



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

Phone (434) 296-5832

Fax (434) 972-4176

October 31, 2013

Mr. Dale Jensen
Zobrist Law Group PLLC
1900 Arlington Blvd., Suite B
Charlottesville VA 22903

RE: SP201300018 Trump National Golf Course

Dear Mr. Jensen--

Staff has reviewed your initial submittal for this special use permit for a golf course in the Rural Areas zoning district.

We have a number of questions and comments which we believe should be resolved before your proposal goes to public hearing. We would be glad to meet with you to discuss these issues. Planning comments below incorporate some major points from the other reviewers, but please read the other reviewers' comments completely.

COMMENTS

Planning (Scott Clark)

- **General Application Concerns**
 - In general, the content of the application gives an overview of the proposed use, but in some areas does not provide sufficient detail. Without specific proposals, staff cannot effectively analyze the proposal or develop a recommendation for the Planning Commission. Specific concerns will be addressed below.
 - According to VDOT, the traffic study accurately reflects the impacts of the daily golf-course activity. However, the traffic impacts for events have not been assessed. Additional information is needed to complete the assessment of traffic impacts for the proposed use.
- **Conceptual Plan**
 - The purpose of a conceptual plan is to establish the major design elements of a use, and to set expectations for what is permitted on the site. Approved special use permits typically are subject to a condition of approval requiring development of the site in accord with listed major elements of the conceptual plan.

- The notes on this plan stating that the layout shown is for illustration only effectively make it impossible to use it as a conceptual plan. We would recommend that a new plan that identifies important elements of the proposal (boundaries of the use, number and location of structures, entrances, etc.) be submitted as a true conceptual plan for the use.
- If possible changes to the golf course design are the reason that you cannot commit to an exact plan at this point, you could address the issue by submitting a plan that shows a general area for the golf course and indicates avoidance areas (floodplains, highly visible areas, etc.) that would not be used for the course. The exact layout and design of the holes is not needed for our review, provided that we have established geographic limits for the course.
- Possible changes to major design elements of the course could be dealt with by condition, rather than by showing them on the plan. For example, a condition related to course impacts could include guidelines (for example, “tees, greens, fairways, and cart paths shall not be constructed within Water Protection Ordinance stream buffers or the FEMA 100-year floodplain”, etc.). This approach would be preferable to proceeding with no conceptual plan or with a purely illustrative plan. Staff would be unable to recommend approval without a commitment to a specific conceptual plan.
- Specific comments about the submitted plan:
 1. Most importantly, the plan should distinguish between existing conditions and proposed improvements. For example, even in locations where development would change the treelines (at the far end of the practice field, at the overflow parking area, etc.), only the existing treeline is shown. Existing and proposed treelines should both be shown. Grading is another example—at least conceptual grading should be shown.
 2. Please check and correct the vegetation areas shown on the plan. For example, the trees along this property’s side of Carter’s Mountain Road near the Deer Ridge Farm entrance do not appear on the plan.
 3. The plan should state the contour interval and label the elevations on some contour lines. A North arrow should be added.
 4. Please note on the plan which entrance(s) will/will not be used for the golf course use.
- Proposed Conditions of Approval
 - The following comments address the proposed conditions of approval listed in the application. Please note that these should be called “conditions” rather than “proffers” to avoid confusion, as “proffers” are only used for proposed rezonings.
 - In general – as noted in the attached Zoning comments, the proposed conditions are, in some cases, not very specific, which limits our ability to analyze the proposal and would raise difficulties in future determinations about compliance. Conditions should be clearly related to mitigating specific impacts of the proposed use. It would be more useful to have clear, specific statements of intended measures to offset impacts that staff can use to develop conditions. Conditions that cannot be practically enforced do not provide sufficient assurance that impacts will be addressed.
 - The following comments address the individual conditions (numbers below correspond with the numbers of the proposed conditions):
 1. Please see Zoning comments requesting more details on the nature of these events—we need to determine what type and scale of events can be considered accessory to a golf-course use. (Unlike farm wineries, golf courses do not have specific regulations establishing the permitted size and frequency of events.) Also, please note that the building-code evaluation mentioned below should include an assessment of the building’s capacity to host these events. It seems likely, given the scale and layout of the building, that 200-person events could

- exceed the building's capacity. If larger events are expected to use tents or other outdoor facilities, please specify the lower limit of attendance for outdoor uses.
2. Please see attached Engineering comments.
 3. We appreciate and support the intent to revegetate areas of the course with native vegetation. However, the level of commitment expressed here ("to the extent required") is not specific and would not be practically enforceable. We would recommend that areas for these replantings be identified on the conceptual plan. Failing that, more specific guidelines on the locations and acreages of these plantings would need to be proposed and written into the conditions of approval.
 4. This proposed condition is too general and non-specific to be enforceable. Commitments to specific actions (e.g., identification of specific areas and management techniques or planting guidelines for them) would be needed to make this a workable condition.
 5. Limits of disturbance are best shown on the plan rather than described generally in a condition. A verbal requirement based on a vague term like "reasonably consistent" is not a specific commitment and would present difficulties of interpretation and enforcement.
 6. Please provide more specifics on exactly which other permitted uses of the property are proposed to be eliminated.
 7. Again, we appreciate the effort to establish native plants on the site. However, specific locations and/or guidelines for the plantings are needed to make this a specific commitment. Also, the condition should only address the required actions, not the thoughts or justifications behind it.
 8. The prohibition on grading on critical slopes is appropriate. The remainder of the condition is too general, and use of the term "reasonably required" relies on interpretation rather than the needed specifics.
 9. Please define what specifically is meant by "legacy heritage trees," and provide the catalog of those trees as part of the application, so that the exact extent of the requirement can be understood.
 10. Please provide details on the types of fencing needed for the golf course. Depending on the nature of the fencing needed, this condition may or may not be necessary. Use of "reasonably" is not specific and could not be enforced.
 11. Please see attached Engineering comments.
 12. This general statement about vegetation would best be replaced by management areas shown on the conceptual plan.
 13. As grass carp are a non-native species that can be invasive, please provide an alternative approach or provide more information on how the carp could be limited to non-breeding "triploid" fish. Alternatively, this condition could be deleted, as it does not directly address a public concern.
 14. Please confirm that "osprey tower" means a nesting platform. While the effort is appreciated, staff does not feel that this condition is needed to address any specific impact of the golf course use and could be eliminated. Voluntary measures to support wildlife are of course welcome, but conditions should directly address specific impacts. Again, conditions should only describe the required action and not make statements or justifications.
- Technical Issues/Specific Concerns
 - Please note that the VDOT acceptance of the traffic study only addresses the impacts of the regular daily golf use. Traffic generation estimates for events and any other proposed uses of the site should be provided. Without this information, it could be necessary to impose a condition limiting the use to just the main golf activity.
 - Please confirm in writing that no tournaments are planned for this course, so that we can develop an appropriate condition of approval. If tournaments are proposed, then a

detailed accounting of the traffic generation and site impacts of those uses should be provided.

- Fertilizer and pesticide impacts on waterways are a significant concern. We understand that the proposed systems would reduce these impacts compared to more chemical-dependent course management, but the application does not quantify the expected inputs sufficiently for staff to analyze the impacts. Please provide more detailed information on these inputs and explain how the management system will effectively set limits on the inputs.
- Facilities and improvements appear within floodplains and stream buffers on the plan. Please revise the plan to move these elements out of those areas. For example, the northernmost green on the east side of Olympic Lake is shown within the floodplain. The fill needed to grade the site in this location would require a separate special use permit, and staff would recommend that such construction not take place in the floodplain.
- Please confirm in writing that irrigation water for the golf course would only be taken from the on-site ponds, and not from wells.
- The application states that the rough areas of the course would be planted in native grasses. However, on page 38-14 of the course management plan, there is a mention of using non-native fescues in the roughs. Please clarify.
- The food-service facility will need approval from the Virginia Department of Health before it can begin operation. We would recommend that you submit the required "Plan Review Application" to the Health Department as soon as possible to identify any potential issues with the facility, so that we can establish whether or not any changes need to be made before the use could begin. It is our understanding that their review process takes approximately two weeks.
- The Health Department has no concerns about general ability of the site to supply water and provide septic fields. However, a condition requiring Health Department approval of the actual wells and septic systems designed for the site would be included with any approval.
- Please provide an estimate of the length of the golf season, the hours (or lighting conditions) during which the course would be open for play, and the operating hours for the clubhouse.
- Would any outdoor amplified sound systems be installed for this use? We would recommend that such systems be prohibited by condition in order to limit impacts on the surrounding properties.
- Please provide the Operation and Maintenance Certificate from the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality for each dam on the site, or provide a statement from DEQ establishing that the dams are not subject to that requirement.
- Would the wooded areas of the course remain as they are, with understory and ground-level vegetation removed, or would the native plantings also include replacing those types of vegetation?

Zoning (Francis MacCall)

- Please see attached memo.

Engineering (Michael Koslow)

- Please see attached memo.

Design Planner/Historic Preservation (Margaret Maliszewski)

- Please see attached memo.

Current Development (Megan Yaniglos)

- A site plan will be required for the use if the special use permit is approved.
- The concept plan is not very detailed. Critical slopes waivers may be required for some areas that appear to be disturbed (ie. cart path that is located between the 'existing pond' and 'quarry lake'). Other areas may be identified during site plan review, as it is stated on the concept plan that the design may change. If required, this waiver will need to be applied for during the site plan process and will require Board approval.

Building Code (Jay Schlothauer)

- As a condition of the SP, the existing house must be evaluated for building code suitability for use as a "Golf Shop". [Planning note: If you have not already done so, please schedule an appointment with Mr. Schlothauer to have him visit the site and evaluate Albemarle House for building code suitability.]

Fire/Rescue (Robbie Gilmer)

- As a condition of the SP, require installation of a dry hydrant that would be accessible by Fire/Rescue. This will help cover the needed fire flow requirements for the buildings.

Virginia Department of Transportation (Troy Austin)

- Please see attached memo.

Action after Receipt of Comments

After you have read this letter, please take one of the actions identified on "Action After Receipt of Comment Letter" which is attached (A).

Resubmittal

If you choose to resubmit, please use the attached form (Attachment C). There is no fee for the first resubmittal. The resubmittal date schedule is provided for your convenience (Attachment B).

Notification and Advertisement Fees

Recently, the Board of Supervisors amended the zoning ordinance to require that applicants pay for the notification costs for public hearings. Prior to scheduling a public hearing with the Planning Commission, payment of the following fees is needed:

<u>\$127.45</u>	Cost for newspaper advertisement
<u>\$200.00</u>	Cost for notification of adjoining owners (minimum \$200 + actual postage/\$1 per owner after 50 adjoining owners)
<u>\$327.45</u>	Total amount due prior to Planning Commission public hearing

Prior to the Board of Supervisor's public hearing, payment of the newspaper advertisement for the Board hearing needed.

\$127.45 Additional amount due prior to Board of Supervisors public hearing

\$454.90 Total amount for all notifications Fees need to be paid in advance. Payment for both the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors public hearings may be paid at the same time.

Additional notification fees will not be required unless a deferral takes place and adjoining owners need to be notified of a new date.

Please note that, from this point forward, your main contact and coordinating planner in Community Development will be Andrew Sorrell, a Senior Planner in the Planning Division. His telephone number is 296-5832, text. 3272. Please feel free to contact him if you wish to meet or if you need additional information.

Your sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'S. Clark', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Scott Clark
Senior Planner



**County of Albemarle
Department of Community Development**

Memorandum

To: Scott Clark, Senior Planner
From: Francis MacCall, Principal Planner
Division: Zoning
Date: October 23, 2013
Subject: SP 2013-018 Trump Golf Course – initial zoning comments

Please consider the following comments. If any of these comments overlap with your comments then strike mine or add on to your in one comment:

1. Regarding Albemarle House being used as the club house, please provide further description in the form of general floor plan of the area within Albemarle House that the pro shop and a small food service facility will encompass. If the entire house is not to be used for these two uses then please describe what the remaining area of the house will be used for.
2. Further description of the events proposed is needed in order to determine if they are related to the golf course use or if they may need separate special use permit approval. If a description is provided of the events, have the applicant show to us how these events would be considered to be normal and customary to the golf course use. Are these events going on at some of the local public courses that are freestanding and not associated with other uses (i.e. Boars Head Inn, Keswick Hall, and Wintergreen)?
3. In regard to the events: The narrative did not say that there were or were not going to be tournaments at the course. If they are not proposing any then a condition prohibiting them would probably be best since they did not provide any information that we could evaluate the nature of a larger 4 day tournament.
4. Certain proposed conditions are not enforceable as written and I am still wondering what impact they are mitigating that is caused by the use of the golf course or what they are protecting that may be deemed to be impacted by the golf course. Specifically parts of proposed #2, #3, #4, #5, #6, #7, #10, #12, #13, and #14. Many of these proposed conditions have to do with particulars that they are proposing within their "Integrated Golf Course Best Management Practices" plan. If this will be how they address these items then condition the final approval of the IGCBMP.



COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902

25 October 2013

Mr. Scott Clark
Senior Planner

Re: Engineering comments for Special Use Permit SP201300018 – Trump National Golf Course

The application for SP2013-00018 has been reviewed and the following comments are noted by the Engineering Division, Community Development Department:

- 1) Please label existing contour elevations in layout plan.
- 2) The extents of grading and proposed grades for roads and parking lots could not be determined due to language on the layout plan. Preliminary analysis of layout plan (exhibit 1) indicates the following potential impacts:
 - 194 Ac Approximate limits of proposed land disturbance / grading
 - 18 Ac Approximate area of proposed Water Protection Ordinance (WPO) buffer disturbance (9 locations)
 - 4500 sft Approximate (if any) area of proposed critical slopes disturbance
 - 4300 sft Approximate area of proposed flood plain disturbance
- 3) It appears WPO buffers are proposed to be impacted (18 Ac). Proposed layout should ideally avoid any impacts to the existing buffers. Based on what is proposed, the preliminary layout plan does not address the locations for mitigation areas (would be approximately 36 Ac per above approximate proposed disturbances). Recommend avoiding impacts or at minimum addressing where these mitigation locations would be proposed.
- 4) It appears managed turf areas for the golf course are proposed. It appears additional impervious surfaces are proposed for a parking area, golf cart paths, and potentially additional roads. Regarding items #2 and #11 in "Proposed Proffers to Address Impacts", Section 1.8 of the Integrated Golf Course Best Management Practices addresses some of the elements of erosion and sediment control (ESC) needed for construction; however a separate set of Water Protection Ordinance plans will be necessary to address ESC, stormwater management, and buffer disturbance mitigation areas if applicable.
- 5) Proposed overflow grass parking area would be subject to requirements for parking areas in the



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

Phone (434) 296-5832

Fax (434) 972-4126

MEMORANDUM

TO: Scott Clark
FROM: Margaret Maliszewski
RE: **SP-2013-18: Trump National Golf Course**
DATE: October 25, 2013

I have identified the following issues with the above-noted proposal:

1. Identify the contour interval illustrated on the Conceptual Layout plan. Label the contours with the existing/proposed elevation.
2. The application narrative (page 6) indicates that the project will not be visible from Carters Mountain Road because of existing berms. In some locations, berms do screen views into the property, but this condition is not consistent along the Carters Mountain Road frontage. There are some open views into the property, and some views through fences and trees. Also, some areas of existing trees that limit views into the site are not shown on the plan. Existing tree areas should be shown accurately on the plan, particularly along the Carters Mountain Road frontage, but throughout the property, as well. A revised plan accurately showing existing tree areas and proposed areas of tree/shrub removal should be submitted for review. A condition for no tree removal along the Carters Mountain Road frontage and no reduction in wooded area or berms along the frontage is recommended.
3. Features associated with holes 15 and 16 are located very close to the road. It is recommended that these features be shifted away from the road and located more interior to the site to limit impacts as viewed from the road and to maintain the rural character of the roadway.
4. Condition #9 on page 12 of the narrative references legacy heritage trees. Define legacy heritage trees. Indicate whether these trees are meant to qualify for any existing state or national or other listing of trees, and identify and provide confirmation of that listing. Locate and identify the trees on a plan that includes the golf course layout.
5. If improvements to the entrances to the property from Carters Mountain Road are proposed, clarify and detail this on the plan. The entrances should maintain an appearance consistent with entrances to historic properties in the area.
6. Inappropriate lighting can negatively impact the character of the historic district. Indicate if any new lighting is proposed. If it is, provide details for review. A condition for no illumination of the course or practice fields is recommended.
7. The existing board fence along Carters Mountain Road is a character defining feature. It is recommended that maintaining the fence be made a condition of approval.
8. Is any safety netting proposed? If so, show proposed locations and provide details for review (type, height, etc.).

9. A note on the plan indicates that road layout may change. Impacts cannot be accurately or completely assessed if proposed revisions to the road layout are not known.
10. Impacts cannot be accurately or completely determined if the conceptual layout plan is only offered as a suggestion of a possible course layout.
11. The following are among the elements required for the development to not create a negative impact on the historic district: minimal grading, no or extremely minimal tree removal, no widening of the entrance drive, no removal of trees lining the drive, maintenance of the existing character of the entrance gateway, no or extremely limited changes to roads, no new lighting, minimal signage. Conditions of approval and/or information on an approved plan are needed to confirm these items.



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

1601 Orange Road
Culpeper, Virginia 22701-3819

Gregory A. Whirley
Commissioner of Highways
October 23, 2013

Mr. Scott Clark
Senior Planner
County of Albemarle
Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Re: SP-2013-00018 Trump National Golf Club

Dear Mr. Clark:

We have reviewed the Special Use Permit Application for the Trump National Golf Club dated August 15, 2013 as prepared by the Zobrist Law Group and offer the following comments:

1. The Traffic Assessment submitted with the application indicates that the existing entrance would not require either right or left turn lanes based on the ITE designation of an 18-hole golf course for the site. Should the intensity of use change in the future, the turn lane warrants should be re-evaluated based on the proposed use.
2. The Traffic Assessment indicates that turn lanes are warranted at the intersection of Route 53 and Route 795 based on existing weekday morning and afternoon peak hour conditions. The peak hour for the proposed golf course will occur on the weekend and not during the peak hour for the Route 53 and Route 795 intersection. The STARS report for Route 53 dated May 2009 does not make recommendations for turn lanes at this intersection. It does, however, suggest that long-term the intersection should be considered for a roundabout which would eliminate the need for turn lanes.
3. It is difficult to quantify any potential impact from the proposed golf course on the intersection of Route 53 and Route 795 since the existing conditions indicate that the turn lane warrants are met.

If you need additional information concerning this project, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Troy Austin".

Troy Austin, P.E.
Area Land Use Engineer
Culpeper District

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



ACTION AFTER RECEIPT OF COMMENT LETTER

Within 30 days of the date of this letter, please do one of the following:

- (1) Resubmit in response to review comments**
- (2) Request indefinite deferral**
- (3) Request that your Planning Commission public hearing date be set**
- (4) Withdraw your application**

(1) Resubmittal in Response to Review Comments

If you plan to resubmit within 30 days, make sure that the resubmittal is on or before a resubmittal date as published in the project review schedule. The full resubmittal schedule may be found at www.albemarle.org in the "forms" section at the Community Development page. Be sure to include the resubmittal form on the last page of your comment letter with your submittal.

The application fee which you paid covers staff review of the initial submittal and **one** resubmittal. Each subsequent resubmittal requires an additional fee. (See attached Fee Schedule.)

(2) Request Indefinite Deferral

If you plan to resubmit after 30 days from the date of the comment letter, you need to request an indefinite deferral. Please provide a written request and state your justification for requesting the deferral. (Indefinite deferral means that you intend to resubmit/request a public hearing be set with the Planning Commission after the 30 day period.)

(3) Request Planning Commission Public Hearing Date be Set

At this time, you may schedule a public hearing with the Planning Commission. However, we do not advise that you go directly to public hearing if staff has identified issues in need of resolution that can be addressed with a resubmittal.

After outstanding issues have been resolved and/or when you are ready to request a public hearing, staff will set your public hearing date for the Planning Commission in accordance with

2013 Submittal and Review Schedule			
Special Use Permits and Zoning Map Amendments			
Resubmittal Schedule			
Written Comments and Earliest Planning Commission Public Hearing*			
Resubmittal Dates	Comments to applicant for decision on whether to proceed to Public Hearing *	Legal Ad Deadline and Decision for Public Hearing **	Planning Commission Public Hearing No sooner than*
Monday	Wednesday	Monday	Tuesday
<i>Nov 5 2012</i>	<i>Dec 5 2012</i>	<i>Dec 17 2012</i>	Jan 8
<i>Nov 19 2012</i>	<i>Dec 19 2012</i>	Jan 7	Jan 29
<i>Dec 3 2012</i>	Jan 2	Jan 7	Jan 29
<i>Dec 17 2012</i>	Jan 16	Feb 4	Feb 26
Jan 07	Feb 5	Feb 11	Mar 5
<i>Tue Jan 22</i>	Feb 20	Feb 25	Mar 19
Feb 4	Mar 6	Mar 18	Apr 9
<i>Tue Feb 19</i>	Mar 20	Apr 1	Apr 23
Mar 4	Apr 3	Apr 15	May 7
Mar 18	Apr 17	Apr 29	May 21
Apr 1	May 1	May 13	Jun 4
Apr 15	May 15	May 27	Jun 18
May 6	Jun 5	Jun 24	Jul 16
May 20	Jun 19	Jun 24	Jul 16
Jun 3	Jul 03	Jul 8	Jul 30
Jun 17	Jul 17	Jul 29	Aug 20
Jul 1	Jul 31	Aug 19	Sep 10
Jul 15	Aug 14	Aug 19	Sep 10
Aug 5	Sep 4	Sep 16	Oct 8
Aug 19	Sep 18	Sep 30	Oct 22
<i>Tue Sep 3</i>	Oct 2	Oct 21	Nov 12
Sep 16	Oct 16	Oct 28	Nov 19
Oct 7	Nov 6	Nov 18	Dec 10
Oct 21	Nov 20	Nov 25	Dec 17
Nov 4	Dec 4	Dec 23	<i>Jan 14 2014</i>
Nov 18	Dec 18	<i>Jan 6 2014</i>	<i>Jan 28 2014</i>
Dec 2	<i>Jan 1 2014</i>	<i>Jan 6 2014</i>	<i>Jan 28 2014</i>
Dec 16	<i>Jan 15 2014</i>	<i>Feb 3 2014</i>	<i>Feb 25 2014</i>

Dates shown in italics are changes due to a County holiday

* The reviewing planner will contact applicant to discuss comments of reviewers and advise that changes that are needed are significant enough to warrant an additional submittal or advise that the the project is ready for a public hearing. If changes needed are minor, the planner will advise that the project go to public hearing.

** The legal ad deadline is the last date at which an applicant can decide whether to resubmit or go to public hearing. If an applicant decides to go to public hearing against the advice of the reviewing planner, a recommendation for denial will likely result. Generally, the applicant will will have only one opportunity to defer the PC public hearing for the project once it has been advertised for public hearing. Additional deferrals will not be allowed except in extraordinary circumstances such as a major change in the project proposal by the applicant or more issues identified by staff that have not previously been brought to the applicant's attention.

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY SP # or ZMA # _____

Fee Amount \$ _____ Date Paid _____ By who? _____ Receipt # _____ Ck# _____ By: _____

Resubmittal information for Special Use Permit or Zoning Map Amendment



PROJECT NUMBER: _____ PROJECT NAME: _____

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

Resubmittal fees for original Special Use Permit fee of \$1,000	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$500
Resubmittal fees for original Special Use Permit fee of \$2,000	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,000
Resubmittal fees for original Zoning Map Amendment fee of \$2,500	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,250
Resubmittal fees for original Zoning Map Amendment fee of \$3,500	
<input type="checkbox"/> First resubmission	FREE
<input type="checkbox"/> Each additional resubmission	\$1,750
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 Amendments 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 Special Use Permit or 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)

**County of Albemarle Department of Community Development
401 McIntire Road Charlottesville, VA 22902 Voice: (434) 296-5832 Fax: (434) 972-4126**