

**Crozet Community Advisory Committee – Minutes – Draft  
Wednesday, March 18, 2015 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.  
The Meadows conference room, Crozet**

**CCAC members present:** Meg Holden (Chair), Jennie More (Vice Chair), George Barlow, Mary Gallo, Beth Bassett, Kim Guenther, Phil Best, Kim Connolly, Brenda Plantz, John Savage, Phil Best, Jon McKeon, Lisa Marshall, Susan Munson, Ann Mallek (Board of Supervisors), Tom Loach (Planning Commission)

**CCAC members absent:** Dave Stoner, Leslie Burns

**Public attendees:** Emily Kilroy, Frank Stoner, Terri Miyamoto, Paul Grady, Bill Schrader, Bevin Boisvert, Mike Marshall, Tim Tolson, Brian Wheeler, Jim Duncan, Alice Lucan

**Chair Meg Holden called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.**

**1. Agenda Review** (Meg Holden – CCAC chair): Meg Holden welcomed our visitors, distributed the agenda and reviewed it with the Committee, and welcomed any additions.

**2. Approval of Minutes from the January 21, 2015 meeting and the February 18, 2015 meeting:** Kim Connolly moved to accept the minutes of the January 21, 2015 and February 18, 2015 meetings as presented, seconded by Beth Bassett, and the minutes of the January 21, 2015 and February 18, 2015 meetings were approved by vote of the Council, subject to any corrections given to the Secretary within a week from today.

**3. Project Updates/Information:**

- **Birchwood Project Presentation – Bevin Cetta Boisvert:** Ms. Boisvert introduced herself as a real estate agent representing a project in Crozet owned by her father, Vito Cetta (who developed Liberty Hall and Wickham Pond). The project is behind the Union Bank site (which has the road frontage) on Route 240, between US Joiner and the Great Valu. They are proposing by-right development (zoned Downtown Crozet District) and the land has been for sale for six years. Ms. Boisvert showed us a rendering of a 19,000 square foot building on the site. It can be accessed from both the Great Valu and US Joiner sides. The rendering depicts offices on upper floors and commercial space below, but the building can be residential on top (one- or two-bedroom apartments) and commercial below, all offices, or a hotel. The land is for sale for \$550,000. Ms. Boisvert noted that this is just a rendering and there is no floor plan. The lot drops off to a stream in the back, and as rendered the building would have a walk-out in the back overlooking woods in the 100 foot buffer along the stream. Pavement in back of the building would be connected to US Joiner’s parking area (it is not now, but this is part of the approval). Meg noted that she thought commercial uses other than a hotel would work in this area. The CCAC then discussed how certain types of uses could be constrained on the first floor (such as uses incompatible with residential space above it), which to some degree are limited by zoning and the owner’s desire to have marketable space. It was noted that residential use would not be allowed on the lower level. It was also noted that there are few rentals in Crozet and apartments are needed. Ms. Boisvert estimated that it would cost \$3,000,000 to buy the lot and

build the structure. She asked that interested parties contact her. It was also noted that architectural review board approval is required because the building would be within 500 feet of an entrance road. Paul Grady said that he had heard that when this project is completed, the easternmost entrance from Route 240 into the Great Valu parking lot will be closed; Ms. Boisvert said that she had not heard that, and so Ann said that she will look into this and whether it is a VDOT requirement.

- Review of Council Rules and Procedures – Emily Kilroy: [Note that CAC means Community Advisory Committees generally, and CCAC is the Crozet Community Advisory Committee.] Emily reviewed with the CCAC changes made by the Board of Supervisors. She explained that two documents will need to be signed by CAC appointees, one describing officers and committees, and the other giving background and information about the CAC’s role. These changes stem from the suspension of the Places 29 CAC in December and efforts to make that group more effective (i.e. more cohesive and reflective of the area’s interests), and some of the changes seemed good for all CACs. All CACs have the same charge, mission, and rules of procedure. It was noted that earlier versions of the materials (including a version limiting the CAC’s ability to take a vote) were not passed by the BOS. Emily noted that each CAC has been interested in different parts of this. She explained that CACs not required to vote, but they can do so in order to provide feedback. Ann said that there were differing opinions on the BOS as to CAC voting, but more important than votes is the need for comments and feedback on issues before the CACs to flow up the chain to the Planning Commission and BOS. Meg noted that the CCAC only votes on key issues. It was also noted that we are now a “Committee” rather than a “Council.” Terms of office for chair and vice chair are one year, with a maximum of two one-year terms. Some CACs like such changeover and some do not. Some CACs struggle with attendance, and so staff support is there to track this if needed. Orientation is now required for members, and the agenda-setting guidelines were changed. Election rules have been changed so that other people can apply any time a spot comes open and a member must re-apply at end of every two year term (reelection is not automatic). The BOS made this change to the rules for all boards and commissions. A member will receive a letter if his or her term is expiring, and reappointment will be more formal. It was noted that there are seven CCAC openings now and it is possible that some members might not be reappointed. It was suggested that any announcement be clear that some board members may reapply, and the announcement could say how many reapplications there are, and how many vacancies. As an example, Bill Schrader said that someone he knows saw this announcement and asked if people had lost interest in the CCAC. Emily will look into implementing the suggestion that the number of vacancies and reapplications be publicized. Emily said that the staff has also talked about, and endorses, the ombudsman/liaison system because it creates a feedback loop (noting that we should take care if more than two members are together because this could constitute a formal meeting requiring notice, the taking of minutes, and other formalities). Emily said that she can help with notices if there is a need for a meeting on a particular liaison issue. Reports or minutes of these meetings can be posted online too. The CCAC then discussed the importance of giving all members a chance to participate in discussions on an issue, even if one ombudsman is more involved in that issue. Tom noted that in the past the role of the ombudsman was information-gathering and then reporting back to the group, but not acting as a subgroup of the CCAC (which creates open meeting issues). Jon noted that if a meeting is going to be held of a subgroup of the CCAC, the rest of the CCAC should receive more than two days’ notice of the meeting so that it is open to

the rest of the CCAC. Meg said that if recommendations are being made or brought back to the CCAC, then all members need to be given an opportunity to participate. Ann noted the importance of being inclusive. Another new rule that Emily noted was dismissal of a member for two unreported absences (which is enforced by the BOS rather than CAC chairs). Mary noted that having our charge clearly spelled out helps to clarify our role in what we do as liaisons. Emily will handle the pipeline of questions and connecting with staff, and she can help us find answers when needed from the County. We can get additional Freedom of Information Act training if we so desire.

- Discussion about Milestone Partners holding a series of public meetings regarding key points of development on the former Barnes Lumber property – Frank Stoner, Tim Tolson (CCA) and Dave Stoner: At the January CCAC meeting, it was proposed that Milestone work with the Crozet Community Association (CCA) to hold a series of (likely facilitated) town hall meetings to provide feedback about the Barnes property. FOIA will not apply to their meetings. Reference was made to the recent email from Dave Stoner for a good summary (attached hereto). The CCA would be the host to have the town hall meetings to consider the property and the implementation of the Crozet Master Plan and the Downtown Zoning District. How would these apply to the Barnes site? The meetings would include an overview of the status of the rezoning. It was also noted that it will be necessary to involve VDOT at some point. It was noted that the MP is a high level document and that the CCA process should be at a lower level, but not down in the details either. Mr. Stoner said that they understand that there are challenges that are “Downtown challenges” and not just “Barnes property challenges.” They will need to get better input on the civic amenities, parking, access, and other items for which there is no solution right now. What should the development look like on the ground? Specific issues should be discussed, including road alignment, branding, and communications about marketing downtown, but they will need community input as to the issues to be addressed. Phil noted that there are adjacent properties, developers, and neighborhoods that might be included too. A question was raised concerning the timeframe for the whole project, and Mr. Stoner said that he does not know what it will be for the whole project. The purchase of the land closed in December and this will be a long project; realizing the master plan will take a while and the process needs to go forward in smaller pieces. He believes it will take three to six months to gather information and then figure out next steps. Mr. Stoner said that the investors behind the project have a keen interest in how the project turns out. It will be necessary to figure out where things will go before they can really get businesses onto the property. Ann asked whether they will have feedback from VDOT about what is possible for the Square in particular before the public gets too excited about a rendering. Milestone will need to be sure their plan fits VDOT’s overall goals, and if not, Milestone will need the community to get behind the project and pressure VDOT. It was asked whether Nelson Byrd Woltz was still helping with landscape architecture and Mr. Stoner said that they were occupied with other projects now and likely will not be able to help with the public engagement process, but may be involved in the design phase. Bill Schrader said that the starting point for the meetings needs to be the MP, and the ideas must fit the MP. It was hoped that Milestone might find some funds at the County level to help with this project. Any proposal that is made will end up at the CCAC for review before going to the BOS. It was noted that facilitators provided by the County were used to develop the MP, but that might not be possible with a private developer (but the work will benefit all of downtown). It was asked whether other property owners, such as the Acme site, be involved. Mr. Stoner and

Tim said that they hoped so. They will approach other landowners in Crozet to participate in this process. Ann said that the community needs to be comfortable with this process and that it is not being driven by the County. The meetings will be to see how the project fits in the Downtown, and is not about the Barnes property itself. It will help for the CCA to do this because it goes beyond what the Planning office would normally have time to do. Mary said that she appreciated Mr. Stoner's statement that this will take a few years to get the project to fit in with the Master Plan and rest of Downtown.

- Review of "ombudsmen" roles and discussion of areas on which members wish to focus: Phil read the definitions of "ombudsman" and "liaison" and it was decided that the latter term is more appropriate, so we will call these positions liaisons. Dave had suggested in his email several categories for liaisons. Because the CCAC has become more focused on commercial growth, the categories will likely need to reflect that. To the extent that some of the categories are geographically based, it is helpful to have people who live in these areas serve as liaisons. Jennie reminded us that several development projects are coming up that are by-right and the liaison role may be important in tracking these. It would be helpful to know what the build-out of these areas might look like and have a map with these projects charted so we know what is coming and where. Tom recommended aligning the liaisons with downtown and neighborhoods, so that each neighborhood (and its homeowners' association) has a contact with CCAC. Accordingly, the CCAC made the following liaison assignments:

Neighborhood matters: Beth Bassett, Phil Best

Economic development: John Savage, Dave Stoner, Kim Connolly

Infrastructure (Transportation, roads, utilities): John Savage, Susan Munson

Schools: Beth Bassett, Mary Gallo

Downtown district growth and development: Dave Stoner, Lisa Marshall, Susan Munson, Leslie Burns

Parks and Trails: Kim Guenther, Phil Best

Gateway edges, buffers and rural areas: Jon McKeon (South), Mary Gallo (West), Brenda Plantz (West), John Savage (East), Beth Bassett (North)

By right projects: Chair (Jennie More) and Co-Chair (Dave Stoner)

Police/fire/rescue: Tom Loach, Jennie More

It was noted that the CCAC may wish to add other liaison categories, and that members can serve as liaisons in more than one category.

- Comprehensive Plan review is almost complete and the Board's public meeting is in April: The review is nearly complete and the BOS will have public hearings in May on the Comprehensive Plan revision. CCAC members should read any chapters of the draft they are interested in when it is posted. The first meeting is May 14. Information about the update can be found here: <http://www.albemarle.org/department.asp?department=cdd&relpage=14219>

**4. Items not listed on the Agenda:** None.

**5. Announcements:**

- The Crozet Independence Day Celebration will be held on Sunday, July 5.
- Crozet Park update – Kim Guenther: Starr Hill is supporting the new dog park through April with “Pints for Pups.” Pitch in at the Park will be on April 25 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. They are looking for a sponsor or two to offset the materials cost.
- Phil said that the Lion’s Club Pancake Dinner and Raffle will be held on Saturday, April 18 at the Field School.
- Ann noted that there is a project plan coming for a café at the Mechums River trestle at the old Gallery Restaurant site (who else can remember the Gallery?).
- There will be a public hearing in April on the selected proposed use of the old Crozet train depot.

Lastly, the CCAC thanked Meg Holden for her years of service to the community on the CCAC, both as a member and as our Chair!

**6. Future Agenda Items:** None announced. Let Jennie know of any items.

**The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.**

George Barlow  
Secretary

Attachment

**David Stoner <davidastoner1@gmail.com>** Mar 17

to me, CrozetCAC, Notification, ekilroy

Folks:

I am not going to be able to make the CCAC meeting tomorrow evening, due to some required out-of-town travel for work. However, I did want to share some thoughts and updates on two of the items on the agenda that you will be discussing:

Milestone Partners – Public Meetings

Per the agenda, Frank Stoner and Tim Tolson will present to the CCAC on this topic in my absence. However, since I participated in an introductory meeting for this topic with Frank, Tim, and a potential consultant I wanted to update the group about that meeting and with my thoughts. I will let Tim and Frank present the details but in short Milestone wishes to sponsor a series of public meetings aimed at gathering public input and engagement into developing a vision, strategy, and plan related to the Barnes Lumber redevelopment. Milestone (and possibly others including the County depending upon funding availability) will engage one or more consultants to help facilitate the process. Given the critical nature of this project to much of the Downtown Crozet District and beyond, Milestone would like as broad of a participation in this process as possible, including working with the County, CCAC, CCA, Downtown Crozet Association etc.

I fully support this effort and think it is an excellent “next step” in the redevelopment of the Barnes site and potential adjoining or nearby properties in the DCD. I also think some of the “economic development visioning” work outlined and discussed in our last several meetings may be incorporated into this effort. Milestone may turn to the CCA as the local “sponsorship entity” for this effort, but I also encourage the CCAC’s active involvement in and support of the process. **Along those lines I would volunteer to serve as CCAC representative to liase with this group on scoping and implementing this process** (via my volunteering for the DCD ombudsman role above, or otherwise). This idea is in the early planning stages and I am sure we will hear more as it progresses, but I wanted to share this update with the group, and I am sure Tim and Frank will have more details to present.

“Ombudsman”

1. I think Lisa Marshall is correct in that “ombudsman” is a misnomer. We should call these roles simply “representatives” or “focus area leads”.

2. I am very supportive of revitalizing these CCAC representative roles. I think that having different members devote some individual energy and focus to various areas will serve to leverage the overall efforts of the CCAC, and allow the CCAC to deal with more issues in a more effective way.

3. A key aspect to success of this approach is good communication and information sharing. CCAC representatives who do work or attend meetings etc. on behalf of the CCAC should provide written or oral reports, updates, or meeting minutes as appropriate at the regular CCAC meetings so all CCAC members can be apprised of such CCAC representatives' activities, provide for information sharing, and so that the CCAC can provide input or direction into CCAC activities in such focus areas.

4. Although needs may vary depending upon focus areas, these roles can include: monitoring issues in such focus areas; staying in contact with citizens, County staff, and businesses or developers; gathering public input; leading efforts related to such focus area (e.g., library fundraising); and reporting back to the CCAC.

5. The focus areas from Fall 2011 are fine – possible suggestions include:

a. Creating focus areas that correspond to the implementation section (Chapter 8) of the Crozet Master Plan, namely:

i. The Downtown Crozet District (the “Priority Area”)

ii. Community Life

iii. Transportation

iv. Land Use and Design (rezonings, text amendments, developments)

v. Parks and Green Systems

vi. Business Development and Support

vii. Community Facilities & Services (schools, emergency services, water/wastewater, etc)

b. In adopting focus areas as noted above we could possibly have one role focusing on monitoring Land Use activities across the board vs the east/north/west/south areas listed in 2011. We could also combine the police/fire rescue and utilities roles. I think keeping schools separate is good.

c. I am unsure if there is enough current activity to keep the Library and Historic District as focus areas?

**6. I would very much like to volunteer to serve as a representative for the Downtown Crozet District (e.g. issues related to Barnes Lumber redevelopment); I would secondarily volunteer to serve as representative for Business and Economic Development issues.**

Apologies for the long-winded thoughts on these issues; I hope this is helpful to your discussions tomorrow. Regrets again on not being able to attend.

Cheers,

***Dave***

+++++