

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
Final Minutes Regular Meeting May 23, 2023**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, May 23, 2023 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were: Corey Clayborne, Chair; Fred Missel, Vice-Chair; Karen Firehock; Julian Bivins; Luis Carrazana; Lonnie Murray (by Zoom); and Nathan Moore

Members absent: None.

Other officials present were: Kevin McDermott, Director of Planning; Andy Herrick, County Attorney's Office; and Alberic Karina-Plun.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Alberic Karina-Plun called the roll.

Mr. Clayborne established a quorum.

Mr. Murray requested to participate remotely because of an illness. He said he was located at his home in White Hall.

Mr. Missel moved to grant Mr. Murray's request to participate remotely. The motion was seconded by Mr. Carrazana and passed unanimously (6-0). (Mr. Murray was the subject of the motion)

Mr. Clayborne introduced Nathan Moore, the newly appointed commissioner for the Rio district.

Mr. Moore said that he managed WTJU Radio, the University of Virginia community station, and he served on the ACSA Board for the past three years. He said that he spent his youth playing *Sim City: City Skyline* and looked forward to putting that knowledge to good use.

Mr. Clayborne welcomed Mr. Moore to the Commission.

Other Matters Not Listed on the Agenda from the Public

Mr. Clayborne read the rules for matters from the public.

Tom Loach said that in a County survey from 2020, residents were asked for input about the future of the County, and 45% of respondents expected the quality of life to decline in the future. He questioned how the comprehensive plan update would improve quality of life and said that the update would do more harm than good for the residents in Crozet. He said he did an online questionnaire for Crozet and received 168 responses in three weeks. He explained that the responses directly reflected Mr. Bivins' statement from the April 5 Commission meeting regarding the public's capacity and willingness for more density and to increase the development areas.

Mr. Loach said that in terms of AC44 Option 1, he did not support 94.48%, but he did support AC44 at 9.52%. He said that the County showed that since 2016, growth had occurred at an

average of 58% of the affordable density. He said residents of Crozet rejected the 2021 master plan update and the new Middle Density category. He said that in terms of Option 2, he supported 85%, and he did not support 11.1%. He said that in terms of Option 3, he did not support 90%, he supported 4.9%, and he had no opinion regarding 5%. He said he supported the County using land for preservation, but not as a land bank for future development.

Pablo Miller said that Crozet business owners and residents had held many long-term planning meetings with the County to sustain the character of western Albemarle. He said that the 2004 Crozet Master Plan resulted in the Crozet that currently existed. He said that there were concerns about the future land use typology in the 2021 Crozet Master Plan. He noted that the County had increased real estate assessments to maintain its bond rating. He said that the assessments had created a difficult tax burden on Crozet residents. He said that there was a growing movement to further delineate a binding contract with the County the exact circumstances which would justify further density zoning in Crozet beyond the integration of affordable housing. He said that increased assessments had put a burden on people who did not intend on selling their homes.

Consent Agenda

Mr. Bivins moved to approve the consent agenda as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Missel and carried unanimously (7-0). (Mr. Murray participated via Zoom)

Presentations

Equity and Climate Action Tool

Mr. Jesse Brookins, Director of Equity and Inclusion, stated that the tool was an introduction to the County comprehensive plan and how it would integrate with the objectives, policies, and strategies. He said that to fulfill the County mission, they had to have a level of accountability for how equitable County services were. He said that they had to consider climate change, how it would exasperate existing challenges, and how appropriate responses could benefit the community. He said that the Board had emphasized the need to integrate equity, climate change, and climate action within overall operations.

Mr. Brookins stated that the purpose of the tool was to reveal information that could create opportunities to benefit the community by incorporating the perspectives of equity and climate action. He said that the tool would aid in examining proposed policies, programs, and projects. He said that within the mission of the Office of Equity and Inclusion, the term "equity" described the continuous process of action, reflection, and analysis of what is fair and just for all. He said that the term was distinguished from equality, meaning to provide the same to all. He said that equity acknowledged unequal starting places and continued to correct and address that balance.

Mr. Brookins said that there were four aspects of equity. He said that recognition equity sought to quantify and measure existing disparities and quality of life, health, education, economic opportunity, political participation, access to resources and services, and the historical and contemporary causes of such disparities. He said that distributional equity reviewed the available resources through the community and looked for ways to maximize access and minimize cost burdens. He said that procedural equity sought to ensure meaningful involvement and community engagement from members of historically underrepresented or excluded

groups. He said that structural equity sought to maintain longevity to rectify policies and institutional practices that excluded groups from participation in the political process or that systemically contributed to disparities in quality of life.

Mr. Gabe Dayley, Climate Protection Program Manager, stated that climate change referred to drastic shifts in global weather patterns due to average warming over time of the Earth's surface temperature. He said that climate action had two main aspects, mitigation and adaptation/resilience. He said that mitigation was a technical term to refer to reducing the severity of climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions. He said that adaptation and resilience referred to preparing the community for changes that were unavoidable.

Mr. Dayley stated that local climate action could happen at various levels. He said that clean water had been a County priority for decades, and preserving and promoting biodiversity was increasingly prioritized by the Board.

Mr. Brookins stated that the intent was to utilize the tool for large initiatives to consider equity and the impacts of climate action. He said that in terms of the correlation between equity and climate action, they considered access to resources. He said that the most foundational resource they had was viable land. He said that if they did not have ways to connect and restore the land, the resources would be impacted.

Mr. Dayley stated that the tool could be used for other programming or projects that the local government engaged in beyond the comprehensive plan. He said that the tool asked several questions to identify the extent to which an initiative made a meaningful contribution to equity and climate action. He said that the tool contained three preliminary questions and seven main questions.

Mr. Dayley said that the three preliminary questions were to validate an idea or initiative. He said the first asked whether there was an awareness of pre-existing disparities or potential climate impacts in the community that intersected with the initiative. He said the other two questions asked whether there was any compelling reason or evidence that the initiative would set back efforts to achieve a more equitable community or advance climate action.

Mr. Dayley said that the first four of the seven main questions aligned with the four dimensions of equity. He said that the last three questions related to three elements of climate action and local environmental stewardship. He said that the work of applying the tool would be to evaluate the proposal at hand and consider the impacts. He said that they intended to derive a score, provide a justification citing evidence or research, and provide a recommendation on how improvement could be made to advance the work. He said that the scoring rubric was 1–3, where 1 was equal to the status quo, 2 offered incidental impacts, and 3 offered meaningful impacts.

Mr. Brookins stated that the scoring rubric was to set intentions and strategies within the plans. He said that they needed to ensure the drafted policies were concise and precise in how they approached equity and climate action. He said that the tool was organized through a series of questions. He said the tool would be used by staff, and the desired outcome was to revise and improve the proposed policies. He said the goal was to embed and operationalize equity and climate action within their initiatives as a County.

Mr. Brookins said they sought to apply the tool to the objectives and strategies for the new

comprehensive plan. He said that they were working with the Performance and Strategic Planning Office for leadership training and to implement the tool within the office spaces.

Mr. Dayley stated that they were available to answer any questions.

Mr. Bivins asked whether the tool would be used for policies in the County ordinance.

Mr. Brookins responded that they were focused on the comprehensive plan, particularly the objectives and strategies.

Mr. Bivins said he struggled with the practicality of the tool. He said that he wanted examples of how an initiative would get scored a 3 in the rubric. He asked what the real impacts would be of a score of 1 or 2. He said that the presentation offered a solid intellectual approach for considering the comprehensive plan, but it did not provide practical approaches or implications. He asked how the County would address greenhouse gas emissions in an equitable way.

Mr. Bivins noted that the County did not own the transportation network, and they were not developing to the density that would allow them to mitigate emission issues. He said he was not sure the tool would be effective. He encouraged the Commission to review the Asset Limited Income Constrained Employed (ALICE) Report. He said that as of 2021, 32% of the County households were working but could not afford to live in the County. He said that if the comprehensive plan was going to mitigate the financial burdens on 32% of County households, he wanted to know how.

Mr. Brookins said that the feedback was appreciated. He said that equity was a continuous process, and the introduction began the process by setting an intention for the work. He said the next step would be an assessment of the impacts to evaluate a process for how the strategies should be implemented.

Mr. Dayley stated that they were looking to apply the tool at the objectives level. He said that tool would review objectives and associated strategies.

Mr. Carrazana said that in terms of overarching policy, there would not be a lot of dissent, but in terms of details, there would be many opinions. He said that it was hard to see how the outcomes were achieved. He questioned how to move past the overarching narrative and build in measurable outcomes.

Ms. Firehock said that a challenge of the previous comprehensive plan was that it was a kitchen sink of plans, and it was beyond the scope of the County. She said that the comprehensive plan update should be more specific. She hoped that there would be a way to measure specific outcomes, develop metrics, and perform benchmarks. She suggested that staff recommend types of benchmarks to consider. She said that the rubric should find ways to address and clarify conflicts in the scoring when initiatives had positive and negative impacts.

Mr. Missel asked how initiatives were defined on slide 13.

Mr. Brookins explained that they used the term initiative because while it was used in the comprehensive plan, the broader goal was to utilize the tool for County projects and departmental operations.

Mr. Missel said that metrics and measurements were important, and those were lacking in the tool. He noted that the tool contained many subjective measurements. He said that the target of the lens was unclear, and it should be better defined. He asked whether benchmarks in other jurisdictions were reviewed. He said that it would be helpful to define how the tool would impact land use in the County.

Mr. Bivins clarified Mr. Missel was asking whether there would be an equity and climate score for special use permits.

Mr. Missel said yes. He said that they should consider it from an applicant standpoint.

Mr. Moore said he appreciated the equity and climate action lens. He said that more examples to explain the framework and scoring rubric would be helpful. He said that some of the items seemed to require significant research, and some initiatives were unknowns.

Mr. Murray noted that he had also emailed comments. He said that a core principle of smart growth was the idea that services would be prioritized where delivery was the most cost effective and efficient. He said that there seemed to be a conflict with distributional equity. He asked for more information about how that conflict would be addressed.

Mr. Clayborne said that there were three areas of influence in the topics of climate equity. He said that there was a staff and organizational level with the most agency, a community level, and an institutional level. He said that they should consider those areas of influence as they evaluate different metrics. He noted that the update process was long and asked whether there were moments where they paused to reflect on how to best move forward. He said that carbon emissions should also be considered when they look to implement climate action and mitigate impacts.

Ms. Firehock commented that when working on metrics and when evaluating a project, they had to watch out for false dichotomies. She said that an example of one would be if a housing provider said that they could not put in street trees because of the affordable housing, but the reality was that people in affordable housing needed shade, lower air-conditioning bills, and a place for their children to play. She said that people would often position climate versus the access to housing. She stated that another example was when the state law was changed more than ten years ago to allow developers to buy off-site credits for stormwater, so although Albemarle used to be a leader in low-impact development, they hardly saw any of that anymore because developers could buy those off-site credits.

Ms. Firehock said that from a climate perspective, she personally would not rate that type of project highly, because they were not treating the water quality impacts generated, but were buying a credit from somewhere else. She said that while developers had the legal right to do so, she would not want to promote the practice due to its environmental effects. She said that she had had success when requesting developers install more environmentally friendly infrastructure, so they had to take a hard look on what the incentives were.

Ms. Firehock said that some communities had utilized a greenlighting process, so that if developers had a certain number of "green" elements to their proposal, they could go through a separate review process that was faster. She said that this incentivized developers who may not have otherwise created an environmentally friendly proposal to include additional elements that satisfy the environmental objectives set by the County. She said that it was important to create a

set of standards in order to hold developers accountable for these responsibilities.

Mr. Bivins asked if part of the equity piece was figuring out during the development of the comprehensive plan how they intentionally brought in different voices for consideration. He said that there were some people in the community who served as great advocates due to their education, money, and time. He said that those residents' observations felt as though they were not received in balance with the rest of the community, so there was question as to if there was room to engage with the members of the community.

Mr. Bivins said that he had issue with the fact that they always heard from people with means, and they also had to hear from people who felt they had been frozen out of the process in some way. He said that he hoped they would be hearing from those people who had a stake in Albemarle County as opposed to advocates who had come to the area from other places, so that people from Albemarle had a chance to step forward and speak

Mr. Clayborne said that he agreed. He said that when they looked at the data and where it came from, they should pause and ask if they had received an adequate sampling of voices.

Mr. Murray said that it would be great to see some current policies run through this tool to see how they scored, and how potential new programs may score. He said that they should also see how policies from other localities scored in order to compare and learn what they could do with that.

Mr. Missel said that on page 13 of the presentation, there were a number of main questions, and it began with saying "to what extent does the initiative play out?" He said that one thing that struck him was that they had not yet discussed education. He said that when discussing this with regard to the comprehensive plan, they discussed it with staff and in terms of their own educations and values, but it would be beneficial to also think about applicants who may not be so well-versed in the areas of equity, sustainability, and climate action, and have some component of education for them to understand what this actually looked like and how it played out.

Mr. Missel said that he knew how challenging it had been for other localities and jurisdictions to promote affordable housing, so when discussing incentives that promoted equity and climate action, it would be a challenge to get there. He said that the educational tool could help applicants understand the benefit of achieving equity and climate action in a way that illustrated value to that.

Mr. Brookins thanked the Commission for the feedback they provided, and it was important that they heard their expert knowledge shared. He said that something they touched on that was extremely important was the numbers and the data, and recognizing how or what they could quantify as the reason people were submitting these applications, and if they had considered how it may impact disparities by exacerbating or mitigating them.

Mr. Brookins said that in prior years, they had done the equity profile, which looked at the current disparities existing in the community, and the goal was to continue through this own office an updated awareness of those efforts and to collaborate with the County and with the region. He said that gathering information would be an extremely important process in bringing recognition to what the issues were, and once they saw where they were, they could see the strategy in place of where they could go.

Mr. Dayley said that they appreciated the feedback. He said that there was some additional context associated with the presentation that could be provided. He said that they would be interested in having another work session if appropriate to look at specific policies and explore that together. He said that from the climate program perspective, they were interested in being aware of false dichotomies while surfacing real tensions and finding where those were surfaced. He said that part of the process of using this tool was for staff to do their best to surface the tensions, make a recommendation, and then all of the information was present for the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to evaluate and make an informed decision on.

Mr. Dayley said that one other element with respect to an example of specific policies was that they did an exercise with staff using the tool, scoring and giving reasons on some of the items from the 2015 plan, and that helped surface things in the tool that perhaps were not working. He said that good feedback was received from that, and it could be applied to existing policies to see how it worked with them. He said that they also wanted to use this with the objectives and strategies of the AC44 Comprehensive Plan Update, which likely could be explored with the Planning Commission. He said that this was developed out of the AC44 update, so they thought about this with respect to County Capital C initiatives, including County-wide policies, comprehensive plan, County code updates, zoning ordinance updates, and new programs or projects provided to the community.

Mr. Dayley said that they did not develop it with the intent of using it to evaluate specific special use projects for individual developments that came before the Planning Commission, but he heard from Commissioners that there may be interest in adapting the tool to accomplish that. He said that more work was required to achieve that, so he wanted to clarify the development of the tool and the interest of adaptation to be used at different layers of the work that County government did.

Ms. Firehock said that she agreed with Mr. Missel's comment about education. She said that as they measured things against rubrics, there were many well-intentioned people in the community who may not be aware of what was required for better scoring. She said that developers had asked her what constituted a green development because they did not know, and engineers may not create plans that included those aspects if the developer did not prioritize it as part of the project.

Ms. Firehock said that it may be difficult, but there would be some value in asking applicants to speak to that and talk about equity as a category they had to answer to, even if the answer was unsatisfactory or was changed. She said that they had to provide the front-end education of what one would do to make a development more equitable or protective of the environment.

Mr. Missel said that a checklist may be helpful, but he was unsure if it was too simple. He said that LEAD gave a checklist that an applicant could easily analyze whether or not it applied, as well as providing information that educated people and gave incentive for them to work to check the box. He said that the checklist also allowed for self-scoring of the project, so the expectation was set. He said that giving that tool allowed for the applicant to understand the resulting numbers, so that the County was not solely responsible for communicating the calculations. He said that they should think about how to go about this in a way that gives education, structure, accountability, and insight to what may become a final judgment on the project.

Mr. Clayborne said that as they continued to develop the tool, he would gladly share information

from the American Institute of Architects' resources on equitable communities and climate.

Mr. Murray said that the Citizens Committee on Environmental Sustainability, a past joint City-County committee, had brought the idea of giving letter grades on applications so that the public could see what applications were rated A and those that were rated F. He said that this would be valuable.

Mr. Carrazana said that the LEAD certification process had been going on for decades, so the U.S. Green Building Council had a large database that had been changed over the years to include different aspects of LEAD. He said that that it was a way to measure, and they had to come up with particulars to measure. He said that these other sources may be useful in determining how to measure something down the road, and a checklist may be a good idea.

Mr. Bivins said that he hoped they would think carefully about putting the climate action score under the new land use map that came out. He said that he cautioned against evolving the matrix very far. He said that there was a way in which that analysis could be used to describe the process in an informed way, because they did struggle identifying the impact of special use permits and zoning map amendments on surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Clayborne thanked Mr. Brookins and Mr. Dayley for their work and stated that the Commission looked forward to further dialogue with them as progress continued.

Committee Reports

Mr. Carrazana said that the MPO Technical Committee met last week, and they went through the budget and priorities. He said that they reviewed Smart Scale projects, scores, and what had been approved, and there was a lengthy conversation on the Rivanna Bridge. He said that the MPO Technical Committee had recommended an alignment that was not the alignment chosen, and it had scored very poorly. He said that there was discussion about whether or not the alignment should be reconsidered, and while they saw a presentation, there was no movement on the MPO Technical Committee to make a recommendation or alignment, and the City's Planning Commission also did not.

Mr. McDermott said that was correct, the matter did not come to the Planning Commission. He said that there was a vote taken at the MPO Technical Committee, and a public poll put out with results shared, and a final decision was made by the MPO Policy Board, which they had two Supervisors of.

Mr. Carrazana said that that was different from what the MPO Technical Committee had recommended. He said that it was an important project and would be unfortunate to lose that project due to what may be poor alignment. He said that in the MPO Technical Committee, they discussed the potential of a joint meeting of County and City Planning Commissions and Board of Supervisors to talk about how the alignment could potentially score higher. He said that the MPO had a good but lengthy conversation on the subject.

Ms. Firehock said that the Historic Preservation Committee met again this month, yesterday. She said that they discussed a process that had been started a year before, then was lost in the six months that the group did not meet, which was the process for recommending new historic markers. She said that a process had been put in place with a special emphasis on communities that had been not recognized in the past or events, people, or places that had not

received attention.

Ms. Firehock said that several markers were designed and installed, and they discussed the potential of a process in which the public recommended an Albemarle County marker, which would be different than the state black and white markers. She said that the committee had gotten far along in the process of nominating them, so it would be finished soon, and they were also working out with staff how much funding was available for the project. She said that they would also work on securing future funding and criteria for ranking applications.

Ms. Firehock said that it sometimes felt that the Historic Preservation Committee's job was to lament the loss of a structure or place, and they documented what was so great that was now being torn down, so it was sometimes depressing. She said that sometimes there were success stories, but they did not always get attention, so they had come up with the idea to give awards to people who did a fine job of renovating their property, but also wanted the program to include smaller, subdued structures and not only plantation homes of wealthy people. She said that they would come up with different categories for awards, and there may be residential of large scale and small scale, and possible one for historic landscapes.

Mr. Murray said that the Crozet CAC met and received a presentation from the Rivanna Water and Sewer Authority. He said that it was interesting to see the projects that were on the way, and they had a detailed discussion of the sewer history and how water was treated, as well as how they were able to do large infrastructure projects with the way their funding was structured. Mr. Murray said that there was a significant number of people still concerned about the Oak Bluff proposal who spoke at the meeting. He said that there were also some more personal discussions about the role of the CACs and if they were meant to allow discussion and bring information to the public, or if they should take positions on matters.

Mr. Moore stated that the water and sewer rates were going up this year, and perhaps apropos to the Commission was that for the first time since 2007, the connection charges would go up for new developments. He said that this was due to steep rate increases from the RWSA to the City and ACSA.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting: May 17, 2023

Mr. McDermott clarified that there was another meeting held that was not listed on the agenda, which was held on May 3, 2023. He stated that there were some items at that meeting that had previously come before the Planning Commission, the first being the City Church Special Use Permit Amendment, on Rio Road near Belvidere for an additional structure in the back of the lot. He said that the item was approved 6-0.

Mr. McDermott stated that another item that came before the Board at that meeting was the rezoning for 999 Rio Road that would remove the requirement for the commercial component of that development, also at the corner of Belvidere and Rio, which was approved by the Board of Supervisors 6-0. He said that it was noted that both of those projects were directly across the street from each other and that there were transportation issues that had occurred. He said that a Smart Scale Grant had been approved this year to reconfigure that intersection for operations and safety.

Mr. McDermott said that the May 17 meeting included one item that had been before the Planning Commission, which was the Riverside Village rezoning, which also was trying to

remove the commercial component. He stated that there had been changes to the application since the Planning Commission heard that item, which originally was removing almost all of the commercial space except for the space that contained Grit Coffee, but after the Planning Commission hearing, they found a tenant for the restaurant portion of the space, so they added that commercial back into the required commercial space, however they were still trying to remove more spaces between those two restaurants that were unutilized. He said that the Board of Supervisors approved that 5-1, so it went forward with more commercial space than seen by the Planning Commission, but they were removing some of what existed.

Ms. Firehock asked if the developer could still put in commercial, but reduced what they had to put in.

Mr. McDermott said yes. He said that the code of development for the rezoning had changed so that the minimum commercial was no longer what it was to include all of those buildings. He said that they were not anticipating immediately putting residential in the middle structure, but they did not have to for the other two structures. He said that the other item that was on the Board of Supervisors agenda on May 17 was the Secondary Six-Year Plan, which was the Department of Transportation's plan to include funding for paving unpaved roads, and was approved at the public hearing. He said that there were a host of new roads requested for paving, and they were working through the Board process to get that done right now. He said that the conversation was deep as far as to how they should be considering the future requests for paving unpaved roads.

New Business

Draft New 2023/24 Planning Commission Schedule

Mr. McDermott said that this was brought before the Planning Commission because there had been some cancelations of meetings, which partially was due to some of the restrictions approved in the initial Planning Commission agenda, where they could only have work sessions on specific dates and times, so he was attempting to revise the schedule so that it was not specified that work sessions had to happen on any particular meeting or at any particular time. He said that the preference was that if there was one item for a Planning Commission meeting that was a work session, they could hold that at 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium like a normal meeting, and if there was some reason that a particular work session would be better served sitting around a table in Room 241, they could make that change.

Mr. McDermott said that the new meeting schedule removed those details and gave the days that they would be meeting, which would still be the second and fourth Tuesday of every month for the rest of the year, typically held at 6:00 p.m., and there would be language on the Planning Commission website that talked about where and when the Planning Commission meetings happened, and if there was a change, they would announce it well in advance to give appropriate acknowledgment to the public.

Mr. Carrazana asked if they had a work session, they would not just be limited to 4:00 p.m., and could have them at any time.

Mr. McDermott said that was correct.

Mr. Carrazana said that was fine, but suggested that if they had multiple in a month, they limited

those that happened at 4:00 p.m., and so that they knew when to block off those additional hours if necessary.

Mr. McDermott said that was correct. He said that the 6:00 p.m. time was recognized as being better for many Commissioners, so what they had on the schedule and in the packet was that Planning Commission meetings were typically held at 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium. He said that that was the default, and if there was ever a change or need to add an additional work session that needed to be in Room 241, it would be properly announced on their website.

Mr. Carrazana said that there sometimes were benefits to the 4:00 p.m. work sessions, but not always.

Ms. Firehock asked if they were getting rid of the 4:00 p.m. meetings, and that the work session could be held on the second or fourth Tuesday at 6:00 p.m.

Mr. McDermott said that was correct. He said that if there was a work session, it would typically be held at 6:00 p.m. in Lane Auditorium, or if there were too many items on an agenda, and one of them happened to be a work session, that was when they would hold a work session at 4:00 p.m. in Room 241. He said that for example, the second meeting in July had two work sessions requested and a public hearing, so in that evening, they would hold a 4:00 p.m. work session. He said that if they held a 4:00 p.m. work session, those would be held at the same time they were previously, on the second meeting.

Ms. Firehock said that she wanted to know in order to block that time out now.

Mr. McDermott said that they still would be booking Room 241 for 4:00 p.m. on the second Tuesday of every month in case this happened.

Mr. Clayborne said that it was in their best interest to hold the time for the 4:00 p.m. meeting on the second Tuesday of every month.

Mr. McDermott said he would appreciate that.

Mr. Clayborne said that they would be notified a month in advance.

Mr. Herrick said that specifically, if this schedule were approved, the Commission would have to approve at the prior meeting for a work session to be held at the successive meeting at 4:00 p.m. so that they could give appropriate notice. He said that it would require action by the Commission on a case-by-case basis to call the next meeting to begin at 4:00 p.m. with a work session. He said that the main purpose of this was to eliminate the distinction between work session-reserved meetings and public hearings for scheduling purposes.

Mr. Carrazana moved to adopt the schedule as presented. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Resolution to set Albemarle County Planning Commission Meeting Schedule

Mr. Clayborne stated that with the Clerk absent on leave, it was acceptable for Mr. McDermott as Secretary to certify this resolution.

Mr. Herrick clarified that when they were looking into whether or not the schedule must be published in the newspaper, the answer was that it did not need to be published on its own. He said that there was not a requirement to publish the schedule in the newspaper, but it was required that if the Planning Commission chose to continue a matter without advertising it to the next section due to weather or other hazards, this schedule was required to be in the newspaper.

Mr. Herrick said that the purpose was not to notify the public of regular meetings, but of the rescheduled meetings in case the meeting needed to be canceled. He said that the separate resolution was required for that automatic rescheduling. He said that the resolution in the packet was prepared in anticipation that Ms. Shaffer would be certifying it on behalf of the Commission, and he suggested that if the Commission approved the resolution, they adopt the resolution with the amendment that Mr. McDermott as the Secretary be allowed to certify the resolution so that it could get to the newspaper in a timely fashion.

Mr. Moore moved the Planning Commission to adopt the resolution as modified, noting Mr. McDermott as Secretary would certify. Ms. Firehock seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

Mr. Bivins said that it would be helpful for the RWSA to give an update to the Planning Commission about the future plans for the water supply of the community, to hear from the Office of Performance and Strategy, and to hear from their assessors to speak to the Commission for the public record. He requested that the Chair and Mr. McDermott discuss the potential for presentation.

Ms. Firehock asked if a memo about the distinctions of committees and subcommittees could be sent to the Historic Preservation Committee for new members to read.

Mr. Herrick said that he could forward the memo to Ms. Firehock to share with the committee members.

Old Business

There was none.

Items for follow-up

Mr. McDermott said that regarding the AC44 update, there had been a recent announcement about a series of open houses being held in the community. He said that the first one was tomorrow evening at Journey Middle School in the Jack Jouett District, and then there would be one per week every following week. He said that they were all being held at different schools throughout the County, and he encouraged Commissioners to attend those closest in their district to see how things were going. He said that they would be presenting and hearing from the public on a lot of information presented to the Planning Commission at the previous work session. He said that information was also available on the AC44 website.

Adjournment

At 7:48 p.m., the Commission adjourned to , June 13, 2023, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m.



Kevin McDermott, Director of Planning

(Recorded by Alberic Karina-Plun, Community Development Planner; transcribed by Golden Transcription Services)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 6/27/2023
Initials: VG