

Planning Commission Work session
August 28, 2012
Minutes

Commissioners Present:

Ms. Genevieve Keller (Chairperson)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Lisa Green
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Mr. Michael Osteen
Mr. John Santoski
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky

Staff Present:

Missy Creasy
Richard Harris
Willy Thompson
Melissa Thackston
Chris Engle

Ms. Keller convened the meeting at 5:02 pm and turned the time over to Ms. Creasy.

Ms. Creasy gave an update of events. She reminded everyone of the Save the Date flier sent for the upcoming community outreach events and encouraged members to forward it to anyone who may be interested. Comments are past due on the two comprehensive plan chapters that were sent out at the end of July. Commissioners are reminded to submit those in addition to commenting on the chapters submitted for review yesterday. There will be a joint work session hosted by the County Planning Commission on September 18 which means there are three commission meetings in the month of September. She also stated that she received a letter concerning the Stonehenge application and copies of the letter are available.

Ms. Creasy turned the meeting over to Summer Frederick from the TJPDC.

Ms. Frederick provided a report on the housing, economic development and community facilities topics that the Commissions expressed interest in reviewing from previous meetings.

Economic Development

Mr. Rosensweig noted that he agrees with the three areas noted in the report where the City and County provide benefit to one another.

Mr. Osteen feels there is pressure on the County to expand their development areas. He likes # 2 under the benefits section, but wonders if redevelopment in the City truly takes pressure off of the County's rural areas.

Ms. Keller noted that there is no guarantee that it will limit growth in the county. She noted that the wording needs clarification because it sounds like we want to redevelop the entire city.

Mr. Keesecker wants to know more about the City benefits of the County open space. Local businesses are growing from using local agriculture.

Ms. Green noted that the city is currently much more progressive than the county in urban agriculture.

Mr. Santoski is not sure the county will be influenced by what the city does.

Ms. Sienitsky suggested looking at the revenue sharing agreement to see if that tool can be used for different objectives.

Mr. Engle noted that the City and County are more aligned on economic development goals than the Planning Commission may think. Ms. Frederick feels that another layer of conversation is needed between the two localities.

Commissioners would like to look more at the perceived differences and see if the community can line up initiatives further. There is concern that staff and the commissions are in a similar place but Council and the Board of Supervisors may not agree.

Community Facilities-Parks and Recreation

Mr. Santoski feels the city and county should be working more closely and expressed interest in having one group address parks regionally.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that the county's parks are different than city parks. City parks need to be looked at differently than regional parks and maybe looking at urban parks in other cities will provide some ideas. He would not like to see the departments combined but would be open to some sort of regional parks planning group.

Ms. Keller wanted to know if UVA played a role in any of the discussions and asked if some arrangement could be made with them since UVA has many recreational facilities.

Mr. Keesecker would like to see a common map of City and County parks and open space so tourists would know what the community has to offer.

In summary there was interest in discussing a regional park entity, getting Uva involved in providing community recreation services and providing opportunities for additional joint ventures similar to Ivy Creek and Darden Towe.

Housing

Mr. Rosensweig wanted to know if the city had a proffer policy like the county pertaining to affordable housing? A regional goal should be set for affordable housing. He explained the differences between roles in housing development allowed in each locality due to the existence of the Housing Authority.

Ms. Keller said there should be mention of student housing since it has an effect on housing costs in the City and County. She feels it is sad that people in need of affordable housing or services can't remain in rural areas due to a lack of transportation access.

Mr. Osteen feels that student housing doesn't really impact the county.

Ms. Green stated that transportation plays a big role in providing access to housing. There are different modes of transportation, not just buses, that should be considered. The County has affordable housing but there is no way to get to it except in a car.

Mr. Sienitsky feels that the new development (Lochlyn Hill) isn't the best location for affordable housing due to distance from services.

Mr. Santoski feels that we don't really know what affordable housing is. Can the city and county really agree on what affordable housing should be, how much is needed and where it should be located? There should be a linkage between localities and transportation access should be made easier.

Ms. Frederick noted that the first step is to align the goals and see what direction each locality is going. There should be a future joint conversation between the city and county to discuss.

Ms. Keller asked Ms. Sienitsky to voice her question about plan implementation. There was interest in understanding the status of current comprehensive plan objectives. It was noted that these were included with each chapter's working papers as part of the draft reviews.

Mr. Keesecker noted as a follow up to the economic development conversation that it would be helpful for there to be a common definition for "industrial" as well as for "affordable housing." He also noted that cooperation between the localities in recruiting business is great. It was noted that this occurs.

Mr. Osteen wanted to see if there are revenue linkages which can be made and perhaps there will be opportunities to have those hard conversations concerning cost of projects into the future.

Public Comment

Mr. Harris stated that he takes his family to Gypsy Hill Park in Staunton due to the variety of activities it offers in one place. He hopes something like that can be established here in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 6:50 pm