

Crozet Community Advisory Committee Minutes
Crozet Library
Wednesday, April 18, 2018 7:00 to 9:00 pm

Allie Pesch called the meeting to order at 7:05.

A quorum was established. Joe Fore agreed to take minutes in the absence of secretary Mike Kunkel.

CCAC Members Present: Allie Pesch, Shawn Bird, Tom Loach, Katya Spicuzza, Kostas Albertis, Kelly Templeman-Gobble, Valerie Long, Doug Bates, David Mitchell, Anne Mallek, Jennie More, Joe Fore, Brian Day, Josh Rector; CCAC Members Absent: Sandra Mears, Jon McKeon, Mike Kunkel.

County Representatives Present: Ann Mallek, Jennie More, Emily Kilroy, Rebecca Ragsdale

Community Members Present: Gabe Elias (Charlottesville-UVA-Albemarle Emergency Communications Center), Dave Stoner, Tess Ortega, Dan O'Neill, Dick Hoffheimer, Charlie Bindig (Old Trail HOA), Tim Tolson (CCA), Michael Marshall (Crozet Gazette)

April 2018 Agenda

1. Agenda Review (Allie Pesch – CCAC chair)
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Welcome New Members
4. Bucks Elbow Mnt Radio Tower replacement (Gabe Elias, Cville-UVA-Albemarle ECC – 30min)
5. WAHS Wireless Tower SUP update (5 min)
6. Discussion on Crozet Master Plan Update Statement to PC & BoS (All 60 min)
7. Items Not Listed on the Agenda
8. Announcements (none)
9. Potential Future Agenda Items
 - a. May – Western Park Master Plan Update (Bob Crickenberger, Albemarle County)
 - b. Jun - Crozet Drinking Water Infrastructure Plan Update (Mr. Mawyer ACSA/RWSA)
 - c. Summer - Albemarle County Stormwater Utility Plans (Greg Harper, Env. Services Chief)

Allie Pesch welcomed new members and began introductions of all members and citizens present.

Allie Pesch noted here were no minutes to approve.

Bucks Elbow Mountain Radio Tower Replacement

Rebecca Ragsdale and Gabe Elias presented on the proposal for replacing an ECC-owned tower on Bucks Elbow Mountain. Ms. Ragsdale explained that the proposal is processed as a public use, so no special use permits are required, but a set-back waiver (special exception) *is* required; that's why they are here to solicit public input. The original tower was approved in 2000, and later it went from 100 to 120 feet. Now, the proposal is to go to 150 feet. Because the lot is small, there is insufficient set-back; hence, the need for the set-back waiver.

Gabe Elias explained that this tower facilities 2-way radio systems used by emergency services, bus services, and other county services. The purpose of this proposal is to update and replace out-of-date equipment and improve reliability for the radio systems. In terms of a timeline, it will take approximately 120 days to build, with the goal of occupying the site by Fall/Winter 2018.

The current tower is a guyed tower, so a thin tower with guy wires. The new tower is a self-supporting lattice—three legs in a pyramid-type structure. At Crozet distances, the visual impact of both the existing tower and the replacement tower will be minimal.

What are the economics of the tower? Mr. Elias: The parcel and tower are owned by the county. Ownership was transferred to the ECC, which is governed by a Board of public safety chiefs from the three different jurisdictions (city, county, university). US Cellular is a tenant; the lease is with the county. ECC is not seeking co-locators; they've inherited U.S. Cellular.

Is the additional height necessary? Mr. Elias: Yes. Since they are going to build a new tower, as they need to do for safety and modernization reasons, they should plan ahead and add additional capacity by increasing the size of the tower. Gabe Elias showed a diagram of the property and the tower. There was a question about the material and color. Mr. Elias responded that it will likely be bare metal steel.

Will the ECC repair road damage? Mr. Elias: Yes. There is a temporary deed of easement; there are specific protections built in there to minimize damage and to repair damage.

Will the new tower require aviation lights? Mr. Elias: No.

Will the old tower remain? Mr. Elias: No. The old tower will be taken down once the current tenants are transferred over to the new tower.

Any information about electromagnetic radiation? Mr. Elias: We don't have specifics at this point, but all equipment will be operating within FCC guidelines. New radiation should be approximately equivalent to the old.

Are commercial tenants possible? Mr. Elias; Perhaps, but ECC is not looking to do that right now.

Tom Loach asked if there was potential to combine the consideration of this tower along with the WAHS tower? Could this tower accomplish some of the things that the WAHS tower was meant to accomplish? Ann Mallek replied that from the Board of Supervisor's perspective, it would be helpful to keep the consideration of these two towers separate, so as to not slow down the ECC project. The 800 MHz system has been discussed since 2009, so it's important to move this forward.

MOTION: Josh Rector moved to support approval of the project. David Mitchell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

WAHS Wireless Tower SUP Update

The applicant has deferred consideration of the tower. Last meeting, the CCAC approved a motion opposing the project. A resolution was prepared by former chair Dave Stoner but the CCAC has decided to hold the resolution until the applicant comes forward again. Jennie More indicated that—according to staff—the applicant is looking to get back before the Planning Commission in May or June. However, the applicant may need to make another public presentation if it makes significant changes to the plan.

Valerie Long mentioned that she serves as legal counsel to Shentel—one of the co-locators on the proposed tower. She will recuse herself from future votes, as necessary, but can serve as a resource to answer questions, given her long experience with cell towers.

Crozet Master Plan Update Statement to Planning Commission & Board of Supervisors

Allie Pesch introduced discussion of the draft resolution to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors that was proposed last meeting and that former chair Dave Stoner drafted. Allie Pesch emailed the draft before the meeting and distributed paper copies at the meeting.

Jennie More started the conversation by noting that there was an important logistical question about how to best present this to the Planning Commission. One goal is to give a presentation to the Planning Commission and, possibly, the Board of Supervisors, and then also give them the resolution as part of that. How can we accomplish the goal of getting this to matter to the Planning Commission and Board without triggering the process of being an Amendment to the Master Plan? Ann and Jennie will look in to the procedural question about how best to proceed by meeting with Elaine Echols before next CCAC meeting.

Tom Loach noted that one key goal is to reduce ambiguity in the Crozet Master Plan for staff. Jennie More noted that one key goal was to make sure that staff are going by the language in the CMP and not relying on its maps, which are outdated.

David Mitchell asked whether saying that we're not expanding the Growth Area conflicting with the need to increase density? Tom Loach responded that it wasn't a conflict. Jennie More noted that we're not trying to amend the Master Plan; we're just trying to reconcile potential differences between the language and the maps.

Valerie Long suggested that this resolution looks like an amendment to the comprehensive plan and that she was not comfortable with doing that without full community engagement. The survey was helpful, but she's not sure if we can use the survey to propose an amendment to the Master Plan. If we just want to encourage the county to do the Master Plan revision, then that's fine, but she reads this document as attempting to change the Master Plan.

Josh Rector echoed these comments and asked about the purpose of the document; do we really need it? Brian Day responded by suggesting that the purpose is to say, "the community has spoken" until the master plan gets updated. Josh Rector responded that he personally didn't even know the survey was taking place and questioned whether the survey could be relied upon to try to do master plan amendments.

Joe Fore noted that the document isn't just about reminding the Board what *shouldn't* be permitted from a zoning perspective; it's about reminding the county about things that were in the master plan that were promised that still haven't been funded or completed. And part of the goal is to remind the county about those unmet needs and to prioritize them. With regard to the wording of the resolution, he suggested specifically mentioning that the survey reached broad consensus on a few key points—the points that are the focus of the resolution.

Dave Stoner suggested that a key question for the Committee is whether this should be presented as a formal addendum to the master plan or as something else. Allie Pesch noted that that's what Jennie and Ann will be working on over the next month and will report with Elaine Echols' input on that. She mentioned that there's no need to pass the resolution tonight. She suggested that committee members look it over throughout the next month and then vote on it at the next meeting. She asked members to please look over the resolution and the master plan and let her know if they have additional thoughts.

Ann Mallek noted that this kind of input from the Committee is helpful for helping her convince colleagues on the Board of Supervisors about Crozet's needs.

Doug Bates suggested that because the survey is so crucial to multiple things the Committee is considering, it would be helpful to have Shawn Bird present on the survey. Shawn agreed to prepare another condensed survey presentation for the May CCAC meeting.

Brian Day noted that one of the key things that came up at last meeting was the suggestion for coordination of all of the advisory committees to discuss broader zoning concerns. Tom Loach suggested that the chairs should get together with the other CAC chairs and have a global agenda that affects all the of the CACs so that Crozet can get support from them and strengthen its position in advocating for common causes.

Items Not Listed on the Agenda

Joe Fore brought up two recent articles in *The Daily Progress* that discussed tax rates and school board funding. The School Board is asking for more funding, and, yet, the Board of Supervisors has deferred the tax rate increase due to increased property assessments. Ann Mallek explained that the School Board has deferred a lot of capital projects—focusing on the high schools rather than Crozet Elementary—and has been slow in providing information to the Board of Supervisors.

Tom Loach noted that representatives from the School Board have been invited a number of times to CCAC meetings, but they have not come.

Josh Rector responded that he was concerned that the School Board rep hasn't come to our meetings and has been slow to provide information to the Board of Supervisors.

Valerie Long suggested that we need a broader conversation about infrastructure and the need for it to keep up with our growth as it's occurring.

Ann Mallek mentioned it was important to remember that there are many people in our community for whom even \$100 in tax increases is a big deal.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:52.