

**FINAL ACTIONS**  
**Planning Commission Meeting May 22, 2012**

<b><u>AGENDA ITEM/ACTION</u></b>	<b><u>FOLLOW-UP ACTION</u></b>
<p>1. Call to Order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Calvin Morris, Chairman.</li> <li>• PC members present were Mr. Morris, Mr. Loach, Mr. Dotson, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Franco, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Lafferty. Ms. Monteith was present.</li> <li>• Staff present was Scott Clark, Sarah Baldwin, Andy Sorrell, Elaine Echols, David Benish, Sharon Taylor, and Greg Kampfner.</li> </ul>	
<p>2. <b>From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>	<p><u>Clerk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required</li> </ul>
<p>3. <b>Consent Agenda</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Approval of Minutes:</b> 1-31-2012</li> <li>• <b>APPROVED CONSENT AGENDA</b>, by a vote of 7:0.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Clerk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalize Minutes for Signature</li> </ul>
<p>4. <b>Regular Item</b></p> <p><b><u>SDP-2012-00020 NTELOS-Tier II Monopole (CV732) "SKI Enterprises, Inc." Final Site Plan</u></b></p> <p>PROPOSED: Tier II treetop steel monopole to be 84.6 feet tall containing a flush mounted antenna array and associated ground equipment.</p> <p>ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA, Rural Areas- agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).</p> <p>SECTION: 10.2.1 (22) which allows for Tier II personal wireless facilities in the RA Zoning District</p> <p>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Rural Areas in Rural Area 1 - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).</p> <p>ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No</p> <p>LOCATION: 1831 Eden Lane, east side of Old Ballard Rd. at Ivy</p> <p>TAX MAP/PARCEL: 05900-00-00-028C0</p> <p>MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller (Sarah Baldwin)</p> <p><b>DEFER SDP-2012-00020</b>, by a vote of 7:0, indefinitely as requested by the applicant.</p>	<p><u>Clerk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action Letter – Defer SDP-2012-00020 indefinitely as requested by the applicant.</li> </ul>
<p>5. <b>Public Hearing Items</b></p> <p><b><u>AFD-2012-0001 Keswick AFD Addition – Gonda</u></b></p>	<p><u>Clerk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action Letter – Recommend approval of the Gonda and Cox additions to Keswick Agricultural and Forestal District.</li> </ul>

<p>PROPOSAL: Addition of a 22.41-acre property to the Keswick Agricultural/Forestal District  ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).  ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No  COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Areas – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots)  LOCATION: 4969 Barn Field Dr  TAX MAP/PARCEL: 0810000006900  MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna  (Scott Clark)</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>AND</b></p> <p><b><u>AFD-2012-0005 Keswick AFD Addition – Cox</u></b>  PROPOSAL: Addition of a 68.26-acre property to the Keswick Agricultural/Forestal District  ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).  ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No  COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Areas – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots)  LOCATION: 4760 Barn Field Dr  TAX MAP/PARCEL: 0810000007200 and 0810000007300  MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna  (Scott Clark)</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND APPROVAL</b>, by a vote of 7:0, of the Cox and Gonda additions to the Board of Supervisors. Keswick Agricultural and Forestal District.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The request will go before Board of Supervisors on a date to be determined.</li> </ul>
<p>6. <b><u>AFD-2012-0002 Hardware AFD Addition – Vlasis</u></b>  PROPOSAL: Addition of a 21-acre property to the Hardware Agricultural/Forestal District  ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).  ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No  COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Areas – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots)  LOCATION: 5245 Dick Woods Rd.  TAX MAP/PARCEL: 07200000051C0  MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller  (Scott Clark)</p>	<p>Clerk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action Letter – Recommend approval of the Vlasis and Eudy additions to Hardware Agricultural and Forestal District.</li> <li>The request will go before Board of Supervisors on a date to be determined.</li> </ul>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AND</b></p> <p><b><u>AFD-2012-0003 Hardware AFD Addition – Eudy</u></b>  PROPOSAL: Addition of a 21-acre property to the Hardware Agricultural/Forestral District  ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).  ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No  COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Areas – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots)  LOCATION: 18 Merit Dr TAX  MAP/PARCEL: 088000000003T0  MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller (Scott Clark)</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND APPROVAL</b>, by a vote of 7:0, of the Vlasis and Eudy additions to the Hardware Agricultural and Forestal District.</p>	
<p>7. <b><u>AFD-2012-0004 Chalk Mountain AFD Addition – Mehring</u></b>  PROPOSAL: Addition of a 551.906-acre property to the Chalk Mountain Agricultural/Forestral District  ZONING: RA Rural Areas - agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots).  ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: No  COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Rural Areas – preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/ acre in development lots)  LOCATION: 3893 Hungrytown Road  TAX MAP/PARCEL: 097000000021B0, 097000000021C0, and 097000000021D0  MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Samuel Miller (Scott Clark)</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND APPROVAL</b>, by a vote of 7:0, of the Mehring addition to the Chalk Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District.</p>	<p><u>Clerk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action Letter – Recommend approval of the Mehring addition to Chalk Mountain Agricultural and Forestal District.</li> <li>• The request will go before Board of Supervisors on a date to be determined.</li> </ul>
<p>8. <b><u>SP-2010-00057 Pine Knot Historical Center</u></b>  PROPOSED: Historical center at Pine Knot with tours, related special events (up to 12 per year, not to exceed 150 persons), restroom facility, and museum and educational building (not to exceed 1,500 square feet)  ZONING CATEGORY/GENERAL USAGE: RA -- Rural Areas: agricultural, forestal, and fishery uses; residential density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots);  SECTION: 10.2.2.49, Historical centers,</p>	<p><u>Clerk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Action Letter – Recommend Approval of SP-2010-00057 with the conditions, as amended, shown in <b>Attachment 1</b>.</li> <li>• Action Letter – Recommend Approval of Modifications of Section 5.1.42(d): to waive the submittal of a site plan as required under Section 5.1.42(d), modification of 5.1.42(a) to permit up to 1,700 sq. feet in aggregate for the Pine Knot Historical Center, and modification to Section 4.1.42(i) to allow an increase of participants at special events from 150 to 200 persons.</li> <li>• The matter will be forwarded to the Board of</li> </ul>

<p>historical center special events, historical center festivals (reference 5.1.42)  <b>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY:</b> Rural Areas - preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density ( .5 unit/ acre in development lots)  <b>ENTRANCE CORRIDOR:</b> No  <b>LOCATION:</b> 711 Coles Rolling Road (Route 712), approximately 0.6 miles east of the intersection with Glendower Road (Route 713)  <b>TAX MAP/PARCEL:</b> 1220000001100  <b>MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT:</b> Scottsville (Andy Sorrell)</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SP-2010-00057</b>, by a vote of 7:0, based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the conditions listed in the staff report, with amendment to conditions 1 to include in “general accord” as shown in <b>Attachment 1</b>.</p> <p><b>RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF MODIFICATIONS</b> to Sections 5.1.42(d) and 5.1.42(i) by a vote of 7:0, as recommended by staff as shown in <b>Attachment 1</b>.</p>	<p>Supervisors on a date to be determined.</p>
<p>At 6:57 p.m., the Planning Commission recessed and then reconvened at 7:02 p.m.</p>	
<p>9. <b>Work Session</b></p> <p><b><u>CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan Revision</u></b>  Work Session 8 – Community Facilities and Design Expectations for the Development Areas (Elaine Echols)</p> <p>The Commission received staff’s presentation, took public comment, and commented on the information provided. Staff was asked to take the Commission’s comments into consideration in the Comp Plan Update as noted in <b>Attachment 2</b>.  No formal action taken.</p>	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to comments, suggestions and direction to staff noted in <b>Attachment 2</b> in further work on the Comp Plan Update.</li> </ul>
<p>10. <b>Old Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>	<p><u>Secretary:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
<p>11. <b>New Business</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be no Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday, May 29, 2012, June 5, 2012 or June 12, 2012.</li> <li>The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 19, 2012.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
<p>12. Adjourn to June 19, 2012, 6:00 p.m., Auditorium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.</li> </ul>	

**Attachment 1** - SP-2012-00057 Pine Knot Historical Center & Modification – Recommended Conditions of Approval

**Attachment 2** - CPA-2013-1 Comp Plan Revision Work Session – Planning Commission Comments

**Attachment 1**  
**SP-2012-00057 Pine Knot Historical Center & Modification –**  
**Recommended Conditions of Approval**

Based on the findings contained in this staff report, the Planning Commission recommends approval of SP-2010-00057 Pine Knot Historical Center, subject to the following conditions:

1. Development and use shall be in accord with the conceptual plan titled “Ex. Conditions and Site Plan Special Use Permit – SP#201000057” prepared by Water Street Studio and dated (last revised) March 22, 2012 (hereafter “Conceptual Plan”), as determined by the Director of Planning and the Zoning Administrator. To be in **general** accord with the Conceptual Plan, development and use shall reflect the following major elements within the development essential to the design of the development, as shown on the Conceptual Plan

- *limits of disturbance*
- *location of buildings and structures*
- *location of parking area and associated BMPs for storm water management*

Minor modifications to the plan, which do not conflict with the elements above, may be made to ensure compliance with the Zoning Ordinance.

2. Transportation to and from the Pine Knot property for attendees of all special events shall be subject to a transportation management plan approved by the Planning Director.
3. Approval from the Health Department for the composting restroom facility shall be required prior to issuance of a building permit for this use.
4. Construction of the new building, as identified on the conceptual site plan (Attachment C) shall commence on or before six (6) years from (the Board of Supervisor’s approval date), or this special use permit shall be deemed abandoned and the authority granted hereunder shall be thereupon terminate.

**ZONING ORDINANCE MODIFICATIONS:**

By a vote of 7:0, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the modifications, as recommended by staff, of Section 5.1.42(d) to waive the submittal of a site plan, of 5.1.42(a), to permit an increase from 1,500 square feet to 1,700 square feet (in aggregate) for the Pine Knot Historical Center, and as recommended by staff with the addition of a modification to Section 5.1.42(i) to allow an increase from 150 to 200 persons in the maximum number of attendees.

**Attachment 2 -**  
CPA-2013-1 Comp Plan Revision Work Session 8  
Community Facilities and Design Expectations for the Development Areas  
Planning Commission Comments

The Planning Commission held a work session to set general direction on the following issues regarding Community Facilities and Design Expectations for the Development Area:

- Neighborhood Model - Re-affirm the recommendations
- Entrance Corridor Needs
- Community Facilities – Review existing and proposed standards and provide input to staff

Elaine Echols and Andy Sorrell made a presentation on the existing Neighborhood Model principles, a proposed change to their format and reduction from 12 to 8 principles, information on the relationship of the Entrance Corridor guidelines to the Neighborhood Model, and expectations for Community Facilities. The following comments were received from Commissioners:

**Neighborhood Model**

- The 12 principles should be kept intact rather than generalizing them to 8 principles. More specificity rather than less is desirable. Reducing the number may send a message that the individual principles are not as important. Whatever you do, don't lose the substance of the 12 principles.
- The proposed 8 principles better reflect what has been learned over with the Neighborhood Model the last 10 – 12 years.
- The principle of “neighborhood friendly streets and paths” seems to be missing. Due to concerns about preservation of paths in the community, this principle needs to be retained and emphasized. There are redundancies in verbiage that should be removed. Mr. Lafferty offered to provide specific information upon request. Additional detailed comments on NH model and public facilities will be emailed by Mr. Dotson.
- More emphasis is needed on multimodal transportation. The term, “multimodal” doesn't have to mean having all modes on the same street.
- Comments in the Neighborhood Model related to concurrency should not be dropped.
- Consider using the City's terminology of “enhanced pedestrian experience” rather than “pedestrian orientation or human scale”.
- Provide a better explanation about different types of housing and the importance of affordable housing in development.
- Look for as many ways possible to emphasize “centers” -- on maps, in the text. The term, “commercial center” may better imply or describe the kinds of centers that are desirable.
- When siting community facilities, see if you can group them together on the ground to create new centers. The principle of interconnectivity needs work, especially where the interconnections may affect an existing neighborhood. In some instances, the Commission has not supported this principle.
- Walkability in areas and having the sidewalks along the street in front of the door to the street is very important to welcome pedestrians to shopping and employment areas.
- If we are going to make the development area pedestrian friendly, then we have to figure out a way of getting people across those major thoroughfares without impeding more of the traffic.
- Having sidewalks along Rt. 250 East and Rt. 29 North with entrances to buildings from these sidewalks is not realistic due to the amount and speed of traffic on these streets and the lack of pedestrian crossings across the roads.
- If the western bypass is built, don't count on less traffic on Rt. 29. There are no real opportunities to make this street more pedestrian friendly.
- The Neighborhood Model has changed the form of development over the last 10 – 12 years, but, has it really increased density? See if you can provide more detailed information on densities achieved.
- How will the upcoming critical slopes changes relate to the NM Principle of appropriate site grading?
- The original NH Model principle, Clear Boundaries with Rural Areas, was left out of the new 8 principles and there does not appear to be a reference to the need for clear boundaries. Is there a change in philosophy? We don't want to lose that principle.

- On the attractive multimodal streets description, the last sentence says, “lighting improves safety and allows for pedestrians to use sidewalks after dark.” Does this conflict with the dark sky goals?

### **Entrance Corridors**

- Why keep the recommendations for developing corridor specific guidelines if there is no staff or money to pay for development of these guidelines?
- More flexibility is needed with application of EC guidelines. It isn't useful to spend hours of time arguing over paint colors.

### **Community Facilities**

- Concurrency goals should be added to the Community Facilities Plan particularly on infrastructure. There need to be benchmarks established.
- Greater direction is needed for guidance on how to provide facilities and services when full funding is not available.
- Cost effectiveness should be defined.
- Statements should be provided that relate to the need for consistency of service delivery.
- Items listed in the CIP need to be listed in the Comprehensive Plan first. There seems to be a disconnect between the CIP and Comprehensive Plan at times.
- A community facilities map is needed so that one can see the relationship of community facilities to one another.

### **Public Comments**

Valerie Long:

- Don't lose the language in the current Comprehensive Plan related to redevelopment and infill. The County historically has supported infill and redevelopment even when it has not been considered to be compatible by neighbors. There is some really wonderful helpful language in the Infill Development process that could be looked to for guidance on this issue.
- How do critical slopes and critical slope regulations relate to goals for site grading? Is more flexibility for disturbing critical slopes contemplated in the designated development areas? If so, how do those two issues relate? It is very important to be clear on the expectation because oftentimes applicants are working so hard to avoid disturbing critical slopes that, final grading is not necessarily the best outcome. There needs to be some balance between critical slope regulations and grading expectations.
- There should be some language added to the introduction of the Entrance Corridor Guidelines to discuss goals, the scope of ARB review, and statement that the guidelines aren't intended to micro- manage design in developments but ensure compatibility.
- There is a need for balance between achieving the kind of development in the designated growth areas that is desirable and the incredible challenges, delays, and expenses that come with the ARB process.
- Retain flexibility in application of the NM Principles. Having 8 rather than 12 provides greater flexibility in how the principles are addressed. If it makes more sense to have 8 principles the smaller number allows the same goals to be achieved. Don't discourage efforts to simplify the process.
- Have the ARB provide better guidance when they are reviewing projects
- Rules need to be flexible enough to achieve the common goals.

Neil Williamson

- The EC Guidelines are ripe for reform as is the role of the ARB. Consideration should be given to establishing performance standards and getting rid of the ARB.
- The Commission should have asked for public comment before discussing the information that came from the staff presentation.
- It is unfair to say that builders are not relegating parking as they are working to do just this.

**No formal action was taken.**