

## **Planning Commission Work Session**

**August 26, 2014 – 5:00 p.m.**

**NDS Conference Room**

### **Commissioner's Present**

Dan Rosensweig - Chairperson  
Genevieve Keller  
Jody Lahendro  
John Santoski  
Kurt Keesecker  
Lisa Green  
Taneia Dowell

### **Staff Present**

Missy Creasy  
Lisa Robertson  
Ryan Davidson

Mr. Rosensweig called the meeting to order at 5:02 pm by having everyone introduce themselves, their role with the city, and what inspired them to serve on the Planning Commission. A welcome was extended to the two new members to the commission, Taneia Dowell and Jody Lahendro.

Mr. Rosensweig explained to the new members that recommending a Capital Improvement Program to City Council is one of the Planning Commission's primary duties that can be assigned by the state.

### **Agenda**

1. Capital Improvement Program
2. Strategic Plan Overview

The Charlottesville Planning Commission started its review of the city's capital improvement budget presented by Ryan Davidson, City's Budget Analyst. He said the GIS map is up and running for the CIP but was unable to show it due to lack of internet connection.

Mr. Davidson explained that the CIP is a five year financial plan and it helps to guide the city's long term projects. The CIP is used to identify future financial needs of the city with relation to the infrastructure and these are the rules set up for the City of Charlottesville's CIP:

Projects must cost at least \$50,000, be nonrecurring and non-operational in nature and they have to have a useful life of least five years. He said #2 and #3 are exceptions since they can have costs under \$50,000 for instance sidewalks or street repaving things that are large ticket items that recur year after year but are necessary. Items funded through the CIP include the Comprehensive Plan Implementation, Public safety, transit, parks, school improvements, bridge replacements, streets and sidewalks, recreational facilities, and storm water.

He said this is a breakdown of the project expenditures: There are about 16.9 million dollars' worth of projects for FY2015 and of the 16.9M, the Planning Commission priorities were related to 8.4 million dollars of those expenditures. Mr. Davidson will provide a copy of the PC priorities and what each funded to the Planning Commission.

He presented the updated CIP process:

1. Preliminary Request
2. Final Request
3. Project Evaluation Criteria
  - A. Strategic Plan Alignment
  - B. Comprehensive Plan
  - C. True Life Cycle Costing

Mr. Rosensweig said to look at where the staff support for Comprehensive Plan comes from and where there might be conflict with the Comprehensive Plan; the final preliminary form will be more specific and not a yes or no. He commented that the preliminary form could have the Comprehensive Plan/Planning Commission priorities split out from the Planning Commission and Comprehensive Plan links.

Mr. Santoski asked if the Planning Commission priorities should have higher priority over the Comprehensive Plan priorities and what about the alignment with the strategic plan. He also stated the Planning Commission might need to prioritize their priorities.

Mr. Keesecker said if we had a small area plan map then projects would be priority of certain areas of the city and would be good to have small area plans in place.

Ms. Keller said the definition of small area plans creates concerns for some people.

Mr. Rosensweig talked about the small area plan implementation being in the forefront.

Ms. Green stated communities are concerned about small area plans and we should meet with the Human Rights Commission to see what thoughts they may have.

Mr. Davidson continued the review of the CIP process.

Mr. Rosensweig asked the commissioners how to form the priorities.

Ms. Keller said we should review what we have, decide if it is valid and what should we add to it.

Ms. Creasy presented the Strategic Plan overview.

Mr. Santoski stated that critical issues drive funding issues.

Mr. Rosensweig said our purview is still planning and we should stay focused, not to look at the issues outside of our purview. He said the Comprehensive Plan focuses on land use and will help the CIP workgroup make funding decisions on land use. He also recommended reviewing existing priorities and prioritizing implementation items.

Ms. Green felt the first objective was too much.

Ms. Keller wants to leave the statements broad so there is flexibility to add something with educating/promoting.

Mr. Rosensweig said these three areas have more details to where we need to focus.

Mr. Santoski said #5 should include the small area plans.

Ms. Green said we should keep #'s 2 – 4.

Mr. Rosensweig stated we should talk about places to start and replace #5 with funding of small area plans and investment into the SIA.

Mr. Keesecker said promote vitality in the strong central core:

- Relate to finding re-development in an strategic area district
- Opportunity for mixed uses as a gateway around the community
- Balance look of opportunity with strong talk about the neighborhood promoting tree planning, and quality of life

Ms. Dowell said she would want to focus more into one area and allow for some broadness.

Mr. Rosensweig stated we need to put money and investment into the SIA.

Ms. Keller wants to see the SIA and West Main Street items specifically noted.

Commissioners continued discussion on the small area plan timing.

Mr. Keesecker gave background on small area/PLACE group and how to prioritize. If we call out certain areas like Hydraulic or West Main would it prevent other areas from being identified.

Commissioners continued discussion on public and private partnership opportunities.

Ms. Keller noted that infrastructure can enhance the identified areas and this should be planned. She also spoke on an identified project, public improvement, rehabilitation and facilities.

Ms. Green said we continue to hear about more bike/pedestrian accessibility and that needs to continue to be a consideration.

Mr. Rosensweig commented on funding for implementing the multi-modal plan.

Commissioners discussed workforce housing and UVA staff housing opportunities in the City.

The Commission continued discussion and noted the following language for their priorities. It was noted that Ms. Creasy and Mr. Davidson will refine the language and share an updated version with the Commission for comment.

- Improve, expand, enhance, and promote the park system:
  - Create and maintain pockets of open space in higher density zoning districts;
  - Create alternative active use opportunities in new and existing facilities; or
  - Maintain and enhance natural areas for the variety of citizens within our community.
- Improve and expand alternative modes of mobility/ implementation of multimodal plan;
- Increase and diversify affordable housing options;
- Improve the natural quality and ecology of streams, rivers and riparian zones;
- Implement Strategic Planning initiatives in areas with plans in, or with completed plans, specifically SIA and West Main.
- Undertake planning initiatives in identified Small Area Plan areas. Current priorities are the development of a full plan for the Hydraulic area and conceptual studies of Preston/Cherry, Harris/Allied and the River Rd./High Street area.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm