

**FINAL ACTIONS**  
**Planning Commission Meeting of February 10, 2009**

<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 Eric Strucko. PC members present were Mr. Morris, Mr. Loach, Ms. Porterfield, Ms. Joseph and Mr. Strucko. Absent was Mr. Edgerton. Julia Monteith was present.</li> <li>• Staff present was Judith Wiegand, Bill Letteri, Ron Lilley, David Benish, Wayne Cilimberg, Elaine Echols, Sharon Taylor and Greg Kamptner.</li> </ul>	
<p>2. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
<p>3. Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – February 3, 2009.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No action required.</li> </ul>
<p>4. <b><u>Work Sessions</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Crozet Library Design Concepts</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A work session was held on the Crozet Library Design Concepts to receive an update from the Design Team. The Planning Commission discussed and asked questions about the concepts, took public comment and provided input on the design concepts as summarized in Attachment 1. No formal action was taken.</li> </ul>	<p>Clerk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff will take the Commission comments back to Library Design Steering Committee for their consideration in the continuing design work.</li> </ul>
<p>4. <b><u>Places 29, Chapters 1 – 6</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A work session was held to review the status of and changes to the Places 29, Chapters 1 – 6 and to obtain the Commission’s direction regarding several questions from staff. The Commission discussed and asked questions about the changes, took public comment and answered staff’s questions as noted in Attachment 2.</li> </ul>	<p>Clerk:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff to incorporate the Commission’s comments into the draft document as summarized in Attachment 2. Future work sessions have been scheduled.</li> <li>• The Places29 work session on Chapter 8 was changed from March 17 to March 31. Staff will review the maps and charts in Chapter 4 on March 17, after the Village of Rivanna work session.</li> <li>• Staff plans to meet with Mr. Loach and Ms. Porterfield to bring them up to date on Places29.</li> </ul>
<p>8. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Business</li> </ul></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Porterfield asked that during the weeks when the Commission does not meet that the materials for the next week’s meeting be delivered by Tuesday to allow adequate time to review it.</li> </ul>
<p>9. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Business</li> </ul></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>None</u></li> </ul>
<p>10. Adjourn to February 17, 2009, 6:00 p.m., Auditorium, Second Floor, County Office Building, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville,</p>	

Virginia.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:42 p.m.

Attachment 1 – Crozet Library Design Concepts - Planning Commission Comments

Attachment 2 – Places 29 Chapters 1 – 6 Work Session – Planning Commission Comments

## **Attachment 1 – Crozet Library Design Concepts - Planning Commission Comments**

The Planning Commission provided input on the design concepts to date, as summarized below:

- There was a concern about the adequacy of the space being proposed, especially considering the potential full build-out capacity of Crozet.
- Acknowledging the problem with funding and the site constraints, the Commission was disappointed not to see the main library entrance off of Crozet Avenue. It was noted that one of the elevations along Crozet Avenue makes it look like the entrance where the pedestrian would want to walk into the library, particularly with the glass. It was not very pedestrian friendly to have to go around to the back of the building to a more vehicular-oriented entrance from a parking lot off of Main Street.
- Bike racks should be located somewhere on the site.
- A fully functional two-story building design is preferable. At a minimum, the building should provide two functioning, connecting and accessible floors as viewed from Crozet Avenue with visible, accessible and usable space on the Crozet Avenue level.

## **Attachment 2 - Places 29, Chapters 1 – 6 Planning Commission comments**

**In summary**, the Planning Commission held a Worksession on Places29 Chapters 1 – 6: Next Steps and provided the following comments, questions, suggestions for map changes and responses to the four questions posed by staff.

The following four questions were posed by staff during the presentation:

**1. How should the two proposed boundary expansion areas be shown on the Future Land Use Map?**

The majority of the Commissioners stated that they wanted the two expansion areas removed completely from the Future Land Use Map. Ms. Porterfield noted that by removing the expansion area north of Polo Grounds Road and west of Route 29, it would be less easy to encourage developer(s) to extend Berkmar Drive. The draft Master Plan notes in Chapter 2, Transportation, section 10: “The road network that will best serve the Northern Development Areas includes US 29, roads that are parallel to US 29, and good east-west connecting roads.”

**2. Should the area occupied by the NGIC be added to the Development Area?**

The Commission indicated that, until the County actually receives a plan for development on the site, no change should be made in the Development Area boundary.

**3. Is the distinction between the 20-year Master Plan Implementation Timeframe and the longer Plan build out clear?**

The Commission did not think the language was clear enough. Mrs. Porterfield also pointed out that the Master Plan would be adopted at best almost five years into the original 2005 – 2025 20-year timeframe.

**4. Should further changes for industrial land designations be deferred until after adoption of the County’s Economic Development Policy?**

The Commission indicated that they wanted staff to wait for possible adoption of the updated policy. Hopefully, adoption will take place in enough time that any follow-up study can be done in time for any necessary changes to be made in the Master Plan before it leaves the Commission’s purview.

**The Commission also had several questions and pointed out some changes that need to be made in the maps:**

1. On the Future Land Use Map, the two parcels near the Airport that are occupied by Avionics need to be changed to Light Industrial.
2. The strip of property between the Heavy Industrial designation and Airport Acres that is now designated Urban Density Residential would be better as Light Industrial.
3. The Commission asked if the language on the transit goal could be beefed up.
4. Mr. Loach stated that the maps should reflect what the public expects; the maps should not be changed unless the public will have an opportunity to review the changes before adoption.
5. Mr. Strucko requested a stronger statement about the possibility of and impact of by-right uses.
6. Mr. Loach requested that the transportation portion of Chapter 4 include the wait times at intersections and the LOSs there. This will show the consequences of not making the improvements.
7. At the Commission’s request, the date of the worksession for the text of Chapter 8 was changed from March 17 to March 31. Staff will be prepared to present the Future Land Use Maps and Tables from Chapter 4, with examples on March 17.

8. The Commission requested that public comment be put at the end of all upcoming worksessions so the public can hear the detailed discussion between the staff and the Commission.
9. Ms. Joseph asked if the UVa students' work on pedestrian crossings of US 29 had been incorporated. She was assured that there were pedestrian crossings listed in the Implementation Table part of Chapter 8.
10. After the worksession, one commissioner and a member of the public pointed out textual errors.