

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
December 12, 2006**

Work Session

ZMA 2006-016 Glenmore Section K2 (Leake) – Signs #31, 32, 44, 69

PROPOSAL: Rezone 110.94 acres from RA - Rural Area zoning district which allows agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre) to PRD - Planned Residential District - residential (3 - 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses to allow for 110 dwelling units. This proposal is an expansion of the Glenmore PRD and does not include commercial uses.

PROFFERS: Yes

EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Neighborhood Density Residential - residential (3-6 units/acre) and supporting uses such as religious institutions and schools and other small-scale non-residential uses.

ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No

LOCATION: 1.25 miles south of the intersection of Route 250 East and Hacktown Road, North of the Rivanna River, west of Carroll Creek, and east of the Development Area boundary.

TAX MAP/PARCEL: Tax Map 94, Parcel 16, 74, and 16A (portion thereof) and Tax Map 93A1, Parcel 1

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville

STAFF: Sean Dougherty

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on ZMA-2006-016, Glenmore Section K2 (Leake) to consider the appropriateness of the applicant's proposals to increase density on each property and provide guidance on transportation constraints and options through response to questions posed by staff.

Leake Property – Questions for the Commission

1. Is the applicant's approach to density appropriate?

The Commission agreed that the applicant's approach to providing a number of smaller, cottage style lots, mixed with larger lots, was appropriate. This increased the number of residential lots proposed from 86 to 110.

2. Should the applicant's proposal be acceptable to the Commission, should the development take access through Glenmore, Running Deer Drive, or both?

The Commission agreed that access to this property should be provided through Glenmore, but needs to be analyzed with a traffic study.

3. Which of the applicant's proposals for providing access to Glen Oaks through the Leake Property is acceptable, if any?

The Commission agreed that the applicant's Option 1, which provides access to Leake and Glen Oaks along a road that runs along the ridge delineating the Development Areas from the Rural Areas, was acceptable.

ZMA 2006-015 Glenmore Section S5 (Livengood) – Signs #26, 30

PROPOSAL: Rezone 32.24 acres from RA - Rural Area zoning district which allows agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre) to PRD - Planned Residential District - residential (3 - 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses to allow for 42 dwelling units. This proposal is an expansion of the Glenmore PRD and does not include commercial uses.

PROFFERS: Yes

EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Neighborhood Density Residential - residential (3-6 units/acre) and supporting uses such as religious institutions and schools and other small-scale non-residential uses.

ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No

LOCATION: 2000 feet south of the intersection of Route 250 East and Hacktown Road, North of Pendowner Lane (in Glenmore), and east of Carroll Creek

TAX MAP/PARCEL: Tax Map 80, Parcel 48 and Tax Map 94, Parcel 1

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville

STAFF: Sean Dougherty

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on ZMA-06-15, Glenmore Expansion: Livengood to consider the appropriateness of the applicant's proposals to increase density on each property and provide guidance on transportation constraints and options through response to questions posed by staff.

Livengood – Questions for the Commission

1. Should the applicant attempt to bring a vehicular connection to Rivanna Village across the common boundary line with the Livengood property?

The Commission agreed that it would not be appropriate to provide vehicular access to Rivanna Village across the only available common property line because it would involve impacts to critical slopes, an intermittent stream and a long proposed road in a circuitous alignment. The Commission felt that a stub out for future connection to Rivanna Village not abutting the Livengood property could allow for access and potentially a second gate in the future.

2. Which scheme or what parts of individual schemes work best to achieve an acceptable density based on the adjacency of Rivanna Village and Glenmore?

The Commission agreed that all of Livengood should become part of Glenmore, but there was no consensus on which of the schemes (41, 42, 51, and 57 lots) was most appropriate in terms of density.

ZMA 2001-08 Rivanna Village at Glenmore (Signs #16, 17, 19, 20, 21)

PROPOSAL: Rezone approx. 94.5 acres from RA -- Rural Areas which allows agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre) residential (3 - 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses and PRD Planned Residential District which allows residential (3 - 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses to NMD Neighborhood Model District which allows residential (3 - 34 units/acre) mixed with commercial, service and industrial uses. A maximum of 500 dwellings is proposed with an overall gross density of 5.29 units/acre.

PROFFERS: Yes

EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Neighborhood Density Residential - residential (3-6 units/acre) and supporting uses such as religious institutions and schools and other small-scale non-residential uses and Community Service - community-scale retail wholesale, business and medical offices, mixed use core communities and/or employment services, and residential (6.01-34 units/acre) in the Village of Rivanna.

ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes

LOCATION: (address/intersection/route number and street name) and Rural Area or specific Development Area

TAX MAP/PARCEL: a 4.583 acre portion of Tax Map 93A1, Parcel 1 and a 0.741 acre portion of Tax Map 93A1-1 zoned Glenmore PRD; Tax Map 93A1, Parcels 2, 3 & 4; Tax Map 80, Parcel 46, 46A, 46C, 46D, 46E, 50, 51, and 55A all zoned RA Rural Areas; and Tax Map parcel 25A also zoned PRD.

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Scottsville

STAFF: Elaine Echols

Mr. Craddock recused himself and left the meeting.

In summary, the Planning Commission held a work session on ZMA-01-08, Rivanna Village at Glenmore to discuss new design, overall density, affordable housing and its relationship to Livengood property. The Commission is requested to affirm these elements or suggest changes to make these elements acceptable. The Commission discussed staff's recommendations regarding the rezoning request, took applicant and public comment and provided comments and suggestions to the questions posed in the staff report as follows:

Should the Rivanna Village at Glenmore development be modified to allow for interconnections and a relationship to the Livengood property?

Staff noted that the Commission had just finished this discussion when reviewing questions about the Livengood property.

The conclusion of the Commission was that the Rivanna Village design did not need to be modified for any future connections. Connections shown on the Rivanna Village Plan provide the opportunities needed for the future.

Does the new design sufficiently address the Planning Commission's request for the park to have natural areas and potentially retain the quarry?

The Commission answered affirmatively.

Is a minimum density essential? If so, are 4 dwellings per acre an acceptable density?

While the Commission did not conclude that a minimum density was essential, they did discuss the problems related to keeping track of minimum density. The Commission said that 4 dwelling units per acre gross are acceptable; how that density is tracked was not important to them.

If the minimum density in a block is exceeded, can the minimum density in a different block be decreased by a like amount?

The Commission agreed that they were concerned about the gross dwellings per acre and that modifications such as these were fine.

Can the minimum density be based on the total area minus the assisted living facility?

The Commission answered affirmatively.

Is the affordable housing proposal appropriate for Rivanna Village at Glenmore?

The Commission said that the proposal for affordable housing in substance is acceptable.

Old Business:

Ms. Joseph asked if there was any old business. There being none, the meeting moved on to the next item.

New Business:

Ms. Joseph asked if there was any new business. There being none, the meeting proceeded.

Adjournment:

With no further items, the meeting adjourned at 12:35 a.m. to the joint Board of Supervisors meeting on Wednesday, December 13, 2006 meeting at 4:00 p.m. at the County Office Building, Second Floor, Auditorium.

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon Claytor Taylor, Recording Secretary.)