



Nelson County Joint Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors
Meeting Minutes
May 17th, 2023




Present: Board of Supervisors: Jesse Rutherford, Skip Barton, Tommy Harvey, and Ernie Reed -
Planning Commission: Vice Chair Robin Hauschner and Commissioners Chuck Amante, Phil Proulx and
Mike Harman

Staff Present: Amanda Spivey, Deputy Clerk - Candy McGarry, County Administrator - Dylan Bishop,
Director - Emily Hjulstrom, Planner/Secretary - Berkeley Group: Catherine Redfearn and Chris Musso

Call to Order: Mr. Rutherford and Mr. Hauschner called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM in the Old
Board of Supervisors Meeting Room, County Courthouse, Lovingston.

Ms. Redfearn explained that this would be the last time looking at specific chapters of the
Comprehensive Plan. She explained that the next time they meet they will be looking at the plan in its
entirety after it has been reviewed by VDOT and the public.

Ms. Redfearn presented the following information:



NELSON COUNTY, VA

Comprehensive Plan Update



Joint Worksession #4 | May 16, 2023




Meeting Objectives

1. Schedule & Progress Update
2. Chapter 5 Outstanding Comments
3. Chapter 3: Shaping Character & Development(Content Review)
4. Chapter 4: Connecting People & Places(Content Review)
5. Next Steps



Schedule & Progress Update

Project Schedule



Meetings & Events

- 4 Joint Worksessions**

 - October – Chapter 1 & 2

 - January – Natural & Cultural Resources;
Community Facilities

 - March – Housing; Economy

 - May – Transportation; Land Use

- County-Led Focus Groups**

 - (December, February, April)

- Final Review Worksession**

 - (Summer 2023)

- Review by VDOT**
(Summer 2023)

- Public Open House**
(Summer 2023)

- Joint Public Hearing &
Adoption** (Fall 2023)

She added that the results of the focus group in April are incorporated into the draft. She added that after this joint work session they will be incorporating additional comments into the final chapters and then compiling them into the plan.

Mr. Rutherford asked about timing for recommendations for zoning and subdivision ordinances. Ms. Redfearn noted that it would be about a month or two after the Comprehensive Plan is adopted. Mr. Reed asked when they will see a draft of the implementation matrix. Mr. Musso noted that they already have them except for chapters 3 and 4 which they will be reviewing at this meeting.

Ms. Redfearn presented the following:



Chapter 5 and 7 Policy Comments

- Ch.5 New Strategy:
 - “Pursue the creation of low-cost or sliding scale cost home maintenance services.”
- Ch.5, Strategy 2 clarification: “Consider allowing accessory dwelling units by right through zoning changes that can allow affordable rental options that benefit renters and homeowners.”
 - Policy for accessory dwelling units as rental options in the County; short-term and long-term?

Ms. Redfearn noted that there are two small outstanding issues from Chapter 5 - Housing.

New strategy:

Ms. Redfearn noted that they had a recommendation to add, “Pursue the creation of low-cost or sliding scale cost home maintenance services” as a strategy in Chapter 5. Mr. Hauschner questioned what

home maintenance services entail. Ms. Redfearn explained that this was in the context of home rehabilitation. Mr. Rutherford noted that it would likely be for the typical mechanicals of the home such as HVAC, plumbing, and electrical. Mr. Rutherford added that older housing stock is abundant so many (approximately 60% of housing inventory) would qualify for this. He explained that this might be too broad for a strategy. Ms. Redfearn recalled that at their last session, the group wanted spot blight and property maintenance strategies removed. Consensus was to not include this strategy in the plan.

Strategy 2 clarification:

Ms. Redfearn asked if this strategy should also apply to short-term rentals, long-term rentals, or both. Mr. Rutherford noted that accessory dwelling units (ADUs) are more often seen in urban and more populated areas. He added that they have a long-term rental aspect to them for the aging community and their use as mother-in-law suites, starter homes, etc. Ms. Proulx noted that they should restrict short-term rentals from ADUs. Ms. Redfearn confirmed that they are in agreement that ADUs should be for occupied or long-term rentals only.

Mr. Hauschner noted that current issues with short-term rentals are not just new structures being built but existing structures being taken away from a long-term market. He added that in order to cap the number of short-term rentals they should not allow short-term rentals for ADUs. Mr. Barton noted that they want to allow ADUs but do not want to encourage their short-term rental. Mr. Rutherford noted that allowing ADUs as short-term rentals could allow for existing housing stock to return to the long-term rental market. Mr. Hauschner noted that he does not see new construction as the issue. Ms. Bishop clarified that ADUs were not an addition on to an existing dwelling but a separate structure that would be accessory to the main dwelling. Mr. Hauschner asked if it would be an ADU if it was attached but with no internal access. Ms. Proulx noted that vacation homes being by right is an issue due to them not always being desirable.

Mr. Rutherford predicted that they would not see a lot of ADUs. He added that people with enough land were more likely to construct a separate dwelling that is not accessory. He added that they could allow ADUs if the main dwelling is a permanent residence. Ms. Proulx noted that she would be ok with that.

Ms. McGarry questioned whether they could remove “that can allow affordable rental options that benefit renters and homeowners.” from the strategy. Ms. Redfearn explained that what they’ve been discussing so far is a zoning issue but that in the context of the Comprehensive Plan they need to be more specific about what kind of rental this would be for.

Mr. Rutherford noted that they don’t want to limit the ability to build additional long-term rentals. He added that if you don’t have a permanent residence there and you build an ADU then it must be a long-term rental.

Mr. Harman recommended removing “by right” from strategy 2 to allow for more flexibility. Ms. Bishop recommended leaving “by right” but adding “with appropriate parameters” or similar. Mr. Rutherford noted that he was fine with the sentence as is as long as it contains “consider.” Mr. Rutherford noted that if they leave the word “consider” he is fine with the strategy as is. Mr. Reed added that if they want to remove “by right” then they should remove the strategy entirely. The consensus was to remove “by right” from strategy 2.

Chapter 3 - Shaping Character and Development

Ms. Redfearn presented the following:



Chapter 3 Shaping Character & Development

Chapter Goal

Nelson County will preserve and enhance its rural character and natural resources by creating opportunities for strategic growth to create a stronger, more vibrant, and prosperous community.

Ms. Redfearn explained that this is the land use chapter and is quite possibly the most important chapter in the plan.

Ms. McGarry recommended changing the wording of the goal to “strong, vibrant, and prosperous community.” Ms. Redfearn noted that they would make this change.

Ms. Redfearn explained that the land use and transportation chapters are unique from others due to having an existing conditions section as well as additional sections (future land use framework and transportation). She added that the focus areas for the land use chapter are to create a coordinated framework for growth and to protect the rural character and environment.

Ms. Redfearn presented the following:

Focus Areas

- 1. Create a Coordinated Framework for Growth**
 - a) Existing Land Use Tools & Development Patterns
 - b) Development Constraints
 - c) Land Use & Infrastructure
 - d) Regional Planning & Coordination
- 2. Protect Rural Character & the Environment**
 - a) Rural Character
 - b) Sustainable Design & Development

Mr. Amante noted that in the existing Comprehensive Plan there is a map of prime agricultural land. He asked if there was one included in the current plan. Mr. Musso noted that it is in the natural and cultural resources chapter.

Table 3.2 Development Assets & Constraints.



Table 3.2 Development Assets & Constraints

Place Name	Lovington	Nellysford	Colleen	Piney River	Gladstone	Schuyler	Shipman	Faber	Afton	Massies Mill	Montebello	Roseland	Arrington	Wingina	Tyro	Rockfish
Development Assets																
Water Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>									
Sewer Service	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>										
Potential for UDA Designation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>														
Primary Transportation Corridor Proximity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Community Center and/or School	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Fire / EMS Facility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Recreation Amenities and/or access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Existing Residential Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Existing Commercial Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Existing Industrial or Business Development	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>												
Development Constraints (See Diagram 3.1)*																
Steep Slopes	<input type="checkbox"/>								<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					<input type="checkbox"/>	
Floodplain		<input type="checkbox"/>						<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Limited or Untested Septic Suitability	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			<input type="checkbox"/>	
Protected Landscapes						<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Route 29, Corridor of Statewide Significance Asset in close proximity

Ms. Redfearn explained that this chart is looking at development assets that either catalyze development or encourage development as well as areas that they want to protect or have constraints to development. She added that the county has no incorporated towns but that there are places with unique identities. She asked if the areas shown (Lovingston, Nellysford, Colleen, Piney River, Gladstone, Schuyler, Shipman, Faber, Afton, Massie's Mill, Montebello, Roseland, Arrington, Wingina, Tyro, and Rockfish) do in fact have unique identities that they should consider in the future land use conversations. Mr. Rutherford stated that Schuyler deserves to be bumped up on the list because historically there have been businesses and industries and there is capacity for development with water and sewer, as well as proximity to a transportation network. Mr. Barton added that the same could be said for Gladstone. Mr. Rutherford pointed out that Schuyler's proximity to Routes 6 and 29 provides more opportunity for growth.

Ms. Proulx questioned if Afton's location on the map was representative of all of Afton and stated that it isn't inclusive of the school or community center. Ms. Redfearn stated that what they are asking is, what is the future potential of these areas and what do we want to happen in these areas? Mr. Barton asked what recreation is available in these areas. Ms. Redfearn pointed out the Blue Ridge Tunnel in Afton. Ms. Proulx pointed out the community center. Mr. Barton asked specifically about Faber, and Ms. Redfearn explained that there is a trail system. Mr. Musso added that you'd have a hard time finding an area in the county without recreation.

Mr. Hauschner noted that Colleen is the only one on the chart that doesn't have substantial residential development listed, he questioned whether they should include a goal to direct residential development to Colleen. Mr. Barton explained that it's almost impossible to be able to identify these areas. Ms. Redfearn explained that if this chart is not useful to the Comprehensive Plan they don't have to include it. She added that they do want to explore the Future Land Use map and the associated charts. Mr. Reed noted that they are trying to fit areas into boxes and that each place is unique and needs its own paragraph.

Ms. Redfearn presented the following:

Nelson County Comprehensive Plan Update

Draft Chapter 6: Protecting Natural & Cultural Resources

Conservation & Rural Areas

Conservation Areas & Natural Corridors	
Description	<i>Natural Corridors and Conservation Areas</i> are areas with significant environmental sensitivity and/or those areas that are currently protected from development through permanent conservation or recreation use. They are established to minimize detrimental impacts to the environment, maximize groundwater recharge capacity, and protect key natural resources. Examples include steep slopes, flood inundation zones, sensitive environmental corridors, and federal and state lands.
Core Concept	Protect natural areas to maximize environmental services, economic potential, and recreation opportunities for the community.
Primary Future Land Use Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation • Parks, recreation, and trails • Low-impact agriculture and other resource-based uses
Planning Guidelines	Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate cluster and/or conservation development principles in areas within or adjacent to this planning area to protect open space, productive land, views, and sensitive resources. • Improve and mitigate negative environmental impacts with conservation design, alternative wastewater systems, and low impact development for filtration or runoff protection. 	<i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i>

She explained that their intent is to have an associated description for each area and that they will need to have a conversation in order to draft those paragraphs.

Mr. Barton noted that they should move Arrington from Rural Destination to Rural Village due to its similarity to Shipman. Mr. Reed stated that you can't group these areas together in this way and that each needs its own description to show their true character. Ms. Redfearn explained that the intention is to have individual descriptions but clarified that Mr. Reed is saying this overarching framework does not work. Mr. Amante referenced that there is a paragraph to describe each land use category and that they need some type of grouping for the areas. Mr. Musso stated that they should try to think less about how they are grouped together now and more about what they want for these areas in the future.

Mr. Hauschner noted that he liked the chart and noted that they should have some sort of protected landscape in Shipman and Wingina. He asked about septic suitability for residential development in Colleen. Mr. Musso stated that Colleen is shown as having more availability for septic. Mr. Rutherford asked how many square miles of floodplain there are in the county. He explained that floodplain is a major inhibitor.

Ms. Redfearn presented the following for land use recommendations:



Create a Coordinated Framework for Growth

Existing Land Use Tools & Development Patterns

Existing Development Patterns

As a rural community, most of the land in Nelson County is being used for rural purposes such as agriculture, recreation, and preservation of open space. Development in the County is primarily concentrated along the Route 29 corridor and the northern portion of the County in and around Nellysford. Historically developed areas, such as Shipman and Schuyler, continue today as rural villages with clusters of denser housing. Existing development patterns form the backbone of the Future Land Use Framework and Development Assets are catalogued in Table 3.2.

Current Land Use Tools & Zoning Regulations

Nelson County's Zoning Ordinance and Map regulate new development in the County. Zoning controls the types of uses permitted on the land, the density of development, and requirements for minimum lot sizes, lot widths, and building setbacks, among other criteria.

The Zoning Ordinance includes districts designated for conservation, agricultural, residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Nelson County has nine primary zoning districts. The A-1 Agricultural District is the predominant zoning district, covering over X% of the county.

It is important to note that the zoning map and future land use map are not always the same. Future land use designations and maps in this Plan have no immediate effect on an individual parcel of land but are used to guide future zoning changes. Future zoning changes should conform with established future land use designations and maps. That said, the two maps must work in tandem. The Zoning Ordinance and Map should be reviewed to ensure compliance with the goals the Nelson 2042 Comprehensive Plan.

Table 3.1 Zoning Districts

Nelson County Zoning Districts			
C-1	Conservation District	B-1	Business District
A-1	Agricultural District	B-2	Business District
R-1	Residential District	SE-1	Service Enterprise District
R-2	Residential District	M-2	Industrial District
RPC	Residential Planned Community District		

Mr. Hauschner noted that there is an opportunity for alternative building styles for environmental protection in areas classified in the plan as unbuildable conservation areas. Mr. Rutherford noted that

building on steep slopes is costly and that building code would be a limiting factor. He added that they need to establish what the gradient of steep slopes should be. Ms. Redfearn noted that it is typically 15-25%. She added that they can still identify them as conservation areas but include alternative building methods in the planning guidelines. Mr. Rutherford noted that most of Wintergreen is a steep slope. Ms. Redfearn asked if Wintergreen is beholden to the Zoning Ordinance. Ms. Proulx explained that they have their own zone within the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Musso asked if floodplain areas should be further restricted. Mr. Rutherford noted that there are a lot of places where people shouldn't build as well as areas that are in the floodplain but have never flooded. Mr. Barton noted that the county experienced a serious flood in 1969 and there is still visible evidence from it. Mr. Rutherford noted that there is a mechanism for owners to show that their property is not in the floodplain and have the FEMA maps amended. Mr. Reed explained that they adopted a fairly strong floodplain ordinance so that landowners can get insurance. Ms. Bishop noted that the Farm Bureau Board is concerned about flooding, they are interested in increased setbacks from river banks and accountability for damage downstream from flood events. Mr. Rutherford noted that floodplain areas are great agricultural opportunities. Ms. Redfearn asked if they want to add a strategy for additional flood restrictions. Mr. Rutherford explained that the floodplain ordinance is already strict. The consensus was not to add a strategy.

Ms. Redfearn presented the land use framework:



HOW WE MOVE FORWARD

Nelson County is committed to a strategic framework for growth that prioritizes rural conservation and community character. The following Future Land Use Framework and strategies provide guidance for fostering sustainable development, economic growth, and enhanced quality of life in the County.

The guiding principles behind the Land Use Framework are to:

- Protect the County's rural character and sensitive natural and cultural resources.
- Provide a network of Corridors, Centers, and Villages to direct future investment and harness the economic potential of regional recreation, tourism, and industrial enterprises.
- Strategically accommodate growth around community centers and planned service extension areas to ensure efficient and sustainable development and the provision of a range of housing options.
- Encourage quality development and design that enhances quality of life and enjoyment for residents and visitors to the County.

Future Land Use Framework

Development Assets & Constraints

The *Future Land Use Framework* establishes the backbone for Nelson County's physical growth and development. It provides direction and guidance on ideal development, conservation, and land use locations and compatibility. This section describes the recommended development patterns for the County over the next twenty years. The framework is derived from a coordinated analysis of the land use implications of each of the Plan Elements included in this plan. The following chart (Table 3.2) summarizes the assets or constraints to development in each of the Future Land Use Elements identified in the Future Land Use Plan. The location of each Future Land Use Element on the Future Land Use Map (See Map 3.1) is informed by environmental features, existing development patterns, existing and planned community services, and transportation networks. This analysis is supported by the data, information, and policies included in each of the following Plan Chapters.

She explained that the intent is not that these are the only types of land uses that can exist in these areas but that they are the primary land uses.

DRAFT

Conservation & Rural Areas



Conservation & Rural Areas

Conservation Areas & Natural Corridors			
Description	<i>Natural Corridors and Conservation Areas</i> are areas with significant environmental sensitivity and/or those areas that are currently protected from development through permanent conservation or recreation use. They are established to minimize detrimental impacts to the environment, maximize groundwater recharge capacity, and protect key natural resources. Examples include steep slopes, flood inundation zones, sensitive environmental corridors, and federal and state lands.		
Core Concept	Protect natural areas to maximize environmental services, economic potential, and recreation opportunities for the community.		
Primary Future Land Use Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation • Parks, recreation, and trails • Low-impact agriculture and other resource-based uses 		
Planning Guidelines	<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate cluster and/or conservation development principles in areas within or adjacent to this planning area to protect open space, productive land, views, and sensitive resources. • Improve and mitigate negative environmental impacts with conservation design, alternative wastewater systems, and low impact development for filtration or runoff protection. </td> <td style="width: 50%; vertical-align: top;"> Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix) <i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i> </td> </tr> </table>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate cluster and/or conservation development principles in areas within or adjacent to this planning area to protect open space, productive land, views, and sensitive resources. • Improve and mitigate negative environmental impacts with conservation design, alternative wastewater systems, and low impact development for filtration or runoff protection. 	Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix) <i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate cluster and/or conservation development principles in areas within or adjacent to this planning area to protect open space, productive land, views, and sensitive resources. • Improve and mitigate negative environmental impacts with conservation design, alternative wastewater systems, and low impact development for filtration or runoff protection. 	Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix) <i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i>		



Nelson County Comprehensive Plan Update

Draft Chapter 6: Protecting Natural & Cultural Resources

Rural Areas	
Description	The aspect of Nelson County valued most by the people who live and visit here is its rural character. <i>Rural Areas</i> comprise the majority of the County, aiming to protect rural character by maintaining natural areas and agricultural uses while allowing low density residential development that fits into the landscape. <i>Rural Areas</i> typify the historic and natural landscape of Nelson County that includes prime agricultural areas, forested mountains, and rural homesteads. The area also currently includes some low-density single-family subdivisions. Alterations and retrofits to these developments to enhance resiliency and conform to current health, environmental, zoning and subdivision standards is appropriate and encouraged; however, expanded, or new subdivisions is not the primary intent of this planning area. Any new residential development must be carefully planned for, taking into account slope, soil, and septic suitability, watershed protection, resource impact, and other factors.
Core Concept	Ensure the protection of the County's rural landscape and economy by maintaining open space, scenic views and agricultural uses with compatible low density residential.
Primary Future Land Use Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farms, agriculture, forestry. • Agritourism uses • Institutional uses • Solar installations (contingent on-site conditions) • Single-family detached residential • Single-family attached residential • Manufactured homes • Accessory dwelling units • Parks, recreation, and trails
Planning Guidelines	Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate cluster and/or conservation development principles in areas within or adjacent to this planning area to protect open space, productive land, views, and sensitive resources. • Setback, screen, or locate development located along primary routes to minimize impact to views from these corridors. • Improve and mitigate negative environmental impacts with conservation design, alternative wastewater systems, and low impact development for filtration or runoff protection. • Buffer residences from more intense farming, forestry, or extraction-based uses. • Discourage development of prime agricultural soils. • Solar development should be sited to have minimal impact to scenic viewsheds and natural resources. 	<i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i>

Ms. Proulx asked what “low-impact agriculture” is. Ms. Redfearn explained that these would be agricultural uses that don’t require a large amount of tilling or high-impact to the landscape. Mr. Rutherford noted that they don’t have many farmers that till on a major scale anymore. He asked if livestock counts as low impact. Ms. Redfearn noted that it depends on the scale. Ms. Redfearn explained that they may not have high-impact agriculture now but the question is whether or not they want it in the future. Mr. Reed questioned if they should change the term to “small scale”? Mr. Rutherford noted that the term “low-impact” is appropriate. Ms. Redfearn explained that the conservation areas and natural corridors are not the prime agricultural areas. She added that a glossary will be included for terminology.

Mr. Rutherford noted that the state will be discussing solar and likely limiting local oversight. He asked how much more they will be discussing solar installations. Mr. Musso noted that it has been touched on in the Natural and Cultural Resources Chapter. Ms. Redfearn recalled that due to topography there really isn’t much capability for industrial scale. Mr. Barton asked what industrial scale is defined as. Mr. Musso noted that it would be anything over 5 MW/10 acres. Mr. Harman stated that the priority for solar should be on rooftops and not prime agricultural land. Mr. Barton added that there is a lot of interest in solar farms being placed within tree farms. Ms. Proulx noted that she read that solar projects can be placed on closed landfills. Mr. Rutherford noted that in the case of an industrial-scale farm it would need to be a Special Use Permit. Mr. Hauschner noted that he wants to tie in clean energy and

distribution with solar and EV stations next to development areas. Mr. Harman asked if a solar farm was a by right use. Ms. Bishop explained that solar farms under an acre are by right and over an acre is a Special Use Permit. Mr. Rutherford added that IRC code is soon to require 30 amps be installed in garages for EV charging. Ms. Redfearn noted that in chapter 6 there is a section on energy efficiency and renewable energy as well as a strategy to strengthen performance standards for ground-mounted solar energy systems. She added that there are complimentary strategies in chapter 3. Ms. McGarry asked what institutional uses were and Ms. Redfearn clarified that they are uses like community centers and schools.

Rural Destinations



Community Centers

Rural Destinations									
Area Name	Afton	Arrington	Massies Mill	Montebello	Roseland	Wingina	Tyro	Rockfish	
Description	Nelson County's <i>Rural Destinations</i> are places with distinct character and identity within the County's rural landscape. These places have specific place names and carry historic and cultural significance for the community but did not develop into larger villages. Today, these places are home to many of the cultural assets and recreation amenities that identify Nelson County. Because of the development constraints that limited and continue to limit development in these areas, focused development is not encouraged. Rather, investment should prioritize improving and expanding access to community centers and recreation assets that serve as the backbone for these Rural Destinations and help bolster economic growth throughout the County.								
Core Concept	Maintain the existing character of and enhance amenities within the County's Rural Destinations to create places with a distinct identity that draw recreation and economic investment and improve quality of life for residents.								
Primary Future Land Use Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single-family detached residential Single-family attached residential Accessory dwelling units Neighborhood commercial (Cafes, shops) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agritourism businesses Institutional uses Parks, recreation, and trails 						
Planning Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure materials, scale, and character of new buildings is compatible with existing structures in each Village. Enhance and protect cultural resources. Connect existing and establish new trails, bicycle routes, and other recreation amenities in and around Rural Destinations. Encourage shared open space or park space. Encourage infill development and retrofitting of existing buildings. Incorporate pedestrian connections and safety enhancements, such as stop bars and crosswalks. Encourage traffic calming, particularly along primary routes. Incorporate wayfinding and signage for Rural Destinations. 				Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix)				
					<i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i>				

Ms. Redfearn explained that this is the first land use category where specific areas are identified and will each have their own description. Mr. Reed noted that "Community Centers" is confusing, and that it could be changed to "Community Areas." Ms. McGarry stated that Arrington could go into Rural Villages. Ms. Proulx stated that the planning guidelines do not make sense for all of these areas such as pedestrian connections. Mr. Rutherford recommended adding the language "as applicable." Mr. Hauschner asked if they should add grocers to the list of land use types. Mr. Rutherford referenced in article about rural areas and the effect of Dollar General. He explained that the Dollar General in Piney

River had a huge impact. Ms. Redfearn noted that they could add “markets” to the list under “neighborhood commercial (cafes, shops).” Ms. Bishop noted that the Zoning Ordinance refers to them as neighborhood retail stores. Mr. Barton explained that there has been a major loss of food stores in the past 30 years. He asked why Wingina was included and not Norwood. Ms. Redfearn noted that they could add it to the plan if they wanted it included. Mr. Rutherford noted that the population density in Norwood is likely less than in Wingina. Ms. McGarry added that they could include Wingina and Norwood together. Mr. Barton noted that the James River is an asset. Mr. Hauschner noted that it is a shared asset with other localities.

Rural Villages



Rural Villages					
Area Name	Gladstone	Schuyler	Shipman	Piney River	Faber
Description	Nelson County's <i>Rural Villages</i> are reminders of the County's rail and rural heritage. These communities grew up along rail lines and near rural commercial enterprises and traditionally functioned and continue to function as community focal points and gathering places. These areas contain a higher concentration of development than in other rural areas of the County and are served by water and/or sewer infrastructure. In addition to a clustering of homes, villages often contain a post office, church, general store, or similar facility that serves residents of the immediate rural area. While they did not develop into larger towns, they have specific place names and carry historic and cultural significance for the community. Future investment and development of these communities should take cues from the historic qualities of the villages, ensuring a continued sense of place that provides economic vitality.				
Core Concept	Focus investment and small-scale development within the County's Rural Villages to protect the rural landscape, ensure more efficient and effective provision of community services, create a sense of place to bolster economic development, and improve quality of life.				
Primary Future Land Use Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single-family detached residential • Single-family attached residential • Accessory dwelling units • Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes • Neighborhood commercial (Cafes, shops) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agritourism businesses • Small-scale business and employment uses • Parks, recreation, and trails 		
Planning Guidelines			Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve existing structures and traditional patterns of development while allowing for a mix of uses in a more compact village setting. • Ensure materials, scale, and character of new buildings is compatible with existing structures in each village. • Enhance design and development standards to ensure compatibility with traditional Village development patterns. • Enhance and protect cultural resources. • Foster the development of a variety of housing types, including affordable housing. • Orient new buildings toward the street. • Encourage infill development and retrofitting of existing buildings. • Incorporate pedestrian connections and safety enhancements, such as stop bars and crosswalks. • Encourage traffic calming, particularly along primary routes. • Incorporate wayfinding and signage for the Villages. 			<p><i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i></p>		



Nelson County Comprehensive Plan Update
Draft Chapter 6: Protecting Natural & Cultural Resources

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Incorporate streetscape, planting, and amenities that contribute to the Village environment.• Locate parking to the side and rear of buildings.• Screen commercial parking and service areas from off-site views with low walls and hedges.• Encourage shared open space or park space.• Connect existing and establish new trails, bicycle routes, and other recreation amenities in and around Villages. | |
|--|--|

Ms. Redfearn noted that all except Faber and Arrington have water and sewer capacity. She added that they will be adding Arrington to this list.

DRAFT

Central Villages



Central Villages		
Area Name	Lovingsston	Nellysford
Description	Nelson County's <i>Central Villages</i> are the County's largest communities and contain a wide mix of uses - residences, businesses, community services, and institutions. These areas contain the highest concentration of development in County and are served by water and/or sewer infrastructure. Future investment and development of these communities should focus on expanding uses and services to both serve the community and grow the County tax base. Development should create a sense of place by taking cues from the scale and character of the villages, focusing on increased connectivity and alternative modes of transportation, and encouraging a mix of use types.	
Core Concept	Focus investment and regional scale development within the County's Central Villages to protect the rural landscape, ensure more efficient and effective provision of community services, create a sense of place to bolster economic development, and improve quality of life.	
Primary Future Land Use Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single-family detached residential • Single-family attached residential • Accessory dwelling units • Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes • Apartments • Live-work units • Hotels & Lodging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agritourism Businesses • Commercial (Retail, shopping, dining) • Professional & Offices • Business & Employment • Institutional uses • Parks, recreation, and trails
Planning Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve existing structures and traditional patterns of development while allowing for a mix of uses in a more compact village setting. • Ensure materials, scale, and character of new buildings is compatible with existing structures in each village. • Enhance design and development standards to ensure compatibility with traditional Village development patterns. • Enhance and protect cultural resources. • Foster the development of a variety of housing types, including affordable housing. • Orient new buildings toward the street. • Encourage infill development and retrofitting of existing buildings. • Incorporate pedestrian connections and safety enhancements, such as stop bars and crosswalks. • Encourage traffic calming, particularly along primary routes. • Incorporate branding, wayfinding and signage for the Villages. 	Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix) <i>EDITOR'S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate streetscape, planting, and amenities that contribute to the Village environment. • Locate parking to the side and rear of buildings. • Setback, screen, or locate higher intensity development located along primary routes to minimize impact to views from these corridors. • Screen commercial parking and service areas from off-site views with low walls and hedges. • Encourage shared open space or park space. • Connect existing and establish new trails, bicycle routes, and other recreation amenities in and around Villages. 	
--	--

Ms. Redfearn explained that Lovingsston and Nellysford are where they are discussing regional scale development. She explained that a lot of the uses are similar to other areas but are expanded to include apartments, lodging, higher-scale commercial, and live-work units. She added that these are areas where they are focusing on connectivity. Ms. Proulx asked for clarification on live-work units. Ms.

Redfearn clarified that this is mixed-use where someone can live in one portion of the unit and work in the other.

Mr. Barton noted that people in Nellysford think they are overdeveloped and that they should concentrate on Lovington. Mr. Reed noted that for Nellysford it depends on what type of development it is. Mr. Rutherford stated this category is reflective of Lovington and what they want for it. Mr. Reed noted that these should not be grouped together and each is unique with different priorities. He added that the plan should say they are served by “limited water and/or sewer infrastructure.” Mr. Musso asked if they agree that it should be in this category without considering the limited water and sewer. He agreed that maybe they should not be grouped together. Mr. Rutherford noted that he doesn’t consider Nellysford to be a “village.” Ms. Redfearn noted that they could separate them and change how they are described. She asked if they want to encourage more development in Nellysford or more infill and connection. Ms. Proulx explained that it being on Route 151 leads her to think that there shouldn’t be encouragement of more commercial development. Ms. Proulx added that they should include the GAP-TA grant for the Nellysford Growth Management Plan. Ms. Bishop noted that she is considering this as a strategy in the Small Area Plan section.

Ms. McGarry questioned whether the language should say these uses are “appropriate” for the areas vs. “encouraging.” Ms. Redfearn asked if additional descriptions of Nellysford and Lovington would suffice or if they need to separate them. The consensus was that they want to promote growth more in Lovington and discourage it more in Nellysford. Mr. Hauschner noted that connectivity is important to the development of the area. He explained that no one is currently walking around Nellysford. Mr. Reed noted that the county’s goals are different for each area and this chart makes it seem that they are the same goals. He added that it would be helpful to separate them. Mr. Rutherford noted that they should be on different pages with an emphasis on their limitations. He added that the emphasis should be on Lovington.

Mr. Hauschner added the planning guideline includes connection and safety enhancements (crosswalks and stop bars). He does not think that they want to put a crosswalk on Route 29 but that a pedestrian bridge could be considered. Mr. Reed noted that they can reference a small area plan to address this for both Lovington and Nellysford in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Rutherford noted that in Gladstone, Shipman, Lovington, and parts of Afton there are many nonconforming structures due to setbacks. He added that being nonconforming makes it difficult to improve upon these structures. He explained an instance where an existing nonconforming dwelling would want to add an additional bedroom, he believes that this is a reasonable expectation that they could potentially encourage. Ms. Bishop noted that a reduction of setbacks could be included in a small area plan. Mr. Rutherford noted that they should have a way for people to ask for an exception. Ms. Bishop explained that when the Board of Supervisors revised the Nonconforming Ordinance they removed the ability to expand a nonconforming structure. She explained that they can change this by updating the Nonconforming Ordinance. Ms. Redfearn encouraged them to look at the planning guidelines included in the new Comprehensive Plan to make sure that it meets their expectations for zoning. Ms. Bishop added that they are talking about development standards that ensure compatibility with traditional development to keep new construction in line with the existing aesthetic.

Service Center



Service Center	
Area Name	Colleen
Description	Colleen is an established center for business, industry, and community services including the Colleen Industrial Park and Blue Ridge Medical Center. This is a highly accessible location that provides opportunity for additional business development. Infill and expansion of this established district is encouraged over new industrial or business developments elsewhere in the County that might impact rural character and resources. Expansions, as appropriate, should provide a “park-like” campus setting with landscaping and safe transportation access. Sustainable development practices, including stormwater management, water conservation, and pollution reduction strategies should be a high priority in facility and site design. Current and future development should support employment without contributing pollution or harming the character of the County. Buffering between lower and heavier intensity uses should be considered for safety, noise, and appearance.
Core Concept	Promote more cost-efficient land use and increase the County’s tax base by focusing quality commercial and business development within defined employment and service centers
Primary Future Land Use Types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hotels & Lodging Commercial (Retail, shopping, dining) Agritourism Uses Professional & Offices Business & Employment Heavy Commercial (Bulk Sales, Outdoor Storage, etc) Logistics & Distribution Light industrial uses Institutional uses Parks, recreation, and trails
Planning Guidelines	Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage a high degree of architectural design and environmentally sensitive site design. Ensure that developments reflect coordinated site design, architecture, signage, and lighting. Incorporate high-quality, enduring materials for all buildings, including franchise architecture. Design buildings so that the scale, massing, and character of new buildings are compatible with existing structures and uses. Incorporate sustainable, low impact and energy efficient design in buildings. Parking lots should be well landscaped and provide on-site stormwater management. Encourage infill development and retrofitting of existing buildings. Incorporate coordinated wayfinding and signage. 	<i>EDITOR’S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i>



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate setbacks and perimeter buffers between incompatible land uses. Setback, screen, or locate higher intensity development located along Route 29 to minimize impact to views from these corridors. Locate fleet vehicle parking to the rear of the property. Locate parking lots to the side or rear of commercial buildings or screened from view by outparcel development. Screen commercial parking and service areas from off-site views with low walls and hedges. Incorporate landscaping and streetscape planting and amenities that improve the community aesthetic. Provide access-management and inter-parcel connections. 	
---	--

Ms. Redfearn explained that the only Service Center identified is Colleen. She explained that it is separate due to the type of development that is happening there now as well as the potential for heavier commercial and industrial uses. She added that they have received comments that show that

they might need to categorize Colleen differently. Mr. Reed asked if they can call the category Multi-use instead of Service Center. He explained that there are appropriate areas within Colleen for more concentrated housing due to it being more easily developable than other areas. He added that Colleen is not necessarily a heavy commercial area but more a destination pass-through. Mr. Rutherford added that Colleen allows for its residents to work in Charlottesville with a similar or better commute than those that live in Shipman. The consensus was to add residential use and update the description.

Gateways & Corridors



Gateways & Corridors

Area Name	Community Gateways	Regional Corridors	Local Corridors
Description	<p>Gateways and Corridors serve as the “front door” for Nelson County and connect and integrate the different elements of the Future Land Use Framework. Gateways are the key entrance points or intersections in the County. They should create a sense of arrival that portrays the identity of the County. Nelson County’s Regional Corridors include Routes 29, 6, and 151, which connect the County and Villages to the region. The County’s Local Corridors are those frequently traveled routes that connect Villages and Centers. The County prides itself on the rural scenery enjoyed along all of these corridors. These routes connect the community regionally and locally and should reflect the rural character of the community.</p> <p>These designations overlay and include other Land Use Elements and are meant to supplement those land use designations. These designations should generally apply to any parcel adjacent to or highly visible from the corridors and gateways.</p>		
Core Concept	<p>Development along and within Gateways and Corridors should protect the rural landscape and incorporate features and quality design that enhance community character and quality of life.</p>		
Planning & Development Guidelines		Supporting Strategies (See Implementation Matrix)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate signage controls, special wayfinding, public art, landscaping standards, quality lighting, undergrounding utilities (where feasible) in Community Gateways to elevate community appearance and create a sense of arrival. Discourage the removal of existing mature trees in Community Gateways and Regional Corridors along the front of sites, and parking should be screened from off-site views using plants of different types and heights. Prioritize Regional Corridors for viewsheer protection through increased setbacks, cluster development, and conservation development principles. Include traffic calming, safety, and maintenance improvements in Regional and Local Corridors – particularly near Villages and Centers. 		<p><i>EDITOR’S NOTE: To be completed at end of drafting.</i></p>	

Mr. Rutherford noted that they should include Route 60. Ms. Redfearn noted that it is included on the map but it is missing from the description and will be added. Mr. Barton noted that he would like to see the sides of the bridge lowered between Amherst and Nelson County so that you can see the river. Mr. Hauschner questioned their ability to change that. He added that Route 56 in Montebello is a corridor. Ms. Redfearn noted that it is included on the map but it is missing from the description and will be added.



Goal Statement

Nelson County will preserve and enhance its rural character and natural resources by creating opportunities for strategic growth to create a stronger, more vibrant, and prosperous community.

Strategies

Protect Rural Character & the Environment

1. Review and update alternative energy standards to ensure the adopted standards protect rural character and the interests of the community.
2. Consider the use of alternative energy on private development through special programs, such as the Code of Virginia permitted solar tax exemption for residential and commercial small-scale solar installations.
3. Reduce or exempt permit fees for residential solar installations.
4. Encourage the use of energy-efficient lighting and investigate outdoor light standards to reduce the impacts of over-lighting, glare, and light pollution.
5. Explore changes to zoning and development provisions to reduce parking requirements and encourage permeable paving and other materials that promote infiltration of stormwater.
6. Revise landscaping regulations to require the placement of shade trees in parking lots and use of native plants in all commercial and institutional landscaping.
7. Identify opportunities to connect neighborhoods and development through sidewalks, shared use paths, and trails and require such connections in new development or redevelopment proposals.
8. Encourage revitalization, repurposing, and rehabilitation of existing structures by promoting available resources, such as grants and tax credits, and pursuing funding to support such efforts.
9. Encourage Low Impact Development practices and alternative wastewater systems in environmentally sensitive areas to ensure the preservation of water quality in the County.
10. Continue to encourage and administer cluster subdivision regulations and incentivize their use in rural areas of the County to preserve open space and reduce the impact of development. Regularly evaluate and modify cluster subdivision regulations as needed to ensure they are effective and meet County standards.

Nelson County Comprehensive Plan Update

Draft Chapter 6: Protecting Natural & Cultural Resources

Create a Coordinated Framework for Growth

11. Conduct a review of zoning and land development codes and ordinances on a yearly basis to ensure compatibility with the goals, objectives, and recommendations of this Plan.
12. Evaluate land use applications for rezonings and special use permits against the criteria contained within this Plan.
13. Update land use regulations to provide clear and simplified requirements that promote economic development, enable creative housing choices, and protect sensitive resources.
14. Review the zoning ordinance, and amend it as necessary, to allow for a wider mix of use types, including accessory dwellings and mixed-use buildings.
15. Encourage new development in designated growth areas so that existing infrastructure can be more efficiently used, and rural lands will be protected from development.
16. Ensure that new development complements and enhances its surroundings through proper land use, design, landscaping, and transitional buffers.
17. Ensure that a natural transition is maintained between the Land Use Elements through careful development review.

Mr. Hauschner noted that they should add a strategy to promote third-party equity audit periodically (every 5-10 years) to ensure equitable distribution of resources. Mr. Harman added that he liked strategy 11.

Chapter 4 - Connecting People and Places

Mr. Rutherford noted that they are going to review Chapter 4 and then schedule another work session at a later date.

Mr. Musso presented the following:



Chapter 4 Connecting People & Places

Chapter Goal

Nelson County maintains a transportation system that provides a safe and efficient multimodal network to connect residents and visitors to places they live, work, recreate, and access services throughout the County and region.

Mr. Barton questioned whether the goal statement was obtainable. Mr. Reed noted that it being in the present tense implies that they are currently doing it but that it is something they are aspiring to do. Ms. Redfearn said the verb tenses are important and should all be the same throughout the goal statements, and the best practice is that it is in present tense.

Mr. Hauschner stated that they don't need to focus on regional connection due to it already being well established. He explained that they need to focus less on the major vessels of transportation and more on the capillaries. Ms. Proulx noted that she disagrees with this, there are many people in the County that work and the only transportation they have is cars. Ms. Bishop believed that this originated from a comment about not encouraging expansion or certain services that they have access to in the region, and that the focus should be on the connectivity to these existing locations (hospitals, colleges, etc.). Mr. Musso noted that public engagement confirmed there are commuters and connections to cities and services in the area. Mr. Reed noted that he likes the statement as it is written.

Ms. McGarry added that transportation is not just the movement of people but also goods. She questioned whether this should be addressed in the goal statement. Mr. Harman noted that they don't have many carpool areas and that people would use them. Mr. Amante added that two carpool areas exist and that there is a strategy that addresses this. Ms. McGarry recommended adding "access goods and services" to the strategy. Mr. Rutherford noted that the goal statement works as it is written. The consensus was to keep the statement as written.

Mr. Musso presented the following:


Focus Areas

- 1. Maintain & Improve the Existing Road Network**
 - a) Road Network
 - b) Road Safety
- 2. Invest in Alternative Transportation**
 - a) Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure
 - b) Electric Vehicle Accessibility
 - c) Shared Transportation
- 3. Coordinate Land Use and Transportation**
 - a) Urban Development Areas
 - b) Small Area Plans
- 4. Priority Transportation Improvement Projects**
 1. Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP)
 2. Vtrans
 3. Priority Transportation Projects


Ms. Redfearn noted that much of the content in this chapter is required by VDOT and will need to be reviewed by them for compliance.

Mr. Musso presented the following transportation maps:


Map 4.1 Existing Transportation Network




Map 4.2 Functional Classification




Map 4.3 Existing Annual Average Daily Traffic



Map 4.4 Crash Volume and Fatal Crashes 2015-2022



Map 4.5 Bridges & Culverts




Map 4.6 Greenways Plan




- Legend**
- County Boundary
 - Railroad
 - Roads
 - Proposed Greenway



Map 4.7 VTrans Mid-Term Needs



Map 4.8 Priority Transportation Projects



- Legend**
-  County Boundary
 -  Railroad
 -  Roads
 -  Six-Year Improvement
 -  Priority Transportation Project



Mr. Rutherford noted that the three intersections that show on the Crash Volume Map (4.4) are always a topic of discussion. He was surprised that there weren't more fatal accidents on Route 151. He added that the hot spots are on Route 29.

Mr. Musso presented Table 4.2 and explained that this fuels their conversation for recommended priority transportation projects:

DRAFT

Nelson County Comprehensive Plan

Draft Chapter 4: Connecting People & Places

Priority Transportation Projects

This section lists priority transportation projects for the future of Nelson County. These projects have been identified by examining the County’s existing and future transportation needs while taking into consideration community input and existing information from the plans and programs included in this Chapter. Table 4.2 provides a list of these transportation projects that Nelson County can undertake to better connect the community to important destinations and services within and outside the County. Where possible, cost estimates have been provided along with the source of the project. The approximate location for each of these priority projects is illustrated in Map 4.7; the project number listed in the table corresponds with the numbers on the map.

Table 4.2 – Recommended Priority Transportation Projects

Project #	Project Name	Description	Cost (in thousands of dollars)	Improvement Type	Source
1	Route 6 Roundabout	Construct a roundabout at the intersection of Route 151 and Route 6.	\$15,705	Operations	VDOT; Nelson County
2	Route 29 Safety Improvements	Widen the shoulders along sections of Route 29 and add rumble strips.	\$9,952	Safety	VDOT; Nelson County
3	Route 151 Safety Study	Conduct a traffic study and evaluate for traffic and pedestrian safety improvements along Route 151 in Afton and Nellysford.	TBD	Traffic Safety Study	Nelson County
4	Adial Road Safety Study	Conduct a study to identify possible safety improvements along Adial Road (Route 634).	TBD	Traffic Safety Study	VTRANS
5	Route 6 Truck Reduction	Evaluate the truck traffic along Route 6 between Route 151 and Route 29 and consider restricting allowable truck size along Route 6	TBD	Safety	Nelson County
6	Route 151 Parallel Trail	Construct sidewalks and trails parallel to Route 151 to connect from Wintergreen to Afton and the Blue Ridge Tunnel Trailhead.	TBD	Operations	Nelson County
7	Greenway Connectivity	Connect and expand existing trails through a system of greenways.	TBD	Operation	Nelson County

Nelson County Comprehensive Plan

Draft Chapter 4: Connecting People & Places

Project #	Project Name	Description	Cost (in thousands of dollars)	Improvement Type	Source
8	James River Multi-Use Trail	Improve local and regional connectivity to trails by supporting a shared use trail along the James River from the Albemarle County line to the Amherst County line	TBD	Operations	TJPDC; Nelson County; Albemarle County, Amherst County
9	Blue Ridge Tunnel Connectivity	Improve local and regional connectivity to trails by supporting connection to the Blue Ridge Tunnel via the Three Notched Trail.	TBD	Operations	TJPDC; Nelson County; Albemarle County, Amherst County
10	Route 151 Speed Study	Conduct a speed study along Route 151 to evaluate safety concerns and the feasibility of lowering the speed limit.	TBD	Traffic Safety Study	TJPDC; Nelson County
11	Route 151 Road Widening	Widen the shoulders along Route 151 and add bicycle lanes where applicable.	TBD	Safety	Nelson County
12	Colleen Park and Ride	Construct an official park and ride lot near Colleen.	TBD	Operations	Nelson County

[Map 4.8 – Recommended Priority Transportation Projects]

Mr. Reed wanted to add that wherever there is going to be an improvement, it should be built large enough to accommodate multimodal transportation. He added that they would need VDOT easements for multimodal to occur.

Ms. Redfearn asked if there were any additional locations where they would like to see improvements. Mr. Rutherford identified the need for a project at Route 29 intersection in Lovingston. He added that they need acceleration and deceleration lanes as well as some kind of crossing. Ms. Redfearn noted that they would add two projects, a decrease in speed on Route 29 in Lovingston and a form of safe multimodal crossing.

Mr. Hauschner states that they should add connectivity from the East to the West side of Lovingston. Mr. Barton asked about the intersection of Route 151 and Route 6. Mr. Rutherford noted the project there is already funded. Mr. Proulx noted that number 6 is not feasible and does not make sense, she added that it should be removed or moved to the bottom of the priority list. Mr. Reed noted that the length should be at least from Rockfish Valley Community Center or Rockfish Elementary School to Devil's Backbone. Mr. Rutherford noted that the county should be more active in advocating for a second exit out of Wintergreen. Mr. Reed noted that there is an existing ROW with access to the Blue Ridge Parkway that could be utilized as an additional exit. Ms. Redfearn clarified that they would be amending number 6 to include that it would be from Rockfish Valley Community Center to Devil's Backbone.

Mr. Reed noted that greenways should be more defined in the plan. Ms. Redfearn noted that greenways are addressed on the Priority Transportation Projects table (4.2). Ms. Bishop clarified that there is more info on greenways in the Tourism and Economy chapter. Mr. Amante asked if there was a trail that connected to the Blue Ridge Tunnel. Mr. Rutherford noted that it is just the tunnel but that Waynesboro has interest in a trail. Ms. Redfearn noted that if there are additional specific projects they should be noted on the Priority Transportation Projects table (4.2). Mr. Musso added that there is a strategy in previous chapter to develop a parks and recreation master plan that could address trails. Mr. Hauschner noted that he would like to see more connectivity within the central villages of Nellysford, Colleen, and Lovingston.

Ms. McGarry noted that the transportation chapter should emphasize the fact that the county does not own or maintain any roads or sidewalks. She added that they are all maintained by VDOT or privately maintained. Mr. Rutherford added that he would like to see sidewalks and streetscape revitalization throughout all of Lovingston as a priority.

Mr. Reed added that there should be a mention of possible speed limit reduction on Routes 151 and 6 in response to the tractor trailer activity. Mr. Musso noted that it is addressed in numbers 5 and 10 of the Priority Transportation Projects.

Strategies



Nelson County Comprehensive Plan

Draft Chapter 4: Connecting People & Places

HOW WE MOVE FORWARD

Goal Statement

Nelson County maintains a transportation system that provides a safe and efficient multimodal network to connect residents and visitors to places they live, work, recreate, and access services throughout the County and region.

Strategies

Maintain & Improve the Existing Road Network

1. Continue to work with VDOT to develop, design, and implement transportation projects, including, but not limited to, SMART SCALE, Highway Safety, Bike Pedestrian Safety, and Transportation Alternatives projects.
2. Conduct traffic safety and speed studies throughout the County, as necessary, based on an analysis of existing traffic volume and crash statistics. Work with VDOT to address priority traffic safety issues, such as a reduction of speed limits.
3. Target safety improvements at high-crash intersections and roadway corridors.
4. Partner with VDOT and TJPDC to prioritize improvements to bridges and culverts with poor ratings.
5. Continue to work with VDOT and other regional partners to provide essential maintenance and expansion of vital transportation systems throughout the County.
6. Coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions, state, and regional agencies in planning and achieving an efficient and cost-effective transportation network.

Invest in Alternative Transportation

7. Identify areas to construct or expand natural trails and sidewalks for pedestrian traffic.
8. Explore opportunities to widen County roadways and introduce bicycle lanes to facilitate safe bicycle travel.
9. Support regional partners in their efforts to link the Blue Ridge Tunnel Trail to regional destinations through pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.
10. Support an expanded greenway trail network and ensure that the trail network connects to key public destinations such as parks, libraries, schools, and community



centers, as well as to private developments and other trail systems, including regional trail networks.

11. Install EV charging stations at County-owned properties such as administrative offices, schools, and libraries.
12. Evaluate the feasibility of installing solar panels above County-owned parking lots to provide both covered parking and clean energy infrastructure.
13. Work with community organizations to help facilitate the installation of EV charging stations in the County.
14. Encourage ridesharing, car/vanpooling, and other means of shared vehicle use.
15. Explore opportunities to create additional commuter parking lots in other areas of the County, such as along U.S. Route 29 near Colleen or Lovingston.
16. Continue partnership with JAUNT to monitor existing service and identify needs and gaps in the public transportation network for potential future service.
17. Explore the feasibility of creating additional public transportation services in Nelson County, such as local or regional shuttle services.

Coordinate Land Use & Transportation

18. Facilitate the study of potential village and urban areas for designations as Urban Development Areas.
19. Facilitate the creation of area plans that identify transportation improvements in County towns and villages, such as Lovingston and Nellysford.

11. Mr. Hauschner noted that they should support clean energy sources of EV charging power.

Next Steps

Next Steps



Edits for Ch. 3, Ch. 4 & Ch. 9, comments by 5/26/2023



Incorporate Edits & Compile Entire Document. Send to Board/PC for individual review and strategy prioritization. – June/July



VDOT 729 Review (90-day review)



Community Open House – July/August



Final Worksession (Open House Feedback & Final Edits) – August/September



Public Hearings and Adoption – September/October

Ms. Redfearn explained that they would like to see comments on chapters 3 and 4 by May 26th.

Ms. Redfearn mentioned that there was discussion of an additional work session scheduled for June 29th starting at 6:00pm. She explained that they would be reviewing plan in its entirety as well as chapter 9 and the implementation matrix. She added that they will have the draft plan to review by June 15th. Mr. Musso added that there is a survey on the website for public comment.

Mr. Reed made a motion at 9:02 PM to continue the meeting to May 24th at 3 PM. Mr. Barton seconded the motion.

Yes:

Jesse Rutherford

Skip Barton

Ernie Reed

Mr. Harman made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:02 PM. Mr. Amante seconded the motion.

Yes:

Robin Hauschner

Phil Proulx

Mike Harman

Chuck Amante

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 PM

Respectfully submitted,



Emily Hjulstrom

Planner/Secretary, Planning & Zoning

DRAFT