

# Crozet Community Advisory Committee\*

Special Meeting  
Monday, November 30, 2020

## Meeting Minutes

**\*Note: This meeting was held pursuant to and in compliance with Ordinance No. 20-A (6); An Ordinance to Ensure the Continuity of Government During the Covid-19 Disaster.**

- Members present
  - Allie Pesch, Chair
  - Shawn Bird, Vice Chair
  - Joe Fore, Secretary
  - Doug Bates
  - John McKeon
  - Joshua Rector
  - Brian Day
  - David Mitchell
  - Ann Mallek
  - Mike Kunkel
  - Jennie More
  - Valerie Long
  - Tom Loach
  - Kostas Alibertis
  - Sandy Hausman
- Albemarle/Government Staff present
  - Andy Reitelbach
  - Vivian Groeschel
  - Rachel Falkenstein
  - Carolyn Shaffer, Clerk
- **The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm**
- The Chair introduced the participants.

- The Chair proposed a plan for getting through the agenda, beginning with a discussion and vote on the proposed Master Plan changes before moving to discussion of the resolutions on development and infrastructure.
- The Committee proceeded to discuss and vote on the specific land-use changes proposed by County staff. The proposals are numbered according to the Summary of Land Use Changes, as updated on September 18, 2020.
- **New Land Use Categories**
  - **Downtown Neighborhoods Overlay (#A1)**
    - The Committee discussed the staff’s proposal for the downtown neighborhood overlay. Members expressed several concerns with the overlay, particularly with the possibility that it did not provide sufficient protection for existing structures and, potentially, allowed existing homes to be torn down.
    - The Committee took two votes on the proposal:
      - First, the Committee voted on the overlay proposal, as written by County staff. **The Committee voted against proposed change A1 as written, with 3 in favor, and 7 against.**
      - Second, the Committee voted on two proposed changes to the overlay: 1) eliminating Pleasant Green, and 2) suggesting that staff modify the infill provisions to reduce or eliminate the possibility of developers tearing down existing structures to benefit from the enhanced density provisions, while allowing for infill development on land that had been vacant for longer periods. **Committee members voted on whether they would support the Downtown Neighborhood Overlay with these two changes; the proposal passed with unanimous support— all in favor, none against.**
  - **Urban Density Residential replaced by Middle Density Residential (A2)**
    - This change was intended to provided a transition between lower and higher densities and to encourage smaller-scale and more affordable housing types. Current Urban Density Residential in Crozet is 6-12 units/acre, while the Middle Density Residential is proposed for 6-24 units/acre.
    - **The Committee voted against proposed change A2, with 3 in favor, and 8 against.**

- **Light Industrial replaced by Office/R&D/Flex/Light Industrial on Three Notch'd Road (A3)**
  - **The Committee voted in favor of proposed change A3 unanimously, with all in favor and none against.**
- **Greenspace delineation**
  - **Separating greenspace and public park categories (G1)**
    - **The Committee voted in favor of proposed change G1 unanimously, with all in favor and none against.**
  - **Brownsville Rd./Crozet Ave/Route 250 (G2)**
    - This proposed change would change the area just to the northeast corner of Crozet Avenue and Route 250 from Greenspace and Neighborhood Density Residential to Neighborhood Density Residential-Low. Staff suggested that this change was intended to reflect existing conditions in the area.
    - Charles Diggans, a resident in the area, spoke against the proposed change, insisting that residents in the area bought their properties specifically because of its rural, undeveloped feel, and that the change could lead to increased development in the area. Several other committee members spoke against the change, suggesting that it would lead to too much development in the area and that it was incompatible with the desire to limit development along Route 250.
    - **The Committee voted against proposed change G2, with 2 in favor and 9 against.**
  - **Change to TMP-55-46B (G3)**
    - This proposed change would change the designation of a portion of a parcel on Mint Springs Road from Greenspace to Neighborhood Density Residential-Low. Several members spoke against the proposed change, suggesting that it encouraged development too far from downtown.
    - **The Committee voted against proposed change G3, with 3 in favor and 8 against.**
- **Mixed-Use/Center Designations**
  - **Downtown Crozet (M1)**
    - The proposed change alters the downtown Crozet area from a Downtown designation to Downtown + Town Center + Public Parks (the Plaza)

- **The Committee voted in favor of proposed change M1 unanimously, with all in favor and none against.**
- **Old Trail Village (M2)**
  - The proposed change would modify land-use categories in parts of Old Trail from Mixed Use to Community Mixed Use + Village Center. Some committee members expressed confusion about the proposal and whether it would allow for more commercial development in Old Trail. There was concern that this represented an expansion of commercial use in Old Trail. At least one Committee Member and community attendees expressed the sentiment that it was for residents of Old Trail, themselves, to decide on this issue.
  - **The Committee voted against proposed change M2, with 3 in favor, 7 against, and 1 abstention.**
- **Clover Lawn (M3)**
  - Proposal to change Clover Lawn from Mixed Use to Commercial Mixed Use + Village Center
  - **The Committee voted in favor of proposed change M3 unanimously, with all in favor and none against.**
- **Wickham Pond area (M4)**
  - The proposed change would change undeveloped parcels in the Wickham Pond and White Gate Farm from Urban Density Residential to Middle Density Residential and add a Neighborhood Center designation.
  - Several Committee members expressed concerns that this change would increase density too much in this area and that added commercial development from the Neighborhood Center designation could detract from Downtown Crozet's centrality as Crozet's commercial hub. Other members suggested that allowing for a pocket of commercial development in the area would decrease vehicle traffic and increase pedestrian traffic to businesses in the development.
  - **The Committee voted against proposed change M4, with 2 in favor, 8 against, and 1 abstention.**
- **West side of Carter St. (M5)**
  - The proposed change would change the land use designation from Mixed Use to Neighborhood Mixed Use
  - **The Committee voted in favor of proposed change M5 unanimously, with all in favor and none against.**

- **Individual Parcel Changes**
  - **White Gate Farm (P1)**
    - This proposed change would change the White Gate Farm property from Greenspace to Middle Density Residential Neighborhood Density Residential
    - Several committee members spoke against this proposed change, suggesting it increased density too much—especially when coupled with other large developments along Three Notch’d Road. One committee member favored the change, citing the parcel’s proximity to potential future employment centers in the new Light Industrial/Office/R&D space along Route 240.
    - **The Committee voted against proposed change P1, with 4 in favor, and 7 against.**
    - The Committee took another vote as to whether members would support changing the White Gate Farm property from Greenspace to Neighborhood Density Low. **The Committee voted in favor of that hypothetical proposed change, with 10 in favor, and 1 against.**
  - **Parcels east of Eastern Avenue, south of Westhall Drive (P2)**
    - The proposed change would remove the Urban Density Residential land use designation in this area
    - **The Committee voted in favor of proposed change P2, with 10 in favor and 1 against.**
  - **Parcel TMP 56-13 (P3)**
    - The change would adjust the Greenspace boundary on this parcel. Because this property is already in the process of seeking conservation easements, the Committee did not vote on this proposed change.
  
- **Resolution**
  - The Chair introduced a *Resolution Regarding the Outpacing of Crozet Population Growth Relative to Concurrent Infrastructure*, which:
    - Expressed the Committee’s sense that the County has not lived up to its obligation to “monitor [the] capacity of infrastructure to support new development” in Crozet, leading to inadequate infrastructure investment that has failed to keep pace with residential development.
    - Requested that the County, in reviewing pending and future rezoning requests, consider whether the request is congruous with the totality of the Master Plan—including not only the land-use

designations but also the status of infrastructure presently available to support the proposed development

- Requested that in consideration of new projects and rezoning applications, the lowest possible densities be preferred.

- Several members spoke in favor of the resolution as encouraging development decisions to be mindful of infrastructure developments.

Two members spoke against the resolution.

- **A vote was taken, and the resolution was adopted by a vote of 8 to 2.**

- **The meeting adjourned at 9:17 pm.**

- **Below is a list of the comments received in the virtual comment box during the meeting:**

**Jennie More :** Attendees can add comments in the chat

**Mike Higginbotham:** Is that the same as the White Gate project?

**Mike Higginbotham:** Yeah, that's the White Gate project. Heck no.

Infrastructure cannot support this type of density increase.

**Clover Carroll:** I am not in support of the change at Wickham Pond

**Lynda Harrill:** Where are all these kids going to go to school?

**Clover Carroll:** I do NOT support more population growth in Crozet, anywhere.

**Kyle:** How big is this area?

**Kyle:** Specifically the White Gate area being discussed.

**Lynda Harrill:** Crozet Elementary should not be expanded. Two more elementary schools are needed in Crozet.

**Lillian Mezey:** I oppose changing white gate farm area from green space to middle density.

**Clover Carroll:** Are there additional sidewalks and support for the LH Creek Bridge in this Master Plan update?

**Kyle:** I disagree with Joe. I think that's an assumption

**Jojo:** White Gate -- This is also loss of green space which can't be reclaimed

**Lynda Harrill:** How can anyone support additional density without a sensible school plan, more recreational amenities and roads?

**Lillian Mezey:** Agree with above comment: green space also cannot be reclaimed

**Lynda Harrill:** Brownsville has 868 students. The optimum size for an elementary school is 400 or less.

**Rory:** "Because the Development Areas covers only 5% of the total County land area, it is expected to have a density similar to the City. Wise use of the Development Areas necessitates building up to the boundary with the Rural Area."

**Kyle:** I am not in favor of the WG proposal.

**Lillian Mezey:** I STRONGLY oppose a change in P3. Lets not change anything that might change the landowners plan to move towards conservation easement

**Lynda Harrill:** This resolution is not the problem. The County increased the cost of living when they designated only 5% for growth.

**Clover Carroll:** Well said, Tom! our infrastructure already lags WAY behind our needs.

**Charles Diggans:** Regarding growth, may I offer Harris County Texas millage is 2.6 per 100. Albemarle County is currently .85. We should not be naïve about the unintended consequences of unsupported growth.

**Lynda Harrill:** Infrastructure isn't even close.

**lisagoehler:** Infrastructure gas ahead of development in other parts of the country . And there is a lot less conflict about it too.

**Clover Carroll:** I am in support of the resolution.

**lisagoehler:** I support the resolution.

**lisagoehler:** Development does not pay for itself. Only way to get infrastructure for more growth is raise taxes.

**Lynda Harrill:** I support the resolution.

**Clover Carroll:** Thank you, Anne! well said.

**Questions and Answers:**

Question	Asker Name
It seems like the CCAC's discussion on this is under-developed? What response do we have from those non-CCAC members? What exposure has the community at large had to these concepts. The public process is not adequately addressing the issues, which is apparent given by the CCAC's discussion.	cliffordfox
will the planners bring it back to this committee after the tweaks, but before final approval?	Clover Carroll

What information do CCAC members have from the community?	cliffordfox
I vote for no overlay, without or without PG, due to criteria not being strong/specific enough.-- Two residents	Anonymous Attendee
Can I ask Valerie or the County officials if this change will alter the build-out requirement for resident change-over for management iof the HOA. If the total potential build out is ever higher.... -- Old Trail resident	Anonymous Attendee
Yes thank you!	Anonymous Attendee
is another summitt allowed in what you are saying Valerie?	Lillian Mezey
We are concerned about that if this change to brown in Old Trail that this vision is for more density, and we are concerned about roads, traffic and schools	Jojo
Can you show maps	Heidi Carlstedt
How would they walk to work?!	Brad Diggans
How big is the White Gate property	Kyle
what is the P3 area zoned now (not what it's land use designation is )	Tim Tolson
resolutions were sent out to the CCA email list and are posted on the CCA website: <a href="https://crozetcommunity.org">https://crozetcommunity.org</a>	Tim Tolson
Thank you	Kyle