



**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
PLANNING STAFF REPORT SUMMARY**

Project Name: ZMA 2010-00001 Pantops Ridge	Staff: Claudette Grant
Planning Commission Public Hearing: January 11, 2011	Board of Supervisors Public Hearing: To be determined
Owners: Richard T. Spurzem	Applicant: Richard T. Spurzem, represented by Valerie W. Long, Williams Mullen
Acreage: 37.5 acres	Rezone from: Planned Development Shopping Center (PD-SC) to R-15 Residential zoning district.
TMP: TMP 07800000005300 & TMP 078B0000A00400 (See Attachments A & B)	Existing Zoning and By-right use: By-right use is for a Shopping Center (Gazebo Plaza) has been approved with a 183,000 sq. ft. shopping center. (See Attachment C)
Location: 1998 Hansens Mountain Road, near intersection of U.S. Route 250 East and Hansens Mountain Road.	Proffers: Yes
Magisterial District: Rivanna	Requested # of Dwelling Units: 562
DA (Development Area): Neighborhood 3 – Pantops	Comprehensive Plan Designation: Neighborhood Density Residential - residential (3-6 units/acre) and supporting uses such as religious institutions and schools and other small-scale non-residential uses; Urban Density Residential - residential (6.01-34 units/acre) and supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses; Greenspace.
Character of Property: Primarily undeveloped with a 1920's stone house.	Use of Surrounding Properties: Primarily single family detached dwellings and some vacant, undeveloped land.
Factor Favorable: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The residential use is more in keeping with the Land Use Plan than the approved commercial use. 2. An extension of Viewmont Court and a relocated Hansens Mountain Road will be a safety improvement for Ashcroft residents and can address many of the traffic impacts of the development. 3. The residential use is less intensive than the approved commercial use and is expected to have less of an impact on surrounding residential developments. 	Factor Unfavorable: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed density is not in keeping with the Pantops Master Plan. 2. There is no commitment to retain Greenspace shown on the Pantops Master Plan. 3. No plan of development that could allow determination that goals from the Comprehensive Plan, including the Pantops Master Plan, related to environmental preservation, design around a Central Green, provision of amenities, provision of a mixture of housing types, and a pedestrian orientation are met. 4. No traffic study has been provided. Without a

	<p>traffic study, requirements of the state's Chapter 527 traffic study regulations have not been met and needed transportation improvements resulting from the development cannot be confirmed, including the proposed relocation of Hansens Mountain Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. The proffers obligate the County or VDOT to acquire any needed land for the relocation of Hansens Mountain Road utilizing funds proffered by the applicant without a commitment by the applicant to attempt to acquire this land themselves. This puts the County or VDOT in the position of potentially needing to condemn land owned by multiple property owners in order for the proffer to be executed. 6. There is no commitment to accommodate transit in the development, nor is there a commitment of any funding for any public transit services. 7. There is no contribution to providing affordable housing. 8. There is no commitment to off-set the development's impacts on public facilities as stipulated in Appendix B of the County Land Use Plan entitled " County of Albemarle, Virginia Cash Proffer Policy for Public Facilities". 9. Proffers are in need of substantive and technical changes.
--	--

RECOMMENDATION: Base on the factors notes as unfavorable, staff recommends denial of this rezoning.

STAFF PERSON:
PLANNING COMMISSION:
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

Claudette Grant
January 11, 2011
To Be Determined

ZMA 2010-001 Pantops Ridge

PETITION

PROJECT: PANTOPS RIDGE (ZMA 2010-01)

PROPOSAL: Rezone approximately 37.5 acres from PD-SC Planned Development Shopping Center, which allows shopping centers, retail sales and service uses and residential by special use permit (15 units/ acre) to R-15 Residential zoning district which allows single family attached/detached uses and multifamily residential uses up to 15 units/acre. Proposed number of units is 562 for a density of 15 units/acre.

PROFFERS: Yes

EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Neighborhood Density Residential - residential (3-6 units/acre) and supporting uses such as religious institutions and schools and other small-scale non-residential uses; Urban Density Residential - residential (6.01-34 units/acre) and supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses; Greenspace.

ENTRANCE CORRIDOR: Yes

LOCATION: 1998 Hansens Mountain Road, Intersection of US Route 250 East and Hansens Mountain Road. Access is proposed from a relocated Hansens Mountain Road and through 106 Viewmont Court.

TAX MAP/PARCEL: Tax Map 78, Parcel 53; Tax Map 78B-A-4

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT: Rivanna

(The actual acreage for this project is 37.5 acres, which yields a proposed 562 units for a density of 15 units/acre. In some instances the acreage was rounded up to 38 acres, which yields a proposed 566 units for a density of 15 units/acre. The staff report refers to the actual 37.5 acres and proposed 562 units.)

CHARACTER OF THE SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

The 37.5 acre site is located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Interstate 64 and U.S. Route 250. The site is located on a hill and is primarily undeveloped except for an existing house. The Glenorchy residential development is located to the west and Ashcroft is located to the north of the development. Both residential neighborhoods are adjacent to this site. Office, retail and other commercial uses, including the site for the Martha Jefferson Hospital are located nearby.

SPECIFICS OF THE PROPOSAL

The applicant is requesting a rezoning from PDSC to R-15 residential. There is no plan of development offered; however, the applicant has proffered to build no more than 562 dwelling units. He would also upgrade Glenorchy Drive, to make it the main entrance to the development by extending Viewmont Court to a relocated Hansens Mountain Road. The existing entrance to Hansens Mountain Road would be closed. (See Exhibit A of Attachment E) A relocated Hansens Mountain Road would allow vehicles from the subject property and the Ashcroft neighborhood access to U.S. Route 250 through Glenorchy at an existing signalized intersection at Peter Jefferson Place. The current vehicular access for this site and Ashcroft is an unsignalized intersection at Hansens Mountain Road and U.S. Route 250. The proposed transportation improvements would be dependent on the County's acquisition of right-of-way from property owners in Glenorchy where there is likely insufficient right-of-way for the improvements.

APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION FOR THE REQUEST

The applicant has an approved final site plan for a 183,000 square foot shopping center. (See Attachment I.) While the proposed shopping center could be built by-right, the applicant feels that

down zoning the property to residential instead of commercial uses will not only decrease the level of intensity of development on this site, but also provide the potential for less traffic and improved safety measures to the transportation network.

PLANNING AND ZONING HISTORY

This property has the following relevant history:

SDP 80 – 44 – site plan approved by the Planning Commission on October 14, 1980.

County Comprehensive Rezoning, December 10, 1980 – property rezoned from B-1, Business to PDSC, with the approved site plan serving as the application plan. **ZMA 98-07** – Proposal to rezone the property from PDSC to R-10 for 375 apartment units was withdrawn prior to any action or recommendation.

ZMA 02 -11 and SPs 02-52, 53, 54 and 55 – Proposal for mixed use development of residential and commercial along with a parking structure was withdrawn after a Planning Commission work session on July 15, 2003.

SDP 04-074 – Preliminary site plan approved September 13, 2005.

SDP 06-030 – Final site plan approved December 26, 2007.

CONFORMITY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The properties are located in Neighborhood Three, also known as Pantops, in the Land Use Plan. The Pantops Master Plan, an element of the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Plan, does not recommend a shopping center at this location as it is currently zoned. Instead, it designates the property as Urban Density Residential around a Central Green, Neighborhood Density Residential adjacent to the existing Glenorchy subdivision and Greenspace along the eastern property line. The majority of the property is shown for Neighborhood Density which is intended to have between 3-6 dwelling units per acre. Single family detached and attached units would be expected as the primary building type. Urban Density Residential areas are intended to have a density of between 6.01 to 20 dwellings per acre, with possible densities of up to 34 dwellings per acres under a planned development approach. The Pantops Master Plan, suggests that approximately 300 units should be built on the areas designated as urban density and neighborhood density. Over the gross acreage of the site, this would translate to 8 units per acre. Fifteen units per acre is the proposed density in this rezoning. Attachment D, the Comparison Maps, show that the green space on the Land Use Plan Map was incorporated to protect the steep slopes near Culpeper Branch along the east and northern edges of the site. It is possible that some development could occur in portions of the property that are shown as Greenspace but have less steep slopes. These areas are near the edges of the neighborhood density and urban density boundaries. The property subject to this proposal is located in a residential area as described in the master plan. The Pantops Master Plan recommends maintaining the residential character in these areas while providing appropriately scaled uses for goods and services within walking distance of residential areas and more natural greenspace. (See Insert below)



The following recommendations are from the Pantops Master Plan for the property:

- The dwelling and accessory structures on the Gazebo Plaza property appear to be fifty years old or older and may be considered historic and should be evaluated and documented.
The applicant has agreed to survey the existing building(s) on the property and provide documentation prior to demolition.
- When development occurs on the undeveloped property (Gazebo Plaza site) provide a Civic Green Center surrounded by Urban Density Residential in the general area shown on the Framework Plan.
No commitment has been made regarding the provision for a Civic Green Center.
- Develop public or semi public park/green space on the northern half of the Gazebo Plaza site and provide trail connections.
No commitment has been made regarding the development of public or semi public park/green space on the northern half of the site. However, the applicant has proffered to provide a trail on the site.
- Respect the Monticello view shed by retaining land in open space.
The applicant has indicated a willingness to work with the Thomas Jefferson Foundation during the site development process to address Monticello viewshed protection recommendations of the Master Plan. Proffers have been provided regarding architectural standards.
- Replant trees that have been removed during grading to help create a wooded canopy, as part of viewshed protection for Monticello.
The applicant has not provided any specific commitment regarding replanting of trees that are removed during grading. However, as described in the previous bullet, the applicant has indicated a willingness to work with the Thomas Jefferson Foundation during the site development process to address Monticello viewshed protection recommendations of the Master Plan.
- Connect this neighborhood to the more intensive land use centers to the west with a multi-purpose path that leads into the planned sidewalk system.
Although the applicant has proffered to provide a trail on the site, no plan has been provided that shows connectivity between this neighborhood and the more intensive land use centers to the west with a multi-purpose path that leads into the planned sidewalk system.
- Create and preserve a vegetated buffer along Route 250 East through this neighborhood and at the Rural Area boundary to this neighborhood to help retain a residential and rural character in this part of Pantops.
The creation and preservation of a vegetated buffer along Route 250 East through this neighborhood and at the Rural Area boundary to this neighborhood to help retain a residential

and rural character in this part of Pantops has not been provided. A proffer is provided for a buffer along Culpeper Branch.

Principles of the Neighborhood Model

As mentioned earlier, the applicant has not provided a plan of development and without a plan, staff is unable to fully evaluate the proposal for conformity with the 12 Principles of the Neighborhood Model. The following assessment is based on the information that has been provided.

Pedestrian Orientation	The subdivision ordinance requires sidewalks and street trees for new streets in single-family developments. The R-15 zoning allows for townhouse and multi-family development. Sidewalks and street trees are not mandatory in these developments. To meet the principle, additional commitments are needed. <i>This principle has not been adequately addressed.</i>
Neighborhood Friendly Streets and Paths	The applicant has proffered to provide a trail. However, the location and type of trail (paved or unpaved) has not been provided. The proffer is in need of technical and substantive revisions. <i>This principle has not been adequately addressed.</i>
Interconnected Streets and Transportation Networks	The proposed extension of Viewmont Court and relocation of Hansens Mountain Road is recommended in the Pantops Master Plan. The proffer to relocate Hansens Mountain Road requires the County or VDOT to acquire land for right-of-way with no obligation on the part of the applicant to first seek to acquire the needed land. While the applicant has proffered a certain level of funding for these acquisitions, the proffer leaves the onus on the County or VDOT to deal with multiple property owners for the acquisitions in order to accomplish this interconnection. <i>Substantive revisions to the proffer are needed to assure this principle can be met.</i>
Parks and Open Space	The Pantops Master Plan designates a Central Green and recommends Greenspace along the eastern property line to protect environmental features of the site. No commitment has been made to provide these areas recommended in the Master Plan. <i>This principle has not been addressed.</i>
Neighborhood Centers	The Pantops Master Plan recommends a Central Green within this property. No such center is provided. <i>This principle is not met.</i>
Buildings and Spaces of Human Scale	No commitments have been made related to building scale, form and massing. Therefore, <i>this principle cannot be evaluated for conformity</i> with the Neighborhood Model. The ARB will review site plans for conformity with the Entrance Corridor Guidelines where development is visible from Richmond Road and I-64.
Relegated Parking	Due to absence of a plan, <i>this principle cannot be evaluated for conformity</i> with the Neighborhood Model.
Mixture of Uses	The site is not recommended for mixed use in the Master Plan and the applicant is proposing a residential development only. <i>This principle is not applicable.</i>

Mixture of Housing Types and Affordability	Proffer 3 provides for a mix of housing types, however, this proffer has no mechanism for enforcement. There are no commitments to make single family dwellings the predominant unit type or commitments to locate multifamily units in the area shown for urban density on the Pantops Master Plan. No proffer has been made for affordable housing. <i>This principle is not met.</i>
Redevelopment	Demolition of the house is expected and further development of the site will occur if the rezoning is approved. <i>This principle is met.</i>
Site Planning that Respects Terrain	The Pantops Master Plan recommends that the natural topography of the site be preserved with the designated Greenspace on the Master Plan. No information has been provided on proposed grading. <i>This principle is not met.</i>
Clear Boundaries with the Rural Areas	The property is on the edge of the Development Area and the Pantops Master Plan recommends the creation and preservation of a vegetated buffer along Route 250 East through this neighborhood and at the Rural Area boundary to this neighborhood to help retain a residential and rural character in this part of Pantops. Although, the applicant has proffered a buffer along Culpeper Branch, clarity is needed in terms of what is being proposed. In addition, the buffer does not relate to the Development Area and Rural Area boundaries. <i>This principle is not met.</i>

Economic Development Policy

While changing a commercially zoned area to a residential district might be considered contrary to small business development, retention, and job creation, the Economic Vitality Action Plan, adopted in August 2010 to further implement the Comprehensive Plan’s Economic Development Policy, states that the Action Plan is intended to work within the guidelines and stated goals and objectives of all relevant chapters of the Comprehensive Plan, including the Land Use Plan. As the Land use Plan recommends residential use at this location, staff finds the proposal does not conflict with the County’s Economic Development Policy.

STAFF COMMENT

Relationship between the application and the purpose and intent of the requested zoning district:

The intent of the R-15 district is to allow for compact high-density residential development with a variety of housing types, which may be clustered. The district also promotes the provision of locational, environmental and development amenities. The applicant is requesting approval for a fairly dense residential development with 562 units. At 15 units per acre, the proposal is consistent with the intent of the R-15 Zoning District. The site plan requirements ensure that some amenities will be provided. However, it is unknown with the information provided for this rezoning how or if any environmental features will be preserved.

It is unusual for a development of this size and type to be requested without a plan of development. Either a proffered plan for R-15 or a PRD would be appropriate for a residential development if density is in keeping with the Land Use Plan. The applicant believes that the exchange of commercially zoned land for residentially zoned land at 15 dwellings per acre is sufficient grounds for not providing a plan of development.

Public need and justification for the change:

With the pending move of the Martha Jefferson Hospital to the Pantops area, the applicant sees a need for additional housing that is conveniently located in this part of the County. The applicant feels the change of use from a shopping center to a residential development will be less intense on the surrounding community. Staff agrees that a residential development will be a less intensive use of the property, but, that the density should be in conformity with the Pantops Master Plan. The

relocation of Hansens Mountain Road as proposed would help to improve the overall road system and safety. This improvement is in keeping with the recommendations of the Pantops Master Plan.

Impact on Environmental, Cultural, and Historic Resources:

Environmental - A stream known as the Culpeper Branch is located along the eastern boundary of this property. As previously mentioned in this report, the applicant has proffered a buffer for this area. However, staff questions what is to be preserved since a WPO permit has been approved for this portion of the site and disturbance in this area has already occurred.

Other important environmental features to protect in the Greenspace area include critical slopes, and some wooded areas. Staff believes development of the site should avoid these features. To do this, the applicant would need to provide a plan showing the areas to be preserved and make commitments to avoid development of the site in the northern wooded portions north of the power line easement. (See Attachment D)

Cultural/Historic Resources - No known cultural or historic resources exist on the site; however, the applicant has committed to survey the existing building on the property and provide documentation prior to demolition.

Monticello Viewshed - The applicant has indicated a willingness to work with the Thomas Jefferson Foundation during the site development process to address Monticello viewshed protection recommendations of the Master Plan. A proffer has been made to use neutral colors, minimize use of white materials, and use dark, non-reflective material for buildings. These proffers are general in nature and require clarification.

Entrance Corridor- Richmond Road is an Entrance Corridor and subject to ARB review. The Design Planner states that a residential development on the subject parcels could be appropriately designed to meet the Entrance Corridor guidelines; however, the submittal materials do not provide a level of detail that allows for any further review or comment.

Anticipated impact on public facilities and services:

Streets –

Traffic Impact Analysis: Both the County Engineer and VDOT have requested a traffic impact analysis meeting the requirements of the state’s Chapter 527 traffic study regulations which, to date, the applicant has declined to provide. The applicant has stated that traffic studies done in 2002 for a mixed use development and in 2006 for the shopping center should be sufficient for County review. The County Engineer and VDOT disagree for the following reasons:

1. Background traffic volume and direction has changed on Richmond Road which must be taken into account.
2. The proposal to rebuild Hansens Mountain Road does not appear able to meet VDOT requirements given the expected traffic volumes.
3. Improvements to Richmond Road to accommodate turning movements may be needed which the applicant is not providing.
4. Neither the shopping center nor the mixed-use development traffic studies adequately reflect traffic to be generated by this development, although the County Engineer and VDOT concede that it is likely less than for the shopping center. The 2006 traffic study showed generation of approximately 9500 vpd for the shopping center and 562 multi-family units will generate approximately 5100 vpd.

Details are provided in Attachments G and H from VDOT and the County Engineer.

As previously mentioned in this staff report, the Hansen Mountain Road relocation is recommended in the Pantops Master Plan. The relocation would help resolve delay issues experienced by residents of Ashcroft. A relocated intersection would support the new development recommended in the Plan. Without the intersection improvement, the amount of traffic generated by the new development could not be accommodated because of the expected volume and the closeness of the intersection to the I-64 interchange.

To make the improvements, the applicant has stated the County must first acquire right-of-way for those improvements and has proffered a set amount of funds to be provided for this purpose. In the past when the County has accepted proffers that involve the County's possible acquisition of right of way, it has been expected that the applicant would first exhaust all measures to acquire the right of way before the County would step in. The proffer leaves the onus on the County or VDOT to deal with multiple property owners for the acquisitions in order to accomplish this interconnection.

Transit:

The Pantops Master Plan recommends the following regarding transit:

Encourage new development to contribute to funding transit services to offset the cost of service and to reduce traffic impacts of development proposals.

Ensure new development is transit ready.

Without a plan, there is no way to assure that the development can be transit-ready. In addition, there are no proffers for transit.

Schools –

Children from this development would attend Stone Robinson Elementary School, Burley Middle School and Monticello High School. This development is expected to generate approximately 74 elementary school pupils, 35 middle school pupils, and 31 high school pupils if developed. These numbers are based on 50 single family detached units, 225 apartment units and 291 low rise residential condominium/townhouses as submitted by the applicant.

Fire, Rescue, Police-

The closest fire/rescue station is located in the City of Charlottesville, which serves the Pantops area. A temporary County facility is being built nearby at Peter Jefferson Place which should allow for adequate response time, if road improvements are made. The Albemarle County Fifth Street Office Building contains the County's Police Department, although police patrol all areas of the County.

At present, the County does not meet its standard of 1.5 officers per 1,000 residents.

Utilities-

The Albemarle County Service Authority (ACSA) states that there are capacity issues for several runs of sewer pipe downstream from this project. They will have to be upgraded to accept the projected flows from the proposed 562 units. (See Attachment F for ACSA comments)

Anticipated impact on nearby and surrounding properties:

The largest impact from the development as proposed will be increased traffic in Glenorchy from Ashcroft and the traffic generated by the new development utilizing the relocated Hansens Mountain Road. Residents along Viewmont Court will likely experience the highest level of impact. Currently, Viewmont Court is a dead end residential street in the Glenorchy development with only a few residences. The relocation of Hansen Mountain Road connecting to Viewmont Court will provide a safer road for residents of Ashcroft and Pantops Ridge, but will also add traffic on a street that currently has very little traffic. Right-of-way for the Hansen Mountain Road relocation will also be needed from some properties in Glenorchy.

PROFFERS

Attachment E contains the current proffers. Of note is the absence of off-sets to the development's impacts on public facilities as stipulated in Appendix B of the County Land Use Plan entitled "County of Albemarle, Virginia Cash Proffer Policy for Public Facilities" and the absence of an affordable housing proffer. The County's cash proffer policy addresses public facilities that will be funded by cash proffers: schools, transportation, parks, libraries and public safety. The policy states:

"It is the policy of the County to require that the owner of property that is rezoned for residential uses to provide cash proffers equivalent to the proportional value of the public facilities deemed necessary to serve the proposed development on the property. Accordingly, the Board will accept cash proffers for rezoning requests that permit residential uses in accordance with this policy. However, the Board may also accept cash, land or in-kind improvements in accordance with County and State law to address the impacts of the rezoning."

The updated cash proffer amounts, per dwelling unit, for CY 2009 consistent with the policy are as follows:

Single Family Detached (SFD) _ \$18,700.00;
Single Family Attached/Townhouse (SFA/TH) = \$12,700.00; and
Multifamily (MF) = \$13,200.00.

The County's Affordable Housing policy recommends that, at a minimum, 15% of all units developed under rezoning and special use permits should be affordable as defined by the County's Office of Housing and Housing Committee or a comparable contribution should be made to achieve the affordable housing goals of the County.

The applicant has indicated to staff that the exchange of commercially zoned land for residentially zoned land should be sufficient to off-set impacts from the residential development. For that reason, the applicant has declined to offer affordable housing or other proffers for impacts from the development.

In addition to items already described in this report, technical and substantive changes to the proffers are needed prior to any action by the Board. The specific changes can be found in Attachment J.

SUMMARY

Factors Favorable:

1. The residential use is more in keeping with the Land Use Plan than the approved commercial use.
2. An extension of Viewmont Court and a relocated Hansens Mountain Road will be a safety improvement for Ashcroft residents and can address many of the traffic impacts of the development.
3. The residential use is less intensive than the approved commercial use and is expected to have less of an impact on surrounding residential developments.

Staff has identified the following factors unfavorable to this request:

Factors Unfavorable:

1. Proposed density is not in keeping with the Pantops Master Plan.
2. There is no commitment to retain Green space shown on the Pantops Master Plan.
3. No plan of development that could allow determination that goals from the Comprehensive Plan, including the Pantops Master Plan, related to environmental preservation, design around a Central Green, provision of amenities, provision of a mixture of housing types, and a pedestrian orientation are met.
4. No traffic study has been provided. Without a traffic study, requirements of the state's Chapter 527 traffic study regulations have not been met and needed transportation improvements resulting from the development cannot be confirmed, including the proposed relocation of Hansens Mountain Road.
5. The proffers obligate the County or VDOT to acquire any needed land for the relocation of Hansens Mountain Road utilizing funds proffered by the applicant without a commitment by the applicant to attempt to acquire this land themselves. This puts the County or VDOT in the position of potentially needing to condemn land owned by multiple property owners in order for the proffer to be executed.
6. There is no commitment to accommodate transit in the development, nor is there a commitment of any funding for public transit services.
7. There is no commitment to providing affordable housing.
8. There is no commitment to off-set the development's impacts on public facilities as stipulated in Appendix B of the County Land Use Plan entitled "County of Albemarle, Virginia Cash Proffer Policy for Public Facilities".
9. Proffers are in need of substantive and technical changes.

Recommendation:

Staff believes that a residential development proposal could be made in this location that would be in keeping with the County's Comprehensive Plan and also address impacts and meet expectations for design. However, based on the factors noted as unfavorable in this report, staff recommends denial of this rezoning.

PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION:

A. Should a Planning Commissioner **choose to recommend approval** of this rezoning:

Move to recommend approval of ZMA 2010-00001 subject to the following: (which, at a minimum, need to include technical changes to the proffers for them to be acceptable)

B. Should a Planning Commissioner **choose to recommend denial** of this rezoning:

Move to recommend denial of ZMA 2010-00001 based on the factors unfavorable as identified by staff or Move to recommend denial for the following reasons:

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. [ZMA 2010-00001 Pantops Ridge Tax Map and Parcel](#)
- B. [ZMA 2010-00001 Pantops Ridge Location Map](#)
- C. [ZMA 2010-00001 Pantops Ridge Zoning Map](#)
- D. [ZMA 2010-00001 Pantops Ridge Comparison Map](#)
- E. [Proffers dated October 18, 2010](#)
- F. [ACSA comments provided by Gary Whelan](#)
- G. [VDOT comments provided by Joel DeNunzio](#)

- H. [Staff comments provided by Glenn Brooks, dated October 26, 2010](#)
- I. [Approved final site plan Gazebo Plaza, dated 3-13-06](#)
- J. [Technical and substantive proffer changes](#)