

Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET
January 8, 2019 – 5:30 P.M.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
NDS Conference Room

I. COMMISSION PRE-MEETING (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 4:30 pm

Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference Room

Members Present: Chairman Lisa Green, Commissioners Jody Lahendro, Taneaia Dowell, Lyle Solla-Yates, Gary Heaton, Hosea Mitchell, and Mr. Bill Palmer

Staff Present: Missy Creasy, Jeff Werner, Brennon Duncan, Lisa Robertson, Kari Spitler, Brian Haluska, Ryan Davidson, and Alex Ikefuna

Chairman Green called the meeting to order at 5pm. Commissioner Lahendro asked how we make sure that the different uses occur for 901 River Road if there are two different buildings. Ms. Robertson noted that a condition can be included to address the timing.

Chairman Green asked for a summary of the changes from the last version of this plan and that information was provided.

There was a discussion about the methods that are in place to comply with storm water regulations. Ryan Davidson from the budget office provided an overview of the process and decision points needed for the CIP this evening. If the Commission has recommendations to change the recommendation, that will be included as the front page of the materials on the CIP that are forwarded to Council. If there are suggestions as to where funds should be taken from, those statements would be included as well.

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Beginning: 5:30 pm

Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference

Members Present: Chairman Lisa Green, Commissioners Jody Lahendro, Taneaia Dowell, Lyle Solla-Yates, Gary Heaton, Hosea Mitchell, and Mr. Bill Palmer

A. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

Commissioner Lahendro: No report.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Attended the HAC policy subcommittee meeting on December 12 and discussed issues regarding the upcoming joint City Council and HAC meeting on January 16. In addition, they are working on coordinating a Planning subcommittee meeting for the HAC to discuss coordination between the Planning Commission and the HAC going forward.

Commissioner Dowell: No report.

Commissioner Heaton: Attended the HAC meeting in December where they discussed goals for the numbers to project affordable housing needs. The HAC mentioned a desire to create a reoccurring time to meet with the Planning Commission in the future.

Commissioner Mitchell: No report.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Bill Palmer: No report.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Lisa Green: The Commission had an extensive meeting on January 5 to discuss the Comprehensive Plan further.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Missy Creasy: Ms. Newmyer is no longer with NDS so we are temporarily down one planner. A work session is scheduled for January 22 to have a preliminary discussion for the Seminole Square redevelopment.

E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

Nancy Carpenter: Regarding the Land Use Plan, we have a problem with keeping routes the same when putting density near transportation hubs. Residents in the 10th & Page neighborhood have been struggling for 3 years because a route has been rerouted away from them and now older residents have to walk even further to find a bus stop. It would be best to make sure the routes are tied down as part of the multimodal plan because it isn't beneficial to have 6 story buildings when the idea was to be able to walk a block or two to find transportation, and hopes it becomes an important focus for the Planning Commission and City Council as the process continues.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

(Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

1. Minutes – December 11, 2018 – Pre- meeting and Regular meeting

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to approve the consent agenda as presented, with the exception of adjusting the acronym "CLICK" to "CLIHC" on page 2. Seconded by Commissioner Lahendro. Motion is approved 6-0.

III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION/COUNCIL

Beginning: 6:00 pm

Continuing: until all public hearings are completed

Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing

1. Charlottesville Capital Improvement Program FY 2020-2024

Chairman Green: Consideration of the proposed 5-year Capital Improvement Program totaling \$125,588,651 in the areas of Affordable Housing, Education, Economic Development, Public Safety & Justice, Facilities

Management, Transportation & Access, Parks & Recreation, Technology Infrastructure, Storm water Initiatives and General Government Infrastructure.

Staff Report, Ryan Davidson: A Capital Improvement Project (CIP) is a 5 year financing plan for projects generally costing more than \$50,000 that are usually non-recurring and non-operational in nature, and have a useful life of 5 years or more. It funds things like public safety equipment, playgrounds, schools, streets, sidewalks, transportation, bridges, recreation facilities, etc. The process was reworked this year and focused on the Neighborhood CIP Request Process, which was brand new this year. Staff wasn't able to fully refine this process because it came in so late, but we continue to make improvements to it. This year there were two work sessions with City Council to provide a summary of the review to be sure we were on track with what was being proposed in the CIP. The priorities of the Planning Commission are the same as last year and include to provide funding for affordable housing, broader planning initiatives, broader systematic initiatives, and place based initiatives. The primary strategies include reprogramming existing balances to reduce FY20 bond amounts, reduce funding in projects to allow for spend down of existing fund balances, reallocate the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund projected amount to assist in the funding of the Public Housing Redevelopment, reduce inflationary factors, maintain funding for the maintenance of infrastructure, and program the FY18 year end fund balance for the Affordable Housing Redevelopment. The total revenue for the CIP is \$35.3 million and although this is an aggressive CIP Plan, there was a substantial unfunded project list of over \$108 million. The needs within our City continue to grow and we are working to maintain the capital needs throughout the City. The largest item in the CIP aside from housing is for transportation and access enhancement, which includes street repaving, undergrounding utilities, bicycle improvements, etc.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Who was involved in selecting the housing spending?

Mr. Davidson: There were several meetings regarding that, as well as discussions within the internal team. It is an ongoing discussion and it was a joint collaborative process.

Commissioner Mitchell: Councilor Hill mentioned that there was no reference to upgrading the police department headquarters. Have you given any thought to this and is Council still interested in pursuing this?

Mr. Davidson: There is still funding for entrance way improvements for the police station and general district court if we needed to do those improvements right now, but the space in that area is still in flux. A larger assessment of the space needs to be determined first.

Councilor Hill: Notes that the police station comment was only an example. The question that came up was that if we don't have any plans to fund projects like this, are they still visionary plans that should be included in the Comprehensive Plan or should we recognize that they are things that we won't be doing in the near future. We were trying to decide if it should be kept in there as a visionary point or if we should just focus on things that can be done within the 5 year period.

Commissioner Mitchell: Another thing that isn't in the budget is parking at McIntire Park. The new skate park is going to attract people and events, so sufficient parking will be necessary. What was the thinking on this?

Mr. Davidson: The Parks and Recreation department didn't submit anything specifically for parking related to that, but they did submit an additional request for funding for the McIntire Park Master Plan implementation and

parking was a consideration for it. It came down to balancing the money since it is such a large CIP being brought forward to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: A major concern of mine has been about how the money can be moved around. Can any of these project be delayed and the money spent on housing?

Mr. Davidson: It would be difficult to make a blanket statement without having a specific project in mind. A lot of the capital projects are bonded projects where we borrow money, which is done on a spend rate basis. Delaying it may be a possibility for certain projects, but we would need to look into the affordability of each case to determine if it would make sense to delay a project.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Is interested in which specific projects could be delayed.

Mr. Davidson: We can look into projects that can be delayed, but each one would need to have the budgets and financing reworked.

Chairman Green: There are a list of priorities set forth by the Planning Commission and affordable housing is at the top of the list. It is important to understand that in order to get a bond, the project needs to be ready. It wouldn't work to have the money ready today if there aren't any projects ready to accept it.

Mr. Davidson: We can't sell bonds and we have a certain amount of time that we have to spend on those bonds. We can't put \$100 million into housing if we don't have \$100 million worth of projects that are shovel-ready. It would affect the affordability and tie up the capacity to do other things. As the debt service goes up, it must be paid. Without knowing the end goal it would be difficult to say which projects could be delayed.

Councilor Hill: Can Mr. Davidson provide more detail on the neighborhood requests?

Mr. Davidson: This year at a Neighborhood Association meeting, a suggestion came up to allow the neighborhoods to be more involved in the CIP process earlier and submit projects that are important to their particular neighborhood. We sent out a form to all of the neighborhood leaders and we received around 17 submissions. These were then sent out to the various departments that would be responsible for managing the projects and had them examined to make comments. At that point, they informed the neighborhood leaders of the results and timeline options.

PUBLIC HEARING

Peter Krebs, Piedmont Environmental Council: Has worked with City, County and University staff over the last year to develop a regional bicycle and pedestrian plan, but it isn't quite ready to be presented yet. As for the CIP, the best way to set ourselves up well to respond to the Jefferson Area Plan is to have both state and federal money for funding. From a strategic budget perspective, it is recommended to increase the amount for the joint park land and trails areas to \$500,000 - \$750,000 because it would benefit the whole community.

Angel Turner: Would like for the Commission to consider increasing the funds given for homeowners like herself because it gives families a chance to raise their kids in good neighborhoods. It also provides communication within mixed income neighborhoods to allow different types of people to come together without tension from having different backgrounds.

Annie Stup: Is part of the Charlottesville Low Income Housing Commission and a resident of the City. After reviewing the responses from last night's City Council meeting about the CIP budget, some concerns remain and would like more clarification about how the Affordable Housing Fund will change from Council's point of view. There is a concern that the transparent process of working with the HAC, which represents many advocates, is not getting the support that enables them to have an equity-focused comprehensive housing strategy. Councilors noted that we need to reexamine how to reallocate the funding, but we need to prioritize public housing redevelopment, rental assistance, and the community-driven redevelopment of Friendship Court, as well as those facing homelessness, those who need permanent housing, having opportunities for wealth building, and preventing displacement through the creation and preservation of affordable homeownership. The City has the resources and funds available and we need to prioritize and allocate it properly, and to have a lot more funds for all housing providers, which is not currently reflected in the CIP. The housing fund should have a permanent funding source and it should be substantial enough to address all housing needs that our most vulnerable neighbors face. Regarding the housing strategy and the Comprehensive Plan, the level of funding for public housing redevelopment is not sufficient to address CRHA's current plans. Hopes the Commission reconsiders the suggested allocations and will increase the commitment to ensure the success of CRHA's redevelopment plans. The current housing need is more than 3,000 affordable units, which will only grow in the future. Finally, we need to ensure that the housing fund and the CIP budgets are reflective of the housing strategy that's being developed in partnership with the HAC and needs to be supported by the Comprehensive Plan. The key to addressing historic, systemic, and intentional racism in Charlottesville is to name it, face it and undo it through zoning, planning, housing, transportation, and more.

Emily Dreyfus: Shares concerns about setting priorities to ensure the progress toward equity is being maximized. Some projects can be delayed and funds could be channeled towards projects that would impact low income people's lives. The sum total of the funding for public housing redevelopment does not correspond with where CRHA's planning is at. The Housing Authority's planning process is resident-led that has great participation and meets weekly. They have received a lot of resident input and hours have been spent figuring out how to move forward to resolve the issues, as the primary message from residents is to just get it done. There are concerns about the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund and would like to be sure they are getting the resources that they need. Encourages the Commission to work closely with the Housing Advisory Committee.

Linda Seaman, McIntire Botanical Garden President: In September 2013, City Council passed a resolution creating a public/private partnership between the City and McIntire Botanical Garden, a 501c3 nonprofit organization. The garden is 8.5 acres and will be free to the public and funds have been raised through private donors thus far. As stewards of this property, there will be a work day on January 19 to begin the process of removing invasive plant species. Bartlett Tree Service and Parks and Recreation staff will be donating their time, equipment and expertise for this project. The Parks and Recreation department requested \$3 million in this year's CIP budget and another \$3 million for next year to build a parking lot for the east side of McIntire Park, a bridge to upper portions of the park, bathrooms, picnic shelters, and other amenities to serve the east side of the park. This request was deleted by staff and does not appear in the budget before the Commission, however the garden depends on these improvements that have been long planned and anticipated for the garden.

Nancy Carpenter: The CIP Plan is not fully completed and there are a lot of omissions in the plan. For instance, there was no follow up regarding neighborhood requests. The plan is supposed to be representative of the values in our Comprehensive Plan but there are no updates to Washington Park, one of the premier places that represents the systemic racism that our community has endured. Staff should revisit this particular funding because it is important to a lot of people. Lastly, why isn't there any money allotted for housing the homeless?

Anthony Haro, Director of Thomas Jefferson Area Coalition for the Homeless: The Affordable Housing investments from the CIP are significant and unprecedented, which is the right thing to do. However, these investments are being made without the context of a housing strategy to guide and ensure that all of the housing needs across the spectrum are being met adequately. For example, The Crossings have half of the units dedicated to formerly chronic homeless persons in our community and the other half for general affordable housing units, which wouldn't have been possible without the Affordable Housing Fund. We can end chronic homelessness in Charlottesville, but the investments in permanent support of housing units to be addressed. There isn't a lot of room for these types of examples in the plan because there is no housing strategy to guide it.

Holly Wood: Notes that she is excited to become a homeowner in Charlottesville in the near future and she is excited about the stability it will provide, as well as the friendships and bonds to be made in a new community. There are a lack of funds allocated for affordable homeownership in the CIP and homeownership is important because it allows families like hers to have a forever home.

Christian Johnson: Shares excitement about the funds given for Friendship Court because she and her mother have lived there previously. She has depended on affordable housing over the years and is grateful because it has allowed her to graduate from affordable housing and become a homeowner. Homeownership needs to be supported because it encourages those in affordable housing units to graduate and become homeowners themselves.

Dan Murphy: Is a resident of Charlottesville in R1 and an economist at UVA's Darden School. There is a lot of money being allocated to supportive housing and some of the decisions made tonight are going to be long-lasting. A Comprehensive Plan for the City is very important and so is integration. There are certain disparities across the City that we can resolve through housing policy, one of which being education. There are short term needs that are understandable, but we are ultimately perpetuating the problem and we need to focus on incorporating housing with integrating the City and improving education. We also need to think about zoning to allow for more density and more mixed-income housing in R1.

Ilgiz Saybanor: Has lived in Charlottesville for the past 5-6 years and is delighted to see continued support for affordable housing. However, the affordable housing line is only at a 3% increase for the next 5 years and if we want to stay true to the intention to fight poverty, this amount is not enough. We need to support the entire spectrum of affordable housing and given the very few details in the plan, they don't seem to be fleshed out yet. Hopes that these details are elaborated on further since this just seems like a fairly rushed process.

Aaron Winston, Charlottesville Low-Income Housing Coalition: Notes that we need a continuity of affordable housing across the spectrum and echoes that we need to look at all of the options. One of the major line items on the CIP is the infrastructure improvements on West Main Street. Although these needs have to be addressed, we should be clear about who is being served through these capital improvements in terms of equity, which would be upper income people and UVA students. The \$15 million allocated in this plan isn't enough to meet the needs of redevelopment for public housing. If the citizens are served around West Main Street, those communities should also be provided with the tools and resources to fully benefit from the upgrades being proposed.

Dan Rosensweig, Housing Advisory Committee: This draft of the CIP is another example of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. It was an NDS priority to rework funding allocations to create a transparent and strategic way of allocating money. Additionally, the HAC has been working on a comprehensive spreadsheet that can align with the housing strategy that is based on data, availability of land, etc. Although it is likely unintentional, this plan lacks strategy and data. The HAC is working on a comprehensive funding plan that could

be tied to the housing strategy that should inform the CIP. Would like to make a recommendation to Council to have the affordable housing funds rolled back into the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund.

Phil D'Oronzio, Housing Advisory Committee Chair: The reoccurring theme is that although the funding is substantial, it is inadequate and is not presented in a strategic way. We have a substantial investment for the next year, but no one knows what needs to go where. CHRA may need much more than \$3 million next year or the year after. Friendship Court has 19 moving parts and they haven't landed on where they need to be, so the same can be said for them. This is a practical matter of allocation, as well as a matter of strategy and coordination. Requests the Commission take the money and roll it together and let the process work itself out because we don't know where to make these investments. Notes that the first subcommittee meeting for this funding model will be tomorrow, January 9.

Karen McIntire, McIntire Botanical Garden: The Botanical Garden is a place for our community to come together where the entire community can participate in nature and knowledge. It could provide a lot of healing for our community and we have attracted private donors to help provide the bulk of the money needed, but before that can be done the City must honor its already established partnership with the garden.

Burnie Davis, Ridge Street Neighborhood Association Member: Applauds the commitment to affordable housing, but the Elliot Streetscape did not make the list. They would like for this to be brought up into the proper part of the CIP. If that cannot be done, they would like to encourage the commitment to putting in a crosswalk at the corner of Burnet Street on Elliot Ave with a flashing light for pedestrians crossing. It wouldn't be very expensive to allocate some money for a crosswalk to address safety concerns.

Ned Michie, Neighborhood Association: There are many tough decisions to make regarding housing, but if we think about what residents of the City of Charlottesville want beyond critically important things, we should look at the data. Parks and Recreation published scientifically valid polls regarding what the citizens want and in 2005, the poll showed that by far the most important facilities were walking/biking trails. In 2018, another survey was done by them and residents stated that they would be most willing to fund preserving open spaces and natural areas, as well as to expand/renovate walking and biking trails and connect existing trails with their tax dollars. Albemarle's Parks and Recreation department did a similar survey in 2017 showing that walking, hiking, biking, and equestrian trails were by far the most important to them. If we get funding, we can then get free money from the state, but right now there isn't anything in the CIP for funding these things. Requests that funding be increased for greenways and to put it in a flexible way so Parks and Recreation can use it for available free grants.

Morgan Butler: Would like to comment on the West Main Streetscape project. In the broader context of affordability, transportation is a very critical piece of the puzzle. Many of the streetscape projects are about taking the important transportation corridors and making them safer and more accessible and it's important to keep that in mind when thinking about these types of projects.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Chairman Green: Reminds the Commission that the goal is to make a recommendation and suggestion to Council based on the information provided. There will not be a vote on this project tonight.

Commissioner Mitchell: Is very excited about the money put forward for redevelopment and having a core structure might be very valuable. However, if we vote to recommend this, we should be sure that the assets

dedicated to redevelopment are being protected. On the surface it makes a lot of sense, but we don't want to jeopardize any of the resources that we are dedicating to redevelopment.

Commissioner Heaton: Agrees that funding made within the next year should not be jeopardized by the reality that a campaign often takes longer than one budgetary cycle. Encourages a creative way to roll the funds together on a 2-3 year campaign and encourages Council to put together a 3 year budget especially focusing on housing needs. This could mean less money might be spent in 2019 and 2020, but it would grow exponentially in 2021.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Notes that he does not feel like he has enough information to make a good decision. There are a lot of missing pieces and we might not have time to get it right.

Chairman Green: We have had a lot of communication that housing the homeless and homeownership are not line items in the CIP. How was that missed?

Commissioner Lahendro: It looks like there is an oversight somewhere because we've supported these things in the past.

Chairman Green: Notes that there are a lot of people working individually like HAC, CLIHC, Thomas Jefferson, and we all need to work together to create a solution.

Commissioner Lahendro: What is the downside to putting the money into the CAHF and letting Council work out how to allocate it through the application process?

Commissioner Mitchell: The only downside is it may dilute the money that's been set aside for redevelopment.

Commissioner Heaton: Is there no mechanism to escrow or to ensure that the budgetary request is passed on from one year to the next?

Commissioner Mitchell: Suggests that we include that in the recommendation and consolidate all of the affordable housing line items under one item. The HAC representatives outlined the desire to roll all the affordable housing money into the CAHF and allow them to work with the Commission and Council to determine how it should be allocated.

Commissioner Heaton: We have an application process for funding, which then go through approvals from governmental bodies.

Commissioner Dowell: Are you insinuating that we pool both of the funds into one from the bondable projects?

Commissioner Lahendro: In 2019 it all went to the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund and they went through the application process. It was then awarded to homeownership, the homeless, and other needy organizations. They decided how it was going to be allocated and from 2020 on. That is taken away from them.

Commissioner Heaton: We aren't sure of the numbers for our goals so we cannot make a good decision since we aren't in agreement on what numbers we are shooting for. We need to escrow the time until we ascertain good numbers and we don't want to lose the money if it's not spent this year.

Mr. Davidson: Notes that any funding in the CIP that is appropriated into these projects will stay in that project until it is spent or Council takes action to move it to another project. It is done automatically year after year through the nature of the CIP.

Commissioner Lahendro: Right now it is being proposed that the money be allocated for specific programs and nothing going towards the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Does not support that strategy. We need to put some money into the CAHF.

Mr. Davidson: Clarifies that the intention of the \$500,000 is to put it into the CAHF.

Commissioner Dowell: Where do CDBG votes come from, and is "HOME" considered separate? The reason for the question is because some programs do have opportunities to get homeownership, down payment assistance, etc. through those funds.

Mr. Davidson: Clarifies that CDBG funds are a totally different process that are all in a separate fund that come through a federal funding process.

Commissioner Lahendro: Has the \$3 million to be spent over the next 5 years been determined based on a schedule that has been laid out?

Mr. Davidson: Those figures were based upon the 2016 work session with CRHA. A gap figure was given to be filled by government or private solicitations. Previously announced private donations and what we already had in there helped determine that number.

Commissioner Lahendro: Has the City vetted this?

Mr. Davidson: It is an ongoing discussion and cannot say for certain that everything has been vetted out.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Notes that he received a lot of communication about spending needs. Why can't we move back the Darden Towe project until after 2020?

Mr. Davidson: That is a joint project done with the County and we have an agreement with them where the City is responsible for a certain portion of the funds related to the improvements of the park. The County has already designated their funds and this would be the City's share. It involves the turfing and lighting of the fields.

Chairman Green: In order to light the fields of Darden Towe, an SUP would be required that would have to go through the County. There hasn't been any talk of submitting one anytime soon, so she would be in favor of moving this project back.

Commissioner Heaton: What are the consequences of not meeting our agreement with the County?

Brian Daly, Director of Parks and Recreation: Darden Towe Park is jointly owned 50/50 by the City and the County. An agreement was reached regarding the management of the park on how funds are dispersed and shared for improvements and general operating costs. The funding agreement calls for the City's share of the cost of operations and any improvements to the park to be the City's percentage of the joint population between the City and County. Roughly about 31% of the population is the City's population, but it fluctuates a percentage or

two. The project has been talked about for years and staff feels that it is a poor investment to provide year-round play and synthetic turf without lighting the fields.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: As a staff employee, would you say this is the best use of the funds for the citizens of Charlottesville?

Mr. Daly: Shares that it is not his position to advocate one way or the other. The community has indicated this as a need and there are multiple needs that require balance.

Commissioner Mitchell: What all is being redeveloped in McIntire Park?

Mr. Daly: The master plan adopted by Council has recreational features and connectivity measures for trail connections. It has multiple components including north-south trail connections that are accessible, east-west trail connections that are accessible, a pedestrian bridge that connects the east and west sides of the park, the relocation of a new skate park, new trails that connect north and south, a parking area, picnic shelters, a plaza area entering into the Botanical Garden on the east side of the park, etc. Additionally, there are bridge opportunities on the north side of the park, as well as several other projects moving to completion. The pedestrian bridge and the skate park are almost finished, but they would like them to open at the same time.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Is all \$3 million needed for the Botanical Garden to proceed?

Mr. Daly: The core area of the Botanical Garden was left blank and there was not a lot of concise design work done at the time. The Botanical Garden Board took the opportunity to hire an architect to design a schematic design that will be integrated very well. The requested \$3 million in the first year of the program would be accompanied by the second \$3 million in the 2nd year of the program in order to phase it in.

Commissioner Lahendro: Moving back to affordable housing, it is much more than simply putting up new units. From being homeless, to having a place to live, to being educated to move into homeownership, it is all important. We have nonprofits to help people with that and the structure for getting those organizations money to do that work is through the application process and the CAHF. We have to put money into the CAHF to maintain these programs and he would like to have as much money going into it as last year. Is it enough to make a recommendation that it be reallocated from other housing line items to the CAHF?

Mr. Davidson: In the current fiscal year we had allocated \$500,000 to CAHF and from FY20 moving forward, it would be a bondable \$3 million.

Chairman Green: Are there are other monies somewhere else? Asks Mr. Mike Murphy's opinion on the matter.

Mr. Mike Murphy, Interim City Manager: Would like to frame the CIP to show that it is strategic and does reflect prioritization. There is still an Affordable Housing Fund that should be spent by preserving the \$900,000 started in the year that we are in for housing subsidies. It is irresponsible to stop giving the subsidies because there is no best practice that would give subsidies for less than 24 months. Part of the equation is to keep people in the houses that are affordable and if they aren't continually renovated, those people will move out and they will get turned into places that aren't affordable. There is still \$1.4 million in affordable housing and staff is just suggesting the way it should be spent. We are looking at a situation where the Housing Authority and Friendship Court are applying for low-income housing tax credits and if the local government doesn't commit money towards it, they will not be successful in obtaining the credits. It is strategic that those are the most ready projects put forward and it may take away some of the process of how allocations get made with the Planning Commission and

Council, but feels that these are the greatest priorities in housing. Earmarking the funds the way we have was important and we have gone to capacity of how much we can responsibly spend.

Commissioner Lahendro: In the HAC meetings there was always an agenda item about master planning and new development. Until recently there was no clear direction for a strategic plan, so it is surprising that they are already moving forward with a \$3 million ask for next year.

Mr. Murphy: For example, there is a plan to modernize Crescent Halls that doesn't take much planning and is ready to be redeveloped now. There is additional planning that needs to be done with the Housing Authority in redevelopment to figure out the sequence, but they are making significant progress towards site plans. The City should be the agent working with the Housing Authority rather than the HAC because the City has tools at their disposal as the funder and decider of the governance of the Housing Authority Board. Knowing that the money is there and deciding how it should be conditioned are two very different things.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Appreciates the point that we cannot grow the budget even more. What potential do you see in Darden Towe?

Mr. Murphy: Notes he wouldn't have started with it being one of the top priorities, but it is part of our partnership with Albemarle County. The County Executive is going to advocate that this moves forward in the County budget, so he feels a responsibility to do the same.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Do you see any other areas where there might be a need, but not necessarily in FY20?

Mr. Murphy: The changes should never come at the expense of paving roads or creating sidewalks. It is important to consider the leverage of other dollars that come to the table. It comes down to quality of life projects and we have placed a high value on our parks and trail systems. It ultimately comes down to a value judgement on what is considered most important at this time.

Commissioner Lahendro: Because there is no money in the CAHF, is it a judgement by staff that it is not needed?

Mr. Murphy: It is important to remember that it was a 5 year plan with a 1 year budget and we look at what was requested and necessary for FY20 first.

Commissioner Heaton: Regarding the Housing Authority, do you have a sense of the percentage of the funds that are managed and distributed through City initiatives and a percentage of those that are managed through the application process of nonprofits and nongovernmental organizations?

Mr. Murphy: The agency budget review team process are nonprofits, as well as some contractual obligations for things like Region 10, that are additional investments of millions of dollars. We have about 45 nonprofits on any given year through the application process. It is currently the intent in the FY20 budget to hold those agencies harmless and to fund them at the level they were funded this year. They may rethink the best way to allocate those funds for 2021.

Commissioner Heaton: Notes that he is unsure of the percentage of the City's funding who works through NGOs.

Mr. Murphy: There is a lot of work to determine how those dollars get allocated, which are operational and annual in nature. We decide to put money into nonprofits because it extends the benefit beyond the core services of government into other domains.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Was equity considered as part of what was selected?

Mr. Davidson: One consideration was equity, but that was only one piece of the puzzle. There was evaluation criteria, departmental priority ranking, affordability, etc. that all played a role.

Mr. Murphy: Equity is an emphasis in the City right now and we are studying the tools in other localities. An organization assessment was created where we start with ourselves to find out what we are doing for equity before we extend outward.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Considers recommending this proposal with the amendments of pushing back Darden Towe and Riverview restrooms and directing those funds to the CAHF, housing rehabilitation and supplemental rental assistance in non-bondable spending.

Chairman Green: Notes that Darden Towe is bondable.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Is it possible to move bondable money to the CAHF?

Mr. Davidson: The housing fund dollars would have to be cash funded. Bonding agencies recommend against that because more specifics would be needed.

Commissioner Heaton: What would the total money adjustment to that amendment be?

Commissioner Solla-Yates: \$1,173,963 in bondable funds that would be moving to CHRA in 2020.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to accept the CIP, with the exception of moving \$928,963 for Darden Towe and \$245,000 for the Riverview restrooms back until 2021, and putting that amount into the CRHA for 2022. No second, motion dies.

Commissioner Mitchell: Shares that he is uncomfortable with that motion because there is an implicit commitment with the County to make the changes to Darden Towe.

Commissioner Heaton: It looks like our sense is that the budget does represent a sincere effort to address the needs of the community with a conviction that it will continue in that direction without amendments.

Commissioner Dowell: Agrees that we need to honor our commitment with the County, but affordable housing has a mixed array of ways to achieve it. Homeownership changes this generation's affordability, as well as the generations after that. Not putting any money into that fund for the next 4-5 years isn't the way to go, but doesn't know where to pull the funds from.

Commissioner Lahendro: Notes that he trusts the HAC because they are made up of the organizations that work with this on a day-to-day basis and they have the capability to allocate those funds in an appropriate place. Would like to fund money to put back into the CAHF, but is also unsure of where it should come from.

Commissioner Lahendro moves to recommends to City Council that \$1 million be put into the Affordable Housing Fund, reallocated from the other line items in the CIP draft budget. Seconded by Commissioner Solla-Yates.

Commissioner Heaton: Out of the funds earmarked towards housing needs, can staff put them into a line item with the belief that through the application process, HAC, and community efforts, the same amount of services will be provided and funded?

Chairman Green: Is it not our job to find that, it's our job to make a recommendation for Council.

Mr. Murphy: The investments that the Council has made in CAHF have always been on the cash side, not bonded, and they will continue to be. Would like for the Commission to clarify the money allocations in their motion.

Commissioner Lahendro: Clarifies that the motion is to add \$1 million to the Affordable Housing Fund, leaving the \$900,000 and \$500,000 that staff has already allocated. This would be in addition to what is currently there for 2020 and leave it to Council to decide where to take non-bondable cash line items out.

Chairman Green: There is an issue with raising taxes because it lowers affordability.

Commissioner Lahendro moves to recommends to City Council that \$1 million be put into the Affordable Housing Fund. Seconded by Commissioner Solla-Yates. Motion is approved 6-0. Recommendation to add one million dollars (for FY 2020 only) to fund the Charlottesville Area Housing Fund (CAHF). The funding could be taken from non-bondable housing funding recommendations outlined in the CIP.

2. SP18-00001 – 901 River Road SUP Request

Chairman Green: Shimp Engineering on behalf of Go Store It River, LLC (owner) has submitted an application seeking approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) request for the property located at 901 River Road with road frontage on River Road and Belleview Avenue. The proposal requests to allow for increased residential density as well as a self-storage company, pursuant to City Code Sections 34-480, where self-storage is allowed via a special use permit and density in excess of 21 dwelling units per acre (DUA) is allowed (up to 64 DUA) via a special use permit if residential density is associated with a mix-used development as indicated in Sec. 34-458. The proposal indicates a total of 54 residential units which equates to 25 DUA calculated with respect to entire development site (2.203 acres) as defined per Sec. 34-458. The property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map 49 Parcel 98 ("Subject Property"). The Subject Property is zoned IC (Industrial Corridor District). The site is approximately 2.203 acres or 95,963 square feet.

Staff Report, Missy Creasy: Ms. Newmyer completed the reporting portion of this project and has been through all four iterations. The uses for this proposal are slightly different, which is to have a four-story multifamily building with 54 residential units with a 1,500 foot retail space. This building would be closer to River Road with a four-story self-storage building at the rear of the site. There is conformance with the Comprehensive Plan's intent for business and technology area because a self-storage company is a commercial use that generates a smaller amount of traffic than other consumer-oriented commercial areas. Ms. Newmyer highlighted the different road typologies for River Road versus Belleview in terms of coordinating the sidewalk project and parking concerns, which is outlined in the report. Another consideration has been the environmental aspects of the site and how storm water and different mitigating factors are going to take place on the site. Staff received a number of public comments with concern from neighbors about traffic, buffering, the use of a self-storage facility in this location, and a consideration for crosswalks within the application. The recommendation is that if the Commission decides to move for approval, that a number of conditions are put in place for sidewalk improvements, curb ramps on Belleview, and handling the environmental factors on site.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Dowell: How are the cars that are currently parked going to be impacted by the rest of the community once the project is redeveloped?

Ms. Creasy: The existing cars and the cars associated with the repair shop will have to go somewhere else. The applicant may have further perspective on what will happen to them.

Chairman Green: Has the issue of water treatment on site been addressed any differently in this iteration?

Ms. Creasy: Notes that she is not aware of any difference at this point.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Did the neighborhood weigh in on this?

Ms. Creasy: They provided concerns, with one of the most prevailing being the use of self-storage in that area.

Applicant – Justin Shimp, Shimp Engineering: Notes that he is not opposed to onsite treatment for the storm water and accepts all four of the proposed conditions from staff. There was a desire from the Planning Commission to have intensity of the use of the site in this case because the storage alone didn't do enough for the site and streetscape. Notes that the junk cars that are located on the property were there before the acquisition of the building. The owner has allowed them to remain there until they find somewhere else for them. The SUP for this proposal is to add one additional floor to add nine units. Some neighbors shared concerns about the use not being intense enough and others thought it would cause traffic to be too high, but one of the benefits of a storage use is that it fills a commercial use that isn't noisy and has limited traffic. Highlights that a few added benefits of the mixed use project include that it will improve the quality of the site, provide a connection to River Road from Belleview, and that the sidewalk and landscape buffer both comply with Streets That Work.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Lahendro: Why are the two buildings so architecturally different and unrelated?

Mr. Shimp: They weren't thought of as being one entity. The storage building was meant to be a business use that isn't invasive to the people living around it. They aren't architecturally compatible because they have very different uses.

Commissioner Lahendro: How much building is above grade on the backside?

Mr. Shimp: It is intended to be two stories tall on the back, which would be about 27 feet.

Commissioner Lahendro: Wishes there was a drawing of the elevation on the entire north side to show the relationship between the apartment building, the storage building, and the residences behind it.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: What kind of hours would the self-storage have?

Mr. Shimp: They are generally daytime hours. It would not be a 24 hour facility.

Commissioner Lahendro: Will this have a unique type of construction that only allows the use to be specifically for storage buildings?

Mr. Shimp: Yes. This building is about half the size of the other proposals, but the type of construction is still a light duty framing for storage uses.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: There has been a concern about the existing truck traffic on Belleview and that this may increase that traffic. Have you considered some kind of traffic calming on Belleview?

Mr. Shimp: We have been reworking that entire street and have designed the exit to be a right-out only so trucks cannot turn up Belleview towards the residential area. This would allow circulation but not encourage traffic to go through the neighborhood.

Commissioner Dowell: Will there be something in the road that prevents them from making a left or would there only be signage?

Mr. Shimp: There would be concrete median in the road to prevent it.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: There is public interest in crossing the street that residents may be interested in. Did you consider a crosswalk?

Mr. Shimp: The issue with a crosswalk is the midblock nature. A crosswalk should be directly across at Belleview on the other side, but there are pedestrian safety issues of crossing midblock that traffic engineers do not advise.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Although an affordable housing component isn't required, it could make sense for the site. Could you elaborate on the decision for not adding this component?

Mr. Shimp: The SUP is for nine more units to make it viable, which is a relatively small addition. It started off with a three story by right building, but the construction costs showed that it was not feasible. This is a small project with conventional financing and there is simply no way to make that happen.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: There has been concern that the project would be phased where the self-storage may go in with significant delays in the residential portion. Can you speak on that concern?

Mr. Shimp: The intention is have one site plan and start both at the same time. They will be built simultaneously.

Commissioner Mitchell: Could you speak on the runoff and the plan to deal with that?

Mr. Shimp: Staff felt that the requirement to treat onsite should be done in this circumstance, which we will agreed to do if the Commission imposes that condition. It's an added cost, but it can easily be done with a slight change to the site plan.

Ms. Robertson: Do you agree that treatment on site is required under the storm water regulations?

Mr. Shimp: No, but it's required under the special use permit conditions proposed by staff. If we were to construct a by right project, we wouldn't be required to do it. However, the intention is to do all treatment onsite.

PUBLIC HEARING

Morgan Butler, Southern Environmental Law Center: With regards to the storm water management, he encourages the wording of that condition to be written in a way to make clear that the applicant will provide onsite treatment to satisfy its entire water quality treatment and may not acquire offsite credits to satisfy any part of that requirement.

Dave Hirschman: Represents the Locust Grove Neighborhood Association and notes that they do not take a formal position on development proposals. However, one of the priorities of the association is to breathe more life into River Road. The neighborhood is a pedestrian neighborhood and it would be great to have the streetscape improved on Belleview with a more formal crossing of River Road. The entire neighborhood is circled by the Rivanna trail system and notes that he is very supportive of having onsite water quality treatment.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Mitchell: Notes that the staff report does articulate that storm water treatment has to be onsite.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Shares that the 4th iteration of this project has improved greatly.

Commissioner Lahendro: Would like to ensure that the project not be phased for construction and that the mixed uses proposed remain there with the same general square footage of the uses in the future.

Ms. Robertson: Because this is an application for a specific development for buildings to be used for specific purposes, the SUP can be approved for the specific development that has been presented. Detailed criteria can be emphasized, including the square footage of the uses.

Chairman Green: Could there be a condition where if phasing does occur, that a timeline be required to complete both phases?

Ms. Robertson: For a mixed use project, it would be reasonable to require construction to proceed simultaneously without phasing.

Ms. Creasy: Section 34-458 notes that the special permit for density can be allowable in a mixed use situation.

Commissioner Dowell: What are the price points of the units?

Mr. Shimp: It would be market rate rents in the middle range, but this part of the City would not be as expensive as the downtown area.

Chairman Green moves to recommend approval of SP-1800010 subject to the following conditions: 1. the sidewalk improvements along River Road and Belleview Avenue will include connections to existing sidewalk networks on adjacent properties: Tax Map 49 Parcel 99 and Tax Map 49 Parcel 95. The sidewalk improvements will be reviewed and approved by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator and ADA Coordinator and incorporated into the final site plan prior to final site plan approval. 2. The Developer will provide curb ramps on the north side of Belleview Avenue to facilitate access. The curb ramps will be reviewed and approved by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator and ADA Coordinator and incorporated into the final site plan prior to final site plan approval. 3. The sidewalk improvements along Belleview Avenue will be designed as a standard

five-foot wide sidewalk that smoothly connects to existing sidewalk, allows for on-street parking to be maintained on the south side of Belleview Avenue while maintaining two-way travel lanes. The design and construction plan for the sidewalk improvements will be approved by the City Engineer, and the final site plan shall incorporate the approved design and construction plan in accordance to the Streets That Work Plan. 4. The Developer will provide on-site water quality treatment by using one of DEQ's approved BMP's (proprietary or non-proprietary), where the BMP is detailed on the site plan and approved by Engineering prior to final site plan approval. This is to be done in lieu of storm water credits. 5. The project construction should be in general accord with SUP conceptual plan 901 River Road, dated October 23, 2018 to include uses and square footage as described. 6. The construction of the projects shall be done simultaneously without phasing in compliance with mixed-used zoning code section 34-458. Seconded by Commissioner Dowell. Motion is approved 6-0.

3. CP18 - 00002 – Emmet Street Streetscape Concept

Chairman Green: Pursuant to Virginia Code section 15.2-2232 and City Code sec. 34-28, the Planning Commission will review the proposed Emmet Street Streetscape concept, located on Emmet Street from the Ivy Road/University Avenue intersection; north on Emmet Street to the Arlington Boulevard intersection, to determine if the general location, character and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. Following the joint public hearing, the Planning Commission shall communicate its findings to the Charlottesville City Council, with written reasons for its approval or disapproval.

Applicant – John Stuart, Clark Nexsen: Would like to discuss where the project is and the plans for the future. The City applied for the project to include multimodal improvements like bike lanes, pedestrian paths, improved intersections for ADA access, landscaping improvements, and bus operation improvements for the corridor. In the fall of 2019, we will be transitioning from the concept design to the detailed design with a final design stage next year. Ultimately, construction will begin in May of 2021.

Applicant – Michael Callahan, EPR: The public engagement process has included a steering committee comprised of neighborhood associations, stakeholders, Planning Commission representatives, and businesses on Barracks Road. There have been 3 steering committee meetings, a community meeting, and a UVA student meeting. This is a funded Smart Scale project and we've learned a lot through public engagement and received a lot of input for the planning and design of the project. In the community meeting, we asked how people used the facility and their perceptions, which were to make this a very walkable corridor. One of the primary questions discussed was deciding which side of the street the shared-use path should go on and the majority of people preferred it on the west side. The walking tour was helpful because it exemplified that it was a loud, auto-centric area. The responses from the UVA student meeting were more mixed for which side the shared-use path should go on, but they requested better bike and pedestrian travel areas and stated that the Emmet/Ivy intersection is not safe.

John Stuart: Overall, the public engagement process has been helpful to determine what options are available. This was built around a multimodal study by our team to assess traffic operations. It is broken into three segments: the Emmet/Ivy intersection to the railroad, the railroad to Massie, and Massie to Arlington. On Emmet Street at Ivy Road, there will be three travel lanes with reduced lane widths, an on street bike lane, a shared-use path on the west side, and a sidewalk on the east side. The tunnel location has yet to be determined, but the goal is to have it as close to the road as possible without impacting the railroad's facilities. The railroad underpass is a constraint with a 40 foot width underneath, so the bike lanes are reduced to 4 feet here, and there won't be any improvements to the bridge or sidewalk. The area north of the railroad transitions to a raised bike lane, which was preferable. The shared-use path will be on the west side, whereas the east side will have a bike lane, a greenway,

and a sidewalk. North of Massie to Arlington will have existing curb outward improvements with a raised bike lane on both sides and a shared-use path on both sides.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Chairman Green: Have there been any changes to this since the last work session?

Mr. Stuart: There was one change. Because the tunnel location hasn't been determined, it was modified to show the closer location, which is the goal. However, we need more geotechnical information to make a final decision.

Commissioner Mitchell: When do you want construction to begin for this?

Mr. Stuart: The goal is to have the engineering details worked out by summer and begin construction in May 2021. Construction could take 18-24 months.

Commissioner Mitchell: Have you worked with railroads before?

Mr. Stuart: We've done other work with railroads before where we put pipeline underneath the railroad. This project will be similar except it will have people and it will be very large. It shouldn't be a problem as long as we stay within their requirements and demonstrate that we won't be damaging their facility.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Have you considered removing some of the adjacent left turns on the east and west side of Emmet?

Mr. Stuart: Based on the plan shown, this is UVA's proposed development plan. This is subject to change, but the only access point is on the right next to the tunnel, which is meant to be a service entrance to a performance hall. It will be a right in, right out situation.

Mr. Callahan: Notes that there is another property further north that has access to Emmet Street at a signal and that access will be maintained.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Did you consider removing access to the signalized intersection at Massie?

Mr. Stuart: We've looked at it but the property owner would have to engage with them to determine if it would be acceptable. If there was an agreement with the property owner to close the access, it could be easily done. Right now that entrance doesn't propose anything unusual to the project and it doesn't seem to be a problem.

Mr. Callahan: There was an expression of interest to maintain that access point at a steering committee meeting.

Commissioner Dowell: Notes that in the event that the adjacent old hotel property is redeveloped another type of access would be necessary, so it would not be advantageous to close that access at the light.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Appreciates the speed control that is being proposed. Is it possible to have a consistent speed of 25 mph for the entire corridor?

Mr. Stuart: That would be more challenging on the north end because it would be hard to make a justification to reduce the speed further. If the City deemed it to be a priority it could be done, but from the traffic engineering perspective there doesn't seem to be a need to do that.

Mr. Brennan Duncan, City Traffic Engineer: Generally, you don't want a jump of 20 mph. The speed north of the intersection is 45 mph, so having the speed be reduced incrementally provides a nice transition zone.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: There was interest of expressed bus service from UVA to the airport. Would this work well with that plan?

Mr. Stuart: That would probably be a question to ask the operators and ultimately if it helps them operate better, it would likely work well.

Mr. Callahan: In coordinating with UTS, they mentioned moving to articulated 60 foot buses in the future. An expressed service might use a bigger vehicle, which has been considered in the design.

Commissioner Heaton: Would encourage that it be well publicized and promoted, especially regarding transportation.

Commissioner Lahendro: The Comprehensive Plan calls for safe multimodal transportation. Have there been decisions on what would be allowed on the shared-use path?

Mr. Stuart: There's no defined restriction. It's a wide path for pedestrians and lower skilled/ less experienced bicyclists. A more experienced bicyclist would use a bike lane, but there is no strict guidance as to who can and cannot use the shared-use path.

Commissioner Lahendro: The Virginia State Code allows the locality to limit what is used on a shared-use path, such as skateboards, electric scooters, etc. Has there been any discussion on this?

Mr. Stuart: No, the specific use has not been discussed at this point.

Commissioner Lahendro: The blue tunnel shows it being 45 feet off of the face of the retaining wall for the bridge. Will this end up being a channel that is going to a tunnel with sharp turns? The concern is that there are bicyclists and pedestrians going through that tunnel too, which would be a safety hazard.

Mr. Stuart: That amount of curvature is less than ideal, but it would be signed and marked so the user would be aware and engaged. This is a preliminary conceptual layout, so the curve can be smoothed out more. The goal is to know the conditions of the railroad fill so we know what we can realistically design. This would be the worst case scenario, but with appropriate signing and warning to reduce their speed, it could be mitigated to a minimum level of concern.

Commissioner Lahendro: There is a shared-use path on the east side of Emmet that stops at Massie where a 7 foot sidewalk begins. Why is this the case?

Mr. Callahan: Originally, the plan was to only have a shared-use path on the west side and a raised bike lane on the east side. This is in the City's bike/ped master plan. The thinking here is that the shared-use path would continue up the east side of Emmet in the future, beyond the scope of this project and they didn't want to preclude that opportunity. The shared-use path should have a logical termination point and an intersection is an ideal place to do that.

Commissioner Lahendro: Would the less skilled bicyclists using the shared-use path then get dumped at an intersection? The choice would be to use a pedestrian sidewalk or to cross a 60 foot wide road.

Mr. Stuart: It is a signalized intersection with crosswalk markings and we would put in some signage to note that users should cross to the west side to use the path underneath the railroad.

Commissioner Lahendro: Would there be an option to do a 7 foot wide sidewalk instead of the shared-use path in the future when we have the capability to extend the shared-use path?

Mr. Stuart: That is certainly an option that could be considered. It could be designed with a plan for a future 10 foot sidewalk and in the interim have a reduced width to a 7 foot sidewalk as part of the final design.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Some of the bicycle traffic is being diverted into the bridge, but also keeping the southbound bike lane through the tunnel. Did you consider diverting all bicycle traffic through the tunnel and then back onto the street?

Mr. Stuart: It was considered, but it provides an option for a cyclist on a dedicated bike lane to continue south on the dedicated bike lane. It would be ideal to have a larger bike lane, but it isn't possible at this point. However, if the cyclist isn't comfortable with this, they have the option to use the tunnel.

Mr. Callahan: Having both a shared-use path and a bike lane have been discussed a lot and there are two types of users out there, the high speed commuters v. pedestrians, slower users, children, etc. Allowing the faster bicyclists to stay on the street is why it is presented in this way. There is also a lot of foot traffic after games and diverting bikes during these times could be a hazard.

PUBLIC HEARING

Peter Krebs, Piedmont Environmental Council: This project has a fully protected, semi-raised bike lane and a shared-use path, which is a great combination. The user for the shared-use path is intended for the relaxed person and the bike lane is for velocity cyclists. VDOT is currently setting up guidelines for motorized vehicles for things like scooters, e-bikes, motorized wheelchairs, etc. Rather than trying to define who a user is, they are looking at the performance specifications of the vehicle itself like maximum speeds, maximum weights, etc.

Kathleen Adams: This project seems to still have a very vehicular focus in the design and the speed is important to consider. The travel lanes are 11 feet and the rule for Streets That Work is 10-11 feet in mixed use areas. It seems like a foot could be taken away from a travel lane and put into a bike lane to provide a little extra space. It's also important to be sure we prioritize time to pedestrians at the signalized intersections in the design.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Chairman Green: Is signalization part of the project, specifically for pedestrians?

Mr. Stuart: Part of the signal design is to provide a lead time for pedestrians to start crossing before a car is given a green light. The pedestrian interval gives the pedestrian a little bit of a head start over the vehicle, which will be built into all of the intersection designs.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Asks Mr. Duncan if it would be possible to make the entire corridor 25 mph?

Mr. Duncan: It is a 4 lane divided roadway and if you were to extend the design elements all the way up, which we do not have the scope or funding to do, it could be done. Imposing a 25 mph speed limit would create a situation where drivers don't feel a natural inclination to slow down, which creates a speed trap.

Commissioner Lahendro: Asks Mr. Duncan what he thinks about narrowing the lanes by a foot.

Mr. Duncan: Anywhere where we have transit lines, it is 11 feet. The 10 foot lanes are only for turn lanes and local neighborhood streets.

Mr. Palmer: UVA has been collaborating with the project team and the one outstanding concern that remains is the right-of-way being taken away for a lot of this project. They are looking at the impact of that and what it does for future programming for that site.

Commissioner Lahendro: Do any of the Commissioners see a concern with going from a 10 foot shared-use path to a 7 foot sidewalk?

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Shares that concern and notes that one of the resolutions for the tunnel would be not to have bike lanes under the bridge and just have shared-use paths on both sides consistently and resume the bike lanes on either side of the bridge.

Commissioner Lahendro: The regular bicyclists would be barreling down the road and then people stepping out into their lane, which could be a problem.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves that the proposed concept for the Emmet Streetscape Project, located on Emmet Street from the Ivy Road/University Avenue intersection; north on Emmet Street to the Arlington Boulevard intersection in the City of Charlottesville, general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted 2013 Comprehensive Plan or part thereof, with the recommendation that it be designed for a consistent 25 mph speed. Seconded by Commissioner Heaton. Motion is tied 3-3.

Commissioner Dowell: Notes that she has some reservations about having a consistent 25 mph speed limit. We've already heard from the traffic engineer and it would be a whole other project we don't have funding for.

Ms. Robertson: In order to change the speed limit on a City street, the speed limit has to be supported by scientifically calculated engineering data. The Commission may want to consider a review of the basis of the speed limit be undertaken at some point in time and based on the engineering assessment, a new speed limit be implemented if necessary.

Commissioner Dowell: As of right now, our engineering study does not support that.

Commissioner Heaton: Asks if there could be any street calming measures.

Ms. Creasy: Traffic calming wouldn't apply on this road classification.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves that the proposed concept for the Emmet Streetscape Project, located on Emmet Street from the Ivy Road/University Avenue intersection; north on Emmet Street to the Arlington

Boulevard intersection in the City of Charlottesville, general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted 2013 Comprehensive Plan or part thereof, with a concern that more consideration be given to extending the 25 mph speed limit throughout the project. No second. Motion dies.

Commissioner Dowell moves that the proposed concept for the Emmet Streetscape Project, located on Emmet Street from the Ivy Road/University Avenue intersection; north on Emmet Street to the Arlington Boulevard intersection in the City of Charlottesville, general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted 2013 Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. Seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion is approved 5-1.

Commissioner Lahendro: Notes that he cannot support the motion because of the safety concerns.

Chairman Green: Would like to make a note for Council that the Commission was split on potentially lowering the speed and the safety concerns at the bridge and eastside shared-use path, as well as clarifying that the city traffic engineer stated that they've already studied the speed of the project.

Commissioner Dowell left the meeting at 10:40 pm.

4. CP18 - 00003 – 5th / Ridge / McIntire Multimodal Corridor Study

Chairman Green: Pursuant to Virginia Code section 15.2- 2232 and City Code sec. 34-28, the Planning Commission will review the proposed 5th / Ridge / McIntire Multimodal Corridor concept, from the intersection of Harris Street and McIntire along McIntire Avenue Ridge Street / 5th Street Extended to the intersection of Harris Road and 5th Street SW, character and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. Following the joint public hearing, the Planning Commission shall communicate its findings to the Charlottesville City Council, with written reasons for its approval or disapproval.

Staff Report, Brennen Duncan: The purpose of the study was to look at possible future projects for the City and do a high level planning of it so staff has something that can be presented when future projects come up.

Applicant – Michael Callahan, EPR: This is a city-funded study looking at how to make this a more complete street in line with the City's desires expressed through the Comprehensive Plan. Notes that Streets that Work were a very important part of the how the project was designed. There were two public engagement meetings in January and July of 2018 that provided input that was incorporated into the final set of recommendations. The general theme was that this is a critical artery of the City and has to work well for all users, including bike and pedestrian travel. The sidewalks are typically right up against the curb and bike facilities are lacking and insufficient in some areas. The transit system was also a large part of the corridor with 4 buses. In terms of safety, this is a high crash corridor that needs to be addressed. The recommendations are to eliminate the slip lane on 5th SB to Harris WB, a new dedicated right turn lane from Harris WB to 5th NB, and a shared-use path and protected bike lanes. On 5th (Harris to Cherry/Elliot), they would recommend switching the shared-use path to the west side at Brookwood and incorporate raised bike lanes. As far as safety improvements to 5th street, a restricted crossing U-turn (RCUT) would be implemented. Bike lane enhancements are also important for Ridge (Cherry/Elliot to West Main) on both sides, which would require an elimination of on street parking on the west side. On Monticello, the bike lane would be extended up to the intersection and adding another dedicated right-turn lane onto Ridge northbound. There will also be a shared-use path on the west side and two northbound lanes on Ridge because of the heavy vehicular traffic. There will be a roundabout at Ridge-McIntire at Preston to reduce delay, speed and conflict points for pedestrians and provides median refuges for pedestrians. On McIntire (Preston to Harris), they would

extend Schenk's greenway to Preston, have bike lanes in both directions, new right turn lanes from McIntire SB to Harris WB and from Harris EB to McIntire SB. Lastly is the concept for improving the bike/ped connectivity. The short term timeframe includes the Cherry/Elliott Smart Scale application, new bike lanes, parking changes, and extending the greenway. The long term timeframe includes the roundabouts, raised bike lanes, and intersection improvements.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Mitchell: Would like to hear more about the proposed roundabout.

Mr. Callahan: This is proposed as a one lane roundabout with room to make it two lanes if need be. The roundabout would help prevent crashes and injuries, as well as making it a gateway feature. There are also fewer conflict points by using a roundabout.

Mr. Duncan: Notes that the traffic would yield to all other traffic and roundabouts move about 35% more traffic than a conventional intersection.

Commissioner Lahendro: Some intersections like Ridge and Monticello have 5 lanes of traffic for pedestrians to cross without a refuge midway. At what point is it too long for it to be a safe pedestrian crossing?

Mr. Callahan: There is a median there and it could be extended out further. It would depend on how much time there is to cross, but it is a trade off because there is a lot of vehicular congestion and pedestrians in the area.

Chairman Heaton: What is the data regarding the crashes at the Preston/McIntire intersection?

Mr. Callahan: It's in the middle of the pack for crash and injury rate, but it is surprisingly low.

Chairman Green: Have you thought about eliminating the left turn from Market to High Street?

Mr. Callahan: Bikes move really fast down Market Street that likely contributes to the problem.

Commissioner Heaton: What do the bicycling community's studies say about roundabouts?

Mr. Duncan: Because the design is 20-25 mph, a bike can traverse it within the travel lane more easily than a conventional intersection with 35 mph traffic. The roundabouts are designed so you physically cannot go above 25 mph.

Mr. Krebs: The overriding goal is to reduce the velocity differential. Having someone drive 25 mph wouldn't be as likely to seriously injure someone. The intersection as it is now is very challenging for cyclists and pedestrians.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: There would still be a slip lane from Ridge/McIntire. Wouldn't it simplify and improve safety to just eliminate that?

Mr. Callahan: It probably wouldn't perform as well when it is modeled, but it would be worth looking at.

Mr. Duncan: Ideally, it would be eliminated completely, but this idea was proposed years ago and residents complained that about that access point. We are trying to respect the past, but having an intersection come in at

that location close to a roundabout does pose issues. Reminds the Commission that this is a conceptual design and public engagement will be part of the process going forward.

PUBLIC HEARING

Peter Krebs, Piedmont Environmental Council: This is a very strategic corridor and this could be a way to get people across the city east to west. This is a large project and there is a lot to see in the report, but believes that the current rendition is pretty solid.

John Erdwurm: The intersection is terrible and this plan is overall a step in the right direction. However, unless these project are broken out and addressed in the near future, there won't be enough funding to complete them. At Elliot and Cherry, it is almost at gridlock and when there is an accident, it is extremely difficult for emergency vehicles to get to that intersection. Generally, roundabouts are not recommended in urban cities so this option may not be helpful. It has the potential to be an eyesore to the community and there is always driver anxiety about using roundabouts. People will try to avoid them and use other local streets, which would be a huge problem. Recommends the Commission to look beyond the traffic engineering aspects of the project and look more at the social and psychological aspects of it.

Susan Sherman: Lives at 818 Harris Road in the Willoughby neighborhood and urges the city to develop and implement stronger safety upgrades to the 5th Street-Harris Road intersection as improvements are made to the 5th-Ridge-McIntire corridor. It is the site of numerous serious accidents, including one that took the life of an Albemarle County teacher in 2016. The time frame of the study was 2011–2016, yet it failed to document this fatality. The report states that no fatalities occurred in the corridor within this time frame. Additional accidents have occurred since the study concluded. In November 2018, Sandra Murray, a neighbor, sustained serious injuries and totaled her car when she was T-boned at the intersection. Three weeks later there was another accident at the intersection. Certainly some of the crashes at this intersection result from north or southbound drivers on 5th Street running a red light at Harris Road, which is a hard problem to fix. Traffic flow onto 5th from Harris is dangerous, as cars come out of Willoughby at the same time as cars on the Jackson Via side of Harris turn onto 5th heading north toward downtown creates a game of chicken that can be fatal. Cars coming out of Willoughby have the right of way to proceed straight across 5th Street or to turn right onto 5th Street, heading north. There is a sign at the intersection facing vehicles coming from the Jackson Via side of Harris Road that cautions those cars to yield to oncoming traffic. However, those drivers often do not yield to the cars coming out of Willoughby and they make a left turn heading north onto 5th Street as we, who have the right of way, are attempting to cross the intersection or turn right. In early 2018, my neighbor Mike Meintzschel spoke in person with Brennen Duncan about the dangers of this intersection. Mr. Duncan assured him that the city would paint directional lines as an initial step, yet nothing was done during 2018. This December, Mike returned to Mr. Duncan's office and inquired about the lack of progress. Mr. Duncan admitted to Mike that he had forgotten about it and that it would need to wait until the weather is better in the spring. On December 17, 2018, I emailed Mr. Duncan to inquire about the addition of a green arrow on the traffic light at Harris Road facing 5th Street. Mr. Duncan noted that due to the heavy traffic at the intersection, this would cause too much delay and back up traffic even worse. The solution must be some combination of painting appropriate lines, creating left turn arrows, and adjusting the timing on the light at 5th Street.

Joan Albiston: Feels that the issues with the intersection of Harris and 5th Street are due to the speed limit. There is difficulty with sightlines because of the grades, which may not be able to be changed. There is also increased congestion due to 5th Street traffic and the Willoughby neighborhood bears the brunt. The safety issues of this intersection need to be addressed now.

Bob Troy, Willoughby Property Owner's Association President: Residents are very concerned about safety at the intersection of 5th and Harris. The speed limit on 5th Street extended is 45 mph, but it is frequently 55-60 mph, which is likely the cause of many accidents. As you approach the intersection on 5th Street, the light does not come into view until the possibility to stop becomes dangerous. Suggests incorporating the synchronized flashing yellow caution signal to give drivers a warning. Reiterates that this is a circumstance that affects all of their neighbors, commuters, children that board school buses, etc. and has doubts that this plan would meet the safety standards in the Comprehensive Plan. Notes that there is also frustration regarding the availability of the report.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Chairman Green: Reminds the Commission that we are discussing if this project is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, however this is only a preliminary plan that needs more engineering, safety studies, design, and community engagement so it can be submitted for Smart Scale funding.

Mr. Duncan: Notes that this was treated as a whole corridor study, but it is fully intended to be broken into smaller projects. The Cherry/Elliott/Ridge intersection was submitted for funding this year.

Commissioner Heaton: When staff hears about imminent safety concerns, do they liaison with the police department for immediate action to be taken?

Mr. Duncan: We don't have the police staff to direct traffic through intersections, which is why the signals are in place. The signals are working, but a lot of the accidents come from people running red lights. From an engineering standpoint, there's not much we can do to stop driver behavior. Notes that Public Works will help paint the lines when the weather warms up.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Notes that he is unable to speak on the matter because he hasn't had a chance to read the report.

Commissioner Heaton: Was the timing of putting this type of project together a reaction or response to an unsatisfactory situation?

Mr. Duncan: This came about after the Streets that Work plan and several of the intersections were on the priority list. It wasn't a response to safety concerns at the time, it was more preemptive on the City trying to get things in line so that we weren't working reactively.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to defer. Seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion fails 4-1.

Chairman Green: Notes that a deferral would simply put it back on as an agenda item for next month's meeting.

Commissioner Lahendro: This project still needs a lot of work and public engagement, but the first step is getting it in the queue so it can move forward. Deferring it would make it take longer to fix these problems.

Chairman Green: Can this be reviewed by the State for Smart Scale funding if we don't vote that it is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan?

Mr. Duncan: It can, but it would make the application stronger to have the support.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to deny that the planning concepts on the 5th -Ridge –McIntire Multimodal Corridor Study, located from the intersection of Harris Street / McIntire Road to the intersection of Harris Road / 5th Street Extended, in the City of Charlottesville, general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City’s adopted Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. No second. Motion dies.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves that the planning concepts on the 5th -Ridge –McIntire Multimodal Corridor Study, located from the intersection of Harris Street / McIntire Road to the intersection of Harris Road / 5th Street Extended, in the City of Charlottesville, general character, location and extent of the proposed improvements are substantially in accord with the City’s adopted 2013 Comprehensive Plan or part thereof. Seconded by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion is approved 4-1.

IV. COMMISSION’S ACTION ITEMS

1. Preliminary Discussion – Entrance Corridor – 140 Emmet Street (Gallery Hotel)

ENTRANCE CORRIDOR REVIEW BOARD

Staff Report, Jeff Werner: This is a preliminary discussion for a COA application. The hotel on this site was destroyed by fire in May 2017 and the applicant would like to construct a 7 story hotel with 79 rooms and suites. In addition, there will be structured parking and a small street level café. The applicant is requesting feedback on 3 material options, all of which are consistent with the massing and scale previously reviewed during the SUP request. They would like to take the input from tonight and prepare a final design and submittal package. Pedestrian routes, streetscapes, building placements, parking concealment, etc. have all been addressed and the 3 options generally follow the EC guidelines.

Applicant – Neil Bhatt, NBJ Architecture: The site plan comments from the Commission and City Council have already been incorporated to this plan. As for the architectural aspect, the building design hasn’t changed except for changing the height and configuration of the garage to accommodate loading and unloading vehicles inside the building. This changed some of the design and the conference area on the main level had to be removed. The top floor will have an open terrace on one side facing Ivy Road. All three proposals have the same design, they just have different materials used throughout. The first option focuses on reducing the impact of the tower and it is now simpler with the facades being a darker color to recede back. The top floor was changed to a metal panel that bleeds down into the rest of the tower to make it less imposing. The lower level is lighter in color to blend with the tower. The first proposal has a black brick on most of the building, a beige color tile and metal panels at the top of the tower. The second proposal is the exact opposite, with a darker tower and a light body of the building. The third option uses the same materials that were presented previously. The client prefers these options as presented, with the first option being most preferable.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Heaton: Feels that the first design option is preferable.

Commissioner Lahendro: Could you show us how you responded to the comments about breaking up the massing and stepping back from the street?

Mr. Bhatt: We haven't set it back any further because the program won't work with that option. Instead, the material has been changed so that it appears to look different with the tower much less imposing.

Commissioner Lahendro: Additional height was granted and the ERB felt that the height would be detrimental in this area because the building would look more soaring than it should, compared to the context. Notes that he doesn't see anything that has been done to address that issue.

Ms. Creasy: The ERB noted from the SUP that it would have an impact on the district. That recommendation was provided to Council and they moved forward with approving the SUP with conditions.

Commissioner Lahendro: The ERB decided that it had an adverse impact on the entrance corridor because of the increased height and proximity to the road, and advised to break up the massing and step back from the street.

Chairman Green: Notes that Council approved the SUP for the height with several conditions, including that the project design will include features that reduce the *apparent* height of tower.

Mr. Vipul Patel, Owner: Comments that two feet of the property will be dedicated towards the seven foot sidewalk. Shares that future buildings in this area will most likely be similar in height and may not go through this body at all.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Has the conference room been eliminated or was it just moved?

Mr. Patel: It has been removed, but a snack bar café will utilize that space. There may be an opportunity to utilize the terrace because it is a flat open space. The conference space had to be removed because we had to raise the garage from the ground level up, which eliminated some parking spaces. We didn't want to create parking issues with anyone trying to use the conference room. However, we created a terrace from the café, which was not previously assigned.

Mr. Werner: Because they had to lift things up a bit, it changed the shape some. Rather than submitting a new configuration and design that is different from what was previously submitted, staff felt it was important to get the Commission's sense of the change. Staff would like for the Commission to determine the sense of the architecture and to have the opportunity to give the applicant feedback in case there are issues with the materials, color palette, landscaping, etc. It's an opportunity to shape the future application so the Commission will feel comfortable with the decisions during the public hearing.

Commissioner Lahendro: Believes that the 60 foot height restriction is in this corridor for a reason. The applicant was given the addition 20 feet and rather than disguising it, it appears that the designer has accented it.

Mr. Werner: Asks if it would help if the future presentation showed a more mature rendering to see how it would relate to the project size, including showing the project with the 4 elm trees.

Chairman Green: Does not have a problem with this project and notes that we don't know what the future holds for this area. We don't have a way to hold some things to the context of the area, so it's difficult to hold the hotel to context in that way.

Commissioner Heaton: There are places in the City where we need to be very concerned about character, maintenance, and historic preservation but this is not one of those areas. This is an economic corridor.

Chairman Green: Reiterates that it has already been determined that it meets the height requirements and now it needs to be determined if it meets the ERB.

Mr. Werner: Asks if the applicant should stick with the L-shaped layout that has been approved or if it should be revisited to look at other possible configurations.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Notes that he was very excited about the conference space as part of the hotel, but does not see any aesthetic issues with anything that has been shown.

Mr. Patel: Agrees that the conference space would have been very useful, but it was a tradeoff because ensuring that adequate parking is available is one of the most important elements.

Mr. Palmer: Notes that traditional brick is on all of the UVA buildings and the black material may be out of context with UVA.

Commissioner Heaton: Agrees, but this property is not part of UVA and UVA has to end somewhere.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Is unsure about how the public will feel about this material design.

Commissioner Heaton: Notes that the material is aesthetic and subjective.

Commissioner Mitchell: Agrees that black will not bend very well and because this is an entrance corridor, it should be taken into account.

Chairman Green: Does not agree and states that the two neighboring owners should be partners with one another.

Mr. Werner: The general concept of the entrance corridor recommends that new building design should be compatible in massing, scale, materials, and colors with those structures that contribute to the overall character and quality of the corridor. There really aren't many buildings left in the entrance corridor, however the Commission could interpret the guidelines under the circumstance of what may go there in the future. As far as the ERB guidelines go, it stops at the Ivy Road intersection.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Shares the concern that a design review is not a judicious use of the Planning Commission at this time.

Mr. Patel: If this comes before the ERB next month, what should we expect?

Chairman Green: Right now it is a split, but personally feels like it would be a very modern approach.

Commissioner Mitchell: Notes that he doesn't want it to have a modern look.

Mr. Bhatt: Notes that they were looking at this with the trend of the greater Charlottesville area, not just within the context of the traditional brick buildings in this specific area.

2. Comprehensive Plan – reserved time for continued discussions

Chairman Green: Notes that she had a meeting with Council in December about the Comprehensive Plan and they have asked the Commission to hold off on future meetings for 2-3 months while the Land Use Plan, Land Use chapter and Housing chapter are being finalized with direction from staff and/or a consultant. It was also noted to work on these things in conjunction with the housing strategy and set it up with the zoning text amendments directly following it.

Commissioner Heaton: Is in agreement with bringing in some direction, but the consultants should be process experts that could help facilitate what we need to do. We don't need a consultant who is an expert on making master plans.

Chairman Green: Notes that the consultant needs to be someone with planning and urban design knowledge. Ultimately, that will be up to Council to decide.

V. Adjournment

12:40 pm – Commissioner Mitchell moves to adjourn until the second Tuesday in February 2019.