

Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET
March 12, 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: Vice Chairman Hosea Mitchell, Commissioners Jody Lahendro, Lyle Solla-Yates, Gary Heaton, and Rory Stolzenberg

Staff Present: Missy Creasy, Lisa Robertson, Kari Spitler, Brian Haluska, and Alex Ikefuna

Commissioner Mitchell called the meeting to order at 5pm. He noted that he would be chairing the meeting this evening as Ms. Green is ill. He provided a review of the agenda and asked Commissioners if they had any questions.

Commissioner Solla-Yates asked about the number of units' SUP condition provided for the Lyman Street application. Mr. Haluska clarified that the condition supported the request provided by the applicant. After additional questions, it was determined that alternate wording of the condition would clarify that 3 single family detached dwellings would be allowable which would not prevent any other by right allowances for those sites. Commissioner Mitchell asked for clarification on the set back modifications and that information was provided.

Ms. Creasy provided background on the CDBG/HOME budget and included an explanation of the request to flip the priority neighborhood years for Belmont and Ridge Street for cost affective development of the selected Belmont project.

Commissioner Lahendro mentioned that the Tree Commission was planning to have Development review staff attend the next meeting to discuss tree preservation in the construction process.

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

Beginning: 5:30 pm

Location: City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference

Members Present: Vice Chairman Hosea Mitchell, Commissioners Jody Lahendro, Lyle Solla-Yates, Gary Heaton, Rory Stolzenberg and Mr. Bill Palmer

Chairman Green was not present; Vice Chairman Mitchell conducted the meeting in her absence.

A. COMMISSIONER'S REPORTS

Commissioner Lahendro: Attended a Tree Commission meeting on March 5. The City will celebrate Arbor Day on Friday, April 26 where there will be a ceremony at Market Street Park by a large basswood tree on the protected list. The Tree Commission would like to understand NDS' site review process to understand how existing trees are identified for preservation and how they are protected during construction. This is a result of recent projects where trees were removed when they were supposed to be protected. Two vacancies are open to applicants from CDBG neighborhoods, which are Star Hill, Belmont, 10th & Page, Rose Hill, Ridge Street, and Fifeville. The BAR meeting on February 20 was canceled due to weather and will take place tomorrow evening at 5:30 pm.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: The HAC's Policy Subcommittee met to discuss a joint meeting with City Council to discuss best ways to manage the meeting, procedural issues, and how best to present the material. The material itself has a tool that has different interventions for addressing the housing crisis. There was interesting public feedback regarding whether members on the committee had a personal stake. The meeting went well and Council seemed interested in the tool. The City Manager stated that the tool should be used considering land use issues to determine if it is possible. It is a potential opportunity to integrate the housing strategy and the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Heaton: Attended a stakeholders meeting and a public meeting regarding the planning of Unity Day. Notes that he will be on that committee going forward and they meet every other week.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Attended a PLACE Committee meeting on February 14 where BPAC's memo regarding the Standards in Designs manual was discussed. There were concerns about the manual's minimum block length and instead suggest a maximum block length to create a better connected street grid. The new long range planner position was also discussed and there will be a steering committee guiding the consultants. The job offer should be posted by now and they are currently drafting the RFP for the consultants with input from PLACE and others. He also attended a human transit workshop, where many City and County officials were able to lay out a transit system in a grid city and determine how to do better in the future. It was a great workshop that gave great perspective on the important issues of coverage vs. service and frequency that are important in planning transit.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Bill Palmer: Attended the human transit workshop as well. At the latest Board of Visitors meeting held in February they agreed to name the new residence hall on Brandon Ave "Bond House" in commemoration of Julian Bond, a former UVA professor and civil rights icon. The building has 311 beds and should be open in the fall semester for upperclassmen undergrad students. They approved the concept site and design guidelines to continue planning for a University Hotel and Conference Center in the Emmet/Ivy area. It is estimated to be about 220,000 sq. ft., which is 225 guestrooms and 25,000 sq. ft. of conference space. It fits nicely with the masterplan that has been developed and it will be about a \$105 million project that will likely be done in partnership with a third party developer. Two committees have been convened by President Ryan and they presented reports to the BOV. The Emmet/Ivy final report was set up to provide a blueprint of what UVA stakeholders see as the best uses, activities, and programs for the area. They recommended the site be prioritized for things like a center for the arts, an academic hub focused on interdisciplinary research, and the data sciences school that was recently announced. They also want democracy focused academics and recommended focusing a lot of development on the eastern end. The western end will be seen as a later stage of development. The Community Working Group has been working to identify issues between UVA and the Charlottesville community. Based on focus groups and surveys, they identified the top four issues to be jobs and wages, affordable and workforce housing, public and equitable healthcare, and youth education issues. A good start of actions related to the study is that UVA will be raising their minimum wage to \$15.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Vice Chairman Mitchell: The skate park is now open. There will be a Grand Opening on April 21st and hopefully Tony Hawk will attend. On February 28, he participated in the Fontaine Streetscape meeting with Mr. Lahendro. The committee and neighborhood would like to have buffered bike lanes along Fontaine, to make it more pedestrian friendly by having crosswalks with beacons, and to have sidewalks covering the area to provide a buffer for pedestrians. The neighborhood is willing to sacrifice parking to make it more pedestrian and biking friendly. The parking doesn't do much good for the people in the neighborhood, as it is usually consumed by UVA

employees. The businesses would like us to do something about the parking because it is difficult for patrons to get in and out, especially during lunch. There is also a fire station nearby and we need to be sure we don't do anything to significantly obstruct their ability to get in and out.

Commissioner Lahendro: It's easier to get all that people desire at the west end of Fontaine since there is a wider right-of-way in that area. The sacrifice is some tree planting areas to accommodate it and the buffer between the bike lane and the street. It's great that we might get large canopy size trees on the western end of Fontaine.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Missy Creasy: There will not be a work session on the fourth Tuesday of this month and the next regular meeting will be on April 9th. NDS is still in the recruitment process for the Grants and ADA Coordinator positions. The April work session will be focused on the Standards and Designs manual, as Council postponed approving the funding for it until last week.

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

None.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

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

1. Minutes – February 12, 2019 – Pre- meeting and Regular meeting
2. Minutes – January 22, 2019 – Work Session

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to approve the consent agenda as presented. Seconded by Commissioner Stolzenberg. Motion is approved 5-0.

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. ZM18-00004 - (Lyman Street) (Lyman Street Residences)

BKKW LLC (landowner) by its member Bruce Wardell, has submitted a rezoning petition for property identified on City Tax Map 58 as Parcels 289.2 and 358E ("Subject Property"). The rezoning petition proposes a change in zoning classification of the Subject Property, from the R-1 (low-density residential) on Parcel 289.2 to R-2 (two-family residential), and from Belmont Cottages Planned Unit Development on Parcel 358E to R-2 Residential. The Subject Property has approximately 145 feet of frontage on Lyman Street, and the total combined acreage of the Subject Property is approximately 0.2 acre (approximately 8,712 SF). Within the Belmont Cottages PUD, Parcel 358E was to be used for open space. Current zoning of Parcel 289.2 would allow that parcel to be used for one (1) single-family dwelling. The proposed rezoning would also allow one (1) single-family dwelling to be constructed on each parcel, or would allow additional unit(s) to be developed with a special use permit for infill development (see related application SP18-00011). The Land Use Plan within the City's Comprehensive Plan projects that the Subject Property would be developed for Business and Technology uses. The Comprehensive Plan also indicates that residential density greater than 15 units per acre would be appropriate in this location.

Vice-Chairman Mitchell: Notes that the rezoning application must be approved to then move on to approve the SUP. However, if the rezoning is not approved, the Commission should still make recommendations to Council regarding what the SUP should look like.

Staff Report, Brian Haluska: Both the rezoning and SUP application are related to development of two parcels on Lyman Street. There was a request for a rezoning of these properties in 2013 to rezone to Downtown extended, which was denied by Council unanimously. The applicant is now requesting to rezone the properties to R2 zoning in order to have two R2 lots. Under by-right conditions, these two lots would not be conforming to current zoning, but the subdivision and zoning ordinance allows a boundary line between two non-conforming lots to be shifted. They could move the lot line to be perpendicular to Lyman Street and the zoning administrator would then have the authority to grant adjusted setbacks to permit the development of a single family residence on the properties. The R1 piece is listed as such because at one point it was un-zoned and the default in the code is to zone it as R1. Removal of this from the PUD for Belmont Lofts does not make that PUD non-conforming or impact the amount of recreational or aesthetic open space that they have. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning to R2. The second application is for an Infill Special Use Permit. Infill SUPs were created as a substitute for smaller sites close to the City's center to allow additional density on the sites through the modification of the lot requirements in R1, R1S, and R2 zones. This is essentially a request to modify the lot conditions, whether it be the minimum frontage on a publically accepted street, minimum setbacks, or minimum lot size. It does allow for a certain amount of modification to the number of lots allowed and this applicant has enough for 3. Staff finds that the application is in keeping with the greater goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the Infill SUP process. It was initially proposed as one large live-work permit and this application shows 3 houses that reflect the character of the area. It frames Lyman Street better than the current vacant land, and the current zoning of the land doesn't lend itself to much development at all. There was a question regarding ADUs and the application was advertised with 3 single family residential units. In our ordinance, a single family residential unit in these zones can contain an ADU as long as they meet the guidelines in the zoning ordinance. With that in mind, staff recommends approval with conditions.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Solla Yates: Down the road if an ADU were permitted, would there be any concern?

Mr. Haluska: Given the requirements of an ADU in the current zoning ordinance, it is unlikely. The main concern here is that the configuration of Lyman Street is challenging for cars. It's narrow and the turns are blind, so there might be a potentially dangerous situation if there were on-street parking on the north side. Provided that they can accommodate the extra parking space required under the code, it wouldn't be a problem.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: For the public's clarification, what is an ADU?

Mr. Haluska: It is an accessory dwelling unit, which would be another unit in the building that is smaller and limited to 2 unrelated persons. The size limitation is based on the overall size of the project. The vast majority of the City permits these uses.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: With regards to parking requirements for ADUs, it's laid out so the driveways go all the way to the back and there is a fully paved area there. Is there a requirement that both spots would need to be separately accessible for the off-street parking, or does the driveway count as multiple off-street parking spots?

Mr. Haluska: If they meet the dimensions of that on a single family, you would be capable of stacking cars in that situation. You can't stack in parking lots and have it count for two. The zoning administrator knows more about

this and could clarify further. This would probably be at the discretion of each individual owner, so it could be dealt with by getting a permit.

Applicant- Bruce Wardell, BKKW, LLC: The rezoning application was a very simple calculation in that the two lots in their configuration in R1 zoning would be unbuildable due to the size and the setbacks. This led to rezoning them to R2, which would provide the ability to build two units with a reconfigured site plan, but still the setbacks wouldn't work. An Infill SUP would allow the property to be configured specific to this site. The way the site is being developed would allow the density to be increased by 1 unit. In R1 and R2 districts, the assumption is that the owners would have the option to add an interior accessory unit that would be about 700 sq. ft. on the lower level below the ground level. The reason for the setback is because during the development of Belmont Lofts, the developer installed a new City waterline that connected the lofts to the main waterline, so 80% of the front parcel is occupied by a waterline. When the easement is set, it would eliminate the whole front parcel. We've put bio-filters on it for storm water runoff and water quantity and quality. We do not anticipate any parking on the north side. Each unit is a two bedroom unit, which requires one space, and we've provided 3 spaces on the site development if ADUs are desired in the future. There will also be space for bike storage. Staff has been extremely helpful and we met with the Belmont Neighborhood Association in December 2018 and sent out 117 invitations for a neighborhood meeting, for which 7 or 8 people attended. We discussed their desires and changed some things after hearing their responses.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Lahendro: The renderings show a sidewalk in front of the houses along the street, but it isn't shown on the site plan. What is the intention for that?

Mr. Wardell: The assumption was that it would be required to have a sidewalk, however it doesn't go to another sidewalk on either end. There was a discussion with the neighborhood regarding its value. We'd have to ask for a waiver to not have the sidewalk there and we'd rather have more planting on that side, but it could be put in.

Commissioner Lahendro: Would a sidewalk on that side of the road only serve 3 residents?

Mr. Wardell: Yes. It goes into the Belmont Lofts and into an unclaimed alley on the other side.

Commissioner Lahendro: Does staff feel that there is a community need for a sidewalk?

Mr. Haluska: As the applicant notes, it is a requirement unless it is waived, which is usually dealt with in the site plan process. There was some interest from the public to not have it since there is a sidewalk on the other side, but ultimately it would be reviewed by staff to determine if it should be waived or not.

Mr. Wardell: We are happy to include a sidewalk if necessary.

Commissioner Lahendro: It wouldn't be wise to waste a resource. We can trust staff and the community to decide whether or not it is needed there and if it makes sense.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: The land was purchased in advance of the previous application. Was it assessed at \$194,300?

Mr. Wardell: No, both parcels together were most recently assessed at \$115,000.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Records show that the front parcel was purchased at \$32,400 in 2006 and the back parcel for \$120,000 in 2012.

Mr. Wardell: The front parcel was purchased for \$2,500 in 2006 and the back parcel was purchased for \$120,000 in 2008. The most recent appraisal was \$115,000 for both parcels when the loan was renewed.

Commissioner Heaton: Was the back parcel previously owned by the railroad?

Mr. Wardell: It was originally owned by the railroad. When CEDA purchased the land, the transfer between CSX and CEDA inadvertently left out this strip of land.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: Shares that he lives in Belmont Lofts, which is adjacent to the property being discussed. After advising legal counsel regarding this, it has been determined that he does not need to recuse himself due to the proximity because he has no financial interest in the project.

PUBLIC HEARING

Ruth Van Riel: Lives at 201 Douglas Ave, which is at the corner of Douglas and Lyman and notes that she has a beautiful view from Lyman over the railroad into the City. If anyone is going to build there, it should be Mr. Wardell. The design and integrity are great and what he is doing will make a perfect triangle. One sidewalk is probably enough and there should not be any parking on the north side. When turns are made onto Lyman from Douglas or Goodman, sometimes people have to stop and back up in order for others to get through. Putting more parking there would be horrific.

Joan Schatzman: Resides at 204 Douglas Ave and encourages City Council to accept Mr. Wardell's plan because it is a terrific idea, however there should not be another sidewalk. It would be better to have 3 accessory units with the 3 houses.

Steve Huff: Resides at the only residential property on Lyman Street, which is a small connecting street. This design is much more sympathetic to the residential nature of the street. It is good that it isn't a high density development because 3 buildings is about right. This will enhance the neighborhood and it is wonderful that another high density development isn't planned for the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Lahendro: As much as the design and layout looks nice, it's important to remember that it doesn't necessarily mean that these will be built there, as the property could change hands. The decision to be made tonight is not for the way it looks, but rather for the rezoning of the land.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: It's appalling that City Council turned down the last application and that on a piece of land that is assessed at \$986,000 per acre, we might put giant single family houses there. The fact that we are seeing this proposal of very large, expensive single family residences and the support that is shown from the Belmont neighborhood just shows the problem we face in trying to achieve affordable housing. Only allowing these monuments there is appalling and notes that he strongly opposes the condition to limit it to 3 homes.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: It's a spectacular place for housing, as it is extremely walkable. The design is lovely and it will fit in well, but it would be better if there was more housing and an affordable housing component.

Commissioner Heaton: Land that has previously been unused and is now being used is a step in the right direction.

Commissioner Mitchell: Agrees with Mr. Heaton.

Commissioner Lahendro: Agrees with Mr. Heaton that it would be much better to see it developed than to sit vacant. The proposed development fits in well with the existing character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Ruth Van Riel: Notes that she did not realize that there was a possibility for this to be rezoned and then anything could happen.

Ms. Creasy: Clarifies that the proposal that has come forward is for a rezoning to change both properties to one unified zoning property. The proposal for the Infill SUP has specific criteria under it, which notes 3 single family units as part of the development. If the zoning change occurs and the Infill SUP is put in place, it goes with the land. The Commission has to think about it in terms of words on a page and what is printed. In theory Mr. Wardell could choose to sell that package to someone else, who chooses to develop 3 single family homes in a way that meets the zoning criteria. The Commission likes to keep in mind that what they are providing a recommendation on is for what is specifically being asked for in the wording and what is attached to that.

Ms. Robertson: One condition in staff's recommendation says that the characteristics of the development will remain the same. If the wording is changed to "the use of the property shall be in accordance with the materials presented by the applicant", you can limit the use of the property to the specific development being presented here. If someone else wants to change that, they would need to go through a public process again. An SUP allows the Commission to craft conditions that allow you to get the use of the property being presented. Additionally, for condition 3 it is recommended that it says "the number of single family detached dwellings in the development shall be three" because that is the category of development it is in and each of those buildings can have an ADU.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: Clarifies that there will be two votes, one for the rezoning and then for the SUP. It is during the SUP vote where the Commission should stipulate these conditions.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Mr. Lahendro mentioned that the proposal fits well with the character of the neighborhood, but that is rapidly changing. The house next to the one on the corner has appreciated in value from under \$100,000 in 2002 to now \$420,000. If we keep built form the same while the City grows in population, the character of the neighborhood will change in terms of the people that live in it. A wise person once quoted, "I'm excited when there's high density development inside the City, rather than suburban sprawl."

Commissioner Lahendro moves to recommend approval of this application to rezone the subject properties from PUD and R-1 to R-2, on the basis that the proposal would service the interests of the general public and good zoning practice. Seconded by Commissioner Solla-Yates. Motion is approved 5-0.

2. SP18-00011 – (Lyman Street) (Lyman Street Residences)

BKKW LLC (landowner) by its member Bruce Wardell has submitted an application seeking approval of a Special Use permit (SUP) proposing a specific Infill Development to be constructed on property identified on City Tax Map 58 as Parcels 289.2 and 358E ("Subject Property"), having, together, an acreage of approximately 0.2 acre

(approx. 8,712 SF) and approximately 145 feet of frontage on Lyman Street. (See related rezoning application ZM18-00004) The Infill Development SUP proposes construction of three (3) single-family dwelling units on the Subject Property (an effective density of 15.2-DUA), with building setbacks and lot area less than would be permitted by right under the R-2 zoning district classification without an SUP. The Land Use Plan within the City's Comprehensive Plan projects that the Subject Property would be developed for Business and Technology uses. The Comprehensive Plan also indicates that residential density greater than 15 units per acre would be appropriate in this location.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Notes that the language suggested by Ms. Robertson makes sense.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to recommend approval of SP18-00011 subject to: 1. City Council approval of the request to rezone the Subject Property to R-2 Residential as submitted in application ZM18-00004. 2. The design, height, and other characteristics of the Development shall remain essentially the same, in all material aspects, as described within the application materials dated December 21, 2018 and revised February 28, 2019 submitted to the City and in connection with SP19-00011 ("Application"). Except as the design details of the development may subsequently be modified to comply with Building Code requirements. 3. The use of the property shall be in accordance with the materials submitted by the applicant, and 4. The number of single-family detached dwellings in the development shall be three (3). Seconded by Commissioner Lahendro.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: It was mentioned that the ADUs would be internal to the structures. Is there any objection to a friendly amendment so that the ADUs do have to be internal to the structure?

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Objects to the friendly amendment.

Ms. Creasy: The single-family dwelling that opens it up to the ADU ordinance allows for internal and exterior, but there would be no space for an exterior unit based on the conditions being adopted.

Ms. Robertson: The application materials do not show exterior units. If condition 2 is going to remain the same, these will be the only 3 buildings that are authorized.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: Withdraws the request for a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Would like to make an amendment to strike condition 4. Does the word "use" mean residential?

Ms. Robertson: If the new conditions are that the use and development have to be consistent with the materials, the materials submitted show 3 buildings. If the purpose of the amendment is to set a different possibility for the number of buildings, it would be working contrary to the other conditions. It's different if the purpose of the amendment is to get rid of it because it's already addressed in the requirement of keeping consistent materials.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: The Commission should vote on the current motion. If the motion does not pass, the objection by Mr. Stolzenberg can be readdressed.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to recommend approval of SP18-00011 subject to: 1. City Council approval of the request to rezone the Subject Property to R-2 Residential as submitted in application ZM18-00004. 2. The design, height, and other characteristics of the Development shall remain essentially the same, in all material aspects, as described within the application materials dated December 21, 2018 and revised February 28, 2019 submitted to the City and in connection with SP19-00011 ("Application"). Except as the design details of the

development may subsequently be modified to comply with Building Code requirements. 3. The use of the property shall be in accordance with the materials submitted by the applicant, and 4. The number of single-family detached dwellings in the development shall be three (3). Seconded by Commissioner Lahendro. Motion is approved 4-1.

3. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Funding

1st Year Action Plan, FY 19 20: The Planning Commission and City Council are considering projects to be undertaken in the 1st Year Action Plan of the multi-year Consolidated Plan utilizing CDBG & HOME funds for the City of Charlottesville. In Fiscal Year 19-20 it is expected that the City of Charlottesville will receive about \$408,417 in Community Development Block Grant funds and about \$76,000 in HOME funds from the Department of Housing and Urban Development HUD. CDBG funds will be used in the City to address neighborhood improvements in Belmont and/or Ridge Street, economic development activities and public service projects that benefit low and moderate income citizens. HOME funds will be used to support the housing needs of low and moderate-income citizens through homeowner rehabilitation.

Staff Report, Missy Creasy: Ms. Tierra Howard has taken the task force through most of this process and she just left the City, but she is helping us transition by working part-time. The CDBG and HOME process occurs on a cyclical basis each year. CDBG and HOME funding are HUD-based funding that focus on housing opportunities throughout the community, but they also have allowances for economic development and core social programs. This funding has been used in the past for a mix of all of those things. A certain allocation of CDBG funds are provided each year and as long as the rules are followed, the City will continue to get the funding. For the HOME funds, we work in consortium with the Planning District Commission so that funding goes to each of the localities within the planning district in order to encourage affordable housing regionally. The budget will take effect July 1 or when HUD releases the money, and everything is in place to begin that process. There are a number of different funding pots that comes from this, and the CDBG task force meets throughout the year to evaluate proposals for the funding. They then bring forth a proposal to the Planning Commission and then to Council for approval. As part of the process, some funds are given directly to a priority neighborhood. They create a task force within the neighborhood to determine how to use those funds. The neighborhoods have rotated through the process to receive funding and the Belmont neighborhood is currently the priority for the coming year. They have been meeting over the past year to get ready for the funds and one request that staff asks the Commission to recommend tonight is a change in the order. As part of how Council prioritized the neighborhoods, it was requested to alternate between Belmont and Ridge Street every other year. Belmont chose a program and if they are able to have 2 years together, the project can be addressed more cost effectively. It is requested that the Commission recommend to Council that instead of alternating those years, to instead allow 2 years for Belmont and then 2 years for Ridge Street. We will work with Ridge Street in advance, and this allows us to cost effectively spend the money without losing it. There is a budget proposal that has gone through the CDBG task force and the Priority Neighborhood task force. The economic development projects also go through the Strategic Investment Area Committee. There has been a lot of feedback from practitioners of housing, economic development, and neighborhood aspect priorities. We never know exactly how much funding we will receive, so we also ask that in the motion it be prorated by percentage of projects so that we don't have to come back for a minor adjustment.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Heaton: Does the Ridge Street neighborhood have a project in the pipeline?

Ms. Creasy: They are not quite there. We are in the recruitment stage right now and the goal is to start that process this summer, which will give some time for projects to come together when the money is available.

Commissioner Heaton: So this isn't subjugating that neighborhood to Belmont?

Ms. Creasy: No. It allows Ridge Street to have time to think about what is best for them and be ready when the money becomes available. On the Belmont side and the program side in general, we're anticipating a cost savings by doing the project together as opposed to breaking it into two pieces.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Is it possible to get consent from the Ridge Street neighborhood on this?

Ms. Creasy: It's the same amount of money, it's just the timing and Ridge Street doesn't have a committee yet.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: Do we have assurances that all of the money will be spent in the Franklin Street area and not in northwest Belmont?

Ms. Creasy: The only project that has been chosen at this point is Franklin. The cost estimates are that it will take both years' worth of money to complete that project.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: If the grant is prorated down, is there any risk of the programs not being able to run?

Ms. Creasy: That is not anticipated and the allotment is normally upward of the amount. They are minor adjustments to the numbers and we don't give anyone more than they requested as part of the process.

Commissioner Stolzenberg: In general, federal funding for programs like these have dropped over time. Have we seen that with these two programs? Is there any expectation that if we push Ridge Street off for a few years that the funding will drop by then?

Ms. Creasy: The Priority Neighborhood funding hasn't changed over time. In the past Council has chosen to keep the same amount of funding and then use the rest for other competitive projects. They could chose to do something differently, but they would likely want to make sure the monies are equal if they moved it one year.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Is there a logistical issue for why we can't check with Ridge Street?

Ms. Creasy: Typically, a task force is set up that works through this process. We would start with the neighborhood group that currently meets. If they were to be allocated the money, they would have to rush to get to a project. That neighborhood has also been spending a lot of effort on the Cherry Ave plan. Notes that she would personally feel okay with having the 2 years because it has always been that way and typically the priority neighborhood has been for a 3 year chunk along the way. Although there have been a couple changes within the past few years, having the number of years together has been very helpful in having enough money for a substantial project. It will also take time for Ridge Street to get to the point that Belmont is already at.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: Notes that he has been on the CDBG task force 3 times and is confident that they have engaged the folks in Ridge Street. The fact that there is no project on tap right now suggests that they're not ready and the task force knows that they aren't ready. Typically, the applicants have to present their applications before the task force and both neighborhoods probably stood before the task force and discussed this.

Commissioner Heaton: The concern is that Council could become the victim of a soundbite. We need to have a high degree of confidence that that isn't the case so that if the accusation is made, they would have a strong case to back it up.

Ms. Creasy: When the discussion came forth originally, there was interest in providing funding to both Ridge Street and Belmont. It wasn't specified specifically how to do that and staff recommended the bulk funding because of the economies of scale. In the discussion with Council there was talk about potentially splitting it each year, but when that happens the neighborhood has to build up the funds. We have spending deadlines and if they aren't met, HUD can take the money. If we were to keep one half of the Belmont project waiting, we would have that significant amount sitting in an account for an extra year, which hurts the whole pot of money. Staff is ready to move forward with whatever decision is made, but it will be much more costly to split it up.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: It might be appropriate in the motion to stipulate that before Council acts on our recommendation that Council or staff check with Ridge Street to make certain that they are on board.

PUBLIC HEARING

None.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Lahendro: Knowing that a significant construction project normally takes over a year, having the benefit of funding over a 2 year period makes extraordinary good sense.

Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to recommend approval of the proposed FY 19-20 CDBG and HOME budgets to City Council as presented in this report, with the requirement that the Ridge Street neighborhood be consulted. When the actual entitlement amount is received, it is recommended that all recommendations are increased/reduced at the same pro-rated percentage of actual entitlement. No agency will increase more than their initial funding request. In addition, it is recommended that Council designate the Belmont Neighborhood as the priority neighborhood for FY19-20 to allow for cost-effective completion of the project selected and designate the Ridge Street Neighborhood for FY 20-21 and FY 21-22. Seconded by Commissioner Stolzenberg. Motion is approved 5-0.

IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

1. Long Range Transportation Plan – Presentation

Applicant, Jakob zumFelde, Thomas Jefferson Planning District: This is a follow-up to an October presentation to the Commission. The process has been going on for over a year and will be completed by May 2019. A regional Long Transportation Plan is a forward looking 25 year plan that is updated every 5 years. It is focused on understanding future transportation needs for the region and is a requirement for receiving federal transportation money. There is also a requirement for having the projects funded through the Smart Scale program. Within the past few years, Smart Scale has deemphasized the important of the LRTP. The long range transportation done before created projects so they were ready to be funded, whereas now they are ready to be applied for Smart Scale funding where they may or may not score high enough to be funded. The LRTP plans for transportation needs that are regional in scope. This plan uses a performance base approach that includes recent federal requirements and uses goals, objectives, and quantifiable performance measures to evaluate the roadway

projects in the plan. The plan includes a fiscally constrained list and an unconstrained visioning list. As part of this process, an estimate of future funding was created, although it was challenging to do given the uncertainties of Smart Scale. It was split into roadways, intersections, bike/pedestrian projects, and bridges. As for how the roadway projects were evaluated in the LRTP, in September a complete list of projects were presented and through scenario evaluation it was developed into a refined scenario. In the last month it was narrowed down into the federally required constrained list, as well as the vision list. In terms of the project lists, the constrained list of roadway projects primarily includes Hydraulic/29 area projects. The proposal is to include the remaining phases of the West Main Street project and the Hillsdale Drive to Rio project. We've been working closely with City and County staff and there are a number of regional projects on the vision list. Similarly with intersections, the constrained section focuses on the Hydraulic/29 area, with a notable list of intersections on the vision list. The bridge list is not a constrained or vision list. It is one list with the understanding that they will be evaluated and money will be put towards them as applicable and available. The bike/pedestrian list came directly from the Jefferson Area bicycle and pedestrian plan, which was recently completed and approved by the MPO and the TJPDC. There is a constrained list of projects that were identified as top priority and all projects identified in that plan were included in the vision list. It wasn't as clear to have a constrained and vision list for transit, but one of the projects here is a study for an express bus on the US 29 corridor. The timeline is to finalize the project lists and review multiple document chapters in March, and review the complete plan draft and hold a public hearing in April. In May there will be a final public hearing and we will have final plan approval by the MPO policy board.

COMMISSIONER QUESTIONS

Commissioner Solla-Yates: Looking at the draft Comprehensive Plan and looking at this, it doesn't look like there is a lot of connectivity. The Comprehensive Plan talks about bicycle and pedestrian access and new and better transit service. It doesn't talk about new vehicular lanes that aren't tolled, but that's the main thing we see here.

Mr. zumFelde: The evaluation that was part of the LRTP was largely focused on roadway and capacity, but part of the reason for that was the separate Jefferson Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan that involved a lot of evaluation of those types of projects that fed into the LRTP. Additionally, a number of the roadway projects are multimodal projects.

Ms. Creasy: Notes that a majority of the ones focused more in that area are not within the City. Since we're working with both the City and County, it's a balance of different types of projects.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: The bicycle and pedestrian improvements looked like a very small slice of the pie. Could you quantify this?

Mr. zumFelde: The way that the numbers were arrived at were based on funding that has been received in the past and particularly on the type of funding. Within roadways, it was estimated based on the Smart Scale projects that the region has received, regardless of whether they were capacity improvements or multimodal improvements. Within bike/ped shown here, that is for the Transportation Alternatives Program.

Ms. Creasy: In order for a project to be competitive, they have to have the multimodal aspect as well.

Commissioner Heaton: Notes that a pie chart may not be the best way to show this since you aren't talking about one piece of funding.

Vice Chairman Mitchell: The Dairy Road Bridge is the one bridge in the City that made the cut, as it is in poor condition. Where in the project backlog is it?

Ms. Creasy: The Dairy Road Bridge has been on our radar and the past City Engineer has spent a lot of time working on this. Repairs have been done to it to stabilize it for a period of time. A CIP request was put in to try to build funds for it and it didn't end up getting funded, but it is still on the radar. Including it here allows us to keep it open for funding, as it's a very costly endeavor and it is difficult to get funded. It is probably not represented in the chart because there isn't a constrained list for bridges.

Mr. zumFelde: It was challenging to create a list for bridges because some may need to be replaced and some may just need to be upgraded.

Ms. Creasy: This is high on the technical radar, which is why we specifically asked for CIP monies to bring it along. Even though the proposal doesn't have it funded for this current CIP, we will continue to move forward with it because it is a priority and there will be a point in time where it has to occur. Rest assured, there was interim work done on the bridge last year and it is safe to drive on.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: There are concerns about the political realities of what is being proposed, as West Main has had a hard time getting funded. Of what the City is proposing, do we have a shot at Smart Scale?

Ms. Creasy: That's one of the few projects that scored very highly.

Mr. zumFelde: Speaking specifically to the most recent Smart Scale application, it was funded for West Main. It was the only application in the MPO area that was funded.

Ms. Creasy: Notes that what was requested was a part of it and it's coming from different sources, which allowed it to be competitive.

Commissioner Lahendro: Regarding the pending Comprehensive Plan, there is a future land use plan that has a large transit nodes component associated with high density developments. At what point does this transit plan become interested in what the future land use plan is proposing? When will they work together and be more than just a conceptual vision plan in the City?

Mr. zumFelde: One of the things that informs the evaluation for L RTPs in general is the projected population and employment numbers for 2045 by transportation analysis zones within the region. Two years ago when the process started, we worked with the City to identify where growth was going to happen over the next 25 years to help come up with the distribution of population within the City. Similarly, we did this with County staff. City staff looked at how growth was distributed by looking at Comprehensive Plans and planning efforts.

Ms. Creasy: We were given the top number from Weldon Cooper and we had to work within the parameters of the data that we had. We took what was currently pending, currently approved but not build, and currently under review and allocated that in the numbers. From there, we worked through the areas where there was potential for growth. The number that they have as a top number may not be where the community necessarily lands and we will take the next map into account for the next round.

Commissioner Lahendro: How do you get from population concentrations to a transportation plan?

Mr. zumFelde: One of the first steps of this plan was to look at the results of the model that use these population projections and if we don't build any new roads or add any new transit service, what will people be doing in terms of travel. It helps determine who will be using the bus, who will be driving on roads, and where there will be congestion. The tools are getting better at determining how transit fits in with roadway capacity but for this model, transit was included but it wasn't perfect. Once the deficiencies are identified where a road may not have the capacity to serve the number of vehicles that the model suggests will be there, we look at possible roadway

projects to increase capacity or possible transit projects to increase the number of people able to travel on the existing roadway.

Commissioner Lahendro: Hopefully it doesn't lead to the presumption that it's going to be done with cars. There are more ways to solve congestion than adding another traffic lane.

Ms. Creasy: From a City standpoint, we don't have that ability in most places anyway and we have to look at it much more creatively than the County does because we don't have the space to work with. Trying to accommodate that is the only route we can go in the future.

Commissioner Solla-Yates: We should be reflecting the constraints we have in the documents we put out because what we see now is not constrained in that way.

Ms. Creasy: West Main is on there and there have been significant efforts from a larger community at Hydraulic and 29 where we anticipate changes, which takes into account multimodal efforts. It is a mix, but regardless there is no space to stretch and add more lanes, so we are forced to find other ways to get from one place to another.

Commissioner Lahendro: Hopefully the advantage of having a regional Planning Commission looking at this will be that the County doesn't build a 6 lane highway coming up to the City limits and then have it stop. It's good that we're working together on this.

V. Adjournment

7:40 pm – Commissioner Solla-Yates moves to adjourn until the second Tuesday in April 2019.