

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
FINAL Minutes September 1, 2020**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 1, 2020 at 6:00 p.m.

Members attending were Julian Bivins, Chair; Karen Firehock, Vice-Chair; Tim Keller; Rick Randolph; Daniel Bailey; Jennie More; Corey Clayborne; and Luis Carrazana, UVA representative.

Members absent: None.

Other officials present were Mariah Gleason; Andrew Knuppel; Rachel Falkenstein; Vivian Groeschel; Andy Herrick, County Attorney; Charles Rapp, Planning Director; and Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk to the Planning Commission.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum

Mr. Bivins called the regular electronic meeting to order at 6:15 p.m. and established a quorum. He said this meeting was held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A(8), "An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the COVID-19 Disaster."

Mr. Bivins said there were no Commissioners attending from the County Office Building, and that the Commissioners electronically present that evening were: Mr. Bivins, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Keller, Mr. Bailey, Ms. Firehock, Ms. Riley, Mr. Clayborne, and Mr. Carrazana.

Mr. Bivins said the public could access and participate in this electronic meeting by following the links available at www.albemarle.org/community/county-calendar, or by calling 877-853-5257.

Consent Agenda

Ms. Riley moved to approve the consent agenda.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Public Hearing

SP202000010 Airport Animal Clinic

Ms. Mariah Gleason, Senior Planner, said she would be presenting a request for the special use permit and the associated Special Exception SE2020000002.

Ms. Gleason said the subject property is located in the Hollymead area and is a corner parcel at the intersection of Worth Crossing and Fortune Park Road. She said it was developed in the late 1990s. She said the property is set back one block from Route 29/Seminole Trail across from the Hollymead Town Center and is surrounded on three sides by similarly zoned commercial buildings that are generally oriented to Route 29.

Ms. Gleason said the subject property shares a parking lot with Stifel Investment Services and Forest Lakes Dental. She said other surrounding businesses include Timberwood Grill, Atlantic

Union Bank, McDonalds, Subway, and Dairy Queen. She said properties southeast of the property are zoned for residential uses and include the adjacent Gateway Village townhouse development and the Forest Lakes neighborhood further on.

Ms. Gleason said this proposal was driven by the relocation of an existing local veterinary clinic located just up the road, at the intersection of Route 29 and Airport Road. She said that as illustrated in the applicant's materials, the proposed veterinary use will occupy approximately 3,000 square feet of the 8,300-square-foot building. She said the remaining building space will be occupied by other commercial/retail office tenants.

Ms. Gleason said the proposed location of the veterinary use requires a special exception due to its proximity to residential properties, which are located approximately 125 feet away. She said in accordance with the supplemental regulations to which veterinary uses are subject, veterinary structures are not permitted closer than 200 feet from a residential property line.

Ms. Gleason said no major concerns with the proposed use in this location were identified by staff or surrounding neighbors during the review of this proposal and, as such, she would keep the presentation short, although she could discuss any of the topics or information provided in the staff report if the Commission so desired.

Ms. Gleason said in the review of the proposal, staff found the following factors favorable. She said no adverse impacts are expected to nearby or adjacent properties. She said the proposed veterinary use is consistent with the character of commercial properties in this area. She said the proposed use conforms with the Comprehensive Plan and meets the relevant supplemental regulations of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Gleason said no unfavorable factors were identified and, as such, staff recommended the following conditions. She presented those conditions to the Commission, noting that they largely worked to solidify aspects of the applicant's proposal that led to the favorable findings by staff and were similar to those that the County has applied to other veterinary uses in the past.

Ms. Gleason said the applicant submitted a special exception request (SP2020000002). She said subsection b of the Supplemental Regulations, to which veterinary uses are subject, require two things: that veterinary uses be located no closer than 200 feet from a residential property line, and that sound generated by this use does not exceed 55 decibels at the property line. She said the applicant has requested a modification to the first part, to allow the veterinary use to be located within 200 feet of a residential property line. She said if approved, the proposed use would still be subject to the sound-related requirements of the subsection.

Ms. Gleason said staff recommended approval of the special exception for the following reasons. She said soundproofing will be incorporated into the building's renovations, and the applicant has indicated that renovations to the building will include sound-attenuating construction materials and techniques, including decoupling the exterior and interior walls to disrupt and diminish sound waves. She said the Gateway Village townhouse development includes a 40-foot landscaped open space that will separate and buffer residential units from the proposed use, and that landscaped elements in the area include bermed earthworks and a mixture of mature, dense, primarily evergreen trees.

Ms. Gleason said that while the proposed use is approximately 125 feet from what the zoning map designates to be the residential property line, the nearest residential structure is approximately 195 feet from the intended veterinary clinic location.

Ms. Gleason concluded the staff presentation, noting she had possible motion language to be used and offering to answer any questions from the Commission.

Mr. Keller said for the public record and discussion, although it was in the staff report, he would like Ms. Gleason to address the aspect of outside animals with this facility.

Ms. Gleason stated that this facility is not requesting any changes to be made to the structure as it is. She said they are not requesting to put in any outdoor runs or exercise areas for animals. She said there is some open and green space with the parcel, but that no structure or anything that would require a site plan would be erected. She said they will simply be occupying the building, and all of the functions of the veterinary use will happen inside the building as it exists today.

Mr. Bivins opened the public hearing and invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Daniel Hyer introduced himself as the civil engineer assisting with the special use permit and special exception request. He said the project is a relocation of an existing veterinary clinic that currently exists at the corner of Airport Road and Route 29 (Dr. Hayes Airport Animal Clinic). He said the relocation of Dr. Hayes' practice would be to vacate that corner to make way for another pending project, which is the Sheetz on the corner of Route 29 and Airport Road.

Mr. Hyer said Dr. Hayes' practice has been in place for almost 20 years. He said because it is actually his own family's vet, he had great things to say about the practice in general. He said Dr. Hayes wants to stay close to the community he has been serving for some time, and this building was available. He said it would be a relocation of the practice and because it is purely veterinary care (without boarding or kenneling), it was simply about checkups for small animals. He said there is the potential that an animal under medical supervision may be required to stay overnight, but other than this case, there is no intended kenneling with this application.

Mr. Hyer said he would imagine Dr. Hayes serves many residents in the Hollymead area, so this relocation would allow his practice to continue to flourish in that area.

Mr. Hyer said this was a straightforward request and that no exterior improvements were proposed. He said Dr. Hayes would be bringing some of his tenants with him to this new facility, such as Molly Maids and perhaps one other tenant in the strip mall located on the corner of Route 29 and Airport Road.

Mr. Bivins asked if there were any public speakers. Finding there were none, he asked Commissioners if they had any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Randolph said he did not have a question, but that he wanted to compliment Mr. Hyer on the materials that were provided. He said they were very helpful in giving the Commissioners a very detailed sense of the proposed new location for the existing business.

Mr. Bivins said he had some questions about the facility. He said in the drawings submitted, he could only identify one exit. He asked if this were correct, adding that he would then have a question about sprinklers.

Mr. Hyer replied that there are multiple exits. He said the building itself actually functions more or less like a split level. He presented a drawing, explaining that there is one entrance near the ADA parking spaces, which is on the upper level of the split level. He said there is then the primary entrance to the veterinary clinic at the lower level. He said there are multiple points of entry and exit for the property. He said the building situates itself with the topography, so it is split level.

Mr. Hyer said as for the sprinklers, he could not speak specifically to that and did not know if it were sprinklered, or if the building typology would require it. He said he could look into this if it were required.

Mr. Bivins said the reason he asked is there was a situation where an animal-focused organization had a fire and could not get the animals out in time. He said he wouldn't want the owner to have to suffer that kind of consequence if that were to happen at the new location. He said he would leave this to Mr. Hyer and Ms. Gleason to explore, as he believed that fire protection would be of interest to people.

Mr. Hyer said this was a good point.

Mr. Bivins asked with having surgery on the second floor, how the animals would be moved up and down. He gave the example of bringing in a dog with a broken leg that would need to be set, and assuming he would have to come in through the main entrance. He asked how the dog would be brought up to the second floor.

Mr. Hyer said this was also a good question. He said the animals in this practice are smaller animals.

Mr. Bivins said he assumed they are companion animals.

Mr. Hyer said yes.

Mr. Bivins said he has a Saluki dog, for example, which is a sighthound weighing at 50 pounds. He asked Mr. Hyer to give some consideration to how animals will be moved between the floors.

Mr. Hyer said this was a good point, and that he believed the architecture was still subject to modification of the interior.

Mr. Bivins closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commissioners.

Mr. Clayborne moved to recommend approval of SP202000010 Airport Animal Clinic for the reasons and with the conditions stated in the staff report.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Mr. Clayborne moved to recommend approval of Special Exception request SE202000002 to modify the permitted building location requirements of Section 5.1.11(b) to allow the proposed

veterinary use to be located within 200 feet of a residential property line for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Ms. Firehock seconded the motion, which carried unanimously (7:0).

Mr. Bivins informed the applicant that the proposal was being moved forward with the conditions set forth in the staff report. He said he hoped the applicant would take the items that were discussed into consideration.

Mr. Bivins asked for an update about the Sheetz being built.

Mr. Charles Rapp (Planning Director) said this was an item that hadn't gone to the Commission yet.

Mr. Hyer said the Sheetz project was before the ARB.

Work Session

Crozet Master Plan Update -- Future Land Use

Mr. Andrew Knuppel, Senior Neighborhood Planner, said he was joined by Ms. Rachel Falkenstein (Principal Planner) to provide an update on the continuing work to the Crozet Master Plan, specifically focused on the future land use plan.

Mr. Knuppel said this would be a work session on the future land use chapter of the Master Plan, and the agenda for the work session included three topics. He said he would provide a brief update on the project background and its current status since the Commission last saw the Master Plan update in November 2019. He said they would have a discussion about a new middle-density residential category that staff has been preparing over the last couple months, as well as a Downtown Neighborhoods overlay.

Mr. Knuppel said as the general flow of the discussion that evening, they would discuss five questions. He said they would begin with a quick recap of the process to date since the last time staff checked in with the Commission.

Mr. Knuppel said the Commission last saw staff on this matter in November 2019 as they wrapped up the first phase of the Master Plan update, which was a check-in about the community vision for Crozet as they move forward. He said the second phase, which is focused on design strategies and getting into site-specific recommendations, began in January 2020 and wrapped up in August. He said they completed their planned workshops and started moving into more of the content refinement and plan-drafting stages of the Master Plan process.

Mr. Knuppel said at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020, staff was forced to move engagement online to adapt to the new reality. He said they had to rework their engagement planning to accommodate online meeting formats. He said they moved engagement online successfully beginning in April 2020.

Mr. Knuppel said Phase 2 included two in-person workshops, which took place before the pandemic hit, in January and February. He said there were three online workshops for three focused discussions that covered Downtown Crozet, housing, and architecture and preservation. He said there were four separate work sessions with the Crozet Community Advisory Committee

(CAC), focusing on refining some of the initial feedback they heard from the community and starting to get some input for staff to begin developing plan recommendations.

Mr. Knuppel said staff has been fairly busy over the past 8 months with 1-2 engagement opportunities per month. He presented a list of the workshops, large engagement events, and focused discussions that were held, as well as special work sessions with the Crozet CAC since May 2020.

Mr. Knuppel said as far as land use work, at the beginning of the year, there were two in-person workshops. He said the first workshop, in January, focused on commercial centers and the edges of the Crozet development area. He said the second workshop, in February, focused on neighborhoods and housing with more of a residential land use perspective.

Mr. Knuppel said there was a focused discussion that covered architectural and preservation topics within Crozet. He said they have heard a lot about historic architecture and preservation through the process. He said they held three work sessions with the CAC between May and July 2020. He said they have focused on refining and gaining community consensus about some of the topics they have heard about throughout the process, but do not have clear direction on so far.

Mr. Knuppel said the purpose of the work session was to provide the Commission with an update on public feedback so far, and to receive feedback from the Commissioners on proposed land use tools and categories that staff has developed. He said in response to community concerns that were heard, staff felt that an appropriate first step would be to come to the Commission about the general concepts of land use categories and tools staff has at their disposal.

Mr. Knuppel said staff planned to come back to the Commission in October to discuss more of the site-specific individual parcel land use designations. He said they first wanted to check in about two new land use tools they are exploring with the Master Plan which they have not used before, and wanted to get the Commission's buy-in first before making the plan for the parcel-specific infrastructure that is required, which designation is appropriate, and the overall impacts on the community as it pertains to infrastructure and planning.

Mr. Knuppel said staff planned to continue to evaluate this as they move through the process and as they continue to work on developing the recommendations for the Master Plan's Connectivity and Conservation chapters. He said staff felt this was an appropriate first step to come to the Commission that evening to focus on those high-level ideas.

Mr. Knuppel said he would provide a recap of some general themes and challenges staff has heard as they moved through the land use plan and Character chapter development process since the beginning of the year. He said he would provide this recap before having Ms. Falkenstein move into the more specific recommendation and answer questions from the Commission.

Mr. Knuppel said throughout the entire Master Plan process, since they kicked off about a year ago that month with the first envisioning workshop, staff has heard the importance of preserving housing affordability as well as Crozet's small-town identity. He said these two concepts were in tension because with the growing community, there are challenges with housing availability and affordability, as well as a desire to maintain the identity and architectural character that has historically defined Crozet.

Mr. Knuppel said part of staff's approach to this includes balancing form and density as regulatory concepts and trying to identify the architectural characteristics of what the small-town identity is. He said staff was grappling with the impacts of density as a regulating tool and its impacts on housing affordability, and trying to find balance between these two concepts.

Mr. Knuppel said managing the infrastructure needs of a growing population has been a major concern staff has heard from the community so far. He said Crozet has experienced rapid growth over the past 15 years. He said staff was accounting for the tension between needing infrastructure for existing growth and determining the appropriate way to grow, and what this looks like in terms of housing density and quantity of housing being proposed with the Master Plan.

Mr. Knuppel said staff's approach would be to continue to develop the housing types they want to see and address those concerns through the infrastructure recommendations in the Connectivity and Implementation chapters as they move through the process.

Mr. Knuppel said that evening, they were focused on two new land use categories that staff has developed to address some of the challenges he just discussed: a Middle Density Residential category, and a Downtown Neighborhoods overlay. He said Ms. Falkenstein would cover the Middle Density Residential category and afterwards, he would cover the Downtown Neighborhoods overlay.

Ms. Rachel Falkenstein, Principal Planner, said staff has been working on drafting these two categories over the past couple months and desired the Commission's feedback on those categories before diving into the land use map and how to apply them.

Ms. Falkenstein said the Middle Density Residential category is a primarily residential land use staff was proposing that would fall on the spectrum of the County's existing residential land uses between Neighborhood Density Residential and Urban Density Residential in terms of density and intensity. She said the intent of this residential category is to balance two competing goals in Crozet: the goal of housing choice and affordability and providing more of those in Crozet, as well as trying to maintain the small-town identity that is so important to the community. She said a goal is to provide development patterns that are consistent with existing neighborhoods within Crozet in support of the identity that is important to the community.

Ms. Falkenstein said the category would focus primarily on lower to middle density residential housing types, sometimes called "missing middle" housing types. She said staff's hope is that these housing units and smaller lot sizes that are encouraged in this category will be naturally more affordable because of their smaller size and the smaller amount of land needed to produce these housing types. She said these would hopefully remain affordable over time, even as the land values increase.

Ms. Falkenstein said the term "missing middle housing types" is a term that has gained popularity in the planning field over the past decade. She presented an image providing a summary of what is meant by "missing middle" housing, explaining that it represents those types of housing that fall between single-family detached housing and higher or mid-density apartments, which can scale from duplexes up to live-work units. She said these are called "missing" because they are not being built very often. She said often times, both ends of the spectrum are seen, but middle housing types are not. She said this is primarily because middle housing is prohibited by many

local zoning ordinances. She said these types are seen more frequently in older neighborhoods, but newer developments often leave these out.

Ms. Falkenstein said this “missing middle” housing is not only middle density, but also falls in the middle of the affordability range. She said staff was trying to promote these housing types with this new category.

Ms. Falkenstein said staff drafted some recommendations that were included in the land use table attached to the staff report for density and form within this housing type. She said the density staff was proposing was between 6 and 24 units per acre. She said they arrived at this number by looking at the existing categories below and above this in terms of density. She said they also looked at density ranges of the “missing middle” housing types they want to encourage. She said staff also looked at some examples of density within existing developments in the community, specifically within Crozet, to come up with what they believe would be a reasonable density to encourage.

Ms. Falkenstein said the land use category also recommends forms that would be appropriate for Middle Density Residential. She said these include the types of housing she mentioned on the previous slides, adding that these are also housing types staff has engaged the community on. She said staff held workshops where they asked members of the community to provide input on types of housing they would like to see, and that these units were all popular with and well-supported by the community.

Ms. Falkenstein said they would allow for some small multifamily housing types within this category, but they have a maximum footprint recommendation to make sure the scale and size of multifamily would be in keeping with single-family types of development.

Ms. Falkenstein presented some images of those housing types, noting that in Attachment 7 of the staff report, there were further descriptions of each unit type that was mentioned in the recommendation. She pointed out that the Commission had recently reviewed a proposal for a missing middle housing type called a “cottage court” or a “bungalow court” with the Bamboo Grove proposal that was proposed within Crozet. She said this came in at about 9 units per acre, with small single-family units surrounding a central green. She said this is an example of a housing type they will hopefully see built soon, adding that it was recently approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Falkenstein said with regard to density samples, staff looked at a number of factors to come up with the density range of 6 to 24 units per acre. She said in order to give an idea of what a built form of these densities would look like, she would show a couple examples from Crozet. She noted that this was not an exhaustive list and that many of the housing types included in this category currently do not exist in Crozet, or even in the County at all.

Ms. Falkenstein said the examples would provide a sense of what the built form of these densities currently looks like in some of Crozet’s existing developments. She said the first was Wickham Pond, which is a townhouse street with 24 units on about 1.68 acres that comes out to about 14 units per acre.

Ms. Falkenstein said going down the street, within the same development, there is a row of townhomes that have accessory units within them. She said these are apartments within

townhomes designed to look like regular townhomes. She said this development comes out to about 27 units per acre, including the lots and adjacent parking.

Ms. Falkenstein said lastly, in Old Trail, there is a block of single-family homes with accessory dwellings built behind them on almost every lot on the block. She said this comes out to a density of about 15 units per acre. She said all of these (except for the Wickham Pond example) would be within the density range recommended by the Middle Density Residential land use category.

Ms. Falkenstein said she would end on the discussion questions for this topic. She said the Commission did not necessarily have to go through the questions in any specific order. She said from this discussion, staff would like to know whether or not the Commission supports the land use category and if they had any feedback or changes, they would like to see before staff moves forward and applies this.

Ms. Falkenstein mentioned that the land use map attached to the staff report was meant to serve as an example of what staff has been sharing with the community so far. She said the attached proposed land use does not incorporate the Middle Density Residential land use category yet because staff wanted to check in with the Commission before doing so. She said once staff has the Commission's feedback, they will go back to the map, take a look at where they think applying the category is appropriate, and bring this out to the community for their input before coming back to the Commission. She said the map was an exhibit of what the land uses were previously and what staff has been debating back and forth with the CAC so far.

Ms. Falkenstein paused for questions from the Commission.

Mr. Bivins said the Commission's tradition has been opening up the discussion for public comment, and then the Commission could discuss it.

Ms. More said she first had a clarifying question for staff as far as the process. She said the CAC had not been specifically introduced to this land use category, but that staff was responding to things they heard from public engagement in creating this category. She said Ms. Falkenstein said after this higher-level discussion, they would go back to the CAC where there might be a more specific discussion. She asked if this would happen within the CAC and if this would then come back to the Commission.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that the intent was that after this work session, staff would go back to the land use map, make changes, and apply the land use category if the Commission supports moving forward with it. She said staff would then come back to the CCAC for their input on the revised map before coming back to the Commission.

Ms. More said she completely understood why staff was not showing the land use category on the map and why they were having the present discussion first, but that while she could definitely respond to the questions from staff without knowing site-specific locations, it was somewhat of a challenge to not know where they might be suggesting those. She said there is only so much more capacity in Crozet, and they know what they have as far as numbers in the pipeline, so she was curious about where this land use category would go.

Ms. More said while she was open to the idea, she felt like there could be a situation where this is a new category that people find to be fairly helpful but it doesn't mean (whether it is Crozet or

County-wide) that some spots will be the right spots. She said she wanted to be sensitive to the process, and hoped that there would be discussion about appropriateness.

Mr. Randolph said he would respond to the first two questions with “yes,” but that he wanted to come back to Question 3, he would like to come back to after there is public comment.

Mr. Bivins opened the public hearing.

Ms. Allie Pesch (Mint Springs Road, Crozet) said she is Chair of the Crozet CAC. She said she had been expecting to speak after hearing the Commission’s discussion, but wanted to say that while she supported the Middle Density category, she was not sure where, exactly, it would be appropriate to apply it in Crozet. She said she liked the creativity as far as trying to support affordable housing opportunities, but worried that many of these units that they already have (e.g. townhouses, duplexes, and other products listed in the category) do not stay affordable in Crozet. She said she supported the category, but also believed that it would depend on where exactly on the map this would come into play.

Ms. Pesch said as a born and raised Crozet resident who is raising her own family there, her priority was on focusing density downtown. She said this was key to maintaining the small-town identity and was the top guiding principle of the Master Plan. She said she wanted to be sure that when these higher-density categories are applied, the goal is to support development downtown (e.g. the Barnes Lumber property) rather than on the edges, as seen more recently.

Ms. Nicole Scro (City of Charlottesville resident) said she is affiliated with the development and building company Gallifrey Homes. She said she was unfortunately unable to see the beginning portion of the presentation, and apologized if she overlaps with some things Ms. Falkenstein may have said. She said she wanted to note two things.

Ms. Scro said she had presented some smaller home, cottage courtyard developments to the County, so she was a big proponent of them. She said she believes they can work to achieve two goals: one being more affordable housing than continuing to build larger homes, and the other being maintaining the look and feel of a neighborhood that she knows is very important to many people in Crozet. She said she believes this is a great solution and that she is a big proponent of middle density. She said she knows the County Zoning Ordinance allows for accessory units that are detached, so if there were continued development pressure in this area, they might already have accessory units sprouting up under the current Zoning Ordinance. She said by having a guided Comprehensive Plan middle density, it is an opportunity to be in front of the problem and allow for the development pressure already happening in Crozet to express itself in positive ways.

Ms. Scro said her other note was one of caution. She said the purpose of the middle missing housing was to be an alternative to larger homes. She said if they replace urban-scale density, then they are doing the opposite of providing affordable housing. She said if they lower the overall capacity of density in the area, then they are not doing affordable housing a service. She said the County should still look to put more urban-scale apartments in downtown and other areas of Crozet instead of using the Middle Density designation to take over for allowing those higher densities.

Mr. Brian Day said he is a member of the Crozet CAC, but was not speaking on behalf of them, as the presentation had not been gone through in detail (although there was a fair amount of discussion that led to this proposal). He said he wanted to second everything that Ms. Pesch had

said. He said he would also jump in behind what Ms. Scro was saying about some creative alternatives, one of which the Commission just approved in Crozet. He said there is a real need for that.

Mr. Day said in listening to the community in the Master Planning process, on the one hand, there is a real, serious desire to have affordable housing in Crozet. He said the flip side of this is that any increase in density brings with it the fact that the infrastructure is woefully behind. He said the \$30 million improvement to Crozet Elementary had just been delayed. He said Lickinghole Bridge needs to be built in order to make things happen. He said Crozet is terribly missing sidewalks and connectivity.

Mr. Day said middle density, in the right place, would be a marvelous addition.

Mr. Bivins closed the public comment portion of the discussion. He suggested the Commissioners answer the questions from staff one by one.

Mr. Bivins asked the Commissioners if they agreed with staff's recommendation in Question 1 about creating a Middle Density Residential land use category to support the stated goals within Crozet.

Ms. More suggested tackling all three questions, since the first two questions may have shorter answers, but the third question may be more involved.

Mr. Bivins said he would particularly like to get a sense about the first question, as he felt this was a major question, and not just for Crozet. He said he would like the Commission to talk about this as an approach to some of the things that perhaps Mr. Randolph and Mr. Keller have talked about, which are infill development and if this would be a viable option for places outside of Crozet.

Ms. More asked if they were then answering Question 1 first.

Mr. Bivins replied yes.

Ms. More said she did agree that this was a land use category that makes a lot of sense, and so her answer to the question was yes. She said in response to what Ms. Scro had to say, however (with the reality of Crozet with what has been developed, what is in the pipeline, and where there is development potential), she was curious to see where this would be site-specific, adding that she knew they were not there yet. She said to Ms. Scro's point, while she likes this scale density, she doesn't necessarily want to see it replace the urban-scale density. She said in looking at the maps and what is available in Crozet, it leaves her wondering where these places are appropriate.

Ms. More said walkability to downtown is important, as downtown is consistently supported by the community as the most important center. She said they will want to support density downtown and yet, around downtown, there are some neighborhoods that they will want to be very careful with, which they would discuss in the next section.

Ms. More said this makes for a tricky situation where there are older, established neighborhoods and while they are not selling quickly or creating a new housing stock, they are housing stock in Crozet. She said this creates some challenges in planning where someone may want to come in and make the area dense, but they would have to acknowledge what already exists there and would need to be careful to deal with how that might infill and how they would approach that.

Ms. More said she wanted to make sure people understand that in Crozet, there is a finite number of places in the downtown area where density would be appropriate. She said to Ms. Scro's point, perhaps pulling back from the higher category may not be appropriate there. She said many places where she sees the new category might go are also places where there is already urban density, and Ms. Scro was telling the Commission to be careful about not replacing one with the other.

Ms. More said that generally speaking, on a high level, the proposed category was a creative way to address matters in Crozet and County-wide and was a positive thing to have further discussion about.

Mr. Randolph said it was important for Question 1 that the Middle Density Residential land use category is deconstructed. He said within this land use category, there is a typology, and he would submit that this typology is one that should be premised on affordability and its capacity to deliver diversity in the housing types within that typology.

Mr. Randolph said looking at that typology, which is a single horizontal line, at the left end of the typology, he would mark it as, "Affordable rental." He said at the other end of the typology, he would mark it as, "Higher-expense ownership." He said then, along the way, is where the "missing middle" housing types fit. He said obviously, the fourplex was perhaps the most affordable because the taxation cost is split four ways for a rental. He said under this typology, the most expensive is the townhome because then, a family is solely paying for property taxes and maintenance of the property.

Mr. Randolph said the Commission could get into a detailed discussion, which was not appropriate at this setting, as to where bungalow courts, duplexes, ADUs, live-work units, and the townhomes fit in.

Mr. Randolph said that earlier, before the public meeting, he established that the answer to both of the first two questions were yes. He said within the question, it was important that when they think about Middle Density Residential land use to support stated goals within Crozet, they need to think about affordability and diversity within these housing categories and seek ways in which the County can deliver, through conscious land use decision making, increased diversity. He said when he says "diversity," he is talking about socio-, economic, and racial diversity. He said a combination of affordability and diversity are two things that are critical when talking about Middle Density Residential land use.

Mr. Randolph said he had segued into the third question in answering that, but he had to bring it up in order to answer the first question fully.

Mr. Keller said he agreed with Mr. Randolph, and wanted to build on his comments. He said first, he would like to suggest that in the "Imagine Crozet" sheet that staff prepared (which he believed to be an excellent primer on these different types), the last sentence in the first paragraph implies (and, as Ms. Falkenstein mentioned, these things have all happened historically in larger cities) that in larger ethnic neighborhoods, multiple generations have lived in different levels of the same house. He said in some cases, they have been rentals and in others, they have been owned collectively or condominium-ized.

Mr. Keller said this brought him to an interesting point on Mr. Randolph's continuum, as it seemed to him that what they don't see in the greater Charlottesville and Albemarle area, but have seen in larger cities with a longer history of more housing stock, is the opportunity to own within each of these different categories. He said one could own a cottage, or one could rent a cottage. He said one could own the first, second, or third floor.

Mr. Keller said while his answer to the first question was yes, what was interesting to him was that staff provided a height and massing scale, and in his ideal world, what they have thought of as single-family neighborhoods (depending on whether they are modest with a smaller square footage, or much larger with a larger square footage) and where he begs to differ with Ms. Scro, this is where they would want to "integrate" (noting he was using this word judiciously) these different building forms and types based on scale. He said in a \$1 million single-family neighborhood, for example, they could see an apartment complex that has a large, high finish, or something of a smaller scale that has a lower finish and is more affordable to others, depending on to what degree one would want to do this.

Mr. Keller said the last sentence in the first paragraph implies that historically, these things have happened. He said there is a cottage court on 14th Street and JPA. He said these were built in the 1920s and wasn't sure how much longer these would exist. He said it was almost as if the last sentence needed to say that over the last 60-70 years with zoning, the County has restricted many of these forms that they had historically had and were important. He said every one of these, they could point to in different communities around the country, and perhaps some Commissioners have even lived in these forms before and found they proved to be useful. He said this is a way to get that kind of integration instead of having one category.

Mr. Keller said that while he answered yes to the question, he was somewhat concerned with this Middle Density Residential use because ideally, everything that staff pointed out could be in every kind of category, except where there is a true reason for a height restriction. He said this gets them into another world that they could discuss, adding that Ms. Falkenstein has brought these up in terms of 29 North, the Neighborhood Model, and where different heights are appropriate.

Mr. Keller said that on the height and scale issue, he has recently seen in larger cities where four stories are being built at a three-story height so they can fit into many of the neighborhoods where 2.5-story houses are being built. He said these houses have an English basement, and the lower unit is actually half below ground and is daylighted due to the way the retaining walls are done around it. He said one could actually get the density of a fourplex without having a scale issue that exceeds a three-plex. He said this is where the nuances and the urban design aspect of this becomes more interesting with a mixture of the different forms and types.

Mr. Keller said he believed staff has taken a great step forward with the proposed set of ways to think beyond single-family detached. He said he thought most of the Commissioners were likely thinking about single-family detached with ADUs, and so staff was taking them to the next level, which he appreciated.

Mr. Bivins said he agreed that this category was a great addition that provides additional flexibility for master plans and for other development areas around the County. He said after hearing Mr. Randolph and Mr. Keller comment, his own comments were not very different, and that he believed there was a potential unintended consequence that could come out of this, although it was a good idea.

Mr. Bivins said it would potentially begin to extend the town center for the urban core. He said if the density is 6-24 units and if developers want to build at the higher end, the Middle Density could begin to look like the town center. He said perhaps this is what Mr. Keller meant in terms of height restrictions and other things that can be used. He said his concern, however, was that they would then begin to expand the urban core and go into other areas of the master plan that were perhaps intended for a different use. He said this is where form-based planning could come in.

Mr. Bivins said his concern was that the density was a fairly large range, and that 6 units per acre versus 24 units per acre are very different in character. He said he would ask about exactly how that range would develop.

Ms. Firehock said she likely completely agreed with everything that had been stated. She said she definitely agreed with Questions 1 and 2 in terms of Ms. More's point that it was all about the map. She said people may say that they philosophically like these units but, "Not near my house." She said she believed the County would likely run into challenges when it comes time to put the units on paper and determine where they will go.

Ms. Firehock said she had an idea that she was not necessarily wed to. She said she recently had been thinking about taking the giant range and break it into parts. She said she has long complained about the range of 6-36 units, and there may be something like 6-12 units per acre, then 13-24 units per acre. She said this would create "two middles in the middle" and may make it easier.

Ms. Firehock said she likes diverse neighborhoods and diversity in housing sizes and forms. She said affordability is very important for vibrant neighborhoods. She said she believed they could do this in such a way where they do not end up with things like they see in some places in Northern Virginia, where she has seen neighborhoods with infill density and there are single-family one- and two-story bungalows next to 6-story and 8-story buildings. She said little by little, the single-family houses have been picked off in those neighborhoods.

Ms. Firehock said despite how her comments may sound, she was very supportive of the additional density and forms. She said she did want to echo Ms. More's concern, however, that where it occurs is important.

Ms. Firehock said she also believed that, in general, in order for Crozet's downtown to be successful, it will need higher density than what they were showing on the map. She said she was harkening back to original meetings they had a couple years ago, when they were first looking at the Barnes Lumber redevelopment and the designs that Frank Stoner brought forward. She said at that time, there was a real reluctance to see density and there was a desire for much closer single-family homes. She said yet, the community wanted to have the vibrancy, character, and commercial success of something like Charlottesville's Downtown Mall. She suggested that some higher density may need to occur in Downtown Crozet to make it a viable business district.

Ms. Firehock applauded staff's presentation, noting that the materials were creatively put together. She said she used to live in Belmont and saw some familiar buildings in the materials.

Ms. Firehock said in terms of preservation of single-family houses, the character of Crozet, and history, she believes the County needs a historic preservation ordinance. She said this is the only way that they can prevent the teardowns. She said Crozet is so desirable and valuable, people

will be very much willing to come in and bulldoze a ranch house to put up another form. She said how they will make Crozet affordable is tricky.

Mr. Clayborne asked what localities (whether inside or outside of Virginia) have done this very well, and what made them so successful. He asked how they put mechanisms in place to encourage this kind of development.

Mr. Bivins said they would look to staff for examples once the Commission's comments on Question 1 were complete.

Mr. Bailey said he did support the Middle Density category and, as was mentioned before, suggested that consideration be made to the by-right development unit range of 6-24. He said he would also echo what Mr. Clayborne just mentioned. He said he understands that one focus was alleviating potential pressure on teardowns by allowing people to have some flexibility on larger homes to make them into quadplexes or the like. He said the question would be about what neighborhoods would be under that pressure for redevelopment, which will be critical to understanding how the County can actually implement Middle Density.

Ms. Falkenstein said she would try to answer the Commission's question. She said there was a question about having these housing types in all communities across all land use categories, and that she believed this was a worthy goal. She said in order to actually do that, they would have to go back and look at the recommended density ranges. She said the one that would likely create a problem would be the Neighborhood Density Residential, as capping density at 6 units per acre would make it difficult to integrate many of these housing types. She said this was probably a bigger conversation that would happen outside of the Crozet Master Plan and could be considered as part of a Comprehensive Plan update (which was the next long-term project in staff's work program).

Ms. Falkenstein said she would address the question about whether or not they were encroaching into the urban core with this density range. She said she didn't believe so and that this was not staff's intent. She said some of the form and scale recommendations within the category would prohibit that. She said the category recommends a height maximum of three stories, which would keep development to a certain scale. She said she believed the 24-units-per-acre occurrence would likely not be commonly seen. She said it may be the creative designs with much smaller unit types that would hit that density range, but if they were getting into larger housing types, she didn't think they would be able to get to that number with the form recommendations and the height maximum.

Ms. Falkenstein said to Ms. Firehock's point about considering two categories, this could be discussed, and perhaps it could come up more when they discuss the density and Question 3. She said staff's intent was to be more form-focused than density-focused, so form is where they started with this new land use category as far as what forms and housing types are appropriate.

Ms. Falkenstein said after they identified those, they looked at what the appropriate housing density ranges for these housing types would be. She said some of them are local examples, such as the ones she showed the Commission earlier, and that they also looked at other examples in the City and County.

Ms. Falkenstein said the "missing middle" housing website has some general ranges for these types of housing and that it is a rather large range, coming down to how big the unit types are.

She said a single-family home takes up much more space than perhaps a small accessory apartment. She said this was why the range was large, and that she would be happy to take more feedback on that and hear the Commission's discussion.

Ms. Falkenstein said to Mr. Clayborne's question about examples of other communities, staff likely needed to do further research on this, especially on local ones in Virginia. She said one she knew of and that everyone had studied up on was Minneapolis, which recently had a comprehensive plan update and, subsequently, a city-wide rezoning where they did away with their single-family zoning category to allow for these types of "missing middle" within all single-family neighborhoods. She said the form has to fit and has to be the same scale as a single-family house, but they do allow multiple units upon a lot or within a house. She said this is one example, and staff could find more, adding that Mr. Knuppel may have some he would like to share.

Ms. Falkenstein said to Mr. Bailey's point and comments from others about the neighborhoods that are under pressure of redevelopment, Mr. Knuppel would talk about this further under the next topic of the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay.

Ms. More asked Ms. Falkenstein about the height maximum of three stories and how many feet would be allowed in this category.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that, looking at zoning as a guide, 35 feet is commonly seen to accommodate three stories.

Ms. More said looking through some of the examples in the materials, one is a fourplex and those are being built in Crozet, but they are all four on the ground. She said the massing of it, around single-family detached, looks much like a large home. She said when she was looking further at fourplexes, there are some with two on the ground and two above, which is why she wanted to ask about the height.

Ms. More said in a particular development that is close to Downtown Crozet, which is by right and very dense, there is a two-over-two but from her understanding, this was a model that Stanley Martin builds in Northern Virginia. She said with what they have in Crozet now, it sounds like this might be too tall, unless they are willing to adjust for Crozet.

Ms. More said this gets into obliterating mountain views and is something they considered in 2017 for master planning, as the views were important to the community. She said height is a major part of the form piece.

Mr. Randolph said he didn't want to belabor the discussion, as this was the first of five issues, but he did want to come back to talking about the housing types and compliment the density and form materials staff provided.

Mr. Randolph said one of the things that he observed in his content analysis was the overwhelming choice in each one of the localities within Crozet was biased to single-family detached units. He said his concern is that with the permitting of this housing type, while on paper it looks like the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will potentially be able to see an increase in a range of different housing types on the typology he referenced earlier, the local neighborhood pressure community expectations appear to be very strongly, heavily weighted at the end of single-family detached units. He said he was concerned that once permitted, there will

be a situation where they will mainly see development at the single-family townhouse attached or detached end and not at the more affordable (fourplex) end.

Mr. Randolph said his second observation in the typology, related to Question 1, is to be mindful about multimodal and public transit interfacing with these housing types. He said if they want diversity in housing types, they must be assured of diversity of transportation, meaning public transit or multimodal (i.e. bike lanes) and the ability to move people from residential areas to work areas in an expedited fashion. He said if this Middle Density Residential land use category is approved, it will be critical to incorporate the housing types that are at the left end of typology and assure that there will be public transit and multimodal.

Mr. Randolph said Mr. Keller was absolutely right that this should be available across the typology and should not be restricted to one end. He said it is critical that if the County is truly seeking a diversity of housing types and population, the County must be assured in delivering public transit.

Mr. Bivins asked if there would be a lot of discussion on Question 2, about whether or not the Commission believes this category would be appropriate across the rest of the County, particularly when coming to the Master Plan. He said if there was not much conversation about this, he would like the Commission to go to the other questions more quickly.

Mr. Keller suggested Mr. Bivins ask everyone if they agreed with this.

The Commissioners all indicated that they agreed.

Mr. Bivins said he wanted to push Questions 3 and 5 together, and also wanted to get a sense of Question 4 first.

Ms. More said she had a question about this. She said her interpretation of the questions was that even though Questions 3 and 5 seemed like they were the same question, Question 3 was more about answering this in the context of the new land category, and Question 5 was more about overlay and housing types.

Mr. Bivins asked Ms. More if her sense was that Question 3 was about Middle Density, and that Question 5 was about the downtown overlay.

Ms. More confirmed this.

Mr. Bivins noted that Mr. Knuppel was nodding yes. He said they would go into Question 3, which was about Middle Density. He said some of the Commissioners had touched upon on the density housing types and form guidance.

Ms. More said the questions that others asked helped clarify the form guidance. She said some (not all) of these housing types are in Crozet. She said Ms. Scro gave a good example of Bamboo Grove, which the Commission was very supportive of and is the smaller-scale development that they want to promote. She said not all the examples shown were currently in Crozet, but they do have many townhomes and some duplexes. She said there was also a cottage development happening in the eastern neighborhoods. She said these units, however, are still not affordable.

Ms. More said she wanted to be careful with the way they create the new land use category that they press the affordability issue. She said getting back to the comment from Mr. Randolph about

single-family detached, she wasn't sure if it was so much about the fear from residents of different housing types, but that it was more about the fear of what the infrastructure will look like with higher density and how it will be managed (e.g. schools, roads). She said this is an issue all over the County.

Ms. More said single-family detached homes are built by developers because that is how they are making money. She said when people shy away from density, it is not always NIMBYism, and the heart of their concerns go back to how much the area has grown, and where infrastructure is.

Ms. More said she wasn't able to attend the work session about the housing policy, but the current policy for rezonings is 15% affordable units. She said moving forward, there is a concern that staff is trying to address. She said to be fair to Crozet, however, under the County's housing policy, they produce affordable units. She said she knew there was conversation about how the County can create more opportunities for affordability, but she wanted to point out that there are some existing units like this. She said Wickham Pond was an example.

Ms. More said she wanted to be clear that although Crozet already had units such as the ones being discussed, she understood the desire to talk about the form guidance to help foster this and create an atmosphere where this is encouraged. She said this would result in other units, such as bungalow courts.

Ms. More said she could ask her questions about the map later.

Mr. Bivins said it was interesting that a number of Commissioners said there are already these housing types in Crozet. He said the question that would come up was about the downtown overlay, historic precincts, and preservation that will allow current residents to be able to continue living there without feeling that they are in the country version of urban renewal. He said these are families that live along Route 240, Railroad Avenue, and Orchard Drive, and he didn't want those people to feel like they are being developed out of their homes.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay they would discuss ties in with the earlier conversation about Crozet's downtown center. He said it is also about how they will preserve the current housing in Crozet and manage historic properties within the area. He said with this land use recommendation to implement future policy rezoning changes, this was the first step in identifying some of the issues.

Mr. Knuppel said he would provide a brief overview of the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay, the intent, and the mechanics of how it would work.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay would try to incentivize the maintenance and preservation of naturally occurring affordable housing. He said this applied to some of the older homes in Crozet's older neighborhoods that are near downtown, and would hopefully help to support the preservation of existing historic neighborhoods within the Crozet Historic District, which is on the National Register of Historic Places as a listed historic district. He said the overlay would also provide new housing with a similar scale and form to support continued growth in the downtown area.

Mr. Knuppel said the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to downtown make up an area that has been greatly discussed throughout the entire Master Plan process. He said with regards to

the preservation of existing historic homes, there are concerns about teardowns and losing the built components of Crozet's historic small-town identity.

Mr. Knuppel said there are also concerns about the potential for displacement or redevelopment, and the teardowns of homes that do not have historical or architectural value to them, which are being priced out by the continued redevelopment of the downtown area, including the Barnes Lumber site redevelopment and expansion of the area. He said there are many areas close to downtown where the land is worth more than the home on it, so there is some pressure for longtime residents in this area in terms of tax bills and development pressure, which could impact their ability to stay there.

Mr. Knuppel said therefore, many issues were trying to be addressed with this overlay, and that he would explain the mechanics of the overlay.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay would apply to areas that currently maintain a Neighborhood Density Residential designation near downtown. He said this is currently 3-6 units per acre and consists predominantly of the single-family detached home type, immediately adjacent to the downtown area.

Mr. Knuppel said he would provide a brief overview of where they would look at applying this overlay, using a couple land use maps from earlier in the summer. He noted that these maps would continue to evolve, and change based on the conversation that evening, but that these were an initial scoping of what the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay would look like.

Mr. Knuppel presented the map and explained that the overlay was outlined in the dashed navy-blue line. He said it captures the historic downtown center, and that areas currently designated as the Downtown Crozet District were in maroon. He said it encompasses areas that are currently within the National Register of Crozet Historic Districts along St. George, Railroad, and Crozet Avenues, as well as portions of Crozet Avenue just south of downtown, where there are some historic farm houses and fruit-packing buildings that are related to Crozet's early 20th-century growth and prosperity during its period of significance on the National Register.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay also includes neighborhoods that are adjacent to the downtown area that have been heard about a lot through the process and developed within Crozet during the period of significance. He said although these were not within the historic districts, they were part of the early post-war building boom that resulted in the construction of Morton Frozen Foods (which is now Starr Hill and Music Today on Route 240) and the Acme Visible Records area was Crozet's second economic boom in the 1950s.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay does include a couple post-war neighborhoods around downtown, which includes a portion of Wayland Drive and St. George Avenue east of Crozet Avenue, which was platted in the post-war period and developed in the 1950s and 1960s. He said it also includes the Hill Top Street area just south of downtown, near Crozet Park, which was all 1940s and 1950s post-war development as well. He said there many currently existing, relatively affordable structures on half-acre lots where the land could be worth more than the structures on the site and where they could expect to see development pressures in the future due to the proximity to downtown.

Mr. Knuppel said the area also includes the area along Route 240, east of downtown between the Crozet Volunteer Fire Department and the industrial area on Route 240. He said this area was

interesting in that it was developed during Crozet's period of significance in the early 20th century and was historically the center of Crozet's African American community, with the Union Mission Church and the site of a school for the community before school integration. He said this is another cohesive community that is adjacent to the downtown area and staff felt was appropriate for inclusion in the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay, even though it was not part of the National Register nomination for the Crozet Historic Districts in the late 2000s.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay does include some vacant land that was included as part of the historic district with the Pleasant Green House, but is generally bounded by subdivision plat boundaries and other natural features, such as streams. He said it was also bounded by streets, where staff was able to do this, to try to provide some definition to the overlay.

Mr. Knuppel presented a slide showing the boundaries from the 1950s and encompassed most of the nucleus of Crozet as it existed during the period of significance or post-war era, including the original core of the community near the fruit-packing plants as well as the post-war expansion to the east and south.

Mr. Knuppel said knowing the sensitivity of the area, staff took an approach of an overlay district that would supplement the recommendations in the Neighborhood Density Residential land use category of 3-6 units per acre.

Mr. Knuppel said staff did, however, want to make sure they considered the fact that there will be development pressure from downtown in this area. He said there is a need for additional affordable residential to support the growth of the downtown area, as well as a need for preservation and incentivization for preservation of the historic homes wherever possible. He said this is one of the few historic areas within the County's development areas where they do expect future growth, and that many of the other areas located across the County do not face the same sort of development pressure that will likely occur around Downtown Crozet.

Mr. Knuppel said in response to this, staff felt that they should take an incentive approach to the preservation of downtown neighborhoods by encouraging higher density and some criteria for infill or renovation redevelopment that could be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. He said certainly, the Master Plan was the first step towards a zoning update and if this were to be pursued in the future, it would consider preservation protections from demolition of historic structures. He said it was the first chance staff had to evaluate what this would look like in the planning step, and emphasized that everything would be a discretionary measure thus far. He said because most of the current zoning is R2 Residential, they cannot hit this type of density that would be supported at this time.

Mr. Knuppel said the criteria would include the conversion of existing structures to multiple units. He said there are several large homes dating from Crozet's period of significance that could be subdivided into apartments. He said returning to the discussion earlier about a stacked duplex, a family could live on one level and rent out the other level. He said the overlay would encourage the conversion if it preserves the existing structure on the parcel in order to preserve the historic fabric.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay criteria also includes the addition of accessories on the lot. He said the County does currently permit attached accessory apartments within all residential districts, but this could extend to detached conversions as well, such as garage conversions or carriage houses (a popular trend in newer neighborhoods). He said there are a number of existing

structures in the neighborhoods that would support such a use, but that the zoning does not currently permit that.

Mr. Knuppel said the overlay also encourages infill development that would preserve existing housing stock. He said they want to be sensitive to the housing that is already there. He said much of this housing is older and likely has a lower value, making it cheaper. He said he wants to make sure they are preserving what currently exists and try to encourage affordability there.

Mr. Knuppel said as form and design go, staff hopes that with the prevailing development pattern of the surrounding street, criteria would be considered, such as scale and massing of the nearby context. He said there was a reference earlier to a six- to eight-story next to a two-story bungalow, and that this would not be anticipated with this type of change. He said staff would be evaluating the context of each development as it comes forward.

Mr. Knuppel said the final criteria is that it would provide additional affordable or workforce housing, supporting the growth of affordable workforce housing stock in the area to meet the needs of the community.

Mr. Knuppel said there is a lot of overlap with the housing types that were discussed in the Middle Density category as far as the types that would be permitted. As examples, he presented a picture of another fourplex in the Belmont area, which was mentioned earlier. He said it looks like an existing house, but has four mailboxes on it. He said other examples on existing structures include garage conversions, attached dwellings, and basement conversions -- some of which are already permitted by code.

Mr. Knuppel said there are structures on St. George Avenue that could support this type of infill as well. He presented a street-level survey from St. George Avenue, noting that the structures are not [inaudible] to the built structure of the street, over time.

Mr. Knuppel said staff looked at the lot sizes in many of these areas, and the size of them have [inaudible] currently. He said many of the areas have developed as quarter-acre to half-acre lots. He said there are some larger lots in the area because they were not subdivided on a standard format. He said some of the density would go above the current three- to six-unit range, so they want to anticipate that in a way where if they can demonstrate these criteria, it can be successful in this area.

Mr. Knuppel said conversion of an existing home to a fourplex and an ADU would add 5 units on half an acre. He said they would still have to comply with County regulations such as parking, which is something other localities have used to address housing issues and impact the costs of producing housing. He said they would still have to be in compliance with County ordinances to support this type of density.

Mr. Knuppel said this was a brief overview of some of the considerations staff looked at with the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay. He said in many ways, it is similar to the "missing middle" housing that was discussed in that it hopes to create many of the same types of housing, with the same sensitivity to existing neighborhoods, although under a slightly different regulatory scheme. He said they would need to see criteria be met to go above the three- to six-unit per acre density range. He said they are trying to set the stage where they can continue to preserve the housing in Crozet, affordability, and housing that is consistent with the neighborhoods and historic district.

Mr. Randolph said he appreciated Mr. Knuppel's presentation and thoughts on this. He said he did want to suggest that perhaps Mr. Knuppel should have plugged in another question, which was, "Do you see the applicability for this category in similar contexts in other areas of the County?" He said this was Question 2 in the first part. He said Mr. Knuppel did not include it here, and he would suggest that he may want to consider that.

Mr. Randolph said he was thinking of the potential growth, as outlined in the Master Plan for the Town of Scottsville, both in the northeastern quadrant and in the western quadrant for the town and are privately owned by Dr. Hurt. He said with that growth, assuming it takes place within the next 10 years, this will have a dramatic impact on the rural area that surrounds both of those quadrants. He said this Downtown Neighborhood Overlay might be applicable for the County to apply, looking into the future.

Mr. Randolph acknowledged that this was far ahead of everything happening now, but said that what he liked about what Mr. Knuppel presented was that it was an overlay district that was adaptive to new situations that are bound to arise simply because the County continues to grow. He said affordability tends to be the primary concern of much of this growth, especially in Southern Albemarle.

Mr. Randolph asked Mr. Knuppel to consider adding the suggested question to the two questions in his section, as he believed there was value in applicability for this category elsewhere in the County and that it would not only be restricted to Crozet, going forward.

Ms. More said she had a question about the map. She mentioned the section outlined in orange as well as that in yellow, which was Buford Street, noting this was intact. She said there was also an open area that did not show anything under development by right (R6) that would come in at 30 [inaudible]. She asked if it made sense for staff to following those same lines and the streams. She said she wondered about keeping those in because those were dense, new developments and she didn't know if the goal of the overlay was to offer protections where this type of zoning never gave those structures a fighting chance of surviving. She mentioned that one of the structures did become a clubhouse.

Mr. Knuppel replied that staff did include the portion that includes the Pleasant Green property and the houses on that property within the overlay because it was originally included in the Crozet Historic District. He noted one structure has since been demolished, and another was converted to a clubhouse. He said staff did include the property because of their proximity to the Blue Ridge Avenue area and the existing historic properties and resources within that area.

Mr. Knuppel said part of this did protect the context of the historic districts, as context was one of the criteria on the National Register of Historic Districts. He said if the project Ms. More described came in for a rezoning or legislative application, the County could consider the context of the new proposed development to the houses on Blue Ridge Avenue and to Cling Lane to help make sure the development along those edges are context-sensitive to the historic structures that are there.

Mr. Knuppel said even though there is not necessarily much on that site as far as historic value and preserving a house that is there, if the project were to come in for legislative review, it could be considered up against those criteria and if they were asking for additional density, the County could make sure it is designed in a way that is respectful to the historic structures at the edges of that project site.

Mr. Knuppel said the challenges with an overlay approach and the inconsistencies between zoning and the Master Plan is that in some ways, the presence of the R6 zoning on that site takes away some of the incentive to rezone under the current Master Plan to what would be the upper end of the three- to six-unit neighborhood density. He said it would probably be more of an incentive to the other areas with R2 zoning because if they were to achieve additional density on their sites, they would have to go through the legislative process to achieve that.

Ms. More said this helped to clarify her question. She said earlier, Ms. Firehock mentioned the desire to have Downtown Crozet grow and be vibrant and active, and have there needs to be density around that. She said the conversation now was that they do have some older existing structures in Old Crozet that surrounds the area that they want to try to be careful with because it could infill or redevelop. She said the two properties she just pointed out are very dense and will give the needed walkability to Downtown Crozet.

Ms. More said she wanted to point out that due to the density that is carried on those properties, they will come in dense, and she didn't know if the Pleasant Green property has any affordability, though The Vue does and is doing 20% affordable rental units. She said this does help some, especially with the rental part, which was lacking in Crozet. She said in Old Trail, there are apartments there, but they are not as walkable to Downtown Crozet. She said here, they were seeing some density that is walkable to Downtown, which went back to the earlier comment about the core of Downtown.

Ms. More said she very much liked the overlay approach. She said this is a high-level conversation to see if there is support for this, and that she agreed with Mr. Randolph's comment about seeing this overlay elsewhere. She said this made a lot of sense and seemed like it was a strategy they could deploy in places outside of Crozet.

Ms. More said in the upper range that might go above that which already exists in the land use designation for some of these areas, the County needs to deal with that process very delicately and thoughtfully. She said she knew they were not in that far yet, but that this would offer some clarity, especially if they are considering not only allowing the upper range, but going over that. She said careful consideration should be made as to how this will be done so that neighbors in those areas understand. She said they won't want to take it too far and be too strict about it, nor too loose.

Ms. More said she did want to talk later about being under Master Plan review in the middle of the pandemic and what this is feeling like for Crozet.

Mr. Keller said he believed the overlay was a great move forward, and thanked staff for the thoughtful investigations and creation. He said he also agreed with Mr. Randolph that this is something that should be expanded to a County-wide consideration and not just for Crozet.

Mr. Keller said several Commissioners were quite taken with the Minneapolis proposals that did away with R1 but, at the same time, were thinking thoughtfully about how to protect historic resources. He said he believed Mr. Knuppel tried to capture the spirit of that. He said it might be helpful to share a copy of that ordinance with the Commissioners to see.

Mr. Keller said to build on Ms. Firehock's comments, the County desperately needs a historic preservation ordinance. He said in order for the overlay to work effectively, these must work in tandem together.

Mr. Keller said his concern with looking at some of the residences staff looked at and talked about as conversions is that they are seen only through the lens of getting more units. He said he thinks the reality is that this is not the Gold Coast in Chicago, where the mansions do lend themselves to a conversion for each floor to be a different residence and, in many cases, a very expensive condominium. He said recently, he was looking at one of these in Chicago, and the value of the English basement level was over \$1 million. He said it then ranged up to the third floor above, which was over \$2 million. He said this demonstrates that there are places where there are those kinds of values.

Mr. Keller said the beauty of the Minneapolis system (although not thoroughly tested, at this point) was that it was working against demolition of structures that would be comparable to those on St. George Avenue. He said he knew Mr. Clayborne had experience of having different kinds of units and historic structures in Richmond, and perhaps he would weigh in on this later.

Mr. Keller said it seemed to him that the adaptation for a property owner who is finding themselves priced out of being able to keep their property, as property taxes go up dramatically, might actually see value in having a first-floor apartment in the house for themselves as opposed to moving into the ADU. He said the idea is that they want to stay on the land. He said if he were going at this, rather than suggesting that the owner be removed to an ADU in the back, he would suggest that the owner have the prominent apartment or condominium in the front.

Mr. Keller said to get at the density issue Ms. More was talking about, about 40 years ago, a historic residence on the corner of Grady Avenue and 14th Street had a large apartment complex added to it in a very appropriate manner in terms of scale. He said although it was much larger, it did not dwarf the stucco historic building on the corner. He said realistically, what they might be talking about, given the square footage of a number of the houses, would be a large addition that would provide those opportunities.

Mr. Keller said he knew staff was trying to float ideas and examples, but that he would encourage them to think more broadly and realistically about those. He said overall, he believed it was an excellent avenue they were going down.

Mr. Bailey said he has personally seen this type of thing happen in Detroit where, as opposed to tearing down large homes, those homes were converted to bring people back to Downtown Detroit. He said he knew Crozet was different, but one thing that struck him with this was, as Mr. Keller aptly said, the matter of balancing the protection of the downtown neighborhood and keeping people on their land with bringing more people in. He said he believed the overlay was a great move in the right direction, and applauded the efforts and progress made by staff.

Mr. Clayborne said while he has heard about the ideas cities like Minneapolis and Richmond have put out, he believed the scale of those cities are so different that he wondered if it was a fair comparison. He said he was curious how, with this type of plan, the economic development vision played into it. He said he didn't see Crozet as a spot where people are working a lot. He said they are probably working in Charlottesville and Waynesboro and residing in Crozet. He asked how this line of thinking would shape the conversation.

Ms. Falkenstein replied that the Downtown Crozet project and the Barnes Lumber redevelopment (Crozet Square) are moving forward, and the County has a public-private partnership with the developer of the property. She said she didn't know exactly what uses will end up there, but that

there will be some commercial and office components of that use that will hopefully provide some employment in the downtown area. She said this will hopefully drive some development in the downtown area and adjacent neighborhoods, resulting in more interest in these neighborhoods and new residential development. She said the overlay will hopefully help to preserve the housing while allowing for additional development.

Ms. More said while Mr. Clayborne was right, the hope was that with the development of the former Barnes Lumber property, there will be businesses in other centers that would prefer to be downtown. She said there is one business under the library who is growing and want to get out. She said they walk to work and live in Crozet, and they would like to employ more people. She also mentioned Perrone Robotics. She said she agreed that largely, people are having to leave the community for work. She said there are some people who work from home in Crozet and are interested to getting into spaces, however. She echoed Ms. Falkenstein's comment that the hope is that downtown will provide more opportunities where people can stay in Crozet instead of leaving for work.

Mr. Carrazana said his comment was along the same lines. He said from a UVA perspective, there are UVA jobs that will likely never come back on-premises. He said multiple people who live in Crozet and the County will continue to work from home, and that this will probably last beyond the COVID-19 pandemic. He said this is being seen in cities all over the country.

Mr. Carrazana asked how they can add this perspective. He said Crozet, in particular, is very well-situated to change dramatically. He said this could be good or bad, and that transportation is key in terms of how the infrastructure is layered and making sure there are "gates" so that when they are developing certain areas to a certain level, they have those infrastructure "gates". He said this means that once they achieve those infrastructure improvements, they can then move onto the next level of development, adding this is always challenging.

Mr. Carrazana recalled that Mr. Clayborne brought up the economic development piece, noting that with more people staying home throughout the day, more opportunities will be created within neighborhoods that at one point may have been considered "bedroom neighborhoods." He said they could be revitalized and thought of as real small towns that are growing.

Mr. Rapp said there had been a lot of good feedback on the idea of an overlay and that the Planning staff came up with a creative solution as a way to address preserving the neighborhoods as well as providing additional housing opportunities and achieving more density. He said as was pointed out, he believed this does warrant additional consideration, and that this was just the beginning of this idea.

Mr. Rapp said without the tools in place to ensure that the potential renovations for these properties are done in the correct way, there is a risk. He said in terms of historic preservation, they must ensure the renovation is done in a way that honors the historic integrity of the structures and adds to the neighborhood versus detracting from it.

Mr. Rapp said there would be much more discussion, but that the overlay was a step in the right direction. He said there are many other tools that need to be in place before the doors are opened to development. He said this has been done well in cities, and that there are also cities that have done this in a way that detracted from its neighborhoods. He said before this overlay is implemented, especially County-wide, they need to know exactly how to ensure that the modifications to the structures do them justice and achieves the intent.

Mr. Bivins said while the Jouett District may not be Downtown Scottsville or Downtown Crozet, it does likely have one of the highest inventories of workforce housing, whether it is in some of the pieces between Georgetown Road and Route 29, or between Hydraulic Road to Barracks Road. He said there is a swath of land with lovely homes, but some [inaudible] value. He said his fear is that those houses there will be taken down and refitted in various ways so that people can easily have access to the places where the jobs are.

Mr. Bivins said one thing that they haven't talked about is that Crozet is not the same place that the housing that they are trying to preserve will be an impetus for those housing types. He said many of the houses on Route 240, St. George, and Hill Top came up because of the kind of industry that was there at the time, such as ConAgra, Acme File, and a number of other close new businesses that required people who could work with their hands. He said he wanted to be very careful not to make any kind of disparaging mark on the wine industry, but there were working farms that had cattle, chickens, and other kinds of animals that went to market, and orchards that had to be managed [inaudible].

Mr. Bivins said there has been an interesting metamorphosis on what drives the economy of Crozet as well as the Greater Albemarle area. He said his concern is that they are focusing on a type of housing stock that doesn't have the jobs available for the people to go to within a reasonable travel distance. He said this has been a concern of his for a number of years as far as where the jobs are that will allow for an economically diverse community.

Mr. Bivins said more and more, as Mr. Carrazana mentioned, as people stay home and as everyone gets deliveries from UPS, the question is to what this will do for Downtown Crozet and for the kinds of small boutique places that might allow for people to have a reasonably priced basement apartment.

Mr. Bivins asked what the nexus is between the housing industry and economic development. He said while this was not the Commission's concern, although he did appreciate it, he hoped it would be a conversation the Planning Commission would have with the EDA at some point to have a better understanding of what it is they are trying to move forward and what the target industries are. He said it would be interesting to see what happens in San Francisco, for example, now that everyone can work from home. He asked how they will work through this so that the desire for housing matches up with the economic opportunities available.

Mr. Bivins asked a hypothetical question to Mr. Knuppel. He said to suppose he had a large sum of money and wanted to buy the Great Value lot. He said to suppose he wanted to put up something with density. He said the Smoked building has four stories, and asked if the English Meadow has six stories.

Mr. Knuppel said the Great Value Crozet Shopping Center property is currently designated as the Downtown Crozet District, and so the overlay would not apply to it. He said the property permits a density of 6-36 units per acre. He said the current zoning ordinance does require ground floor active uses. He said it might be up to six stories with a special use permit. He said some form of that could potentially be with some special use permits or special exceptions, but it would not be under the category being discussed that evening.

Mr. Bivins said his point was that there is one piece they are trying to preserve, and that they are dealing with a community that has to be a place with an integration between what they were as a

mid-1900s town that grew up in an exciting place and what they are becoming now, where there may be a whole migration to work from home, and what this means.

Mr. Bivins said this means that perhaps they do away with stub-outs so that people can move between various cul-de-sacs that exist in Crozet. He said this will allow one to ride their bicycle or walk from Clover Lawn over to the library without having to get ticks because they had to walk through the woods as opposed to along a path.

Mr. Bivins said while they are talking what they want and the various opportunities, he hoped they were talking about a community that is connected to itself as opposed to being dispersed.

Mr. Bivins said although he was in favor of what was proposed, he was concerned they would see in Crozet the same types of pressures they were seeing in the Jack Jouett District and in Scottsville. He said they may be seeing in Downtown Crozet that the housing stock intensity is very close to people's jobs, wherever they are working currently.

Mr. Randolph said he appreciated Mr. Bivins' comments and agreed with him wholeheartedly, but wanted to point out that COVID-19 has reminded everyone of the class differences between those who can stay home and work and those who are essential workers who make the economy actually operate during the pandemic.

Mr. Randolph said he believed that the Commission has to be mindful of the potential unintended consequences and the moral hazard of creating new categories that may have, within them, the means through which the community becomes more segregated and less interactive, as Mr. Bivins pointed out. He said if they establish housing types where ownership is by one individual who can control who else lives in the building, then there are biases that have become prevalent in society that can be applied and reduce the kind of socioeconomic and racial diversity that was discussed.

Mr. Randolph said as Mr. Rapp posited as being three values, he would submit there is a fourth the Commission needs to be mindful of, in terms of the fact that there are now two national crises: a pandemic; and some final recognition (by some) of the absolutely deteriorating, deleterious effects of racism for hundreds of years and that is still operates this way today. He said they must be careful here in looking at what is being proposed to ensure that it will create a good, caring, diverse, and open community. He said they don't want to see a situation where, in fact, the old values can come in and be applied indirectly when establishing mechanisms that are intended to be for the better.

Mr. Bivins asked staff if they needed anything else from the Commission before closing comments were made.

Ms. Falkenstein replied no. She said staff had their direction and feedback and that they would be back to the Commission next time with a land use map.

Ms. More said she appreciated the comments from both Mr. Randolph and Mr. Bivins. She said these were important, and segued into a two-part point that she wanted to add to the conversation. She said generally speaking, Crozet as it currently exists has a reputation that is quite different from Old Crozet. She said she did not want to offend the New Crozet citizens, but wanted to be very clear, as they touched upon in the overlay discussion, that this was workforce housing and there was nothing pretentious about it.

Ms. More said she was deeply concerned that in the initial engagement and Master Plan reviews, some people may not have felt that they were welcome to be part of that discussion. She said she worried that this may still be happening.

Ms. More said what everyone was trying to be aware of was creating protections around the neighborhoods and trying to do the work to create the things that [inaudible]. She said from the historical perspective of Master Plan engagement, often times the County does miss the opportunity to engage some of the most important places and voices in the community that comes from the heart of Old Crozet. She said this is important to everyone in Crozet.

Ms. More said before transitioning to comments about the current Master Plan review, she wanted to remind everyone that for those individuals who did feel invited to the table or were called upon to participate in the original Master Plan review, the County had consultants who evaluated Crozet's growth, and they came up with a number that they said was the ideal population, which was 12,198. She said as the story goes, the community who engaged in that process at the time understood that this ideal population would happen for the area. She said what happened was that number was hugely inflated and was since brought down, but the process unfortunately resulted in a violation of trust for some residents who have been around since that process.

Ms. More said the County may not get those people back at the table because of that. She said there are new people who are excited to get involve, which was great, and there are others who are the "usual suspects" that show up at all the meetings. She said there was a scientific survey that was sent to the community, and there are data sets of results. She said during a time like this, she would hope that the County might look at some of that data.

Ms. More said it was not as specific as what they would need to have for some of the discussions, but within one of the data sets was 84% of 701 responses to the scientific survey stating that in terms of [inaudible] new residential development, it was either somewhat or very important to them. She said because there was an older population number that people remembered that was much more reasonable for the area, in some people's minds, and because of infrastructure pressures and projects that were on lists for a long time, this could explain why the community might be responding that way.

Ms. More said that to the point of the type of housing and cost that is being built in Crozet, when the pandemic first started happening, people who have lived there [inaudible] want to see the prices on these units. She said the units are selling and people moving in. She said she wasn't doing Master Planning on the original plan, and didn't know if people imagine that these were the kinds of things that were going to be built. She said especially in Old Trail, there is some flexibility because of the way they are zoned where they are building expensive single-family detached, and there is some shock in older parts of Crozet that came out of the development that was directed at the area.

Ms. More said overall, this is a new meeting situation for everyone, and that Master Plan review involves online comments where staff is working hard to have their educational piece and ask the community questions. She said the numbers looked somewhat better than she thought they were. She said she wanted everyone to be sensitive as to how they can make the situation good for the community, and this also meant the community being sensitive to staff that they are trying their best to engage in a meaningful way.

Ms. More said her initial thoughts had been that they were going to receive a lot of feedback and that CAC meetings will be well-attended because members just have to log on at home. She said she did not give enough thought to how much pressure and stress the pandemic situation has created for different people. She said there is a long list of things, but people have kids at home and are trying to work with them at school. She said they are on the computer all day at work, and perhaps this wasn't how they worked previously.

Ms. More said unfortunately, particularly with CAC members and meetings (noting she has been long involved with this group in different capacities), the CAC almost didn't establish a quorum in July. She said they didn't even have people informing the chair that they would be out of town. She said she believed people "checked out," and on the list of things in life that are important, with the pandemic presenting different challenges, showing up to the meeting (even during a time when all hands on deck are needed), other life priorities took precedent over that.

Ms. More said everyone would need to be patient, and that staff was trying hard. She said it was a unique time, and there will be demographic groups that won't be able to engage in that participation as easily. She said these include older folks in the community who don't do things online. She said it also includes a variety of people in the community who will have challenges with that.

Ms. More said she appreciated the creative ways in which staff is trying to engage and readjust as they go. She said she has been somewhat shocked at the lack of participation, though she did think about it a lot and was trying to be sensitive as to why this is happening. She said this was not just about the Crozet Master Plan, but was true for all community engagement. She said it is a tough time and realistically, things will probably [inaudible] for Crozet. She said despite staff's creativity, some people from the public will respond better in person. She said she appreciated the efforts from everyone to make the best out of this.

Mr. Bivins asked Mr. Rapp if he wanted to talk about his ideas around community engagement, as many Commissioners were grappling with these issues in their own districts.

Mr. Rapp replied that as Ms. More stated, this has been an interesting and challenging time. He said with this particular plan in Crozet, it was somewhat unfortunate that half of it was started one way, and they had to transition halfway through to another way. He said things would have certainly be easier starting out with a new plan and outlining a public engagement process if they knew it was all going to be virtual or with a distance approach.

Mr. Rapp said staff has had to be adaptive with the Master Plan, and it has been a learning process. He said they have tried approaches such as putting small bits of information going out to the community with simple questions, recognizing that people may not have the ability to pay attention to something significantly long with having work challenges and kids at home. He said the idea was to put things out in bite-sized pieces, then put all the information together. He said staff has been using different types of online questionnaires and will continue to do so.

Mr. Rapp said the American Planning Association and other organizations are continuing to offer guidance for localities that staff will continue to pay attention to. He said they are also looking at how other localities are doing their Comprehensive Plans, noting that the City was just laying out their approach to community engagement. He said they will continue to try to follow all the different avenues.

Mr. Rapp said it is a new process and will be a learning experience as they go, but staff was open to continuing to try different approaches however they can so that the community can understand what is happening. He said this is something staff needs the community's help with as well as far as different avenues to reach people, different groups to speak with, and different structures.

Mr. Rapp said they continue to reach out to local organizations who may want to partner with the County. He said for the Master Plan, the Crozet Trails Crew is one group staff has been reaching out to. He said staff is continuing to reach out to build new relationships and a larger network to help get the word out. He said they appreciate the community's help and understanding as they try to adjust their way of doing business and learn new techniques.

Ms. More said she could help staff with this. She said the Crozet Community Association (different from the CAC) has pushed out a lot of content online, including the list of the things the County is working on.

Ms. More asked about Attachment 5, noting that on top of that, there was another summary of the proposed changes, and the land use map wasn't included. She said she would very much like to have that, unless it was something that was a working document. She said it would correlate to the numbers and would offer an explanation. She asked if this were something staff was willing to share with the Commission, as it would help her understand it better for future discussion.

Mr. Knuppel replied that the map in Attachment 5 of the packet and the companion table had a brief description of each land use change for the July Crozet CAC meeting, where they talked about some of the site-specific land use changes and started the conversation about the potential for the Middle Density category. He said staff would look to provide the Commission with this at the next meeting.

Mr. Knuppel said they planned to come back to the Commission in October, after they have had a chance to go back out to the CAC and determine where they could potentially apply the Middle Density category. He said they would give the Commission feedback and some updated guidance for the Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay. He said in October, they would likely have an updated version of the map that would include the Middle Density categories and spots they will look at with the CAC, as well as a change list from the 2010 Master Plan to identify where revisions have been made. He said they did not include the map that month as they were focusing on the abstract, high-level discussion about if this was the right category. He said next month, it would be included in the packet.

Committee Reports

Ms. Firehock said the [inaudible] committee has not met since she last informed the Commission of their work, but that several members were working on criteria for including conservation value in the easements and using several different data sets to put together an overlay map. She said when they get easement applications when funding is restored, they will be able to figure out the biological value of those properties for their biodiversity goals. She said they were hypothetically looking at easements to see how they would have scored. She said she would have future reports on that at a later time.

Review of Board of Supervisors Meeting – August 19, 2020

Mr. Rapp said there were two projects that went before the Board: Scott's Ivy Exxon and the

Bamboo Grove projects. He said for both projects, the recommendations from the Planning Commission were approved and carried forward by the Board.

Old/New Business

Mr. Bivins mentioned the September 2020 calendar and that the Commission was getting a break.

Mr. Rapp said the month of October would be very full.

Mr. Bivins said the Commission was pleased to receive the work on the Crozet plan. He said their role is to be both loving and difficult, and that staff did good work on the plan. He said he wanted to personally thank staff on the Commission's behalf.

Adjournment

At 8:58 p.m., the Commission adjourned to September 15, 2020, Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting, 6:00 p.m. via electronic meeting.



Charles Rapp, Director of Planning

(Recorded and transcribed by Carolyn S. Shaffer, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)

Approved by Planning Commission
Date: 10/06/2020
Initials: CSS