

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<p>AGENDA TITLE: Places29: A Master Plan for the Northern Development Areas</p> <p>SUBJECT/PROPOSAL/REQUEST: A work session to introduce the Places29 Master Plan and to request the Board's guidance on several items related to the Master Plan</p> <p>STAFF CONTACT(S): Wayne Cilimberg, David Benish, Elaine Echols, Lee Catlin, Judith Wiegand</p> <p>LEGAL REVIEW: N/A</p>	<p>AGENDA DATE: January 13, 2010 – Board of Supervisors</p> <p>ACTION: INFORMATION: X</p> <p>CONSENT AGENDA: ACTION: INFORMATION:</p> <p>ATTACHMENTS: Yes</p> <p>REVIEWED BY: VWC</p>
--	---

BACKGROUND:

In 2004, the Board directed staff to prepare a master plan for the County's four Northern Development Areas: Neighborhood 1, Neighborhood 2, the Community of Hollymead, and the Community of Piney Mountain. In conjunction with the Thomas Jefferson Regional Planning Commission (TJPDC), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and a team of land use and transportation consultants, staff has prepared the Places29 Master Plan (hereinafter referred to as "the Plan").

The Plan incorporates the results of the US 29 North Corridor Transportation Study that was managed by the TJPDC and was overseen and funded by VDOT. In May 2005, staff and consultants began the public process of preparing the Plan. The US 29 North Corridor Transportation Study Final Report was completed on August 18, 2008. The MPO Policy Board adopted a resolution endorsing the Final Report on November 24, 2008.

Over the course of work on the Plan, there were over twenty public meetings held, including those held by the Planning Commission and Board. In addition, information about the Plan has been available at the County's website. A list of the meetings, including work sessions, is included in Appendix 3 of the Plan. At a public hearing on October 27, 2009, the Planning Commission voted to forward the Plan to the Board with a recommendation for approval.

A copy of the Master has been provided under separate cover. In addition to the Plan, a summary fact sheet on the Plan is provided for additional background (Attachment A). At this juncture, staff will provide the Board a summary review of the components of the plan and asks that the Board offer guidance regarding two specific areas in advance of future work sessions on the details of the Plan: possible expansions of the development area (not endorsed by the Planning Commission) and transportation improvements on US 29 North.

STRATEGIC PLAN:

Relevant Goals:

1. Develop Policies and Infrastructure Improvements to Address the County's Growing Needs.
2. Effectively Manage the County's Growth and Development.

DISCUSSION:

The Plan contains sections covering existing conditions, needed infrastructure improvements, a future land use plan, a transportation plan, and an implementation strategy. The Plan integrates land use and transportation planning and represents the ultimate vision desired for the area. The vision does not have a timeframe, but includes a list of public and private actions—the implementation projects—that will be needed over the next 20 years.

The Implementation section of the plan includes the existing backlog of needed infrastructure improvements, as well as new projects, to support growth and development in the Places29 area. Projects are grouped into four categories: Transportation, Land Use and Development, Community Facilities and Services, and Parks and Green Systems. With the exception of the enhanced transit recommendation, all of the projects listed would also be necessary under the current Land Use Plan adopted in 1996. The enhanced transit project is considered fundamental to fully enabling the form of development recommended in the Plan and eventually reducing future vehicular traffic in the corridor.

Overall, the land use component of the Plan and most of the “local” level transportation recommendations (pedestrian, bike, transit, and local parallel and perpendicular road system recommendations) have been generally supported by the public. However, there are two important areas where public and minority commission concerns were expressed that staff believes warrant early discussion and guidance from the Board of Supervisors:

Expansion Areas: Since adoption of the 1996 Land Use Plan the Board has generally maintained the Development Area (DA) boundaries in an effort to preserve the Rural Areas with two exceptions. Boundaries were changed in Crozet to balance the addition of north downtown with removal of an area along US 250. The boundary of Pantops was reduced to balance similar areas on the west and east side of Route 20 North.

Expansion Areas in Places 29 were requested by property owners and were considered in two areas: adjacent to Piney Mountain and the southern end of Hollymead. Early in the Plan review process, the consultant and staff recommended expansion of the area south of the existing Hollymead boundary west of US 29 as a way to potentially enable development that would include construction of Berkmar Drive Extended, a high priority parallel road improvement. The recommended land uses in this area were primarily neighborhood and urban density residential and neighborhood-scale commercial uses, different than the property owner request for regional service and mixed use land uses in part of this area. The Board also directed staff and Commission to consider expansion of the east side of the Piney Mountain Development Area to compensate for the loss of land to the federal military installation (Rivanna Station Military Base), a second property owner request. In this case, the consultant and staff recommended against the expansion as sufficient residential area appeared to be available nearby.

The majority of the Commission believed that sufficient capacity and opportunities for development were available within the existing Development Areas and that the DA boundaries should not be expanded until absolutely necessary. However, the Commission did have staff draft a potential map and text amendment for the southern Hollymead Development Area expansion, which is provided as Attachment B. Most public comments received to date have opposed the expansions.

Does the Board need additional information to advise staff on whether expansion areas should be included in the Master Plan? If so, what information is needed?

US 29 Road Improvements: The US 29 North Corridor Transportation Study transportation modeling demonstrated that a series of improvements to the road network would be necessary over the next 20 years to remedy existing congestion and to provide for future growth and development. These recommended transportation projects form a unified set of improvements. Several of these improvements are on US 29: widening to six lanes from Polo Grounds Road to Hollymead Town Center and constructing grade-separated intersections at Hydraulic Road, Rio Road, Hilton Heights Road, Ashwood Blvd., Timberwood Road, and Airport Road. The primary reason these grade separations would be needed is to enable increased traffic volumes both on US 29 and the east-west crossing roads to flow through these intersections without unacceptable delay. Traffic on US 29 is given preference over traffic on the cross streets. As traffic increases in all directions, eventually there will not be enough time within each signal cycle to permit all of the necessary crossing and turning movements with at-grade intersections. By raising the cross street over (or under) US 29, traffic can adequately flow in both directions simultaneously. The grade separations would also be designed to include pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities and to integrate with the adjacent private lands so as to maximize their development potential and minimize disruption.

What additional information does the Board need before completing its review of the transportation component of the Master Plan?

BUDGET IMPACT:

The Master Plan contains a list of approximately 60 projects that are deemed to be necessary over the next 20 years to fully support growth and development of the US 29 North corridor. As mentioned previously, the infrastructure projects identified—transportation, schools, parks, and others—would generally be necessary with or without the land use recommendations of Places 29. Much is a result of already approved development projects in the area and would be necessary to address future projects that would result from the 1996 Land Use Plan. However, Places 29 coordinates

the needs identified with its land use recommendations, providing the opportunity for incremental improvements based on available resources and the possibility of reduced vehicular traffic demands if development occurs as the Plan recommends.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff requests Board guidance regarding the Expansion Areas and US 29 Improvements as well as any other information the Board needs for future consideration of the proposed Plan. Staff will schedule future work sessions based on the timeframe needed to provide requested information and the Board's upcoming agendas.

ATTACHMENTS

[Separate cover--Places29: A Master Plan for the Northern Development Areas](#)

[A – The Places29 Master Plan: Ten Important Facts](#)

[B—Expansion Area memorandum and potential amendment language](#)

Note: All eleven Technical Memoranda from the US 29 North Transportation Study are available on the County's website.

Planning Commission minutes:

[February 10, 2009](#)

[April 14, 2009](#)

[May 12, 2009](#)

[June 16, 2009](#)

[July 14, 2009](#)

[September 15, 2009](#)

[October 27, 2009](#)

[Return to regular agenda](#)