<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM/ACTION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to Order.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mr. Morris. PC members present were Mr. Franco, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Loach, Ms. Porterfield, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Morris, Vice Chair. Members absent were Duane Zobrist, Chair. Ms. Monteith was present.  
• Staff members present were Claudette Grant, Ron Higgins, David Benish, Sharon Taylor, and Greg Kamptner. |                 |
| 2. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.  | Clerk:  
• No action required |
| • None | |
| 3. Consent Agenda  | Clerk:  
• Finalize minutes for signature  
• Place minutes of July 26, 2011 minutes on the consent agenda at the next meeting. |
| Approval of Minutes  |  |
| February 8, 2011, July 12, 2011, and July 26, 2011 |  |
| APPROVED CONSENT AGENDA, by a vote of 6:0 for approval of the minutes for February 8, 2011 and July 12, 2011.  |  |
| By a vote of 6:0, the minutes of July 26, 2011 were pulled and placed on the next Commission agenda for approval. |  |
| 4. Item Requesting Deferral:  | Clerk:  
• Action Letter – Deferred ZMA-2010-00011 to October 18, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.  
• Note: Ms. Porterfield provided comment: There was some discussion at the Historic Preservation Committee that maybe this applicant might want to consider moving the tot lot over to the cemetery area so that lots to be sold would not be abutting the cemetery. There was some discussion that change might make marketing the lots easier and also might be better for cemetery maintenance, access, and other things. |
| ZMA-2010-00011, Estes Park  |  |
| PROPOSAL: Rezone 12.75 acres on Tax Map/Parcel 032000000300 and TMP 0320000003400 from R-1, Residential zoning district which allows 1 unit/acre to PRD, Planned Residential Development zoning district which allows residential (3 – 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses and to rezone 0.56 acres on Tax Map/Parcel 046B4000000500 from R-1 Residential zoning district to R-1 Residential zoning district with proffers. Proposed number of units is 68 for a density of 5.33 units/acre.  
PROFFERS: Yes  
EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY: Urban Density |  |
### Residential – residential (6.01 – 34 units/acre); supporting uses such as religious institutions, schools, commercial, office and service uses.

**ENTRANCE CORRIDOR:** No  
**LOCATION:** in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Proffit Road (Rt 649) and Worth Crossing, approximately 800 feet south of Proffit Road in the Community of Hollymead.

**TAX MAP/PARCEL:** TMP 03200000003300, TMP 03200000003400, and TMP 046B4000000500

**MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT:** Rivanna

**DEFERRED FROM THE AUGUST 23, 2011 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

**APPLICANT REQUESTING DEFERRAL TO THE OCTOBER 18, 2011 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

(David Benish)

**RECOMMENDED DEFERRAL OF ZMA-2010-00011, by a vote of 6:0, as per the applicant’s request.**

### 8. ZMA-2010-00017/Redfields PRD

**PROPOSAL:** Rezone 58.47 acres from PRD (Open Space) - Planned Residential District zoning district which allows residential (3 - 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses to PRD (Residential) - Planned Residential District zoning district which allows residential (3 - 34 units/acre) with limited commercial uses. Proposed number of units is 126 for a density of 2.15 units/acre.

**PROFFERS:** Yes

**EXISTING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE/DENSITY:** Rural Areas- preserve and protect agricultural, forestal, open space, and natural, historic and scenic resources/ density (0.5 unit/acre in development lots)

**ENTRANCE CORRIDOR:** No  
**LOCATION:** Located on west side of Old Lynchburg Road and accessed by Sunset Avenue and Redfields Road.

**TAX MAP/PARCEL:** 076R00000000E4 and 076R0000000100

**MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT:** Samuel Miller

(Claudette Grant)

**Clerk:**

- Action Letter – ZMA-2010-00017 will go before Board of Supervisors on a date to be determined with a recommendation for denial based on the recommendation of staff.
- Action Letter – Denied critical slopes waiver request based on the fact that the PC recommended denial of ZMA-2010-00017 Redfields PRD and therefore the Commission has nothing on which to base consideration of the waiver.

The reasons that the various Commissioners indicated for their denial are listed in Attachment 1.
**RECOMMENDED DENIAL**, by a vote of 6:0, of ZMA-2010-00017 Redfields PRD based on the recommendation of staff.

**DENIED**, by a vote of 6:0, the critical slopes waiver request based on the denial of ZMA-2010-00017 and there was nothing on which to base consideration of the waiver.

10. **Old Business**
   - Mr. Franco pointed out that when he read the staff report for ZMA-2010-00011 Estes Park one of his questions was regarding the off-site access. He was concerned that they could build it, but without the dedication, there would not be a public road. He asked staff to check that.
   - Mr. Benish pointed out that was the reason for the deferral. The adjacent property owner had expressed some concern in granting that permission. Staff felt it was best that is worked out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secretary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **New Business**
   - Request made that the auditorium have a check-up due to recent sound and visual problems.
   - Request made to pick up staff report on Wednesday.
   - **There is no meeting on Tuesday, October 4, 2011.**
   - **The next Planning Commission meeting will be Tuesday, October 11, 2011.**

12. **Adjourn to October 11, 2011, Planning Commission Meeting at 6:00 p.m., County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.**
   - The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Attachment 1 – ZMA-2010-00017 Redfields PRD – Reasons for Denial Recommendation
The Planning Commission recommends denial of ZMA 2010-00017, Redfields PRD based on staff’s recommendation because the residential use proposed is not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan land use designation and the following unfavorable factors.

- The proposed residential development is inconsistent with the Growth Management and Rural Areas policies.
- The Land Use Plan Map in the Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Rural Area, which is not recommended for this proposed scale of development.
- This rezoning request does not follow the process and direction the Planning Commission provided at last year’s worksession. The Commission recommended future expansion areas be studied in a comprehensive manner and that the Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA2010-001) currently underway be studied with the comprehensive plan. These initial discussions are scheduled to begin October 11, 2011 with the Planning Commission.
- Some proffers need to be rewritten to address staff’s concerns, as noted in the proffer section of the staff report.
- The loss of open space/trails that the community has been using.
- An increase in traffic to the area.
- No commitment has been made to provide affordable housing.

Although Staff recommended approval, the Planning Commission recommends denial of the critical slopes waiver based on the their denial of ZMA-2010-00017 Redfields PRD because the result of that denial meant the Commission had nothing on which to base its consideration of the waiver.

Should the Board of Supervisors recommend approval of the rezoning, the Planning Commission recommends consideration of the following concerns and conditions. (See Minutes for Detailed Comments)

- It is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. They need to take a look at that section of the Comprehensive Plan so not to piece-meal things together.
- It was inconsistent with the density of the adjacent neighborhood.
- There are some safety issues. This plan did not seem consistent or in keeping with the character of the district and was totally out of character with the neighborhood.
- Proffers – could not support the request because of deficiencies in the proffers, especially on the affordable housing side. The proffers are inadequate or inconsistent with County policy.
- It is not only the fact that there are safety issues, but there are also other impacts in terms of where the location of the density is in the existing neighborhood.
- The larger question brought up was where are we, what is the inventory, and how great an impact should that be in making the decision on these comprehensive plan amendments versus just looking at a V spot therein and does it work. There was a broader context that has to be taken into consideration. They have infrastructure projects that are not even on the long-term planning list and have to be paid for based on development that has already been approved. They have to get to the point where that infrastructure catches up to our Comprehensive Plan. One of the reasons they wanted to do master planning in the beginning was to ensure there was concurrency of infrastructure for the growth area residents so there was no degradation in the quality of life in our growth areas because development got too far ahead of the infrastructure. That was where they are today.
- There are infrastructure issues with the small road to their amenity that has 16 parking spaces. There is no place on the road to park. It is not easy to get to. There could be real problems with the roads that are leading into the site. It is not the way they should go about adding density to our areas.

- The county needs to figure out how many residential lots they have in the development areas that have not been built on. They need to decide how much more amenities, infrastructure the county could provide. They need to make sure before they start bringing in more residential into the development areas that they can handle what they already have. That includes our water situation.

- A hope was expressed that they would see in the future a master plan for the southern part of the County. It may be the right development in the wrong place because there are some good things about it. There is a place for density in the growth area as long as it is in the right place.

- One Commissioner felt disadvantaged of not having heard from staff the report they are expecting next month regarding an evaluation of this with the Comp Plan. They have to get to a point in time where the residents and the developers (the owner) have clear understanding of what the expectations are going to be. Everybody is getting tired of coming here every couple of years and readdressing this situation. As long as the developer owns the property, he has the right to request a rezoning. There was disappointment expressed that the applicant could not wait until next month to hear what staff’s evaluation of the property was before the Commission was required to take a vote.

- They should consider what conditions, if any, they would recommend for approval of this property when it goes forward so that the Board has a basis for making a decision the other way.

- Provide an overview of where the county is going that give a synopsis of the build out and what is available. The Commission gave clear direction last time that this should wait until the Comprehensive Plan takes a look at this. They don’t have that study or evaluation in front of them. So they are being required to make a decision.