neighborhoods Architectural and Cultural Resource Study. She said when they talk so much about the overlay for the downtown neighborhood, and they moved away from that, she thinks this was an effort to study and then replace the idea of the overlay. She said something sooner than the 10- to 20-year timeframe would make sense to her.

Ms. More said her final comment was when she reads the narrative in the Implementation chapter about Western Park, she feels that she wants to understand it more. She said when she reads it or reads about all the projects, when they say it will be up to 10 years for the first phase, or 10-20 years for Phases 2 and 3, perhaps in the narrative, they can be clearer about the evolution of the Western Park project, for example. She said this is from the present forward and not the 10 or more years that have already passed.

Ms. More said when she goes to the Conservation chapter to look at Western Park, she still feels that more of a narrative around the park would be helpful. She said it does talk about how this was given when Old Trail was rezoned, but it does not talk about the prior planning and the timeframe seen. She said this is missing, and it is an important part to add to that history and conversation.

Mr. Randolph said that to Ms. More's point, while he did not know they were going to talk about specific items at that point, in terms of future projects, he agrees that Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing Survey Recommendations and Downtown Neighborhoods Architectural and Cultural Resource Study need to be moved into the catalyst phase because if they wait 10 years, these studies will become irrelevant in Crozet.

Mr. Randolph said when they get to the catalyst side, while he wanted to hear from the public first, he thinks the last five of the catalyst projects are all Albemarle County related, and they depend on the County to develop policies which are applicable not only in Crozet, but elsewhere in the County. He said he thinks there is room to try to introduce Crozet-specific projects at catalyst projects as much as possible. He said since Ms. More brought this up, he wanted to echo her sentiments of moving the two projects mentioned to catalyst projects.

Mr. Bivins added that this is in keeping with what Mr. Keller was getting at. He asked Ms. Schaffer if anyone from the public wanted to speak to the Implementation piece.

Ms. Schaffer replied that no one from the public had their hand raised at that time.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Keller if he agreed about moving Downtown Neighborhoods Architectural and Cultural Resources Study from the 10- to 20-year timeframe to the catalyst phase.

Mr. Keller replied yes. He said he thinks the way it was originally articulated by staff and was well done in terms of different options like ADUs and thinking creatively about how there might be multiple units within a historic house, the affordable housing study needs to be moved up. He said with the way they were presented and the thoughtful way these are being looked at all over the country, they are paired. He said he thinks they are very important land use components, as Mr. Randolph and Ms. More noted. He said he would defer to hear what they have to say about the other three that Mr. Randolph was talking about moving up besides those two.

Mr. Bivins asked if anyone else wanted to add to or endorse this.

Mr. Bailey said he completely agreed. He said getting into implementation and economic development supporting the area, reading the master plan, it starts off about Crozet being a bedroom community of Charlottesville. He said he did not want to take away from the conversation about supporting the Downtown Neighborhoods, but he thinks it is related in the sense that they still have learning to do, if this is for the next 10 years, of what the effect of COVID will be on remote workers and how this impacts what was once a bedroom community. He said the question

is if Crozet will still be a bedroom community, the effect on transportation, and if there will be more people looking for places to get outside of their house post-COVID.

Mr. Bailey said his own company is remote, and they currently do not have intentions of bringing people back into the office at this time. He said this is a possibility because in his review of CEOs, the prevailing wisdom was that it would likely go to hybrid and not fully in-person, meaning there will be at least a few days of people who would have been commuting to work. He said he thinks this lends credence to downtown, affordable housing, and promoting this to a higher priority because they are in a transition as a country and as a county about people's habits with the relationship to being a bedroom community and transportation.

Mr. Bailey said he agrees and it leads him to questions such as how they might get more insight to this as they think about the reprioritization of future projects to current catalyst projects and supporting economic development of a transitioning society and a community that is largely been a bedroom community. He said people may be in the enclave of the community more than they have been in the past, and this will change how they think about the prioritization of these projects.

Mr. Randolph said they could get into a robust discussion about those bottom five items on the catalyst list, but what he would say is that he, Ms. More, and Mr. Keller have proposed that they move things over to the catalyst list.

Mr. Randolph said there is another thing that he does not feel should be on the catalyst list – not that it is not worthy or deserving, but it does not seem to have nearly the salience of the transportation concern of citizens in the community. He said what he is hearing from the community is transportation projects, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, being able to safely move people through an increasingly congested and growing community.

Mr. Randolph said he does not understand the Three Notched Trail Feasibility Study, with everything else on the list of catalyst projects. He said it is a low-cost study, but if they were to fund this in the next 10 years, without funding from the City of Charlottesville or the County for the trail to go through the Samuel Miller District, it does not strike him as making much sense that one funds just the Crozet portion of the feasibility study when there are so many other things that are financially needing for those dollars.

Mr. Randolph said that for example, in the future list, Project 2A talks about a need for sidewalks. He said he is balancing sidewalks in Downtown Crozet versus Three Notched Trail Feasibility Study and considering which one he thinks will be more important in terms of have an immediate impact on the safety and welfare of the people in Crozet. He said he sees the feasibility study project as something that should be on the 10- to 20-year list and that they move things in its place, as they have already proposed moving two items up and perhaps moving the sidewalk project there in turn.

Mr. Randolph reiterated that the last five items are all projects that require the County to develop a countywide policy and program. He said there is no sense in building a transit stop in Crozet unless they have a transit system of which Crozet is a part, and they are not there yet. He said they talked about this on the Board of Supervisors six years ago, and they are still not there because there are so many other priorities for the community. He said he thinks it is very important for the Commission to be mindful of the projects that are going to have the greatest bang for the buck immediately in Crozet to change the equation in terms of updating and extending ease of transportation around Crozet and safety of transportation either by foot, bicycle, or automobile.

Mr. Bivins asked the Commissioners if they had reactions to what Mr. Randolph was proposing. He said there were thumbs up reactions from Mr. Keller, Mr. Carrazana, Mr. Bailey, Ms. More, and Mr. Clayborne. He said he was hearing that from Downtown Crozet District Zoning Updates all the way to the Crozet Transit Plan (2B, 1B, 4E, 4C, 3C, and 3A) should be shifted over to the longer-term list. He said regarding the other conversation, they would shift from page 18 3A and 2A (including priority sidewalk connections) over to the catalyst projects. He acknowledged the thumbs up reactions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Bailey said he agreed with Mr. Randolph about the feasibility study for Three Notched Trail. He said he did not know whose responsibility it is, but electric vehicles are coming, and this will create a quantum shift in the way they think about personal electric vehicles, parking, and infrastructure. He said they are already talking about the need to catch Crozet up in infrastructure, and they should also prepare for the future. He asked where this would fall as far as having a study related to the impact of electric vehicles on the infrastructure needs and planning for Crozet.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Keller, since he sits on the NPA Tech Board.

Mr. Keller said he thinks it is an interesting point, and there is an NPA meeting coming up in a month. He said he could broach the subject, but what he would be interested in (which may be something handled by Mr. Rapp or Mr. Bivins) is economic development. He said the County has been offering support to Perrone Robotics, and he wonders if there is a central location or if a portion of that could somehow be worked with so that there can be a designated area that they would be interested in, but could also be articulated in the plan. He said this could possibly be implemented as a first stage of a major docking station in the greater downtown area.

Mr. Bivins asked if there is room in the discussion of the Barnes Lumber project to talk about the kind of charging pods that Mr. Bailey was referring to and Mr. Keller was describing, or if this was something they were not allowed to get involved with.

Ms. Falkenstein replied she was not sure if the developer was considering charging with that development, and she would have to look into it.

Mr. Bivins said this might be one place where they would have the quickest leverage, and it may be about, as Mr. Keller was suggesting, bringing someone like Mr. Roger Johnson into the conversation to see if there is some way to leverage the discussions going on in that redevelopment in terms of building in space for that kind of facility. He said he and Mr. Rapp could have a conversation about how to rope Mr. Johnson into the conversation, as it may get them there at a quicker pace. He asked Mr. Bailey if this was what he was considering.

Mr. Bailey replied yes. He said looking at the aspect of tourism and at companies such as General Motors, which have targets for electric vehicle penetration, which will change the concept of a gas station (which may have a 10-year lifespan), if they are talking about 10-20 years out, the impact should be considered as well as where they should have studies about infrastructure planning for the area.

Mr. Bivins said that in Europe, filling stations have already discovered that if they put charging stations in, they actually make more money because people who are charging are getting something else (like food). He said those things off the shelves that are higher margins are purchased by those spending 20 minutes to charge their vehicles. He said there is also a higher

percentage of rapid charging stations coming in, and they are looking at having snacks. He said what Mr. Bailey is suggesting is actually playing out in some areas.

Mr. Randolph echoed that certainly, the County sees this with their local fuel and oil company, which uses gas as a loss leader to attract customers in to purchase food. He said he wanted to compliment Mr. Bailey for bringing up this point because he thinks one thing Mr. Bailey was doing was also confirming what the resident survey research showed: that they are really asking the County to help them realize an urban vision for Downtown Crozet. He said they did not use those words, but reading through the lines, that is what they are really asking for. He said they want the County to be a catalyst for Crozet to achieve much more of an urbanized vision, and a safe vision, for the community. He said certainly, electric cars are an attribute of that urbanized vision, going forward, and he thinks this will be an increasingly important point.

Mr. Randolph said he would also add that Crozet is ideal, given the number of resources going into bike-ped. He said with e-bikes, which is the fastest growing segment of the bicycle business, one should not only think about charging stations for cars, but also charging station for e-bikes. He said he thinks those will both be highly attractive to helping the County realize this vision for Crozet.

Mr. Rapp said as recently as the past week, the County opened a pilot project at the McIntire building, where they have electric charging stations. He said there are six level 2 chargers and three level 3 chargers that are currently being used. He said the idea is to monitor those, see their usage, and see how the program works out as a pilot and expansion to elsewhere. He said they are already taking those steps forward. He said as Mr. Bailey pointed out, there is already some heavy usage happening.

Mr. Bivins said if the project is successful, they may expect an installation at the library, for instance, as this is a piece of property that the County apparently owns. He said as Western Park builds out, they may expect to see something there, as this is a place where people naturally gather, but the property is owned by the County.

Mr. Randolph added that he heard about this, and he knows at least one Supervisor who is already out talking to dealers about the potential purchase of an electric car because the County has the charging facility available. He said that during nine-hour Board meetings, they could be charging their car and probably all their batteries in the automobile at the same time, then run for a week afterwards.

Mr. Carrazana said to add to Mr. Rapp's comment, it may be helpful to connect with Ms. Becca White in the Transportation Department. He said UVA has had electric charging stations for a while, and there is a significant increase from year to year. He said they could probably provide the County with data that may be helpful. He said there are many people coming into UVA, so it does not mean that the usage they see necessarily translates out into the community, but he thinks it would certainly be a good measure. He said it is not going down but only going up, so to Mr. Bailey's point, looking at this as part of new infrastructure that is needed in Crozet – roads being number one, whether the cars coming in are electric or gas – will be the key to the success of the master plan.

Mr. Randolph said he appreciated Ms. Falkenstein providing the Commission with Attachment 3, which was a summary from their work session on May 12. He said the only note he would make was with regard to the item under Transportation, at the third item down, which noted that High

Street is a low-speed local street that is not recommended for a bicycle lane. He said just because it is a low-speed local street does not mean that it should be invalidated from having a bicycle lane. He said given where High Street is and the number of different facilities there, and as they were just talking about charging cars and bicycles potentially at the library off of High Street, he thinks there is reason to look at this as a safe passageway for cyclists to be getting around that center hub of Crozet.

Mr. Randolph said he did not know how it came to pass that this was said and how he and Ms. More did not pick up on this, but he did want to cite that even if it is a low-speed local street, to ensure safety and the comfort of people going to these facilities and using a bike, the more they can have bike lanes, the better.

Ms. Firehock said she echoed this because it was part of her statement at the beginning about the fact that there are more opportunities for bike lanes on roads than what is shown in the plan.

Mr. Bivins said he thought Attachment 3 was very helpful. He said moving forward, he would suggest that as they look at the appendix, being able to say what the major issues were and how they were dealt with might be helpful for when staff brings this matter to the public hearing and Board of Supervisors. He said they will then have a sense of what the major comments were and what the reactions were from staff and the Commission.

Mr. Bivins said another thing he thought might be helpful is to have some sense of what the staff time that is involved in some of these projects might be. He said while they see the spent cost and while it would be helpful to see the baked-in cost, they should see what the inherent cost would be so that they have the fully loaded expenses, times, and days. He said when the Supervisors are wrestling with the priorities, they will have a sense of what completing those projects will entail.

Mr. Bivins said the last thing he would offer for consideration is to have some sense of how this particular small area plan's book of potential investments compares with the other plans. He said this will give people a sense of what they are doing across these small areas vis-à-vis the master plans so that it is not just looking at it in an isolated way but rather, looking at how these items line up across the County. He said while each plan is wonderful, it also has an impact not only on staff's time, but also in the CIP and how funds are allocated across the County. He said this would be helpful at the next level of review.

Ms. Falkenstein said they would move onto the next portion of the presentation, which Ms. Accardi would cover.

Ms. Michaela Accardi, Senior Planner, said she would talk about the draft Crozet Master Plan and begin by providing an overview of the engagement and content development process. She said Attachment 1 of the staff report has a detailed summary of this, which she would walk through.

Ms. Accardi said the first phase of the Crozet Master Plan Update began in September of 2019 with a series of community workshops, with the goal of identifying community concerns and hopes for the future, priorities, and a revisit of the 2010 guiding principles. She said this phase concluded in December of 2019 with draft guiding principles for each chapter, which are contained in the draft.

Ms. Accardi said the themes from engagement were called “focus areas,” and those were identified during the first phase and used to shape engagement in the subsequent Phase 2. She said these focus areas include topics like housing variety and choice, safe and accessible transportation options for all users, and trail and greenway connectivity.

Ms. Accardi said the second phase of this project, Focus Area Input and Design Strategies, took place from January to July 2020 and included the transition to virtual engagement due to the COVID-19 pandemic with the use of an online engagement hub at publicinput.com. She said Crozet CAC meetings were held virtually via Zoom.

Ms. Accardi said the purpose of this phase was to further evaluate and facilitate conversations around the focus areas from Phase 1 and create strategies to address challenges and community goals related to those topics. She said conceptual recommendations and implementation projects were generated during this phase and included items like identifying specific locations for bicycle and pedestrian projects, identifying appropriate types of housing for Crozet, and discussing parcel-specific land use changes.

Ms. Accardi said the third phase of this project, Draft Recommendations, took place from August 2020 through March 2021. She said virtual engagement continued to be used through publicinput.com and the Crozet CAC meetings. She said it involved working through the draft maps and recommendations for each chapter, and several CAC meetings were used to discuss and refine the future land use plan and recommendations. She said for example, during this phase, the Middle Density Residential land use designation was drafted based on community feedback on the initial concept of a Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay, which was discussed in Phase 2. She said this demonstrates the iterative process of revisiting ideas and improving them based on community feedback.

Ms. Accardi said the draft future land use plan, parks and green systems plan, and future transportation network plans were developed with related recommendations.

Ms. Accardi said staff is currently working on Phase 4 – Plan Draft, Review, and Adoption – by incorporating community member, Planning Commission, and Board feedback on the draft chapters, including developing the draft Implementation chapter presented earlier by Ms. Falkenstein. She said there is currently a draft master plan document for review by community members, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors before holding public hearings.

Ms. Accardi said moving into the content of the master plan document itself, the master plan document contains five chapters and an appendix, which staff continues to work on. She said she would be walking through each of those chapters throughout the presentation and sharing their main components and major updates.

Ms. Accardi said the Introduction chapter is one of the most recent draft chapters, which contains introductory information about the master planning process and guiding principles. She said it includes an overview of the community history, current demographics and existing conditions, as well as a summary of key challenges and opportunities that were evaluated and heard, starting in Phase 1 (Community Vision) and heard throughout the process.

Ms. Accardi said the Transportation chapter includes overview and background information related to this topic, and future bike and pedestrian and street network plans, as well as street typologies and recommended intersection improvements. She said it concludes with a summary of the chapter's guiding principle, goals, and recommendations, and the format is varied through each of the chapters (Land Use and Conservation) as well. She said each recommendation is associated with an implementation project in the Implementation chapter.

Ms. Accardi said following the Commission's feedback at the May 12 work session, staff made several updates to the Transportation and Conservation chapters. She said a summary of these updates is detailed further in Attachment 3 of the staff report. She said the updates for the Transportation chapter include additional background maps about existing conditions in Crozet, including a heat map of crash incidents and average annual daily traffic (AADT). She said the addition of an inset map to provide more specificity, missing and proposed sidewalk connections, as well as a priority order of sidewalk projects in the Implementation chapter was added.

Ms. Accardi said the Transportation chapter now includes language regarding bicycle needs for storage and parking and the potential for a downtown hub in both the Introduction chapter's "Key Challenges and Opportunities" section as well as the Transportation chapter. She said there is now language in the Transportation chapter about locating street lighting in appropriate areas for safety that is also full cutoff; about the fact that streets should not be widened with future improvements; and that calls for a welcoming and enjoyable [inaudible].

Ms. Accardi said the Land Use chapter follows a similar structure to the Transportation chapter with a future land use plan, a table of future land use designations and different types of centers and districts, as well as [inaudible]. She said the Land Use chapter is also associated with the appendix section on the new Middle Density Residential future land use designation and housing types.

Ms. Accardi said since the Commission has reviewed and provided feedback on this chapter, several updates have been made including the designation of several properties in the Tabor/High Street area as Middle Density Residential, with supporting language about the importance of tree and historic structure preservation on these properties. She said this change was made in response to feedback from the Commission and the CCAC about a desire to see additional areas of Middle Density Residential in Crozet.

Ms. Accardi said the [inaudible] Middle Density Residential land use to properties in the Tabor/High Street area was supported by the majority of CCAC members who shared comments about this change, adding that not everyone shared comments. She said the property owners of this area do not support the Middle Density Residential designation.

Ms. Accardi said there are also additional land use housing and demographics in the introduction section of this chapter that were not in the previous draft. She said there is a new recommendation to explore opportunities for community and rooftop solar projects with development downtown and within the Employment District to align with the County's energy planning goals.

Ms. Accardi said the Conservation chapter follows a similar structure to the two preceding chapters, with a narrative and maps on biodiversity, natural resources, and green systems, as well as cultural and scenic resources. She said several updates have been made to this chapter following the May 12 work session, including the addition of a tree canopy map and an updated narrative, and a map to show recreational opportunities and future connections to them. She said

there is a new typology of parks called School Recreational Areas. She said there is also additional language about water quality, with information on the Total Maximum Daily Load Study and Implementation Plan. She said finally, there is additional information on local agriculture in the area.

Ms. Accardi said since the Commission has already discussed the Implementation chapter, she would move on to the discussion questions, thinking about the full draft before the Commission. She said the questions are, "Is the draft master plan consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan?" and "Do you have any feedback or suggested changes to the draft Crozet Master Plan?"

Mr. Randolph said to answer Question 2, he would reiterate that this master plan is even more detailed and thorough than the Pantops Master Plan, which he had thought was an outstanding update of a master plan. He said what the staff team is doing is they are giving the Commission a taste of what the fully updated Comprehensive Plan will look like, which is exciting because these master plans have much greater specificity, detail, and prioritization, as well as a clearer picture, especially adding (as the Chair has recommended) the amount of staff time that will have to be invested that will help guide Boards, going forward, over the next decade in terms of making choices and decisions as to where money should go.

Mr. Randolph said he did have a cautionary note about the change in the Land Use section on page 5. He said it is under "Rural Context," and it is the word "independent." He said he understands what staff was trying to say in the first sentence, where it stated, "Crozet's setting as a satellite community, separate from the County's Urban Ring Development Areas." He said from this standpoint, it is similar to the Village of Rivanna, which is also a satellite community.

Mr. Randolph said the statement goes on to say, "It makes it important that the community develop in a way that allows it to operate independently." He said he is concerned about the word "independently" because Crozet is very much part of Albemarle County unless, as mentioned earlier in discussions about the Crozet Master Plan, if Crozet is selected to become a town, it would then truly be independent.

Mr. Randolph said he thinks that somehow, staff needs to couch this a little differently to say, "to operate somewhat independently." He said he does not want this to be read by some people to argue that the master plan says Crozet is truly independent in the way that they are going to operate, with a mix of housing types, commercial, and employment uses, as he does not think this is what staff intended. He said words matter, however, and he thinks they need to be careful about how this is worded, as there could be a powder keg around that word "independent." He said perhaps he was being dramatic or exaggerating, but he is trying to be sensitive to that single word. He said otherwise, he would applaud everything else in the plan.

Mr. Bivins said going back to page 4, as well as the cover page on page 3 that has the guiding principle, he would come alongside of Mr. Randolph to point out the words "as a self-sustained town." He said these are terms of art. He said first of all, it is not a town, although it may be at some point in the future. He said it is not self-sustaining because as Mr. Bailey pointed out earlier, 0.5% of the people at this particular moment are doing what they do on a daily basis within the confines of Crozet. He said he would want to be very careful on how they say, "to support and strengthen Crozet's history of a self-sustaining town."

Mr. Bivins said at one point, Crozet was a place that fed the area through produce, frozen food, and cattle. He said the agribusiness that took place in Crozet actually did have a sort of internal economic system to it. He said this is not what is happening today, even with all the grand vineyards that are there. He said it is no longer the purely agri-based business that it used to be in its history, which was brilliantly laid out in the introduction.

Mr. Bivins said his point was that when they talk and craft a narrative about Crozet being a place apart, he wants to be very careful in the language that they use there. He said according to the data staff shared with the Commission, they are not a place apart. He said they are deeply dependent on the rest of the activities that happen in the County, such as UVA, which is still in the County. He said when people go to work in the County, they are still connected to the County. He said he wants to therefore be careful about what they say on page 3 and in the guiding principle on land use within Crozet.

Ms. More noted that she had been having technology issues with her audio and asked if there had been any public comment yet.

Mr. Bivins replied that there had not been.

Ms. More said she had some items that would wait until after public comment. She said she heard the presentation, but she missed the comments due to audio issues. She said she thought that Ms. Accardi said in the beginning that through the community engagement process, with the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay idea, the idea of Middle Density emerged. She said she was not sure if she misheard, but this is not her recollection of how it went, though she did not remember every detail.

Ms. More said her understanding of the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay, which is not seen in the current draft, was that the land use designation recommendation of 3-6, which already exists in the neighborhoods, would stay the same, but there is nuance in the idea that they can incentivize the things that they hope to happen, which is not having every older home torn down, so there would be a way to build more density back in. She said this was her recollection, and she knows they let go of that idea.

Ms. More said she is making a clarification because the idea of Middle Density, which has changed since it was originally presented, was a contentious part of the land use discussion. She said she wanted to clarify that what is proposed now (up to 12, then potentially 18 if certain circumstances are met) are two separate ideas. She said the reason she wanted to make this clarification is because a change has happened since the Commission talked about land use, and as Ms. Accardi touched on, several properties collected together along Tabor Street (as seen on the map, and as written about in The Daily Progress) was a proposed change that came later in the process on the heels of the Board's work session about land use and the Crozet Master Plan.

Ms. More said the reason she was bringing this up was that this area, although a small area, was originally shown in a draft in the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay, and it was presented that with these Downtown Neighborhoods (which still shows through in the context of the plan), the County recognizes that people (and not just those who live in these neighborhoods) worry about what will happen, how these will change, and how they will grow and have infill in a popular area that should become denser around downtown but still have protection.

Ms. More said when people hear this discussion, then suddenly and surprisingly, later in the process, they see an area taken that was proposed to be in this overlay that was intended to provide protection, then the potential land use designation tripled, she thinks this was shocking to people. She said she has had people (mostly those who live in the Downtown Neighborhoods) approach her to say that they are very confused about what to expect for their neighborhood and when or if there could be a process change. She said she has frequently had the conversation about the difference between zoning and land use, and she knows the Commission and staff understand this, but it is confusing and should be repeated as much as possible.

Ms. More said she also sees how the process went, and she does feel that there is a valid point in being a little confused about that change. She said she understands the draft will go forward to the Board and will come back to the Commission again, but she did want to put it out there that having participated, watched, and a good understanding of what the overlay was to pull a collection of properties out of the overlay and say that they are now “missing middle,” this is a major bump in the road for many people who are a little confused about the process and what the goals are with those two different categories.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Shaffer if there were any individuals from the public who wished to speak.

Ms. Shaffer replied there was no one waiting to speak.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. More if she wanted to continue with her items.

Ms. More said she did have some other items to bring up. She said she had some more difficult feedback and that it was difficult to figure out the right way to say it all. She said she would preface that as a whole document, the draft is amazing. She said she thinks it sets them up to have even better master plans across the County, and to get to the main question, she does think this reflects the County’s Comprehensive Plan. She said she thinks this has been a difficult process, and the amount of creativity, engagement, and staff’s willingness to hustle in a time where they cannot get together and are trying to engage a community has been outstanding.

Ms. More said part of what she wanted to say in terms of feedback and the community engagement piece is that it is not for a lack of opportunity. She said it has been a little different, but there are certainly ample opportunities, and there is an attachment that shows all those. She said there is still more opportunity for people to participate and learn. She said this sets them up to have an amazing expectation for other master plans that are waiting to be reviewed.

Ms. More said while she does think this plan is in line with the Comprehensive Plan, for a lot of community members who participated, it does not necessarily represent their feedback. She said this is not an across-the-board statement, but it is certainly true about some more contentious topics.

Ms. More said she knows that when they have people participate, it is not representative of the entire community. She said she knows there are people, across all the plans and interactions, that do not participate for a variety of reasons, and this is always a problem. She said she has no expectation that a group of people that self-selects and chooses to be the most vocal should drive the way that they craft the plan, and she does not think this at all. She said she does think, though, that this process at times has been very challenging for community members and staff, so she wonders about what they can do to make this better for everyone, in the future. She said she thinks setting up clearer expectations for people should be done.

Ms. More said even though they want to enhance engagement, and they know they are not reaching everyone, what they do not want to do is have people leave the process. She said this is happening, and she believes much of it is because some people are not in for the long haul, and people tend to pop in during the parts that are most important to them.

Ms. More said she knows, however, that over the years and talking to older residents who have been in the area for longer, there are a lot of people who do not participate in the process who say that they read an article or heard from their neighbor and that this process is why they do not participate because they did it in 2010, and they are not doing it again. She said they have watched this happen, and she wonders what the County can do to fix that to the extent that it is possible, or how people who participate can hang on, buy in, and continue to participate.

Ms. More said when she reads the first page of the introduction, "About This Plan" and "Community Engagement Plan Drafting," she wonders if this is all really true. She said she did not say this to be mean or cause a problem but since this is a draft, when she reads that, she does not know that she would say this has been her experience or that this is the experience of the average person who participated.

Ms. More said she did not mean this in a negative way, but she wonders that when they say this, and with someone like herself who moved back to the area in 2009 and who read the plan many times along with sentiments and statements, many of which are true, she worries that when people read this and come into a future plan or vision with these expectations, they will be disappointed again to learn that even if there is only 200 people participating and 90% of them all feel a certain way, it does not mean that it is going to happen.

Ms. More said in this first statement in the plan, perhaps they can make the Comprehensive Plan more of the star in that all these things will fall under that, as these are things that drive the County's goals and policies. She said though it is nice to think that it is about this was about sitting around and talking to neighbors in Crozet, she does not think that it was. She said she thinks that it is because these are the goals and policies the County has, and they try to educate and pull people into it. She said she just does not know when she reads the first part of the plan if she thinks it is accurate. She said to her, it could be more honest, and it would be helpful to people in the future to understand the process.

Ms. More said when they talk about community engagement, it is not just community members but stakeholders and all other people who have a say in the plan. She said there are neighbors who do not even live there yet that they need to think about that will read this plan and want to be a part of it. She said she knows staff has to balance all of this, so she was not trying to be negative, but having watched this process, she thinks there are some things they can do to make it smoother in the future. She said the first page of the draft strikes her as an opportunity to reword and restructure it. She said she was happy to send an email with her specific thoughts.

Ms. More said she had a couple other small comments, but she did not know if they were necessary to go through. She said she could email those to the team.

Mr. Bivins said this was up to Ms. More. He asked staff if they would welcome those.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that if they are substantive comments, it would be good for the whole Commission to hear. She said if they are small typos or word changes, however, and email would be fine.

Ms. More said there were a few small items that she would email about. She said her last item was that regarding the first chapter, there is an opportunity the part that speaks to growth to include more robust data that shows the growth and change that has happened over a period of time. She said putting this in would also help with the story of how Crozet has grown and changed. She said it also explains some of the feedback that staff receives from community members. She said she could send more information about that to staff.

Ms. More said along the lines of what she sees when she looks at the image on page 11 of the draft, where it shows 1957, 1974, and 1990, those images are very hard to see. She said she knew it was showing growth, but she had no idea why it stopped at 1990.

Ms. More said she thinks that picture is how she feels when she reads some of the data sets that staff shows in the narrative that leads up to it, and there is more there that could be provided to tell the story. She said there are better images that could be had there to bring them up to at least 2020. She said there is a picture of the mural being painted, which has happened in the last couple of weeks, so she feels like they can show a more current image. She said it is a set of three that is showing the growth. She said there are a lot of good images but that this is probably not one of them.

Mr. Bivins said if there was no additional feedback, he believed they could agree that the draft is consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan. The Commissioners indicated their agreement.

Mr. Clayborne asked staff if they should mention anything about broadband in terms of whether Crozet is adequately covered, or if there is a look to expansion. He said this is such a prominent utility, in light of everything, but there does not appear to be any mention of it.

Ms. Falkenstein said this was a great point and is something that has come up previously, as there is a countywide effort to expand broadband. She said she could look into this further but did not have any information about broadband access, although anecdotally, people tend to have connection issues from time to time, as seen during virtual meetings.

Mr. Carrazana agreed this was a good point from Mr. Clayborne. He said there are some improvements going on in and near Crozet. He said he was not sure whether Firefly, the utility company, covers all of Crozet, but it covers a good portion of it. He said this is a good topic to understand what areas are being improved now and which areas are still potentially lacking.

Mr. Bivins said regarding the introduction, he wanted to thank staff for their inclusion and description of Union Mission. He said he thought that this was an interesting and appropriate section to include in the master plan. He said he also wanted to thank staff for what they did in the Transportation chapter on page 15, where it talks about the challenges of creating a network when so much of a new development has cul-de-sacs and how it is hard to create a network of streets. He said hopefully, this will be a reminder moving forward of how it is hard to retrofit into communities with cul-de-sacs, particularly when people feel as if they want to be connected and how they can do this in a way that will not affect people but allow people to get places.

Mr. Bivins said he had shared with staff his concern about the self-sustaining language in the land use overview. He said he hoped this would be addressed. He said that an appendix may be a good place to note that there is not a lot of land to create jobs. He said there is one 26-acre lot where Acme file system is and some areas downtown, but there are not many places to create jobs. He said perhaps having a conversation with Economic Development could be an appendix item in terms of thinking about how to create a place to build and enliven the community, keeping in mind Mr. Bailey's points when coming up with options and possibilities.

Mr. Bivins thanked staff for leading in the conservation area on page 21, where it talks about the history of the Crozet area being one that was in the agricultural business which, when linked with the introduction, brought the point home to him that this was an area that was engaged in the population of the community. He said this becomes even more important living in a post-pandemic time in terms of having preserving places that can feed people, grow things, and sustain us. He said this is what the Crozet area did at one point in its history, and it will be helpful to look at this as they develop across the community.

Ms. Firehock thanked staff for mentioning many good things about trees in the plan, as they do add a lot to community livability. She said she knows staff knows this well, as well as all the Commissioners.

Ms. Firehock said she noticed in the section that talks about trees, some green bubbles were shown to note where tree focus may be needed in the future. She said she would recommend considering the fact that it would be worthwhile to do a detailed tree canopy map for Crozet. She said her graduate students do this for small towns every semester, so if it is something that the County would like, the students could probably take that on.

Ms. Firehock said as the canopy ages, it will start to die. She said she wants to make sure that as they look at making Crozet walkable and downtown vibrant and thriving, they have some strategies. She said she mentioned standards for planting earlier, but they also need to have a plan to monitor and evaluate the condition of the trees and also ensure they are planted into the future. She said this includes engaging with the community to plant in their backyards and front yards. She said the average urban tree (or about 50% of urban trees) lives less than nine years due to the rough conditions they are in.

Ms. Firehock said that in order to keep Crozet cool and comfortable as the South continues to heat up with climate change, and to facilitate walking more and farther, and to have a successful Downtown District, they may want to think about the wording in that section. She said she could send a follow-up email to staff regarding talking more about the need for overall tree canopy coverage and evaluation and encouraging community plantings. She said there is a lot of funding available for that type of activity and that she is happy to help with some of the mapping.

Mr. Clayborne said he does not like making observations without any possible solutions, which is why he hesitated, but when he was looking at the demographics, he could not help but notice that this part of the County is significantly less racially diverse than the rest. He said they know the enrichment that comes from cultural diversity within respective communities. He said he was not sure if this was an opportunity or challenge, but he felt that something should be said, though he did not know how to address it. He said perhaps there is an opportunity to enrich this as they look 20 years into the future, as the master plan does. He said he did not have an answer or constructive advice, but it was simply an observation that he thinks is worthy of further deliberation.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. Falkenstein if she needed anything further.

Ms. Falkenstein replied no and said that she appreciated the Commission answering staff's questions. She said she did have a slide to share showing the next steps.

Mr. Bivins said he hoped staff was hearing that each Commissioner, without exception, thought the work established a new level and was done in a way that was easy to receive. He said technical writing can be dreadful to have to work through, and this was not a dreadful piece. He said staff has a good writing and editing team. He said some of this was a process piece that was supported more by Ms. More, but as far as the project and the draft is concerned, staff has done exceptional work.

Ms. Falkenstein said she appreciated this and that it was a team effort, as well as the community putting in a lot of time. She said regarding next step, staff is in the process of starting to vet the draft with partner agencies, such as VDOT and other internal and external partners, to make sure there are no red flags and ensure it is not inconsistent with any larger policies. She said there will be a work session on August 4 with the Board, where staff will share similar content and get their feedback on implementation and the full draft. She said pending that feedback, if the Board is comfortable with the content, they will move into public hearings. She said both Planning Commission and Board public hearings are required prior to adoption.

Committee Reports

Mr. Bivins said the night before, there was a Places29 Hydraulic CAC meeting, and there were two good presentations. He said one was on Hydraulic crime statistics, where the police came to talk about the good things happening in the community. He said one thing he wanted to speak about was the agenda item titled, "Albemarle County Growth Management Policy Overview and Connections to Climate Action Planning." He said this was led and delivered by Ms. Accardi and a new staff person.

Mr. Bivins said even though he knew what Ms. Accardi was talking about, he learned more things out of that presentation and language will be helpful as he talks to people in the community who are not as schooled in the technical jargon that the County takes for granted. He said at first, the jargon is hard to deal with because it could be related to planning, legal matters, or simply intellectual posturing. He said other Commissioners with CACs will want to invite Ms. Accardi to the meeting because her presentation was smart, spot-on, and accessible.

Ms. Accardi added that the presentation was recorded.

Mr. Bivins said regarding crime topic, Lt. Tripp Martin and Mr. Andrew Freeman presented an area-specific analysis about what is happening vis-à-vis crime and how it compares to the County. He said he found this interesting, and Hydraulic is doing well. He said for some who sit in CACs surrounding Charlottesville, and with the concerns in the area about whether or not they are seeing a spillover in some of the shootings that have been taking place, while there have been a couple of incidents, they are not seeing the same level of shootings in their particular part of the County. He said except for Avon Street, Hydraulic is probably one of the closest, dense places. He said he would suggest other CACs have this presentation as well.

Mr. Bivins said for those who have been wondering whether or not there will be a Tesla dealer at Stonefield, the answer was no. He recommended trying dealerships on 29 North or Pantops to purchase an electric vehicle. He said Stonefield was coming back, according to the new manager there.

Mr. Bivins asked everyone to watch their catalytic converters, as these are apparently the new hot item for people to steal due to their rare earth minerals. He said they are easy to remove from vehicles and easy to sell.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – June 16, 2021

Mr. Rapp said the Board came very close to adopting a new housing policy. He said it will be coming back to the Board in early July with more details on incentives.

Mr. Rapp said the Board also approved of the Midway Solar Project, which had come to the Commission a few weeks earlier.

Mr. Rapp added that there would not be a Commission meeting the following week.

Old Business/New Business

There were no items.

Items for Follow-Up

There were no items.

Adjournment

At 7:44 p.m., the Commission adjourned to July 6, 2021, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

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

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 07/06/2021
Initials: CSS