

**Planning Commission Work session
May 24, 2011
Minutes**

Commissioners Present:

Mr. Jason Pearson (Chairman)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Genevieve Keller
Ms. Lisa Green
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Mr. John Santoski

Not Present:

Mr. Michael Osteen

Staff Present:

Missy Creasy
Brian Haluska
Richard Harris
Michael Smith
Willy Thompson

Mr. Pearson convened the meeting at 5:00 p.m and turned the time to Ms. Creasy.

Ms. Creasy asked if a meeting would be necessary in June to discuss the CIP. Mr. Davidson is available to assist and provide new members training on the CIP. Some Commissioners felt it was not necessary to meet prior to November but decided to take a look at the existing goals to see if revisions were needed. That information will be included in the regular June meeting packet.

Ms. Creasy provided an overview of the kick off event in April and noted that the next event will be June 23rd to review performance measures.

Ms. Creasy gave an overview of the new Many Plans One Community website. She gave a brief presentation of what types of things you would find on the web page that could be useful and how to use them. She outlined the location on the website for comments that will be posted for public review.

Commissioners felt the first kickoff event was a success and were happy to see a diverse turnout. Some thought that the information presented was too much to process at one time and that more was taken in from the conversations with staff. They also felt that the city gets lost in the MPO maps and feel that the map of the City's area should be shown at a larger scale

Ms. Creasy provided an overview of the packet memo including two questions for discussion. She noted that Mr. Haluska will coordinate the Land Use update process with the following discussion areas: land use surveys, windshield surveys data will be used

Build out analysis, neighborhood concerns and development trends.

Public participation events will take place between the months of September-January.

Things suggested on how to get the public more involved.

- The kick off was very quiet. Need an avenue at the meetings for discussion to get started –have a presentation at set times with opportunity for individuals to share ideas? This could be done as a larger presentation or a presentation at different stations. Have questions available for discussion. Questions could include: These challenges have been identified. What are we missing? What new challenges do you see?

- There was concern about having topic area meetings without considering the linkages between the topics. There should be discussion about how the topics are linked. The attached drawing is a visual they began to construct and it was seen as a process that might build through the meetings.
- There was a suggestion to have an imaginary problem for citizens to solve.
- Instead of asking for the “problems/concerns,” acknowledge those we know and ask the public to give information on what we have not thought of.
- A time needs to be available to have the tough discussions.
- There was a suggestion to have a web forum and pose questions for debate

Suggestions on how to have more public to attend the events;

- Have a recorder for folks to comment for those who have concern with handwriting or are visually impaired
- Provide Child Care at meetings
- Think about transportation options (Example: have a phone number people could call to be matched with rides)
- At the September meeting – need to be able to give out the schedule for the full process in regards to the times and types of public participation.

City specific process comments

- There was interest in determining the commission’s role in the process. A suggestion was made to develop guiding principles to reflect on throughout the process.
- Integrate the city town hall meeting feedback into the comp plan
- The level of goals for the comp plan was outlined to be similar to this example “density belongs in mixed use corridors and preservation of the green infrastructure should occur in other areas.” This type statement provides guidance along with flexibility.
- There was interest in really looking at the economic drivers section. The current plan lacks direction in this area.
- Commissioners gave themselves the homework of identifying what the hard discussions may be. (Example – the balance of locating density vs. trees)

- Some discussion and suggestions were made to provide for opportunity for verbal comments and discussion in addition to written communication.
- An additional homework assignment outlined was to identify how the current plan has not worked and provide feedback on how to improve.

Mr. Pearson allowed for public comment.

James Moore, 1215 Hazel Street, felt that HUD has a lack of experience and should not be involved in this process. He feels that UVA should not be involved due to conflict of interest. He also feels that the borrowed money should not be used and he is fighting the project.

Morgan Butler, SELC, felt that great conversation is happening between the involved parties. He is really looking forward to the discussions that will come in the future.

Bill Emory, 1604 East Market Street, would like the Planning Commission to not let HUD control their judgment as we continue with the Comprehensive Plan.

Paul Beyer, 201 Huntley Avenue, noted he is very excited, but has a few concerns. He feels more green space should be preserved and the issues discussed should be narrower based.

Meeting adjourned at 7:00 pm