

**Crozet Community Advisory Committee – Minutes – Draft  
Wednesday, March 16, 2016 from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.  
The Meadows, Crozet, Virginia**

**CCAC members present:** Dave Stoner (Acting Chair), Phil Best, John Savage, Lisa Marshall, Brenda Plantz, George Barlow, Beth Bassett, Leslie Burns, Kim Guenther, Jon McKeon, Alice Lucan, Susan Munson, Ann Mallek (Board of Supervisors), Jennie More (Planning Commission)

**CCAC members absent:** Kim Connolly, Mary Gallo

**Public attendees:** Paul Grady, Ann Dessertine, Brian Day, Robin Luecke, Mike Vonn, Mike Marshall, Tom Loach, Keith Lancaster, Charlie Armstrong, Maynard K. Davis, Valerie Long, Ashley Davies, Keith Zackrisson, Bevin Boisvert, James Thacker, Bernice Thacker

**Chair Dave Stoner called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.**

**1. Agenda Review** (Dave Stoner – CCAC chair): Dave Stoner summarized the agenda. Jennie More asked that a discussion regarding whether it is appropriate to support development at a higher density in one area if a lower density is used elsewhere. This topic would be discussed at the end of the meeting.

Jeff Stone, manager of direct sales at Starr Hill Brewery, spoke with the CCAC about an upcoming event at the brewery. He said that Starr Hill was founded in 1999 on Main Street in Charlottesville, and moved to Crozet in 2006. Their whole operation takes place here in the community, and they see many visitors. Starr Hill is now the 135<sup>th</sup> largest craft brewer in the United States. Because they have many ties to the music industry through their ownership group, they have been planning a musical festival for beer styles, focused on India pale ales (IPAs). IPAs are a big part of their business and comprise 65% of the craft beer community. So they have zoning clearance for the first year, with the festival to be held June 25, from 12:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the back of the hangar park parking lot across the street from the tap room. They expect between 1,500 and 2,000 people, and will be selling only Starr Hill beers but will have sample beers from other breweries. There will be several different musical groups all day. If you have any questions, please contact Jeff at [jeff@starrhill.com](mailto:jeff@starrhill.com) or call the brewery at 823-5671. Mr. Stone said that the County and ABC are supportive, and the Albemarle County Police and Fire and Rescue are on board with the festival. Parking will be handled by an expert parking contractor. This Saturday Starr Hill will host a St. Patrick's Day festival, to include pipes and drums and the UVA Irish dance team. The event will also feature Ken Farmer (an Antiques Road Show appraiser and County resident), who will play Irish and mountain drinking music. There will be a chef throw down as well, with several chefs competing, and featuring Rock Barn pork and a vegetarian option. They will also be releasing a foreign export stout that day. Tickets are \$17.00.

**2. Approval of Minutes from the February 17, 2016 meeting:** Subject to any corrections communicated to the secretary within the one week from today, John Savage moved to approve the February 17, 2016 minutes, seconded by Beth Bassett, and the February 17, 2016 minutes were approved by vote of the CCAC.

**3. Public Meeting/Project Update – West Glenn Project and Powells Creek Stream Crossing SUP (Keith Lancaster and Charlie Armstrong, Southern Development):** Mr. Lancaster and Mr. Armstrong gave the CCAC an update from their presentation on the West Glenn project at the December meeting. The owner, West Glenn LLC, has done more surveying and engineering work and they wanted to report on their findings. In January they applied for a special use permit (SUP) for the project. Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Lancaster reminded the CCAC that the Cling Lane neighborhood had originally been given a restricted SUP for 30 units because of the single entrance to Cling Lane across Powell’s Creek, using a double 12’ x 8’ box culvert. The number of homes in the neighborhood must be restricted until a second connection to Orchard Drive is made, and this SUP application proposes the second point of crossing, which would allow adding 18.13 acres to the development. The land is zoned R-6, which would allow up to 108 units; they are now projecting 75 units. They have had to shift some of the features and lot lines because of stream side buffers. The SUP application is for the stream crossing only. There is an existing dam on the creek (used in years past for mixing chemicals for local orchards) that creates a small (approximately 40’ x 40’) pond with about four feet of elevation change. The Clean Water Act requires mitigation for the impacts caused by the bridge construction and so the developer proposes to do so by removing the dam and restoring the creek, which would allow the creek to revert to its natural state. The new proposed bridge would be located in a pinch point in the flood plain and would be a double 12’ x 8’ box culvert like the existing bridge. The bridge would provide a minimum of about one foot of freeboard at the crossing, so that the 100 year floodplain will not overtop the road. They removed the area of floodplain to determine density, which came out to 81 units. The development will include open space.

In designing the location of the new entrance into Orchard Drive, they moved the entrance so that headlights will not shine into the house that is opposite the entrance. The location is currently flagged. The developer is proposing pedestrian trail easement access from the property to Jarmans Gap Road. The Piedmont Housing Alliance (PHA) owns the adjoining parcel, which is being divided and this access would go across one of those parcels. A question was raised about the road connection back over to Cling Lane and whether there could be two accesses there, but there is an existing house lot that makes the development property too narrow at this point to do a second access to Cling. The cul de sac will be lost, but this is because projects are designed for connectivity, and it was noted that cul de sacs are shown as potential streets into neighboring parcels. They would prefer to have two functional entrances, but it could be possible to get a waiver from VDOT that would allow one entrance to be used only for fire and rescue access for emergencies. It was noted that the new homes will cause 500 to 750 car passes per day being added. The development currently has 31 townhouses and 44 single family homes, but this is only a conceptual plan for the crossing and could change because the property has not yet been subdivided. Several Cling Lane residents expressed surprise that there were homes proposed between their lots and the creek because they had thought that the southern lines of their properties were in the floodplain. Some had been told that the land could never be built upon. One resident noted that Powell’s Creek feeds into Lickinghole Creek, where the water quality is only fair, and the proposed development will adversely affect water quality. Mr. Armstrong noted that the stormwater rules are now much more stringent than they were when the original development was put in.

West Glenn owns to the creek on its side of crossing, and PHA owns to creek on its side. Paul Grady suggested a retaining wall (rather than a steep slope) near the crossing, and Mike Marshall asked about the County engineer's report on crossing plan. It was noted that there is some discrepancy between the County GIS system and the flood plain map, and they will research this and confirm which is correct. They do not see any significant design issues. Rachel Falkenstein, the County planner for the project, will send information to Dave Stoner, and Ann Mallek said that she would be watching for the correct GIS definition of critical slopes, and will ask that it be field checked. It will probably be necessary to update FEMA's flood map when this is confirmed. Leslie asked about stream restoration, and Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Lancaster said that they will reforest part of the stream pursuant to a mitigation plan, and the flood plain will be open space and wooded. They said that they will only take down trees for utility corridors. They were asked what happens if they do not get the SUP, and they responded that this would send them back to the drawing board because of the limitation on development using the first crossing. It was also noted that it is very steep coming off of Orchard Lane at the new proposed entrance. The entrance could be softened and reduce the pitch, but doing so makes it wider, and more trees would have to be removed to do it. They could reforest, but that takes some time. Mr. Armstrong said that they could build a retaining wall to lessen the disturbed area, but in his experience most people don't like those as much. From the creek to the road surface is about 10 feet and there was some discussion of how high above the creek the houses will be. County Natural Resources Manager David Hannah has looked at the mitigation proposal, but not the subdivision plan. It was noted that most of the road is on another party's land (PHA, which has the same goals) and they need this cooperation to make it work. The other developer gets more floodplain area to boost its density for an apartment development.

Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Lancaster have received staff comments and hope to turn around the plan by first of month. They can defer going to the Planning Commission if they haven't responded to staff comments. If they are able to address the comments, it will nonetheless take about a month to get to the PC. The County will notify all adjoining (i.e. the parcels must touch) landowners of the PC meeting. The PC makes its recommendation to the Board of Supervisors and then there is another month of turnaround. The site plan process would probably start in the summer, likely resulting in some tweaking of house and street locations, and so it would likely be late summer to fall before they submit the application for subdivision. Tom Loach suggested inviting PHA to the next meeting to see what their plans are for their part of the property in question. Mr. Armstrong said that they would get engineer comments and send these out. It was noted by a neighbor that the loss of trees will make the neighborhood hotter in the summer. Ann Mallek noted that the idea of the growth area is to consolidate services and deliver them, and also said that there have been problems in the past about tree areas and utilities and so the developer needs to protect the forest as best it can. They said that there is an existing sewer line crossing the creek and they hope to use that as much as possible for other utilities. Water lines will be located in the road, and the dry utilities will run along road, so they hope not to have any utility cuts. It was noted that the Albemarle County Service Authority has cut a large number of trees in a nearby pipeline easement, but this action was unrelated to this project. Mike Marshall noted that these will be 75 units in walking distance to downtown, and said that dense development closer to downtown is consistent with the Master Plan.

**4. Public Meeting – Foothills Crossing Project ZMA (Valerie Long and Ashley Davies, Williams Mullen, Scott Collins, Engineer):** Ms. Long and Ms. Davies (an attorney and a planner, respectively) gave a presentation of the proposed Foothills Crossing rezoning. Riverbend Management (the developer of Foothills) is the contract purchaser of the property, which will be an extension of the Foothills subdivision. Rather than develop the land by-right, they hope to rezone a portion of it from R-1 to R-6, and will continue to help with road connections. Alan Taylor, a principal of Riverbend, could not be here tonight. Ms. Long noted that the zoning of this particular tract is a patchwork and the zoning lines do not always match the lot lines. One point of this property touches a point of Crozet Park, and the tract is the last piece to establish a connection between these neighborhoods. The land includes part of the proposed Route 240/250 connector, and Park Ridge Drive becomes the connector to downtown Crozet.

The reason for the rezoning is that some parts of the overall project are by-right development in the R-1 zone, and another part of the property is zoned R-6. They want to bring 38 acres into R-6. The property is comprised of five parcels and the majority of the property is neighborhood density, 3-6 units per acre, and some is urban, at 6-12 units per acre. The proposal is to rezone to R-6, and they will use the Eastern Avenue connector as the break point for the zoning, with R-1 on the west side, R-6 on the east. Essentially the zoning had not caught up with the Master Plan and this change will make the land comply with the Master Plan. All the R-1 land to the east of the connector is not compliant.

Ms. Long and Ms. Davies said that the project will include a central meeting space for the Foothills neighborhood. Questions were raised about a plan for the connector and how all the connections will work. Ms. Long said that there is still one owner near Lickinghole Creek who is not on board yet for a road, and there are some pieces that the County will have to pick up. The southern portion of the connector is a high priority (3<sup>rd</sup>) for the County but is not yet funded. However, as projects develop, the connector project will become a higher priority. The northern portion of the connector will cross a property being remediated for pollution problems (former Acme Visible Records site), and will also have to cross the railroad. A comment was made that although there is ongoing building, and we have conceptual plan, we continue to kick this issue down the road. We are building in the interior, but have no plan for the exterior. It was noted that this project will provide more exits for Westlake and other neighborhoods and will disperse traffic in Crozet. The R-6 maximum will be around 210 houses. Why not phase this project with infrastructure? Here a private developer is building a lot of the infrastructure for the area, by constructing this portion of the connector road. It was noted that Foothills Crossing was developed by right and was intended to be part of the road network, and the developer has volunteered to provide infrastructure by building part of the public road. Tom Loach said that infrastructure should be tied to development so that existing infrastructure is not overwhelmed.

Should the developer be required to build Park Ridge Drive to downtown? Ms. Davies and Ms. Long said that development will move into this R-6 area from the west and the east, and this process will create the connection. Plats are at the County now to do the R-1 development to the west of this property. This rezoning includes a small parcel near Route 240, demonstrating the need to piece together these parcels with different zonings. The zoning area lines are skewed and create challenges when they start putting in roads and lots. For instance a 3.24 acre portion

of a Light Industrial tract along Route 240 is cut off by a stream from the rest of the LI land along Route 240, making it undevelopable in its current configuration. So that piece of “landlocked” LI land is included in this rezoning too and will be incorporated into the development (although it is mostly stream buffer). There is also a small piece of R-2 land being rezoned to R-6. Because this is a rezoning, Board of Supervisors approval is needed. They expect to have staff comments on April 1, and can either resubmit or go to the Planning Commission. The PC has a hearing and then makes a recommendation to the BOS. Phil Best suggested that the Eastern Avenue bridge over the creek include a culvert for the trail so that the trail does not have to be rerouted up to the street and back down. If developed by right, the R-1 land could have 35 units and in R-6 the maximum would be 210 units. It was noted that the Beam Company owns the Acme site and should be ready to sell the land by the end of 2016. The Riverbend parcel is planned to have a public space in the interior for people to meet (the Master Plan requires a civic space). At this point, they are not sure of the form of the space, but it could simply be green space for the community, or a pavilion or playground. There will not be a swimming pool because the Crozet pool is nearby and these are a burden for homeowner associations. Most homes will be single family detached, but a small section will be villas (single family attached), similar to the cottages at Old Trail. There is a draft proffer statement which they will send to Dave Stoner.

**5. Items not listed on the agenda:**

a. Tom Loach commented that the Crozet Master Plan update was to be done in 2015 and is now past due. Jennie and Ann noted that other County master plans are further behind in their initial development than Crozet and have been prioritized ahead of an update for Crozet. Realistically, the Crozet update likely will be in 2018 or 2019. Ann said that she would like to see more community reassessment before we go into a Master Plan update anyway, because such information would help inform the update and we would build from there. Tom recommended that the County perform a build-out analysis and see where we are in terms of the projected population of 12,198 at full build-out. What about infrastructure? Dave noted that more developers will be bringing in new projects, and there are older projects that could yet be constructed too, so we need to think about poising for the next Master Plan round. Tom said that the Crozet Community Association survey that Tim Tolson oversaw was very useful to him on the Planning Commission because he could point to it as where the community stood on many issues. Perhaps such a survey should be done again. Leslie agreed that such information would be important to have in hand and also said that we need a way to gather and curate information about the area in terms of its historic property uses. Such information could help us plan for land uses for the future and maintain the quality of life that brought people here.

Mike Marshall noted that the issue is always over the density of development, and that if we get above a certain density the culture of the place is lost. If we allow wrong density, then we lose what is great about Crozet. Lisa noted that R-6 zoning seems to be the fallback now for neighborhoods, rather than something less dense.

A concern was raised that the Planning Department staff may be advising Planning Commissioners that adding density in certain areas in reaction to unplanned lower density in others is an acceptable trade-off. Mike noted that there are now several developments moving

forward at maximum density. The CCAC wondered whether this was a position staff was taking for the Adelaide project or a strategy overall. Dave asked whether the CCAC wanted to give Ann its thoughts on the question. Should the CCAC reach out to other advisory councils on this and other matters? Tom recommended that the CCAC invite other Community Advisory Committee chairs to come to our meeting and talk about issues that affect all of us. It was noted that Emily Kilroy has scheduled meeting of CAC chairs next week, but the agenda was not yet known. Ann noted that Crozet is a bit of a drive for some of the other CACs and it may be better for Dave or other members of the CCAC to go to their meetings, but at a minimum the chairs should get together and start the discussion. It was noted that the transferable density issue has been around for some time and has benefited developers.

Lisa Marshall made a *motion*, seconded by John Savage, as follows: The Crozet Community Advisory Committee respectfully requests that Ann Mallek advise the Albemarle County Planning Department that the CCAC does not believe that density should be transferable in a manner inconsistent with the Master Plan, and that development by right in one area that is inconsistent with the Master Plan should not serve as a justification for more dense development in areas not designated for such use. The shifting of such density to a new development should not be seen as a positive factor in evaluating the new development. The CCAC approved the resolution unanimously.

**b.** The CCAC then discussed the impact of denser development on our infrastructure, particularly roads and schools, and that such dense development should not be proposed without clearly taking those issues into consideration. It was recommended that this issue be considered in light of Tom's recommendation that a build-out analysis be prepared. The analysis should look at development that has already occurred and projects that are approved but not yet built, and also quantify the status of affordable housing units in Crozet (defined as 80% of average median income, around \$200,000). Transportation needs are also tied to higher density development.

Phil Best made a *motion*, seconded by Beth Bassett, as follows: The Crozet Community Advisory Committee requests that the County Planning Department prepare a build-out analysis for the Crozet Master Plan area, which analysis will include housing stock in projects that currently exist and projects that have been approved but not yet begun. The analysis should also include an assessment of the status of affordable housing units in the Master Plan area, both existing and approved but not built. The CCAC approved the resolution unanimously.

**c.** Phil Best then commented that he felt that our schools are too large now, and the trend should be toward smaller schools. Brownsville Elementary, recently expanded, is now near capacity. It was recommended that the CCAC include our School Board representatives (David Oberg, White Hall District, and Jonno Alcaro, at-large, both of whom live in the area) in CCAC announcements and invite them to our meetings. Beth said that she can reach out to them. Given the nexus between schools and development, the CCAC believes that we should raise the awareness as to growth that is coming.

d. Following up on Gerald Gatobu's (County Transportation Planner) visit last month, and his request that we give him our priority road projects, the CCAC discussed transportation priorities on our area. Is this only the Lickinghole Creek bridge for the 240/250 connector? It was noted that at the moment it is not clear where the bridge would go. It was also noted that smaller projects have a better chance to be funded in certain categories in the new state process. It was further noted that our area is not as high a priority on the statewide list as other areas with greater needs, but ours is a busy place with lots of growth. Several Crozet projects in the County's transportation plan have been completed, but Eastern Avenue is still undone and should remain a priority. The Lickinghole Creek bridge and the railroad crossing are two significant unfunded components. Phil noted that Mr. Gatobu said that the state likes to see some investment in projects and a portion of Eastern Avenue has been built, and so there is some investment there.

Phil Best also thinks something needs to be done about Three Notch'd Road because it has no shoulders (but does have deep ditches along it) and sees considerable bicycle and foot traffic. He said that improvements should be made from the Acme site to Highlands. Kim Guenther noted that Route 250 at Harris Teeter is another key project area. Apparently a traffic circle has been mentioned for that location, but Ann noted that the traffic island and improved crossing are in the budget and she hopes that a more expensive option (like a traffic circle) will not prevent the planned improvements from being made. John Savage said that the Route 151/Route 250 intersection is another issue, and several ideas (including a traffic circle) have been floated for that one.

The CCAC decided to ask Dave Stoner to send a consensus email to Gerald Gatobu listing our priorities as Eastern Avenue, Route 240 improvements, and the Radford Lane/Harris Teeter crossing issues.

**6. CCAC 2016 officer nominations and elections (John Savage):** March is the end of the year for the CCAC and some members are term limited out, and others aren't renewing. If you are eligible, and want to renew, submit your application to the County soon. Elections for officers were then held and it was noted that all current members can vote. John Savage had served as the nominating committee and had received two nominations for a one year term: Dave Stoner as Chair, and Mary Gallo as Vice Chair. No nominations from the floor were received and Phil Best moved to close nominations. No secretary was nominated but Leslie Burns said that she would act as secretary for a couple of months until a permanent secretary comes forward. Dave and Mary were unanimously elected to the positions to which they were nominated.

**7. Announcements:** To be safe, Emily will provide public notice for the DCI meetings as CCAC meetings. Applications for open CCAC seats must be submitted by March 22 <https://www.albemarle.org/boards/>

**9. Future Agenda Items: None.**

The meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

George Barlow  
Secretary



## DENSITY OF DEVELOPMENT RESOLUTION

**WHEREAS**, development on certain properties in the Crozet Growth Area has proceeded on a “by-right” basis at a density less than that recommended by the Crozet Master Plan;

**WHEREAS**, the Crozet Community Advisory Committee (“CCAC”) is concerned that the Albemarle County Planning Department may recommend approval of proposed development projects at higher densities in areas proposed in the Master Plan for lower, or a range of densities, because of such prior by-right development; and

**WHEREAS**, the CCAC believes that the interests of the community are best served by continuing to adhere to the goals as set out in the 2010 Crozet Master Plan regardless of such prior by-right development, and accordingly it is hereby unanimously

**RESOLVED**, that the Crozet Community Advisory Committee respectfully requests that Ann Mallek advise the Albemarle County Planning Department that the CCAC does not believe that density should be “transferable” in a manner inconsistent with the Master Plan, and that development by-right in one area that is inconsistent with the Master Plan should not serve as a justification for more dense development in other areas. The shifting of such density to a new development should not be seen as a positive factor in evaluating the new development.

I, David Stoner, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true correct copy of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Crozet Community Advisory Committee at its regular monthly meeting held March 16, 2016 by a motion made by Lisa Marshall and seconded by John Savage. CCAC Members present: David Stoner, Acting Chair; George W. Barlow, III, Secretary; Beth Bassett; Phil Best; Leslie Burns; Kim Guenther; Alice Lucan; Alice Marshall; John McKeon; Susan Munson; and Brenda Plantz.



---

David Stoner, Acting Chair

## RESOLUTION REQUESTING BUILD-OUT ANALYSIS

**WHEREAS**, the Crozet Community Advisory Committee (“CCAC”) is concerned about the impact that existing and proposed development projects will have on the schools, roads and other infrastructure in the western portion of Albemarle County;

**WHEREAS**, the 2010 Master Plan projected population of 12,000 in Crozet in 2030;

**WHEREAS**, the CCAC desires to have an understanding of the current state of affordable housing in Crozet as more development projects are proposed; and

**WHEREAS**, the CCAC believes that it can better understand the impact of proposed development projects on Crozet and its citizens if the CCAC has a build-out analysis of existing and approved projects, and accordingly it is hereby unanimously

**RESOLVED**, that the Crozet Community Advisory Committee requests that the County Planning Department prepare a build-out analysis for the Crozet Master Plan area, which analysis will include housing stock in projects that currently exist and projects that have been approved but not yet begun. The analysis should also include an assessment of the status of affordable housing units in the Master Plan area, both existing and approved but not built. Finally, the analysis should compare current build-out and resulting population estimates against projections in the Crozet Master Plan.

I, David Stoner, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true correct copy of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Crozet Community Advisory Committee at its regular monthly meeting held March 16, 2016 by a motion made by Lisa Marshall and seconded by John Savage. CCAC Members present: David Stoner, Acting Chair; George W. Barlow, III, Secretary; Beth Bassett; Phil Best; Leslie Burns; Kim Guenther; Alice Lucan; Alice Marshall; John McKeon; Susan Munson; and Brenda Plantz.



---

David Stoner, Acting Chair