

An adjourned meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Albemarle County, Virginia, was held on January 13, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., Lane Auditorium, County Office Building, McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia. The meeting was adjourned from January 6, 2010.

PRESENT: Mr. Kenneth C. Boyd, Mr. Lindsay G. Dorrier, Jr., Ms. Ann H. Mallek, Mr. Dennis S. Rooker, Mr. Duane E. Snow (arrived at 9:42 a.m.) and Mr. Rodney S. Thomas.

ABSENT: None.

OFFICERS PRESENT: County Executive, Robert W. Tucker, Jr., County Attorney, Larry W. Davis, Director of Community Development, Mark Graham, Director of Planning, V. Wayne Cilimberg and Senior Deputy Clerk, Meagan Hoy.

NonAgenda. Prior to beginning the meeting, the Board briefly discussed scheduling Arden Place on an agenda to receive public comments. This discussion had tentatively been scheduled for the night of February 10th. The Clerk informed Board members that February 10th was a heavy meeting.

Mr. Rooker indicated that at the Board's last meeting they agreed that the developer at Woodbrook should go ahead with their plan. The developer agreed to amend the plan whenever the County was ready – as it would cost them less if the trail were shortened or narrow. Mr. Rooker said that there is no pressure to do anything there until they're ready to build it, although for sake of efficiency the County should deal with it in the next few months.

Mr. Thomas commented that his concern is that the developer gets his permits so he can pay his tap fees before March 1st.

Mr. Davis stated that the agreement would be designed so it allows for lesser improvements to be made at the direction of the Board.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that the Board is not taking any actions that will hold up the developer one way or another, and technically it only needs to be dealt with when they are ready to construct the improvements.

Mr. Thomas said that he would send out a notice to the homeowners association and that they would be notified when this item is scheduled to come to the Board.

Mr. Rooker noted that he would like to walk out to the site again, but with the snow cover it can't really be viewed.

Mr. Tucker reiterated that the discussion on Arden Place would be scheduled on a future agenda and that the citizens would be given an opportunity to speak at that meeting.

Agenda Item No. 1. The meeting was called to order at 9:42 a.m. by the Chair, Ms. Mallek. The Board then did the Pledge of Allegiance and had a Moment of Silence.

Agenda Item No. 1a. From the Board: Matters not Listed on the Agenda.

Ms. Mallek said she has circulated to Board members suggested language provided by the Virginia Municipal League concerning the proposed constitutional amendment to exempt combat-disabled veterans from local property taxes. She noted that some improvements and alterations were made from the original version, and this will affect County residents. She asked for feedback from Board members on whether they should consider sending a similar letter to County legislative representatives and VACo. She noted that this request came from Kristin Szakos, in the City.

Mr. Rooker said that if the State wants to do something for disabled veterans, they have a whole host of things they can do that would not require a constitutional amendment – such as an income tax credit. He thinks it is very easy for the State to talk about giving things away when they are giving away localities' revenues instead of their own. He appreciates the thought that something should be done for veterans, but the State has many easy ways of doing that with their own money that does not require a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Dorrier said that he does not think there will be that many veterans with 100 percent disability requesting the exemption, as 100 percent service-related disability is a high standard to meet. He said that only about ten percent of citizens are veterans, and a much smaller portion of those meet the 100 percent requirement.

Ms. Mallek said the only suggestion is to refine the approach to make it less burdensome on local governments and more broadly applicable. She added that the first year this was passed; it has to be passed a second year, and then go to referendum. She added that the initiative being worked on in Lexington has made some good suggestions.

Mr. Davis noted that the practical result is that what's being requested is for the General Assembly not to approve it in this session, which would effectively kill the constitutional amendment, and propose an alternative relief through legislation that would not require a constitutional amendment.

Mr. Rooker said that there's no reason to amend the constitution to give disabled veterans a benefit. "It's killing an ant with a steamroller."

Mr. Snow commented that he has a question about whether they are disabled because of service, or disabled because of age.

Mr. Dorrier responded that this requirement is for 100 percent service-related disability.

Mr. Rooker said he is not arguing that disabled veterans should get benefits; the question is what is an appropriate benefit to provide. It does not make sense to him to amend the constitution in this way. The legislature could provide any kind of benefits it wants to – they could be given an income tax credit, and then they all could benefit, not just the ones that own property.

Mr. Boyd pointed out that the reason they may be addressing it through a constitutional amendment is that it would be much more difficult to repeal that way.

Ms. Mallek asked Board members how they'd like to handle the matter.

Mr. Rooker said he would support sending a letter supporting the changes suggested by Lexington, as it states that a constitutional amendment may not be the best way to achieve benefits for veterans.

Mr. Rooker then **moved** that the Board send the following letter of support to VaCo and the Legislative representatives:

"The Albemarle County Board of Supervisors does not support passage for the second year of the constitutional amendment establishing a property tax waiver for disabled veterans. We all support programs to assist our veterans and seek more inclusive programs and better delivery mechanisms than the property tax waiver.

A constitutional amendment to grant an exemption from real estate taxation for veterans who have a 100 percent service related disability represents an inefficient and inequitable way to recognize the sacrifices that veterans have made. The amendment enacted in the 2009 session 8 2010 VML Legislative Program poses several policy issues:

- Not all veterans would be eligible for the benefit; many of those are already eligible for local real estate tax exemptions for the elderly and the disabled.
- Surviving spouses of those who died while in service are not eligible.
- Veterans who do not own houses are not eligible.
- Veterans with a disability rating of less than 100 percent are not eligible.
- The exemption is granted with no regard to income level.
- The State is providing tax relief using the revenues of local governments, instead of using its own revenues.

Should the state wish to assist veterans with service-related disabilities, it has many potential avenues it could follow that could assist all veterans with service-related disabilities, including those who do not have the means to own their own homes or who are homeless. Some options include:

- Provide a state tax credit based on the real estate tax paid by the eligible veteran. The tax credit could be prorated to the level of disability and to the income level of the veteran, and could be extended to surviving spouses who have not remarried.
- Survivors of those who die while in service could be eligible to receive the credit at the same level as veterans with a 100 percent level of disability.
- Not tax the unearned income of veterans with service-connected disabilities. While veterans' disability income is not subject to state income taxation, unearned income is.
- Increase services available to homeless veterans.
- Provide a refundable income tax credit for qualified veterans.

We request VACo assist us and other localities in this regard and for our representatives to vote against the bill to forward the constitutional amendment."

Mr. Thomas **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Snow and Mr. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Ms. Mallek said that Board members will be receiving a mailing and CD from an energy-smart solutions website, designed to help people focus on small personal improvements they can make to conserve energy and lower their utility bills.

Ms. Mallek said that yesterday she attended a re-dedication of the Martin Horn building, where they have achieved LEED certification of their existing building. This shows tremendous leadership on the part of a private business and is an inspiration to others.

Mr. Rooker commented that this is the first building in the area to achieve the LEED status by retrofitting an existing building.

Ms. Mallek noted that they received a score of 92 out of 100.

Ms. Mallek said she would like or the Board to consider is a resolution to allow an expenditure of \$1,000 from the existing ACE Program advertising fund to be the local match for the recently awarded grant from a State Development Block Grant for the Artisan Trail. She stated that this grant application was in conjunction with Nelson County, and the \$1,000 would be combined with that county's match and the grant to produce a similar brochure to Floyd County's – featuring the artisans, craftspeople, artisan farmers, and rural business people in the area. Ms. Mallek said that the brochure would have a large map showing where these businesses are located, and she sees it as real economic development tool and a way to bring awareness to the ACE Program.

Mr. Rooker commented that it makes sense to do this with Nelson County. It reduces the cost of producing something that would be helpful to rural business people and would also encourage tourism.

Mr. Snow asked how it would be distributed.

Ms. Mallek responded that it would be placed in all the tourist kiosks where beer and wine trail information is displayed, through the Visitors Bureau.

Mr. Boyd said he supports the request as it does promote the County's rural business interests.

Mr. Snow said he supports the request.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Rooker to approve the allocation of \$1,000 from the ACE advertising fund to serve as the match for the recently awarded grant from the State Development Block Grant for the Artisan Trail. Mr. Thomas **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Snow and Mr. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 1b. From the Public: Matters not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.

Mr. Morgan Butler, of the Southern Environmental Law Center, said that he directs the Charlottesville-Albemarle project, which promotes development patterns that reduce both environmental and financial strains that poorly planned growth can have on the community. He said that the SELC has been focused on the Places29 issue, which would be discussed later in this meeting. Staff will be asking the Board what additional information they need on two key Places29 issues.

Mr. Butler said that the first issue is proposed expansions of the growth area, which the Planning Commission has rejected – the Hollymead South request, which would expand the growth area north of the Rivanna River to allow for a new large-scale retail store in exchange for money and land to go toward a new Berkmar Bridge and extension. He stated that while the SELC understands the need to leverage transportation dollars from the private sector, but urged Board members to have some critical information prior to making any changes to the Comp Plan. Mr. Butler said that some information necessary to weigh the pros and cons of the Hollymead South proposal is not in front of the Board, specifically no traffic modeling has been done that shows what effect it would have on the rest of the Places29 transportation network. He stated that staff estimated that the new big box store alone could generate up to 8,500 new vehicle trips per day – a significant number of new cars for this already congested stretch of Route 29 to absorb, and traffic modeling may show that additional improvements would be needed to handle this volume. Mr. Butler said that approving the request might set the County up to receive funding for one project, it may also be creating or accelerating the need for other costly projects that the landowner has not promised to cover, and County taxpayers would be left holding the bag. He urged the Board to make sure it has this information in hand before deciding what to do with the request.

With regard to the transportation projects, SELC recommends that the Board make sure it has all vital information before making changes to the Plan. Mr. Butler noted that the idea of a grade-separated intersection has provoked concerns from the landowners whose property could be impacted, numerous studies have shown that two grade-separated interchanges – one at Rio Road and one at Hydraulic Road – are critical to reducing congestion on Route 29. That is why they're in the plan, and that is why the County has already invested so much time and money into thinking about them. He stated that it would be extremely risky to remove a long planned transportation piece from the Plan without a clear understanding as to how it would impact the rest of the network. SELC believes that the best way for the Master Plan to address the grade-separated interchanges is to make sure clear that nearby businesses and citizens must be able to sit down with the County and State officials to shape a design a plan that minimizes impacts to nearby properties – such as the small-area plans that Places29 envisions.

Mr. Jeff Werner, of Piedmont Environmental Council, distributed to Board members a spreadsheet of commercial retail space that has been approved or is pending from the County, and a listing of residential property in the County (copies on file in Clerk's office). He said that he has fielded many questions about Biscuit Run and its impact on the growth area now that it will not contain residential units. He is the data on residential property relates to approved rezonings, special use permits, and site plans – not building permits. Mr. Werner stated that taking Biscuit Run out of the mix leaves about 12,000 dwelling units that are already approved and another 1,000 pending, which is enough for 30,000 residents. Mr. Werner noted that combined with those approved in the City (4,000 units), there is enough housing in the pipeline for 40,000 people – several decades' worth of growth that could be accommodated.

With regard to the commercial retail space, Mr. Werner, said about 4.0 million square feet have gone through in the last several years. He thinks that about 2.5 to 3.0 million of that amount is still unbuilt. This information is provided to the Board as part of its future discussions, and he is available to discuss the information in further detail.

Mr. Boyd asked if a traffic study is required as part of the County's process for development on Route 29.

Mr. Cilimberg explained that the State's 527 regulations require traffic studies to be done for Comprehensive Plan Amendments, rezonings and site plans.

Ms. Mallek asked who pays for that study when it is a CPA, and what that cost would be.

Mr. Cilimberg replied that the applicant pays for a rezoning study, but for Comp Plan changes staff has not talked about it with property owners.

Mr. Rooker commented that Comp Plan changes usually involve a group of property owners – not a single one – and they may not all be in favor of it. He added that it would be helpful to know the cost and who would bear it.

Mr. David Benish, Chief of Planning, said he has had some very preliminary discussions with VDOT as it may relate to the Route 29 Corridor Study, and it is possible the study could be incorporated into the work.

Mr. Thomas asked if VDOT is still using the same traffic modeling process.

Mr. Benish replied that VDOT has completed the development of the actual technical model, and there is a "much better, more sensitive model" now that can provide for much more detailed analyses of roadway networks, and now that is being passed onto the Planning Districts to be handled through the MPO process. The new model is better at tracking some of the issues with more accuracy, i.e., transportation impacts of walkability and modeling of local roadways. He added that what has not been completed with the new model is all the updated data that goes into it, because there is no new Census data yet as well as a household transportation survey patterns that feed into the assumptions used.

Ms. Mallek commented that 2010 is the year for the new household data to come forward, and she is looking forward to the new information.

Mr. Benish noted that there would be some lag time in getting that data though, possibly up to two years.

Mr. Rooker said that the new model is being used by the Planning Districts.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that the TJPDC's new staff person from Georgia is "very experienced in traffic management."

Ms. Mallek then asked for an update on the status of Dickerson Road to Airport Road.

Mr. Rooker commented that that's a very important part of the network. He thought there was a time limit on its completion.

Mr. Graham said that the developer and VDOT have been going back on forth on the proper design of the roundabout there – Towne Center Drive and Meeting Street (Berkmar Extended). The developer built something before they had an approved plan; VDOT did not find the design acceptable and it appears they have finally reached some resolution on that as far as the design issue. Once they get that done the developer can finish the road up. He said that a year is probably realistic, not six months.

Mr. Rooker stated that it will be nice for people to be able to access the shopping center from the back instead of having to go out onto Route 29.

Agenda Item No. 2. Consent Agenda. Mr. Rooker **moved** to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Snow **seconded** the motion. (Discussions on individual items are included with that agenda item.) Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Snow and Mr. Thomas.
NAYS: None.

Item No. 2.1. Increase Department of Social Services (DSS) Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Employee Authorized Staffing Level.

The executive summary states that to date, the County Executive's Office has implemented various strategies to address the ongoing shortfall in County revenues without resorting to employee layoffs and furloughs. One of these strategies is the voluntary reallocation of County staff experiencing a reduced workload to a department with an increased workload. To date, these staff reallocation efforts have contributed to generating the equivalent of fifty-eight (58) positions that have been eliminated, frozen or offset with alternative revenue sources.

The Department of Social Services ("DSS"), a County Department experiencing an increased workload, has benefitted from this strategy with several of its vacant positions being filled in this manner. In December, the Board authorized an increase in overall FTE staffing for DSS by 2 positions to 100.2. Since the Board's December meeting, the Human Resources Department has identified three (3) additional employees that are qualified to perform work in DSS and are eligible for reassignment. In order to proceed with relocating these employees to DSS, the Board must approve increasing the number of DSS authorized FTE employees from 100.2 to 103.2.

The rationale for seeking an increase in staffing for DSS is linked to the fact that DSS has experienced an unprecedented growth in caseload over the past two years without additional resources to manage or address this growth. Staffing was below state standards prior to this growth and continues to be a significant problem for DSS to manage. The majority of growth has been seen in the Benefit Programs that provide Medicaid, TANF, Employment Services and SNAP (formally Food Stamps) assistance to citizens. As set forth in the quarterly DSS workload summary provided to the Board at its December 2, 2009 meeting, these areas have witnessed the following changes since November 2007:

- 52% increase in SNAP (Food Stamp) cases; 55% increase in applications
- 63% increase in TANF cases; 23% increase in applications.
- 19% increase in Medicaid cases; 50% increase in applications

The following graphical information is provided:

- Attachment A – Applications and case trends for Benefits programs
- Attachment B – Workload Measures for Benefits programs
- Attachment C – Overtime hours and overtime payouts for selected programs

Workload standards established by the State for line staff are monitored by DSS on a regular basis. Based on those standards, the DSS Eligibility Division, as of November 2009 was understaffed by a total of five (5) positions. Given the County's financial situation, it is not possible to consider hiring new employees to fill those positions, or other vacant positions; however, reallocating existing staff into the DSS Eligibility Division allows for federal reimbursement of up to 50% of those employees' compensation. For every two employees the County can move into the DSS Benefits Programs from other departments whose positions are fully funded by County dollars, there is the equivalent savings of one FTE's cost.

Increasing the overall FTE employee total in DSS from 100.2 to 103.2 and voluntarily transferring three (3) existing local government employees to fill these positions will generate the equivalent of 1.5 additional positions offset with alternative revenue given that the County will receive 50% federal reimbursement for any position that can be allocated to Benefit Programs.

Staff recommends that the Board authorize an increase in the number of authorized General Fund FTE Employees in DSS from 100.2 to 103.2.

(Discussion: Mr. Snow asked how much overtime is being spent now to cover the three positions being recommended.

Mr. Bryan Elliott, Assistant County Executive, said that he is not certain what the impact on overtime would be; the Department has clamped down on overtime. Instead of caseworkers doing the work, it is being done by Supervisors since they do not fall under the requirements for overtime. By adding these positions, it would allow the workflow to go back to the caseworks and eligibility workers.

Mr. Snow commented that the Board has not had a chance to see the effect of the two additional employees that were added in December.

Mr. Elliott agreed, and added that the workload graph continues to show that the standards are way above. These additional personnel will get the County closer to the state standards. He added that the state standards are a matrix that calculates caseload per eligibility worker. The County has not met those standards for a number of years.

Mr. Rooker noted that the effect on the budget is a net reduction in the budget, as these employees would qualify for federal reimbursement.

Mr. Elliott said that was accurate.

Mr. Snow commented that his point was that it might be better to free three more positions and then have an even greater reduction in the payroll.

Mr. Tucker responded that you would be eliminating positions and laying people off, which the County has been trying to avoid.

Ms. Mallek said that the Department of Social Services is the only safety net to provide for people in need.

Mr. Rooker stated that Mr. Snow hasn't been to any of the presentations from Social Services, and the increase in their workload – and at last count Albemarle has been down 12 to 14 people there, which is well below the state standard. Mr. Rooker explained that the state is supposed to fund these positions, with the federal government matching the salaries, but the state hasn't been covering their end. The Department is undersized for state and federal guidelines. He suggested having the Department come back in and talk about their workload.

Mr. Elliott said that there are two aspects to the casework – taking the applications and screening for eligibility, and then providing the ongoing services. He emphasized that there are requirements from federal and state governments, and following the cases is where the workload lies.

Mr. Snow stated that there were two added in December, plus these three, and according to the information in the chart, the Department was actually down seven. He added that with these additions the Department should come out in a better position than previously.

Mr. Elliott agreed.)

By the above-recorded vote, the Board authorized an increase in the number of authorized General Fund FTE Employees in DSS from 100.2 to 103.2.

Item No. 2.2. FY 2010 Appropriation.

The executive summary states that Virginia Code § 15.2-2507 provides that any locality may amend its budget to adjust the aggregate amount to be appropriated during the fiscal year as shown in the currently adopted budget; provided, however, any such amendment which exceeds one percent of the total expenditures shown in the currently adopted budget must be accomplished by first publishing a notice of a meeting and holding a public hearing before amending the budget. The Code section applies to all County funds, i.e., General Fund, Capital Funds, E911, School Self-Sustaining, etc.

The total of the new requested FY 2010 appropriations, itemized below, is \$1,500,000. A budget amendment public hearing is not required because the cumulative appropriations will not exceed one percent of the currently adopted budget.

This request involves the approval of one (1) FY 2010 appropriation as follows:

- One (1) appropriation (#2010060) totaling \$1,500,000.00 for the ECC U. S. Department of Justice COPS Technology Grant

A description of this request is provided in Attachment A.

Staff recommends approval of the budget amendment in the amount of \$1,500,000.00 and the approval of Appropriation #2010060.

Attachment A

Appropriation #2010060 \$ 1,500,000.00

Revenue Source: Federal Revenue \$ 1,500,000.00

The Department of Justice awarded Albemarle County, as fiscal agent for the Charlottesville-U.Va.-Albemarle Emergency Communications Center ("ECC"), a \$1,500,000 COPS technology grant to obtain detailed digital imagery of the 10 counties and 14 cities in the 5th Congressional District. Pictometry International will contract with the County to provide flight-captured image software, which will be used by dispatch, law-enforcement, and fire and rescue providers throughout the 5th Congressional District.

(Discussion: Mr. Rooker said that he had a question about Appropriation #2010056 – the Visitors Center. He asked why, if the County gave the property away, it has an expenditure of \$144,556.63. The summary also states that the County's share would be transferred to the General Fund balance, as the property has already been deeded away.

Mr. Tucker stated that that particular appropriation was approved by the Board at its January 6th meeting. It was inadvertently included with today's packet. The only appropriation on the agenda today is for the Emergency Communications system.

Mr. Rooker and Mr. Boyd indicated that they would still like an explanation as to why there would be funds available.

Mr. Davis explained that over the life of the property, the County collected rent from the Monticello Foundation – and that rent account had a remaining balance. Under an agreement with the City there was a 50/50 requirement to maintain the facility. He said that once the facility was closed and all expenses zeroed out, there was money left over in the fund that was split between the City and the County.

Mr. Rooker asked what the appropriation was for.

Mr. Elliott said the \$144,556.63 was a maintenance escrow account that had built up over 20 years. As stated by Mr. Davis, the County and the City split the funds 50/50. Part of the appropriation (\$50,000) of the County's balance went towards fulfilling the contractual requirement with the SPCA for their capital fund (which had nothing to do with the Visitors Center). The reason for the difference in the amounts is that the City's share represents their full share of the escrow account.

Mr. Boyd said that the reference to maintenance and repairs is confusing him, and asked if that had to be done in order to sell the building.

Mr. Elliott responded that every year as part of the rent paid there was an amount built in to go into the maintenance fund – which also covered electrical costs – and when the transfer occurred with PVCC there were some items that needed to be taken care of before the building was turned over.)

By the above-recorded vote, the Board approved the budget amendment in the amount of \$1,500,000.00 and approved Appropriation #2010060.

COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE							APP #	2010060	
APPROPRIATION							DATE	1/13/2010	
							BATCH#		
EXPLANATION:			US Department of Justice COPS Technology Grant awarded to ECC - Pictometry System						
					SUB LEDGER		GENERAL LEDGER		
TYPE	FUND	DEPT	OBJECT	DESCRIPTION	CODE	AMOUNT	DEBIT	CREDIT	
2	4100	33000	330403	DOJ - COPS Program	J 2	1,500,000.00			
1	4100	31040	800304	ECC Pictometry System	J 1	1,500,000.00			
	4100		0501	Est. Revenue			1,500,000.00		
			0701	Appropriation				1,500,000.00	
TOTAL						3,000,000.00	1,500,000.00	1,500,000.00	

Agenda Item No. 3. **PUBLIC HEARING** to solicit public input on local housing and community development needs in relation to the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding available to the County. (Advertised in the Daily Progress on December 28 and January 4, 2010.)

Mr. Ron White, Director of Housing, said this is the first of two required public hearings for input and housing and community development needs, which could be addressed with the Virginia CDBG program. He reported that each year, the Department of Housing and Community Development has approximately \$10 million in federal CDBG funds available for projects that benefit low and moderate income persons, prevent slums or blight, or address urgent community needs. Mr. White said that eligible activities include economic development, housing rehabilitation, housing production, community facilities, and community service facilities. He stated that each locality is asked to prioritize its community development needs and submit them to their Planning District Commission. In the past Albemarle has used housing, community facilities – including water and sewer - and community service facilities as top priorities. Staff is requesting concurrence from the Board to continue to use those.

Mr. White said that the County can apply for grants totaling up to \$1.8 million for eligible projects. Each project requires a separate application. Currently the County is administering a \$700,000 grant for land development and installation of infrastructure at Crozet Meadows, which will increase the number of affordable rental units for seniors from the current 28 units to 66 units. He commented that the grant is moving along very well, and the contractors are on schedule and on budget.

Mr. White reported that past grants have supported the construction of a community center at Park's Edge Apartments, and community improvement activities including housing rehabilitation in the

Porter's Road/Yancey School neighborhood. He said that potential applicants are asked to submit something in writing to the County by January 30, and his office would handle those. Mr. White stated that the applications would be needed electronically by February 19th, with full applications by March 5th in order to meet the March 10th public hearing date.

Mr. White said the request today is to conduct a public hearing for input on needs and set a second public hearing for March 10, 2010 to review and approve any application submissions.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

Mr. White added that he has been in discussions with two potential applications for this year. He said that the Albemarle County Service Authority is interested in extending sewer lines to the Oak Hill neighborhood to serve 58 or 59 residents, and all surveys are in process for that. The other potential application is from JABA for the Southern Albemarle Intergenerational Center, although the DHCD rejected a planning grant application for this project last year stating that the type of center planned was not a high priority. The two projects are under consideration.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Motion was offered by Mr. Rooker to set a second public hearing for March 10, 2010 to review and approve the submission of any proposed applications. Mr. Thomas **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Snow and Mr. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 4. **PUBLIC HEARING: ZTA-2009-00010. Downtown Crozet District (DCD).** Amend Secs. 4.15.2, Definitions, 4.15.11, Regulations applicable in the PUD and NMD zoning districts, 20B.3, Area and bulk regulations, and 20B.7, Sidewalks and street trees, of Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Albemarle County Code. This ordinance would amend Sec. 4.15.2, to add a definition of sandwich board sign; Sec. 4.15.11, to add the DCD as a zoning district subject to the sign standards in Sec. 4.15.11 and to authorize sandwich board signs in the DCD subject to standards; Sec. 20B.3, to add setback standards for secondary buildings on a parcel, to add definitions of primary and secondary buildings, and to clarify the regulation pertaining to determining setbacks on corner lots; and Sec. 20B.7, to amend the standards and procedures for waivers from the sidewalk and/or street tree requirements. (*Advertised in the Daily Progress on December 28 and January 4, 2010.*)

Mr. Cilimberg said that staff is proposing changes in the existing ordinance due to what they have found in administering the ordinance since it was originally approved in June 2008. At that time, he said, the intent of the ordinance was to help implement the Crozet Master Plan – particularly the downtown area – and the rezonings of land to enable some properties to better have an opportunity to develop. He stated that staff is recommending amendments to specify sign regulations, to deal with front setbacks where there are multiple buildings on the same lot, and to address waiver provisions for sidewalk and street tree requirements. In the sign regulations, he said, the DCD was inadvertently omitted from any regulations in the ordinance so no regulations were available to utilize for the Downtown District, and this would add the District; additional language would allow sandwich board signs in the Downtown District.

He said that the front setbacks were set fairly clearly in the ordinance and were designed to reflect the character of downtown Crozet and to allow special activities that might occur there such as café seating, but did not address how to deal with a secondary building on the same site. Mr. Cilimberg said the third area that needs to be addressed deals with sidewalks and street tree waivers, as there are existing administrative waivers. He explained that the requirements along Crozet Avenue, Three Notch Road and the new Main Street would be ten feet, with eight feet on all other streets and a five-foot minimum on locations such as the access between buildings. He added that there was a spacing range for street trees along those streets, incorporated into the sidewalks, of 25 to 40 feet. Mr. Cilimberg said that there are two criteria for waiving those requirements – VDOT prohibition of sidewalks or street trees, and when there are existing utility easements that prohibit establishing sidewalks or planting street trees. He stated that staff has added waiver provisions for unusual physical conditions on the lot or an adjoining lot that might prevent the sidewalk from being built as the regulations require, or if the strict application of the requirements would not further the purpose of the Downtown District.

Mr. Cilimberg indicated that all of the additions to the Districts have been recommended for approval by staff and the Planning Commission, and proposed ordinance language has been included in the Board's packets.

Mr. Boyd asked if there are people interested in development in those areas.

Mr. Cilimberg responded that the issues arose because there were no provisions for sign ordinances, such as the sandwich board. Staff also encountered a situation where there were physical limitations for a sidewalk in front of a new business just north of the Dairy Queen. He thinks it is more practical in terms of dealing with what needs might exist for the businesses and the owners in the downtown area. He added that the sidewalk extension from Dairy Queen northward was certainly an example of business activity stimulating the need.

Ms. Mallek commented that she hears stirrings on a regular basis, and it's unfortunate that the adoption of the downtown zoning district coincided with the downturn in the economy. There is a lot of thought and things going on in the area. She said that in the next few weeks there would be a meeting with landowners who are in the process of working out the easements for the streetscape so the utility work can begin. Ms. Mallek said that will also help to liven things up once some work begins on that project.

Mr. Cilimberg confirmed that these are agent waivers – not requiring Planning Commission involvement but appealable to them. He added that staff is trying to move towards more that it can do administratively in the waiver provisions.

Mr. Thomas said that he couldn't find anything in the Planning Commission minutes regarding this part of the amendment.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the downtown area is considering becoming a state-designated historic district.

Ms. Mallek noted that the community organizations have raised money to provide some salary for the person doing the Phase II of the Historic District application.

Mr. Rooker commented that that is something that the property owners themselves initiate.

Ms. Mallek added that it would make them eligible for tax credits in their renovations.

At this time, the Chairman opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak, and the public hearing was closed.

Motion was then offered by Mr. Thomas to adopt the proposed ordinance for ZTA-2009-0010. Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion.

Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Snow and Mr. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

(**Note:** The adopted ordinance is set out below:)

ORDINANCE NO. 10-18(1)

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 18, ZONING, ARTICLE I, GENERAL REGULATIONS, ARTICLE II, BASIC REGULATIONS, AND ARTICLE III, DISTRICT REGULATIONS, OF THE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE, VIRGINIA

BE IT ORDAINED By the Board of Supervisors of the County of Albemarle, Virginia, that Chapter 18, Zoning, Article I, General Regulations, Article II, Basic Regulations, and Article III, District Regulations, are hereby amended and reordained as follows:

By Amending:

Sec. 4.15.2 Definitions
Sec. 20B.3 Area and bulk regulations
Sec. 20B.7 Sidewalks and street trees

By Amending and Renaming:

Sec. 4.15.11 Regulations applicable in the PUD, DCD and NMD zoning districts

Chapter 18. Zoning

Article I. General Regulations

Sec. 4.15.2 Definitions

The following definitions shall apply in the interpretation and implementation of this section 4.15:

...

(46.1) *Sandwich board sign.* The term "sandwich board sign" means an A-frame sign with two (2) faces that is periodically placed directly in front of the place of business that it advertises.

...

Article II. Basic Regulations

Sec. 4.15.11 Regulations applicable in the PUD, DCD and NMD zoning districts

The following regulations pertaining to the number of signs permitted per lot or establishment, the sign area, sign height, and setback requirements shall apply to each sign for which a sign permit is required within the Planned Unit Development (PUD), Downtown Crozet (DCD) and Neighborhood Model (NMD) zoning districts:

Sign Type	Number of Signs Allowed	Sign Area (Maximum)	Sign Height (Maximum)	Sign Setback (Minimum)
Directory	1 or more per establishment, as authorized by zoning administrator	24 square feet, aggregated	6 feet	5 feet
Freestanding	1 per street frontage, or 2 per entrance, per lot with 100 or more feet of continuous street frontage plus 1 per lot if the lot is greater than 4 acres and has more than 1 approved entrance on its frontage	24 square feet, aggregated; if more than 1 sign, no single sign shall exceed 12 square feet	12 feet	5 feet
Projecting	1 per street frontage	24 square feet	30 feet, but not to exceed the top of the fascia or mansard	Not applicable
Subdivision	2 per entrance per subdivision	24 square feet, aggregated, per entrance	6 feet	5 feet
Temporary	1 per street frontage per establishment	24 square feet	12 feet, if freestanding sign; 20 feet, if residential wall sign or 30 feet if nonresidential wall sign, but not to exceed the top of the fascia or mansard	5 feet
Wall	As calculated pursuant to section 4.15.20	1 square foot per 1 linear foot of establishment structure frontage, not to exceed 32 square feet if residential wall sign, or 100 square feet if nonresidential wall sign	20 feet, if residential wall sign or 30 feet if nonresidential wall sign	Same as that applicable to structure

Within the DCD, one (1) sandwich board sign is permitted for each establishment subject to the following: (1) the sign shall not exceed four (4) feet in height, two (2) feet in width or eight (8) square feet of area per sign face; (2) if the sign is placed on a sidewalk or any other public pedestrian right-of-way, it shall be placed in a location that provides a contiguous and unobstructed pedestrian passageway at least three (3) feet wide; (3) the sign shall not be located in any required off-street parking space, driveway, access easement, alley or fire lane; (4) the sign shall not be illuminated; (5) the sign shall be removed during non-business hours; and (6) if the sign is located on county-owned right-of-way, prior to placement of the sign the owner shall agree to indemnify and hold harmless the county against any claim or liability arising from the placement of the sign, and the agreement shall be in a form and have a substance approved by the county attorney. Sandwich board signs shall be exempt from review and approval under section 30.6.

(12-10-80; 7-8-92, § 4.15.12.4; Ord. 01-18(3), 5-9-01; Ord. 03-18(2), 3-19-03)

State law reference – Va. Code § 15.2-2280.

Article III. District Regulations

Sec. 20B.3 Area and bulk regulations

Area and bulk regulations within the DCD are as follows:

- A. *Area and bulk regulations, generally.* Any buildings, structures (collectively, “buildings”) and improvements established on and after June 11, 2008 and to which subsection 20B.3(B) does not apply, shall be subject to the following area and bulk regulations and subsections 20B.3(C) through (J):

Building Setbacks (See Figure 1) Primary Buildings Front-Minimum Front-Maximum Side-Minimum except from accessway or alley Side-Minimum from accessway or alley Side-Maximum (See Figure 2) Rear-Minimum Secondary Buildings Front-Minimum Front-Maximum Side-Minimum except from accessway or alley Side-Minimum from accessway or alley Side-Maximum Rear-Minimum	1 foot 10 feet, except up to 20 feet with administrative modification (See subsection 20B.3(H)) 0 feet 3 feet, except 1 foot within a building façade break 20 feet, except with administrative waiver (See subsection 20B.3(H)) 0 feet 1 foot Prevailing building pattern, as determined by director of planning 0 feet 3 feet, except 1 foot within a building façade break Prevailing building pattern, as determined by director of planning 0 feet See also subsection 20B.3(C) for corner lots
Parking Setbacks Front-Minimum-As a primary use (stand alone parking) Front-Minimum-As an accessory use	Same as maximum front building setback (10 feet, except up to 20 feet with modification (See subsection 20B.3(J)) No closer to the right-of-way than any existing or proposed primary structure on the lot. Parking areas shall be located to the rear and/or side of the primary structures, as viewed from the right-of-way to which

Side-Minimum-As a primary use (stand alone parking) Side-Minimum-As an accessory use Rear (Minimum)	the lot abuts. On corner lots, the parking areas shall be located to the side or rear of the primary structure, and not between the structure and any rights-of-way that intersect at the corner. 0 feet 3 feet 0 feet
Stepbacks (See Figure 4) Front-Minimum	Floors above 40 feet or the third story shall be stepped back a minimum of 15 feet
Building façade breaks (See Figure 3) Front-Minimum	Every 200 linear feet (See section 20B.3(E)), except with administrative waiver (See section 20B.3(H))
Lot size Minimum	1500 square feet
Density Residential-Maximum	36 dwelling units per acre
Frontage Minimum	None
Building Height (See Figure 4) Minimum height-by right Minimum height-by special use permit Maximum height –by right Maximum height-by special use permit	30 feet or 2 stories 1 story 50 feet or 4 stories 70 feet or 6 stories

- B. *Area and bulk regulations, pre-existing buildings, structures and improvements.* Notwithstanding subsections 6.3(A)(1) and (3), and subsection 20B.3(A) of this chapter, any building or structure established before, and existing on, June 11, 2008, may be extended or enlarged without complying with the maximum front and maximum side yard setbacks and the minimum front yard setback for parking as an accessory use.
- C. *Corner lots; determination of front and other sides.* Notwithstanding sections 4.6.2(b) and 4.6.3 of this chapter to the extent they determine when front yard setbacks apply, for purposes of determining setbacks on corner lots the director of planning (the “director”) shall determine which side of a corner lot abutting a street shall be the front based upon the prevailing building pattern that has developed in the vicinity of the lot, and shall then determine which other sides will be the sides and rear of the lot.
- D. *Minimum standards for a building façade break.* Each building façade break shall provide either pedestrian access or motor vehicle and pedestrian access to the side and/or rear of the building on the same lot. A building façade break providing only pedestrian access shall be a sidewalk having a minimum width of five (5) feet. A building façade break providing both motor vehicle and pedestrian access shall have a travelway at least twelve (12) feet in width and a sidewalk on at least one side having a minimum width of five (5) feet. The travelway and the sidewalk shall be designed and constructed to the applicable standards in the design standards manual. Buildings separated by a building façade break shall have a minimum separation of the width of the pedestrian access or motor vehicle and pedestrian access at all points above the ground. See Figure 3.
- E. *Building entrances.* Each building abutting a street shall have a primary entrance from either the front or side of the building. A building also may have secondary entrances on the side or rear of the building. If the primary entrance is located on the side of a building, its doors shall face the front of the building.
- F. *Stories.* For the purposes of this section 20B, each story shall be visibly discernible from the street and be composed of habitable space and/or occupiable space, as defined by the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code. Visibly discernible stories shall be achieved through the use of windows or building entries on each story, using varied building materials, special ground-floor design treatments, or other façade elements or other architectural details. In accordance with the procedures stated in subsection 20B.3(I), the director may waive the requirement that windows, building entries or other façade elements be used to make each story visibly discernible if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the director that the use of other architectural details would render the stories visibly discernible to an equivalent degree.
- G. *No structures within easements within setbacks.* No structures shall be established within easements located within setbacks.
- H. *Modifications or waivers to change maximum setbacks or minimum building façade break.* In accordance with the procedures stated in subsection 20B.3(I), the director may modify the ten (10) foot front building setback and authorize the front building setback to be increased to up to twenty (20) feet, may waive the maximum side yard setback and establish a different setback, and may waive the minimum building façade break and establish a different minimum building façade break. The director may grant a waiver or modification in the following circumstances: (i) to allow outdoor café seating; (ii) to accommodate public spaces and plazas; (iii) where topography, easements, or unusual physical conditions make compliance with the requirement impracticable; (iv) where the required sidewalk and street trees are located on the lot instead of in a public right-of-way; (v) the strict application of the requirement would not further the purposes of this chapter or otherwise serve

the public health, safety or welfare, and the waiver or modification would better achieve the goals of the comprehensive plan or provide a design that better meets the purpose and intent of the DCD; or (vi) the waiver or modification would allow the building to be consistent with the prevailing building pattern that has developed in the vicinity of the lot.

- I. *Procedure for administrative modifications and waivers.* Applications for modifications or waivers (collectively, "waivers") authorized to be reviewed and acted upon by the director or the agent (collectively, the "director"), as applicable, pursuant to this section 20B shall be reviewed and acted upon according to the following procedure:
 1. *Application.* The applicant shall file a written request with the department of community development stating why one or more of the applicable circumstances exist or criteria are satisfied to allow the waiver to be granted.
 2. *Action by the director.* The director shall act on the waiver request in conjunction with the county's action of the site plan, subdivision plat or special use permit or, if no such action is required, within thirty (30) days of the date the application was submitted and determined to be complete. The director may grant the waiver if he or she determines that one or more applicable circumstances exist or criteria are satisfied. In granting a waiver, the director may impose conditions deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety, or welfare. If review of a site plan or subdivision plat by the commission is requested, the agent may either act on the waiver or defer action and allow the commission to act on the waiver as part of its consideration of the plan or plat, in which case the commission shall have the same authority as though it were considering the waiver on appeal.
 3. *Appeal to the commission or the board.* The denial of a waiver, or the approval of a waiver with conditions objectionable to the applicant, may be appealed from the director to the commission and from the commission to the board, as the case may be, as an appeal of a denial of the plat, as provided in section 14-226 of the Code, or the site plan, as provided in sections 32.4.2.7 or 32.4.3.9 of this chapter, to which the waiver pertains. If subdivision plat or site plan approval is not required, the applicant may file a written appeal with the clerk of the board of supervisors within ten (10) days of the date of the written action by the director or the commission. A waiver considered by the commission in conjunction with an application for a special use permit shall be subject to review by the board of supervisors without the filing of an appeal. In considering a waiver on appeal, the commission or the board may grant or deny the waiver based upon its determination of whether one or more applicable circumstances exist or criteria are satisfied, amend any condition imposed by the director or the commission, and impose any conditions deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety, or welfare.
- J. *Waiver to allow alternative location of parking area.* The parking area setback requirements in subsection 20B.3(A) may be waived as follows:
 1. *Consideration by commission.* The commission may waive the parking area setback requirements in subsection 20B.3(A) and allow a parking area to be located between a street and a primary structure, subject to reasonable conditions that it may impose, upon a finding that:
 - a. There are unusual physical conditions on the lot or an adjoining lot including, but not limited to, the location of existing structures and parking areas, steep topography or other environmental features, narrowness or shallowness or the size or shape of the lot that make it impossible or unfeasible to provide parking to the side or rear of a primary structure;
 - b. The potential safety of patrons and employees cannot be achieved with adequate lighting and other reasonable design solutions; or
 - c. The strict application of the applicable regulations in subsection 20B.3(A) would not further the purposes of this chapter or otherwise serve the public health, safety, or welfare or achieve the goals established in the comprehensive plan.
 2. *Consideration by the board of supervisors.* The board of supervisors may consider a request under this subsection only as follows:
 - a. The denial of the request, or the approval of the request with conditions objectionable to the applicant may be appealed to the board of supervisors as an appeal of the plat, as provided in section 14-226 of the Code, or a denial of the site plan, as provided in sections 32.4.2.7 or 32.4.3.9 of this chapter, to which the waiver pertains. If subdivision plat or site plan approval is not required, the applicant may file a written appeal with the clerk of the board of supervisors within ten (10) days of the date of the written action by the director or the commission. A waiver considered by the commission in conjunction with an application for a special use permit shall be subject to review by the board of supervisors without the filing of an appeal.
 - b. In considering a request, the board may grant or deny the request based upon the findings set forth in subsection 20B.3(J)(1), amend any condition imposed by the

commission, and impose any conditions it deems necessary for the reasons set forth in subsection 20B.3(J)(1).

- K. *Terms defined.* The term “primary building” means the buildings or structures on a lot that comply with the minimum and maximum front yard setback requirements for a primary building as provided in subsection 20B.3(A). The term “secondary building” means any building or structure that is not a primary building on a lot containing at least one (1) primary building.

(Ord. 08-18(3), 6-11-08)

20B.7 SIDEWALKS AND STREET TREES

For each development requiring approval of a site plan under section 32 of this chapter, sidewalks and street trees in the DCD shall be provided as follows:

- A. *Sidewalk design.* Each sidewalk proposed to be accepted for maintenance by the Virginia Department of Transportation shall be designed and constructed according to Virginia Department of Transportation standards or to the standards in the design standards manual, whichever is greater. Each sidewalk proposed to be privately maintained shall be constructed using concrete, designed so that no concentrated water flow runs over them, and otherwise satisfy the standards in the design standards manual. Each sidewalk on Crozet Avenue, Three Notch'd Road and the street identified in the Crozet master plan as the new Main Street shall be at least ten (10) feet wide. All other sidewalks shall be at least eight (8) feet wide. See Figure 9.
- B. *Sidewalk ownership.* Each sidewalk, including street trees, proposed to be accepted for maintenance by the Virginia Department of Transportation, shall be dedicated to public use. Each sidewalk, including street trees, proposed to be privately maintained, shall be maintained by the owner of the lot on which the sidewalk and street trees exist or an owners association that is obligated to maintain the sidewalk and street trees. The agent may require that a sidewalk proposed by the developer to be privately maintained instead be dedicated to public use if the agent determines that the sidewalk serves a public purpose and there is a need for the sidewalks to be publicly owned and maintained.
- C. *Street trees.* Notwithstanding section 32.7.9.6 of this chapter, street trees shall be planted within grates on each sidewalk or in a planting strip abutting the sidewalk, spaced at a minimum of twenty-five (25) and a maximum of forty (40) feet on center and the distance of each tree from the edge of the sidewalk shall be approved by the agent. Street trees shall be selected from a current list of recommended large shade trees, subject to the approval of the agent when site conditions warrant medium shade trees. See Figure 9.
- D. *Waivers from sidewalk and/or street tree requirements.* In accordance with the procedures stated in subsection 20B.3(l), the agent may waive the requirements for a sidewalk and/or street trees where the developer demonstrates that: (i) either the Virginia Department of Transportation prohibits establishing sidewalks and/or planting street trees or existing utility easements prohibit establishing sidewalks and/or planting street trees; (ii) there are unusual physical conditions on the lot or an adjoining lot including, but not limited to, the location of existing structures and parking areas, steep topography or other environmental features, the narrowness, shallowness, size or shape of the lot, or the width or alignment of the existing sidewalk, that make it impossible or unfeasible to provide the required sidewalk and/or street trees as provided in subsections 20B.7(A) and (C); or (iii) the strict application of the requirements of subsections 20B.7(A) and (C) would not further the purposes of this chapter or the DCD or otherwise serve the public health, safety, or welfare or achieve the goals established in the comprehensive plan.

Agenda Item No. 5. **Work Session:** Places29: A Master Plan for the Northern Development Areas.

Mr. Benish stated that this work session is to begin the review of the Places29 Master Plan, and the primary purpose is to provide highlights of the plan. He said that staff would like for the Board to provide any additional information it needs to further review and deliberate on the plan. Staff has raised two additional areas in which they would also like input on - potential expansion areas to this portion of the development area, and recommended US 29 improvements.

Mr. Benish reported that Places29 is one of five master plans for the County's development areas, and covers Neighborhoods I and II, Piney Mountain, and Hollymead communities. He stated that the plan is a coordinated land use and transportation plan, with a transportation study that was undertaken in conjunction with VDOT. Mr. Benish noted that the Places29 Master Plan establishes a vision for the area, and this is the same vision that the Commission and Board reviewed and supported early on in the planned development process – with the intent of establishing the ultimate desired future condition for the community and it should be recognized that it may take many years or decades to fulfill the vision depicted in the land use component of the plan. Along with the vision, he said, there are guiding principles that provide more detailed direction as to how to achieve the vision – covering development, transportation, open space, community facilities, and amenities. Mr. Benish stated that the vision itself encourages compact development organized around centers, pedestrian-oriented and mixed-use neighborhoods, a variety of housing choices, and commercial office with employment opportunities – as well as a regional multi-modal transportation system. He added that interconnected parks and green spaces are planned to enhance the overall quality of life in the area.

Mr. Benish presented a visual depiction of how the concepts of the Places29 Master Plan might change the "gasoline alley" corridor on Rio Road East, which shows improvements that might encourage development and facilitate activities – such as interconnected lots to improve accessibility and safety, planted medians, pedestrian crossing and sidewalks, and grade separation and landscaped strips between sidewalks and the travel way. He added that streetlights and pedestrian lights would further enhance safety and activity day and night in the area. Eventually they hope to get infill development and redevelopment in the area.

Mr. Rooker commented that there are areas in Northern Virginia where almost this exact progression has occurred – which start out not looking so good but over time end up looking like the "finished product" as indicated with Places29.

Mr. Dorrier asked if this was Fairfax County.

Ms. Mallek noted that Arlington chose to go with the Places29-type development, and Fairfax chose the sprawl model. She added that it really effects how they turned out.

Mr. Benish commented that you are starting to see that in Fairfax City as well.

Mr. Boyd said that that has been driven in part by huge increases in population, but it's harder to envision for a community like Albemarle/Charlottesville.

Mr. Rooker stated that if you have a plan at least you know it's developing in a fashion that will fit into the community.

Mr. Snow added, "rather than haphazard."

Mr. Benish emphasized that this is a vision plan and there is a patience factor here because of the scale of development locally. He said that the major concepts and themes in the Master Plan include a coordinated land use and transportation to serve not only local needs in the region, but also regional traffic needs for those passing through the area; encouragement of walkable neighborhoods and centers; a regional multi-modal transportation system with transit, sidewalks, and bikes; emphasis of the City and County planning together and planning for extended areas as well – Zions Crossroads and Greene County. Mr. Benish reported that the plan has also identified the community facility needs in the area, and its' established priority areas to guide public investments to provide for more efficient, effective use of those public investments and land use decision making related to that. He commented that the plan tries to respect existing neighborhoods and recognizes that those existing neighborhoods will likely stay as they are. Mr. Benish said that another goal is to minimize disruption to businesses and provide opportunities for redevelopment. He reported that the plan is built around the notion of a parallel and perpendicular street system to provide access to those centers and adjacent neighborhoods to those centers. Mr. Benish stated that within the land use plan component there is also the parks and green system plan, which lays out the greenspace, trail areas, and desired interconnections for both the northern and southern sections.

Mr. Benish reported that within the Places29 area, two priority areas have been established – Priority 1: Route 29 North corridor, recognized as needing focused resources to provide for the necessary transportation and infrastructure improvements necessary to support the regional and local transportation demands. The area attempts to address existing backlog of necessary improvements based on existing and approved development. The priority area focuses on creating a parallel and perpendicular roadway network to the Route 29 corridor, enhanced transit, bikes and sidewalks, as well as access management by consolidating entrances and establishing an intelligent system of coordinated traffic lights. Mr. Benish stated that Priority 2 reflects new development that has been approved, and where redevelopment is encouraged; public resources should be focused on this areas to anticipate the growth – including both the Rio Road/US 29 area, and the US 29/Hydraulic Road intersections – addressing both current destination centers and future target development areas. He added that the second area of focus is the Airport Road/US 29 corridor including the Airport Road corridor to the Airport and the Hollymead Town Center; public improvements may be necessary to support the development there. Mr. Benish reiterated that those are the two land use areas and the transportation corridor, which are the focus for public investment and land use decision making.

Ms. Mallek commented that she is concerned about what is being done to keep major industries, such as Sperry Manufacturing. She is concerned that the County not do anything to "box them in" or make them less apt to stay.

Mr. Benish said that is an issue staff has been discussing with regard to land use inventory. His desire is that existing areas designated would retain a designation to encourage them to stay or give them flexibility to expand out to different operations that still provide for employment opportunities. Certain locations are in difficult market areas. As an example, approval of Albemarle Place which surrounds Sperry, creates some long term disadvantages for Sperry, but staff continues to designate it for employment use as a way to try to encourage that activity to stay there.

Mr. Rooker noted that Sperry had owned the property now targeted for Albemarle Place, and they could have kept as much as they wanted for industrial. He said that there is potential for Sperry to look at the Comdial building.

Mr. Benish pointed out that County staff has had conversations with Comdial and has encouraged them to stay there even though the area is primarily retail. He reiterated that this is a long term plan and vision that is reviewed every five years.

Mr. Thomas mentioned that he has had several discussions with Northrup Grumman and they didn't indicate a plan to move, but were concerned about the retail behind them. He added that it would be bad to lose Sperry because they are such a large employer.

Mr. Benish said that that's why the plan shows it will not convert to another use.

Mr. Rooker said he thinks that if it converted, it would be because they found another suitable location. He commented that it helps that they have moved their corporate headquarters to the D.C. area, and Northrup Grumman has added more people at the Research Park as the DIA gears up. He added that Sperry employees a lot of engineers and many of them are graduates from the University of Virginia.

Ms. Mallek asked if there is text in the plan that addresses Sperry's value.

Mr. Benish said he is not sure there is specific mention of them in the text, but staff can make that adjustment.

Mr. Thomas said he thought the Planning Commission had included the Western Bypass in the discussions of Places29.

Mr. Benish responded that there is section that refers to the status of the Bypass in the plan, and the Commission offered adjustments to the language – which staff has made.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that early on in this process, there was discussion of a closer-in western road – the Ruckersville Parkway – on the table, but it was removed in consideration of this plan.

Mr. Thomas asked the staff and Board if they felt the public has had enough information about Places29, and whether the public hearing could be held at night so that people could attend.

Mr. Rooker said this is a very important plan covering 15 square miles of the County and it should be held at a night meeting.

Mr. Benish reported that expansion areas to the development area were considered during the master planning process. The expansion areas in Places29 were requested by property owners in four areas. The Planning Commission made an initial consideration of all four but focused in on two – an area adjacent to the existing NGIC site in the Piney Mountain area (Area I), and an area on the southern end of Hollymead (Area II). He said that the Master Plan recommended by the Planning Commission does not include any of the expansion areas, and the majority of the Commission believed that sufficient capacity and opportunity for development were available within the existing development area, and that neither expansion area were needed at that time. Mr. Benish stated that the consultant and staff had recommended expansion of this area south of the existing Hollymead boundary to encourage developer contribution toward the construction of Berkmar Drive Extended – as it flows through the center of that expansion area. He said that the land uses the consultant and staff recommended were focused on residential and smaller-scale neighborhood services. There was also a public request from a property owner in this area for regional service and mixed-use land uses to permit some level of destination center, retail development, or big box. Mr. Benish stated that the Commission directed staff to provide for a potential map and text amendment for the area, which is provided as an attachment (copy on file) to the Board's Executive Summary. Mr. Benish said that the Commission did not recommend expansion of this area because they felt that existing capacities were sufficient within the existing development areas. Mr. Benish reported that they also focused on the Piney Mountain expansion area, which the Board had directed staff and the Commission to consider – east of the Piney Mountain development area and adjacent to NGIC.

Mr. Rooker asked for the size of acreage that had been considered previously by the Board, as he recalls the expansion was comparable to the size of the property that had been sold for the DIA expansion.

Mr. Benish responded that the total expansion includes what the federal government has already purchased, plus what would be added as a balance of that. He said that the total expansion area – approximately 50 acres – includes some of the land that was purchased that the County would be compensating for. He thinks what the Board is asking is does it balance the sale of the land for the military base. Mr. Benish said that was the intent of this exercise. He said he would bring back exact numbers for the Board, but the intent of the Board's adopted resolution was to compensate for land loss.

Ms. Mallek stated that the resolution refers to 30 acres in Piney Mountain and 80 acres at Pantops.

Mr. Benish noted that the staff had offered as land use for the expansion area to be neighborhood density residential, intended to provide for more residential opportunities adjacent to the base and proximity for access. He reiterated that the Commission did not recommend adding the area because they felt existing capacities within the development area were adequate for the foreseeable future.

Citing Oceana Naval Station, as an example, Ms. Mallek said that the County needs to be mindful of protection for future expansion of the DIA facility so that they will have the opportunities, but because

they are a protected base they may not want to have residential right in their midst. She cannot wrap her brain around how this is compatible with what their future needs are going to be.

Mr. Benish explained that his last conversations with representatives of NGIC – which go back several years – were concerns about security with large commercial buildings because of the ability to control what is happening in those buildings. There are other land use issues that may conflict, but when NGIC first located in the area, their main concern was Badger Powhatan and the International Auto Parts building across the River, as opposed to what may develop in other areas.

Mr. Boyd commented that when NGIC purchased their land, they purchased it with the buffers they needed.

Ms. Mallek said she is concerned with what they may need 20 years from now. The County has some very large approved projects within a mile of this site that are waiting for customers.

Mr. Rooker commented that it would be helpful to understand from the NGIC and DIA people what their long-term view is of their presence and potential expansion plans, as many of the conversations took place four years ago. He said that he did recall them mentioning at that time future expansion plans and intended locations – but they didn't have enough money to buy that property at the time. He thinks that if the County is going to look at potential expansion of the growth area, it should find out from NGIC what they have in mind.

Mr. Boyd responded that he has met with their representatives a couple of times and they are not sure what they have in mind, as there are a lot of governmental entities involved. He suggested that Susan Stimart may have the most current information.

Mr. Rooker indicated that they had wanted to buy a bigger piece of property, and he doesn't think the County would want to box them in with surrounding development.

Ms. Stimart, Business Development Facilitator, said that from other communities' experiences, there have been issues regarding residential encroachment into military base areas, but she is not aware of any specific future expansion plans for NGIC.

Mr. Rooker stated that they had wanted to buy another piece of property, but couldn't afford it, and identified it for future expansion if funding becomes available.

Mr. Boyd commented that the General, from DIA, was vague about that point, perhaps for security reasons.

Mr. Snow suggested that Mr. Benish talk with NGIC again to see if he can get any clarification.

In terms of the transportation element part of the plan, Mr. Benish reported that the transportation study for the Places29 area was funded and developed in partnership with VDOT and the local MPO. One of the major challenges of the study was an effort to recognize and balance the different functions of the Route 29 Corridor – which serves both as a state and regional highway, and a local main street that provides access to adjacent lands, commercial properties, and important businesses. He added that it was also important to recognize that there is a backlog of improvements necessary and existing deficiencies that need to be addressed. Mr. Benish stated that the transportation concepts and strategies embedded in the plan take a multi-faceted approach, encouraging a pattern and form of development that lessens the need for vehicular travel, and fostering the implementation of a multi-modal transportation system with enhanced transit, bike, and sidewalk facilities. He said that an important component is the creation of parallel and perpendicular street system to better distribute traffic and improve community access opportunities, as well as managing and planning for accesses and traffic flows. Mr. Benish added that the plan also includes strategic improvements to US 29 that maintain the needed volume and flow of traffic – with the focus being creation of the parallel and perpendicular road systems and eventually orient development more to those systems from an access standpoint. He mentioned that the plan includes potential grade separation at Hilton Heights Road, but that would be very long term, and at Ashwood Boulevard to connect to Berkmar Drive to allow those residential areas to cross Route 29 and utilize the parallel road without the traffic light where there have been serious accidents and fatalities. He added that there would also be a grade separation concept at Airport Road and Timberwood Boulevard.

Mr. Dorrier asked if this would be an additional four-lane highway on both sides.

Mr. Benish explained that the Route 29 Corridor would have the same cross-section that it does now in the Southern Urban Area – which is an eight-lane section that may have double left turns or longer right turn lanes. He said that the major widening component is the current four-lane section from the South Fork Rivanna River to the six-lane section by the Hollymead Town Center. Mr. Benish noted that the bridge over the Rivanna River would be included with the Berkmar Drive Extended as part of the extension going from Sam's Club to Airport Road.

Mr. Benish reported that the five most important transportation improvements for the Master Plan area are: 1) improvements recommended as part of the Route 29/H250 Studies – previously adopted several years ago – including the extension of Hillsdale Drive (located in the City) from Hydraulic Road to Greenbrier Drive, and the existing section of Hillsdale in the County; turn lanes and additional lane improvements along US 29 and the Emmet Street interchange, and eventually an interchange at Hydraulic and US 29; 2) extension of Berkmar Drive; 3) grade separation of Rio Road and US 29; 4) widening of route 29 to six lanes north of Polo Grounds Road; and 5) an enhanced transit system. Mr. Benish said

ongoing process include access management, better control of access points, and intelligent transportation system concepts. He noted that these five items are not listed in priority order; they are all essential.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that three of these improvements date back to the early 1990s. There was a joint resolution of the City, County, and University with VDOT that spoke to the order of improvements to deal with traffic in the area – and it did include the interchanges at Hydraulic and Rio Roads, as well as the widening of Route 29 throughout the corridor.

Mr. Rooker commented that it also included a Greenbrier interchange, as the road was intended at the time to go through to Rio Road, but it did not go happen.

Mr. Cilimberg said that those improvements were all an attempt to deal with the traffic on Route 29 even if there were to be a Western Bypass, with the idea of creating a bypass after the other improvements were completed. Mr. Cilimberg said essentially these are improvements that have been around for a number of years as needed on the corridor.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Three-Party Agreement was used in the Places29 planning.

Mr. Cilimberg responded that the Agreement is no longer in place, but it could be something that evolves out of Places29 being approved. It has been in the planning stages for all those years.

Mr. Rooker emphasized that it is all based upon traffic modeling – except for Berkmar Extended, because the land use changes on the other side of the River need to be incorporated when doing the modeling. He stated that the highest traffic point on Route 29 is at Hydraulic Road. He noted that the 29/H250 Study addressed having a lane added on Route 29 so there would be two lanes going onto the Bypass, and a ramp lane at Best Buy so people would have more time to integrate into traffic.

Mr. Boyd asked where that is in this plan or is it a City project and not part of the County's plan.

Mr. Rooker said that is the top priority project in the area; the City is pursuing it. The region received special legislation passed so that primary road funds could be used. It is part of the first priority. The County also allowed some of the Albemarle Place proffer money to be allocated towards the improvement. Mr. Rooker said that Hillsdale Drive Extended traffic studies show that 8,000-10,000 vehicles per day would be taken off of Route 29, with the cost of that project at about \$24 million and most owners have said they would donate the right-of-way if the project moves forward. The City has identified that as one of their top priorities. He added that he thinks there is a very good chance of getting the first priority done, absent the grade-separated interchange at Hydraulic Road as that is another expense altogether.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that she can remember back as far as 1988 when there were plans for a very small interchange at Hydraulic Road, with one option being considered keeping it at street level with pedestrian and bike lanes. There are lots of other ways to do this with small slip exits so that it could be done in a minimal footprint. There are different kinds of designs that could help in that area.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the Board had an action last month on the official map that would allow for the Hydraulic Road/Route 29 interchange, and that was based on a small footprint design similar to what Ms. Mallek is describing.

Mr. Benish said that the concept for all the interchanges is to minimize the impact of ramps.

Mr. Boyd asked where the City stands on the interchange at Hydraulic Road.

Mr. Benish responded that they are not necessarily working with the County, as there seems to be disparity between what the Planning Commission and City Council envision for the interchange – but they are concerned about the impacts to adjacent properties, and the potential impacts will likely drive their review. He said they accepted the 29/H250 Study, which called for in the long-term the concept of developing an interchange. The devil is in the design of that interchange and we haven't gotten to that step.

Mr. Rooker said that this is a long-range plan, and that area from Hydraulic to the 250 Bypass has been identified as an acute issue, so it is a top priority along with Hillsdale. He stated that the stretch from Polo Grounds Road out to Hollymead Town Center need lanes added there, along with improved geometric configuration of the road to make it safe for the speed traveled through there. When that's done, he said, combined with the other improvements at Hollymead and Northpointe, there will be a six and eight-lane profile for Route 29 all the way out that has an intelligent transportation system with synchronized lighting – which VDOT has been improving over the last few months. To do those things is going to use up the transportation dollars for a pretty good period of time. If we could all get behind those things and agree that we need to push and try to get the money as best we can under the circumstances to do those things, we'll be a much better locality in terms of the traffic flow than we are today.

Mr. Snow asked if there is any data on how many cars will be taken off of Route 29 with the Berkmar Drive Extension.

Mr. Benish responded that it depends on the section and he could certainly bring those figures back. He believes it is in excess of 10,000.

Ms. Mallek said that as a member of the CHART Committee and an early proponent of that, she was concerned about how small the numbers were.

Mr. Boyd stated that there are 5,000 on Berkmar right now.

Mr. Benish agreed.

Mr. Rooker said that one thing needed now is to have the Berkmar Extended traffic model based upon some assumptions concerning how the land on the other side of the road might be used. It's a \$60 million project, and Hillsdale is \$24 million and most of that is being handled by the developers there, so less than one-half of that cost is going to end up being a public cost. Mr. Rooker mentioned that he had meetings with Wendell Wood eight to ten years ago and asked if he would build a bridge and he said "no". He has never been able to get from him – to pin him down – as to exactly what it is that he would do if there was a land use change over there. From our perspective, he thinks we need to understand what it does to the traffic system better and in setting our priorities, we want to get the most bang for the buck that we can."

Mr. Thomas said that he would never want to close the door with the City on conversations regarding Hydraulic Road, and would actually like to open it wider. He said that when he was on the Commission they were meeting with the City Planning Commission and a consultant presented a strategy to address the flow of traffic from the 250 Bypass to Hydraulic Road getting onto the bypass. Mr. Thomas said that one part of the plan was to shut down the crossover lanes there, but later that night he learned that the City had approved Best Buy. While they were meeting, none of them knew City Council was about to approve Best Buy. He emphasized the importance of communication between the two bodies.

Mr. Benish stated that the 29/H250 Study also addresses access to the properties in the City in the "Devil's Triangle" area, with connections intended for Angus Road, etc. He agreed that dialogue with the City needs to be continued.

Mr. Benish summarized that Places29 does not call for dramatic widening of the road but instead utilizes a combination of approaches, including grade separations that minimize ramps and a system of parallel roads to pull traffic off that corridor. He said that most of the interchanges are conceptual at this time. The Rio Road and Airport Road areas provide an opportunity for residents there to look in more detail as to what the land use and transportation improvements are, and to try to achieve a higher level of planning for those to get a better sense of what those impacts are, and better plan with the property owners in that area for those improvements and make adjustments to the plan as necessary. Mr. Benish then presented some photo simulations of road improvements at the quadrants of the Rio Road/Route 29 intersection.

In summary, Mr. Benish said staff would like for the Board to provide them with direction to further discussion the expansion areas and transportation issues. Is there any additional information the Board needs before providing guidance on these two issues? Does the Board agree with the Planning Commission's findings and recommendations on the expansion areas?

Mr. Thomas asked if the plan takes into account the potential impact to residential areas, noting that he lives in Carrsbrook. He has been asked what affect this plan has on those areas such as Carrsbrook and Woodbrook.

Mr. Benish replied that the Plan does not encourage redevelopment of those neighborhoods, and the adjacent land uses provide for opportunities such as walkable centers nearby, but there haven't been any centers forced in neighborhoods such as Carrsbrook or Forest Lakes. The intent is to leave the existing neighborhoods as they are, and try to address the service needs and the infrastructure needs to support that development. He added that entrances and access to Route 29 may need to be improved to provide for good access, but the neighborhoods would stay as they are.

Mr. Dorrier asked if there is any evidence of the affect these changes – interchanges - will have on existing businesses.

Mr. Benish said any time there is major construction along a road corridor there are temporary impacts that could be significant to existing businesses, but they are not at a place where they have specific plans for those improvements, the areas of construction, the detours, etc. Mr. Benish said the intent for finished product is to minimize the impact to adjacent properties within the interchange so that existing properties can continue to have viable activities after development, and have good access to those areas.

Mr. Rooker commented that, long term, what's envisioned is to provide opportunities to substantially enhance the value of properties, because over time there is more intense development permitted in the quadrants along Route 29 that are the centers. You want investment to occur in your corridor, and you want it to occur in a way that fits into the community and doesn't disrupt it. He mentioned that Albemarle Place will end up being the biggest investment ever made in the Route 29 Corridor. He meets with those representatives about once per month to talk about where they are and what they are doing. Mr. Rooker noted that they are not afraid of a grade-separated interchange at Hydraulic Road and Route 29; they have set aside property for that purpose.

Mr. Boyd commented that they are not concerned because they do not have a business there now.

Mr. Rooker responded that the shopping center will be in place long before a grade-separated interchange will be. He said that they like having the traffic in the corridor, but the worst situation is having traffic at a standstill – which keeps people from shopping there.

Mr. Snow said that he would like to involve some of the merchants in the area there, as well as the City. He added that a lot of the 13 percent total provided to County taxes from the business community comes from those on Route 29.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that staff has had a series of meetings with those interests over the time that this plan has developed, and the County is aware of their concerns over the possible impact of interchanges. He said that the small area plans will be equally important, because that will be an opportunity to more precisely plan for how those interchange areas would be addressed. This is very conceptual right now, putting out a concept of how you can best deal with traffic and land use. Mr. Cilimberg added that one of the biggest challenges is not just the traffic on Route 29, but people trying to get across Route 29 – and without interchanges, the traffic numbers show that all of the intersections fail to the point where people will not be able to cross within a reasonable amount of time. That will affect the businesses. He mentioned that the interchanges will also allow for people to get across using bike and pedestrian lanes, adding that Forest Lakes residents have complained that they cannot utilize the Hollymead Town Center as an adjacent center to their neighborhood because they cannot walk or bike across Route 29.

Mr. Snow added that the same issue occurs at Pantops.

Mr. Boyd stated that pedestrian bridges would help solve the problem.

Mr. Thomas asked if VDOT would allow walkways to go over Route 29.

Mr. Rooker said that a long time ago he participated in a Route 29 Corridor transportation study, and that study recommended places for potential pedestrian overpasses – including one at Timberwood – but those cost \$3.0 to \$4.0 million each. He noted that the aesthetics of them are also an issue. Another issue is accommodating people with disabilities – which can increase costs.

Mr. Benish stated that the plan does incorporate some of those prior recommendations, and the Route 29 Business Community has indicated that they would like to pursue them.

As to how the Board wants to proceed Mr. Cilimberg said as staff understands the Board has not indicated that they want to pursue the expansion areas, but does want communication with the DIA folks regarding their future plans.

Ms. Mallek commented that she would like to hear from staff on their opinion of the capacity issue, including outstanding units and permits in the growth area.

Mr. Rooker said that it would help to have a list of the approved retail square footage that exists today. The Board has received from Mr. Werner a list of approved projects that could be verified by staff. He stated that a map showing that capacity would also be helpful, as well as estimates of absorption rate for retail for the next five, ten and fifteen years. He asked if there is a need for any additional retail over the next 20 years, and if so, what areas should the Board look to have it. He thinks the same information should be provided on industrial land including maps. Mr. Rooker said the Board is to provide for a community that accommodates the needs of the community in a way that ultimately improves [it] and doesn't occur in a way that's detrimental.

Mr. Boyd stated that he would also like to have the private sector weigh in on that – including Thomas Jefferson Partnership for Economic Development (TJPED) and the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Snow agreed.

Mr. Rooker commented that the County must be sensitive to the fact that approving additional retail square footage may not be “friendly” to all businesses – as approving more and more retail further and further out may actually be detrimental to existing businesses. He said that it is a struggle to get together the group of tenants you need to have to make a shopping center work. If we're not careful, we can end up with five 'ghost towns' with a building here and a building there, and nothing fully completed. Mr. Rooker cited an article written about Hollymead Town Center, which is not yet built out. Right now it is just a huge graded area, but when it is all built in, he thinks it will look nice. The question is how long that will take.

Mr. Boyd said that what he is hearing is that the County's process is too bureaucratic to allow things to fully build out, citing a hotel that wants to locate on North 29.

Ms. Mallek stated that the reason the hotel didn't work out is because the company put one on Pantops first and then decided it did not want to have two.

Mr. Rooker said that he worked with the Hilton Gardens on Pantops, and that happened rather quickly.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that the Hilton got “hemmed in by its own Code of Development,” and then needed negotiation with other landowners to get square footage they could use on their part of the

property. The County was waiting for that. They are now free to go. He thinks that staff has approved a preliminary site plan for them.

Mr. Boyd said that it was the County's Code of Development that slowed the process. These companies get disinterested when they have to sit around for two years or more to get a project done; they move on.

Mr. Rooker stated that red tape for the sake of red tape serves no one, but if you look at the most successful communities, they are the most attractive communities. He mentioned Boca Raton, Florida; Scottsdale, Arizona; and Carmel, California. They look good and people want to get in there with their businesses because they have the kind of appearance that breeds success. He thinks it is important that the County maintain some high aesthetic standards in what it is doing.

Mr. Boyd agreed, but said there is a balance to be achieved there.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that staff would come back with information on approved inventory and absorption that can be provided based on input from the people who know. He added that the Board has mentioned looking at the area south of Hollymead in terms of traffic impacts if it were to become part of this plan. He added that staff hasn't looked at the alternative traffic impact of that area as compared to existing traffic projections based on the plan as it is – see what Berkmar would carry, Route 29 and the remainder of the road system.

Ms. Mallek responded that the Board would like assurance that there is actually some gain from that, not just the status quo.

Mr. Rooker stated that he would like assurance that there would be some gain if money is diverted from other projects that might have significant gain in transportation improvement. He added that it would be helpful to have a large map of the area that includes some distance indications along the Berkmar corridor. Where is the existing road network coming from the north? What is the distance that would have to be built going south to the River and what separate parcels are involved? What the current land use plan designation is for those parcels? If the land use designations are changed, how would that impact the traffic flows?

Mr. Snow mentioned a similar development out west, where a lot of interchange work was done and by the time the work was complete his friend had lost a business and employees. He suggested that the County provide something like a tax credit during construction. If we are going to shut some of these businesses down for a year or year and a half, then we ought to do something to help them stay in business until they can reopen.

Mr. Tucker said that staff can look into it, but he is not sure by State law that the County would be permitted to do that. He emphasized that this isn't going to happen anytime soon, as there is no money to do anything.

Ms. Mallek said something that can be done is to make sure the new access is developed before the old access is eliminated.

Mr. Rooker stated that the priorities need to be done before the smaller interchange areas are even addressed, and the kinds of businesses that would be impacted through small area plans will likely have changed.

Ms. Mallek commented that the vision adopted will give people the view that in 15 or 20 years they will have the opportunity, as landowners along the corridor, in an organized way to do some "dramatically new things" and improve the value of their property. She emphasized that she in no way supports an expressway being made with this roadway. This is a County street; it is not a highway that is meant for getting through fast. Keeping people moving at a slower speed would increase our capacity all by itself, and that's the goal that she is looking for.

Mr. Thomas said that Lynchburg would probably say something else.

Ms. Mallek mentioned that there has been a dramatic impact to those businesses because of the expressway there. The County does not need to repeat that part of that experience.

Mr. Rooker noted an article in the *New York Times* about businesses that were concerned that no one was going to stop there.

Mr. Thomas commented that the County is doing everything on Route 29, and that does create issues.

Mr. Cilimberg responded that that's one reason why the parallel road system is so important, to try to get some of the activity off Route 29 that is more local. He said that businesses can be oriented to those parallel and perpendicular streets – which are still very accessible from Route 29.

Ms. Mallek commented that when the Advance Mills Bridge opens sometime in a couple of weeks, there will be a shift of people off Route 29 to get into town.

In response to Mr. Snow's earlier concerns, Mr. Benish said that staff could look into other localities' efforts to address the impact on small businesses when they are disrupted by construction.

Mr. Cilimberg asked if Board members had any other items it needed for a followup meeting, and if that meeting should be a work session or public hearing.

Mr. Benish also asked if there are other sections of the plan, the Board wants staff to go through in more depth.

Mr. Rooker stated that prior to public hearing he would like to have one more work session to go over the information.

Mr. Thomas said that he agreed.

Mr. Boyd added that he would like in that work session to see what is feasible in the short term. How do you make the Hillsdale connector happen?

Mr. Dorrier said that the work session should allow input from TJPED and the Chamber. He feels we need to work together on this thing.

Mr. Rooker responded that people should be informed that they will be able to give public input at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Boyd commented that he would rather have a chance to review the staff information first before taking public input.

Mr. Snow complimented Mr. Benish and Mr. Cilimberg for all their work. Other Board members concurred.

Mr. Cilimberg thanked the Board and the community for their patience with this very large undertaking.

Ms. Mallek said that it is great to see so many of the comments provided from early Places29 public hearings in print now.

Mr. Cilimberg stated that this plan has a great opportunity to "set a new footprint" for that area.

Ms. Mallek commented that people have said the County needs to plan ahead better, and this certainly speaks to that.

Mr. Cilimberg mentioned that staff has become aware of an opportunity to utilize some State assistance under the Urban Development Areas legislation in addressing the small area plans – but Places29 would need to be adopted first. He said that the State wants local governments to undertake plans and establish urban development areas, with zoning put on the ground as in Crozet so that things can happen. Although they have not received any official agreements, they have been told they have some assistance.

Mr. Thomas thanked Ms. Judy Wiegand, Senior Planner, for all of her work on this since 2004.

Agenda Item No. 6. Appointments.

Mr. Rooker **moved** the following appointments/reappointments:

Appoint Mr. Richard Carter as the Jack Jouett District representative to the Albemarle County Service Authority, with said term to expire December 31, 2013;

Reappoint Mr. Blake Hurt as the Rivanna District representative to the Economic Development Authority, with said term to expire January 19, 2014; and

Appoint Mary Lou Fowler as the Jack Jouett representative to the Social Services Board, with said term to expire December 31, 2013.

Ms. Mallek **seconded** the motion. Roll was called, and the motion passed by the following recorded vote:

AYES: Mr. Boyd, Mr. Dorrier, Ms. Mallek, Mr. Rooker, Mr. Snow and Mr. Thomas.

NAYS: None.

Agenda Item No. 7. Adjourn.

With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Chairman

Approved by Board
Date: 03/03/2010
Initials: EWJ