



**COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE**  
**Department of Community Development**  
401 McIntire Road, North Wing  
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902-4596

Phone (434) 296-5832

Fax (434) 972-4126

February 26, 2014

Frank R. Stoner  
Milestone  
300 2<sup>nd</sup> Street NE  
Charlottesville, VA 22902

RE: ZMA201000018/Crozet Square and SP201400001/Barnes Lumber Redevelopment

Dear Frank:

Staff has reviewed your re-submittal for a rezoning from HI Heavy Industrial to DCD Downtown Crozet District and for a special use permit to allow up to 200 residential units of any authorized dwelling type in the DCD district under Section(s) 20B.2F 1, 2, 4, and 5 of zoning ordinance. We have several questions and comments, which are listed below:

**ZMA Comments:**

**Planning**

The following comments are provided by Claudette Grant:

- The subject proposed development is located on a large parcel of land in the Downtown Crozet area that is slated for redevelopment opportunities guided by the Crozet Master Plan (CMP). One of the primary recommendations for Downtown Crozet and in particular for this property in the CMP is that development includes a mixture of office, research and development (R&D), flex uses, retail, and service uses in redevelopment of the lumber yard property.

In review of the plan submitted, there is not a lot of information about the yellow area described as residential. It appears to be approximately half or 50% of the developable area of the subject property. The percentage of total land area in residential use per the CMP for downtown is intended to be a low to moderate density form, while the expectancy for the rest of the developable land area is for a significant portion of the development to provide employment, and other economic opportunities that are typically expected in a downtown area. Thus, per the CMP, residential and light industrial uses are secondary uses for this area. If the residential use is 50% or more of the proposed development this would reflect to some extent a lost opportunity for the non-residential mix of use recommended in the CMP for the downtown Crozet area.

Provide additional information that shows how this development will be a development with residential uses as secondary uses. For example, providing the percentage of land area or square feet for the various proposed uses within the development will help provide a comparison for primary and secondary uses. If the residential uses are the primary uses and not secondary, you need to explain and justify why you wish to make this development a primary residential use development, which is not the recommendation of the CMP for this property.

- The DCD provides for flexibility and variety of development for retail, service, and civic uses with light industrial and residential uses as secondary uses. The regulations for the DCD are intended to promote a development form and character that is different from typical suburban development allowed by conventional zoning. Because the DCD District in many ways determines the form and character of development, in this particular case, we feel a conceptual plan can be a bubble plan. In addition to showing where the various development uses will be located (as you have shown in the legend with various color descriptions) the bubble plan should show important elements of the project, such as the general location of Main Street, major road connections, and the public green/plaza. As described in the CMP, Main Street includes on-street parking, medians, bike lanes, sidewalks, etc. these are important elements that should also be noted on the plan (i.e. by showing the expected street cross section). The DCD regulation determines the form of development; therefore, showing details such as specific building locations, parking areas and travelways is a bit premature at this stage of the process and can be confusing since these details can change as you get into the site plan process. For example, identifying general areas for parking is good, but you do not need to show the specific parking lot with layout/design. As you can see by some of the staff comments in this letter, once these details are shown, staff reviews the plans accordingly. A good bubble plan can provide staff with enough general information about the proposed development without getting into a level of detail that may need to change later on.
- There are physical constraints regarding how this proposed development will tie in with the Square, in terms of road connections, parking and expectations for the connector road as shown on your plan. Per the comments from VDOT and Engineering (see page 4 and attachment of this letter for comments) provide additional clarification (narrative information) regarding how this proposed development will tie in with the Square and any additional information regarding your vision for this connection. See item 1 in the proffer section on pages 5 and 6 of this letter for a suggested use for the area near the square.
- Elaborate on what the difference is between the salmon colored mixed use and the purple colored mixed use shown on the conceptual plan. It would be helpful to have this information delineated/noted on the plan.
- The plan provided shows an adjacent area for development (CSX property) within this proposal that you do not own. It is not recommended that you show development on property you do not own. However, the CSX property is designated for industrial types of uses. Also, the recommendation for the CSX property is an important one in the CMP for the downtown area. As a result, the uses proposed for the CSX property should be included in other portions of your site, particularly for the areas adjacent to the CSX property. We suggest the CSX property either be removed from this plan or if you wish to show it, you can note

or delineate this area in a different way on the plan.

- There are concerns with the Main Street road layout as shown. It appears to have on-street parking and a round-about. The Crozet Master Plan (CMP) shows a street section for an Avenue, which includes on-street parking, a median strip, bike lane, sidewalk and a landscape strip. Will the main road shown on the plan be able to accommodate this? If yes, explain how this is planned.
- Will this development be phased? If yes, please describe the phase plan. For example, are there specific blocks or areas that will be developed first? We suggest you use a block approach. It will be easier to follow and easier to reference as you develop proffers. A block approach is helpful for distinction purposes.
- The concept for the community green is not clear. Is it public owned/dedicated, private, or a combination of both? Is the Downtown community green, the proposed plaza area? If yes, is this area intended for general public use or is it intended for use by private entities with restaurants, etc. It could also be an area that includes both types of users, but this is not clear. It seems the community green/plaza should be accessible to the community and not necessarily tied to a particular building or use. With block designations it is easier to reference and provide more possible flexible locations for a community green/plaza. Explain how the proposed plaza area will function as a public space with a road intersection going through the middle of it. It is difficult to visualize how this public space will work. What is the intent of the community green? And how will it function?
- Previous plans for this development showed green space in the non-residential areas. This revised plan shows pocket parks primarily in the residential areas. Pocket parks and/or green space can be located in the non-residential portions of the development as well. It is encouraged and recommended in the CMP.
- With regards to parking, you have discussed some of your concerns in previous communications regarding the financial difficulty in providing structured parking versus providing large amounts of surface parking, therefore, taking up space from potential development. Without knowing the specifics of the uses going into this development, it is somewhat difficult to determine how much parking will actually be needed. In trying to understand your concerns, are you trying to provide parking for a specific potential user? A variety of approaches could be considered: As in Stonefield, there is a larger schemed plan that is approved (i.e. future structured parking), but for a variety of reasons, the developer is not ready to develop to this form, so they are developing based on the current market (surface parking), and hopefully will be able to revisit the large plan when the timing is appropriate. Per the DCD, the details for the number of required parking spaces could come later in the process, unless there is a specific end result you wish to achieve now rather than later. Another approach could be similar to Stonefield in that you make a big picture plan and provide flexibility that allows you to build for the current market and increase what you provide when the appropriate density allows it.

Section 20B.4 of the Zoning Ordinance provides some options regarding required parking. Although there are a minimum number of parking spaces required, there is no maximum amount of required parking spaces. In developing this property we suggest you always keep the intent of the DCD in mind. Perhaps you have to initially develop for the current market (surface parking) and phase

(structured parking) for the future, goals that are currently hard to reach, but could be easier as the market improves. This is a small downtown, surrounded by a fair amount of existing residential neighborhoods. The CMP envisions residents walking, and biking to the downtown as well. Providing multi-modal opportunities is also encouraged.

### **Zoning**

The following comments related to zoning matters are provided by Francis MacCall:

- If the C & O Railway property owners have not signed on to the application before re-submittal then the next plan that comes in must remove all reference to those properties being shown with a proposed use plus the proposed road improvements will need to be moved from the C & O Railway property as well.
- The application plan needs to have the Residential, Commercial/Retail, and Mixed Use, areas on the plan given numbered blocks. These numbered blocks will help with the establishment of the residential uses proposed by Special Use Permit and the timing to establish the desired mixture of development.
- The plaza area only shows up on the concept plan for the SP, so it will need to be also shown on the ZMA application plan if it is to remain.

### **Engineering and Water Resources**

See the attachment for comments related to engineering and water resources, which have been provided by Glenn Brooks:

### **VDOT**

The following comments related to transportation issues are provided by Troy Austin. These comments are for the ZMA and SP:

- A full scale drawing would be helpful for review.
- The connection to The Square does not meet the minimum radius requirements.
- The parking shown near the intersections appears to create obstacles to the sight lines at the intersection.
- The sewer line will need to be located outside of the paved surface.
- The plan view does not accurately represent the typical sections provided.
- The roundabout needs to be designed with proper splitter islands. The alignment of the private streets off of the roundabout may not work as shown.
- Access Management Spacing regulations need to be considered. The private streets to the east of the roundabout appear to be too close to each other.
- There is a portion of the roundabout and roadway that appears to be located on property owned by the railroad.
- The traffic study for this development needs to be completed and submitted for review.

### **Entrance Corridor**

The following comments related to the Entrance Corridor Guidelines have been provided by Margaret Maliszewski:

- It is anticipated that the development will be inward oriented. Nevertheless, the elevations of buildings visible from the Three Notch'd Road and Crozet Avenue Entrance Corridors should not have a "back of building" appearance. The ARB

will expect fully designed elevations with careful attention to materials, colors, details, proportions and the relative scale of buildings to each other.

- Standard Entrance Corridor landscaping will be required and will be reviewed with the site plan. A landscape strip will be needed along the railroad side of the development, free of utilities and easements. Allow for utility-free planting area along all streets, parking areas, cul-de-sacs, hammerheads, etc.
- Note that the Crozet Historic District was listed in the Virginia Landmarks Register on 9/20/2012 and in the National Register of Historic Places on 11/28/2012.

### **ASCA/RWSA**

Comments have not been received yet. Once the comments have been completed and sent, staff will send them to you.

### **Fire/Rescue**

The following comments related to Fire/Rescue have been provided by Robbie Gilmer: There are no objections to the rezoning of this property. The following is a list of things to keep in mind as the project moves forward. These comments apply to both the ZMA and SP:

1. Construction documents shall be submitted to the fire department for review and approval prior to construction. VSFPC 501.3
2. Where required, Fire Apparatus access roads shall be provided and maintained in accordance with sections VSFPC 503.1.1- 503.1.3 and VSFPC Appendix D
3. Specifications - Fire apparatus roads shall be installed and arranged in accordance with sections VSFPC 503.2.1 – 503.2.8
4. Markings – Where required by the fire code official, approved signs or other approved notices or markings shall conform to VSFPC 503.3, VSFPC D103.6 – D103.6.2 and Albemarle County Code section 6-204
5. Obstructions to fire apparatus access roads shall conform to VSFPC 503.4
6. Required gates or barricades for fire apparatus access roads shall conform to VSFPC 503.5 – 503.6
7. Key Boxes required on all commercial buildings per VSFPC 506.1
8. Fire Protection water supply requirements shall conform to VSFPC 507 and VSFPC Appendix C
9. Fire Flow requirements shall conform to VSFPC Appendix B
10. Fire Department Connections shall conform to VSFPC 912 and Albemarle County requires that the connection be within 50 ft of a hydrant.

### **Housing**

Comments have not been received because proffers are not specific to housing/affordable housing. Once you have addressed these issues more specifically, comments will be provided to you.

### **Proffers**

The following comments related to the proffers are provided by Claudette Grant:

1. In regards to the public space/plaza, what happens if the intersection location

does not work? Consider providing flexibility in proffer 2 to locate the public space/plaza elsewhere on the property. One suggestion to consider is reserving some area near the Square that could be an extension of the Square for the public space. Per the VDOT comments, transitioning this proposed development with the Square could be difficult. Setting aside area in this location for the public space may be a good idea, given the potential problems. Additional questions regarding Proffer 2 include: Is the intent of Proffer 2 to incorporate the public and private spaces for outdoor restaurant seating? What happens if the plaza costs more than \$200,000? Consider proffering \$200,000 plus the value of the land? Will there be additional public parking for this public space? If yes, will there be some level of commitment to provide this? In general this proffer should provide the information needed to develop this space as you envision it, but also needs to provide a level of flexibility in case something needs to change. This could help so that you do not need to come back and amend the proffer later.

2. The 15% allotted for affordable housing should be based on all the housing provided in the development, not just the housing provided in the special use permit. If you see this differently you should explain this.
3. How many residential units are proposed for this development? The section on conditions states that you will construct no more than 100 residential units in the areas shown in yellow designated for residential use on the Conceptual Plan, but you also state in the project proposal that you are requesting approval to build up to 200 residential units without by right commercial uses on the first floor. You go on to explain that these will be constructed in the transitional areas shown in yellow on the attached land use plan. It is unclear where the different types of residential units will be located on the property. For example, it appears single family units will be allowed per the special use permit request, but not in the yellow or light violet areas, yet the single family units could be a transitional use in the yellow area. Also unclear is where the multifamily/apartments will be located on the property. There are areas in the narratives that appear contradictory with proffers and conditions.
4. The Plan should be proffered to provide commitments to major elements within this development.
5. The County has a cash proffer policy that addresses impacts to the County's capital improvements pertaining to roads, public safety, libraries, schools and parks that would be impacted by the rezoning. All rezoning requests which intensify development of a property are reviewed for impacts to the public infrastructure. The County policy also requires that the owner of property that is rezoned for residential uses to provide cash proffers equivalent to the proportional value of the public facilities deemed necessary to serve the proposed development on the property. The Board will accept cash proffers for rezoning request that permit residential uses in accordance with the cash proffer policy. The Board may also accept cash, land or in-kind improvements in accordance with County and State law to address the impacts of the rezoning. You have indicated that you are not offering cash proffers for various reasons. The impacts of this proposal are considered.
6. The proffers will need to be written in standard proffer language and in the appropriate proffer format.

The following comment related to the proffers and zoning concerns have been provided by Francis MacCall:

1. The road construction proffer should include some standard language regarding the completion of the road being required before the first CO of a new residential or commercial building is issued.

## **SP**

### **Planning**

The following comments are provided by Claudette Grant:

- As already mentioned, the number of residential units is unclear. The ZMA says not more than 100 units. The SP says up to 200 residential units. Which is it?
- While I understand your SP request for residential, it is important that you work to provide strong commercial/employment uses that focus on the recommendations described in the CMP. Without focus on the non-residential uses, I am concerned that we may get another primarily residential development plus a road connection. This is not the intent of the CMP for this area.
- The submittal does not appear to specifically address Section 20B.8 Residential uses allowed by special use permit: Additional factors when considering special use permits of the Zoning Ordinance. Please describe how this SP request addresses the four criteria listed in Section 20B.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- We suggest you look at your needs and the big picture for this development to make sure you are considering appropriate uses that will work in this development.

### **Zoning**

The following comments related to zoning matters are provided by Francis MacCall:

- If the public plaza is to remain then the Board of Supervisors will need to grant a modification to the maximum setbacks for any building within each block of the four corners of the intersection that includes the plaza (Another reason to number blocks on the plan). A supplement page to the application plan that provides more detail to the plaza and building locations will be needed to evaluate the modification request.
- Each of the proposed SP conditions for the residential uses should reference "residential units" and not just "units".
- In the proposed condition #3 the agreement to construct "residential units" does not say in what area these units will front on Library Ave. The following provides direction that will help with tracking conditions like the proposed Condition #3: The application plan needs to have the Residential, Commercial/Retail, and Mixed Use, areas on the plan given numbered blocks. These numbered blocks will help with the establishment of the residential uses proposed by Special Use Permit and the timing to establish the desired mixture of development.

### **Engineering and Water Resources**

The following comments related to engineering and water resources are provided by Glenn Brooks:

- Engineering comments will depend on the traffic study. That appears to be the only significant factor in changing uses to residential, other than changing the downtown district character.

### **Entrance Corridor**

The following comments related to the Entrance Corridor Guidelines have been provided by Margaret Maliszewski:

- The addition of residential uses is not expected to have any additional negative impact on the EC.

**Action after Receipt of Comment Letter**

After you have read this letter, please take one of the actions below:

- (1) Resubmit in response to review comments on a Resubmittal Monday --  
Schedule can be found at this address:  
[http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/forms\\_center/departments/Community\\_Development/forms/schedules/Special Use Permit & Zoning Map Amendment Schedule.pdf](http://www.albemarle.org/upload/images/forms_center/departments/Community_Development/forms/schedules/Special_Use_Permit_&_Zoning_Map_Amendmen_t_Schedule.pdf)
- (2) Request indefinite deferral
- (3) Request that a Planning Commission public hearing date be set
- (4) Withdraw your application

If you choose to resubmit, please use the form provided with this letter.

Please feel free to contact me if you wish to meet or need additional information. My email address is [cgrant@albemarle.org](mailto:cgrant@albemarle.org)

Sincerely,



Claudette Grant  
Senior Planner, Community Development

Enc: Engineering Comments  
Resubmittal Form





County of Albemarle  
Department of Community Development

---

Memorandum

**To:** Claudette Grant, Senior Planner  
**From:** Glenn Brooks, County Engineer  
**Date:** 18 Jan 2011  
Revision 1: 10 Mar 2011  
Rev.2: 10 June 2011  
Rev.3: 3 Apr 2012  
Rev.4: 22 Jan 2014  
**Subject:** Crozet Square (ZMA201000018)

---

*revision 4;*

The revised application plan has been reviewed. The following comments are offered for planning use;

1. The traffic issues are still unresolved, as noted in previous revisions. Without these issues resolved, and the accompanying off-site impacts and mitigation, no road layout can be recommended for approval.
2. A stream assessment has not been performed, as noted in revisions 2 and 1. Without this, the buffer must continue further west, as noted in revision 1 comment 10. The layout in the southeast corner of the site cannot be recommended for approval.
3. It does not appear that adequate planning for stormwater management has been done. More room may be needed even to meet current regulations. See revision 1 comment 3.
4. The plan needs to specify which roads are public.
5. The hard right turns for the roads serving the southern blocks, and The Square, do not meet geometric road requirements. These will not be acceptable.
6. T-turnarounds are not recommended. They end up as parking spaces for nearby units.
7. The 5-road intersection roundabout will require splitter islands and tighter dimensions on the southern side to maintain flow and lane widths.
8. It is not clear how the road sections apply when no median is shown on the layout.

*revision 3;*

This revision consisted only of a letter proposing changes to the rezoning and traffic study. The original traffic study reviewed by VDOT has not incorporated prior comments from VDOT. It is not considered an acceptable study until the VDOT comments are satisfactorily addressed. When those comments are resolved, this proposed letter amending the study and rezoning should address the following points;

- a. The study should be amended and the full study and results provided for VDOT and County review. This letter only included a brief table of results. It is not clear what road connections or other assumptions were used for the partially built phases.
- b. The phases referenced to be developed need to be defined in terms of development areas and blocks on the application plan.
- c. The phases referenced to be developed need to be defined in relation to street and intersection improvements.
- d. The phasing and plans need to be proffered in some manner that is easily enforceable. Using traffic trip data and future studies is not practical. The phases need to be defined in terms of square footage, certificates of occupancy, and areas on the plan.

- e. Physical improvements need to be in place to mitigate impacts from the development before it occurs. The letter proposes a scheme whereby improvements are built only after development and studies prove the impacts are already there.

*revision 2;*

The revised conceptual plan has been reviewed. As I understand it, only the conceptual plan counts. The sheet titled "application plan" is not actually an application plan, but only an exhibit provided for informational purposes, and irrelevant to zoning enforcement. As such, it has not been reviewed.

The conceptual plan itself appears acceptable, with a few minor concerns;

1. It is not clear the right-of-way would be acceptable with the corner of the railroad property as shown.
2. The islands in the right-in-right-out entrances are not recommended. Only a median really works to limit these movements.
3. Roadway parking on the inside of the curve may be a problem.

We await further information before finalizing review. Specifically, the traffic study and possible mitigating improvements are pending. Also, I have requested a professional assessment of the intermittent stream on the south side of the property to ascertain the extent of the Water Protection Ordinance stream buffer.

*revision 1;*

The new concept plan for Crozet Square has been reviewed. This plan is much more detailed than the last concept plan, but I am concerned that we have not yet seen a proffered plan. The substantial time and effort spent on possible concepts may be time wasted, if none of it is proffered, whenever we finally receive the real application. Furthermore, it may be misleading to the public and to elected officials, if the plans they are shown are not to be implemented. So, as with the last submittal, a complete review is not possible until an actual application plan (not just a concept) is provided with the application.

1. The geometry of Main Street is much improved with this revision, but the number of entrances may be a difficulty with the VDOT standards, as was indicated by VDOT in preliminary meetings.
2. The road connecting Main Street to The Square should be a public road, as it will connect two public roads.
3. Rather than the complex notes on sheet 3, it would be more clear to provide a proffer to address stormwater management. It appears the intent is to provide stormwater quality treatment above the ordinance requirements, specifically to a 35-50% removal rate on-site. The re-use of water on-site, green roofs, and pervious pavers are also measures beyond ordinance requirements that could be proffered, but some quantitative commitment is needed. I think the applicant will find these measures over-ambitious during final construction plans, so specifying areas or having a proffered plan is essential. Stormwater detention and the pro-rated fee to Lickinghole Basin are required by ordinance, and should not be confused with commitments with the rezoning.
4. ~~This concept revision incorporates the railroad property in the development. It would appear that an~~

interim plan is needed, should the railroad property not be acquired. It is not clear how the circulation will function without this property, and they are not on the application as I understand it.

5. The circulation loop between buildings 13 to 15 utilizes the public road at one end. This needs to be revised. Plans should not include public roads in site parking circulation.
6. The drop-offs on the roadways should maintain minimum radii (12.5') so exiting and entering vehicles can stay within their lane.
7. It is noted that although the typical street sections show planting strips and street trees, most of the plan does not allow for them, instead placing sidewalks flush with the parking lane, or removing sidewalks to run closer to the property lines. Typical sections should be typical.
8. Should the property be subdivided in the future for buildings, or building and parking parcels, it will be difficult to establish which travelways are private streets for purposes of the subdivision ordinance, and how standards apply. It would be helpful to plan for any subdivisions or phasing with the rezoning.
9. The plan should clarify what parts of main-street have already been constructed, and where the applicant's improvements begin. This is also true to The Square.
10. Upon field inspection, it is evident that the stream and buffer actually continue further west. While stormwater management is allowed within the buffer according to the conditions of 17-320B, this plan appears to replace the stream and buffer with a developed landscape. The intent of the ordinance is that these facilities can enhance or help in the preservation of the stream, typically being placed at the edges of the buffer. In the words of the ordinance, "The facilities are designed and constructed so as to minimize impacts to the functional value of the stream buffer and to protect water quality." This also holds true for the walking paths and footbridges. The buildings and parking within the stream buffer which extends further west will need to be moved, or an exception granted according to Water Protection Ordinance section 17-308.
11. The traffic study is still outstanding. Impacts to the surrounding road network and possible mitigation improvements are critical. Issues that have been raised in preliminary meetings are the proximity of signals at The Square and Meeting Street not meeting VDOT standards, and the amount of traffic to assume from future connections to the east.
12. There is currently an unpermitted stockpile on the site without any erosion control measures. From the topography, this appears to have happened in the past also. This current stockpile needs to be removed, or stabilized and permanently seeded.

*Original comments of 18 Jan 2011;*

The concept plan for Crozet Square has been reviewed. This is the only document received with the rezoning, so a complete review must wait until more comprehensive documentation is provided with the application. For purposes of discussion, I have provided below a layout of the plan on county mapping (*omitted with revision 1*).

1. The Main Street extension should avoid the hard left and rotation around the green space before

continuing through to Hilltop Street. It is recommended that a design more closely adhering to the Crozet Master Plan be used, which calls for bike lanes, pedestrian crossings and sidewalks, street trees, a possible median, fewer access points to parking areas, etc.

2. The documents should clarify which roads are to be public roads.
3. The documents should provide preliminary sizing for stormwater management, and/or indicate what other measures will be used within the development.
4. A traffic study meeting the VDOT 527 guidelines appears to be required. A scoping meeting should be scheduled.

# Resubmittal of information for Special Use Permit or Zoning Map Amendment



PROJECT NUMBER: ZMA 2010 00018 PROJECT NAME: Crozet Square  
SP 201400001 Barnes Lubber Redevelopment

Resubmittal Fee is Required       Per Request       Resubmittal Fee is Not Required

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Community Development Project Coordinator      Name of Applicant      Phone Number

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature      Date      Signature      Date

## FEES

<b>Resubmittal fees for Special Use Permit -- original Special Use Permit fee of \$1,000</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$500
<b>Resubmittal fees for original Special Use Permit fee of \$2,000</b>	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,000
<b>Resubmittal fees for original Zoning Map Amendment fee of \$2,500</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,250
<b>Resubmittal fees for original Zoning Map Amendment fee of \$3,500</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,750
<input type="checkbox"/> Deferral of scheduled public hearing at applicant's request – Add'l notice fees will be required	\$180

To be paid after staff review for public notice:

Most applications for Special Use Permits and Zoning Map Amendment require at least one public hearing by the Planning Commission and one public hearing by the Board of Supervisors. Virginia State Code requires that notice for public hearings be made by publishing a legal advertisement in the newspaper and by mailing letters to adjacent property owners. Therefore, at least two fees for public notice are required before a Zoning Map Amendment may be heard by the Board of Supervisors. The total fee for public notice will be provided to the applicant after the final cost is determined and must be paid before the application is heard by a public body.

**MAKE CHECKS TO COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE/PAYMENT AT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COUNTER**

➤ Preparing and mailing or delivering up to fifty (50) notices	\$200 + actual cost of first-class postage
➤ Preparing and mailing or delivering each notice after fifty (50)	\$1.00 for each additional notice + actual cost of first-class postage
➤ Legal advertisement (published twice in the newspaper for each public hearing)	Actual cost (minimum of \$280 for total of 4 publications)