

**Planning Commission Work Session  
September 25, 2012  
Notes**

**Commissioners Present:**

Mr. Kurt Keesecker  
Ms. Lisa Green  
Mr. Dan Rosensweig  
Mr. John Santoski  
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky

**Staff Present:**

Jim Tolbert  
Missy Creasy  
Richard Harris  
Brian Haluska  
Michael Smith  
Willy Thompson  
Ebony Walden

Mr. Rosensweig convened the meeting at 5:10 p.m. and turned the meeting over to Ms. Creasy. Ms. Creasy made announcements concerning upcoming community outreach events and other reminders related to the Comprehensive Plan. She turned the time to Mr. Haluska who provided an overview of the Land Use Map update process. He stressed that this map is general and used as a one of a number of components for review of development applications. He reviewed the components of the memo and opened the discussion.

Mr. Keesecker asked why parcels were shown on this plan? It was noted that information is need to assist individual owners as they contemplate development of their parcels. It was also noted that a companion “Heat Map” could be helpful for showing the intensity of potential development in the City. Mr. Keesecker note that this potential “conceptual diagram” could include the “C” shape path (Route 29 south to Emmet extending around to West Main Street into W Market Street) and other nodes of activity. These diagrams could be included in the executive summary.

Commissioners provided feedback on specific map elements with the following conclusions:

- Mixed Use areas should be a deeper color (would need to adjust business-tech color to make these complementary).
- Public/Semipublic should be a less bold color.

Ms. Kathy Galvin noted that consideration of the Torti Gallas study and links between transportation routes and land use should be made. She asked about public input for this process. Mr. Haluska noted what activities had occurred to date and Ms. Creasy outlined the upcoming community input events. Mr. Haluska pointed out that a number of our survey respondents in the community did not want to see Charlottesville move in a different direction.

Mr. Santoski asked if there was potential to expand the commercial area further west on Fontaine. It was noted this could be a consideration.

Discussion concerning the identification of centers/nodes keeping in mind walking sheds continued. Staff reminded the Commissioners that each area of the City currently has its own character and that should be taken into account. Ms. Galvin sketched potential “transects” into

the Woolen Mills area and Ms. Green pointed out the physical barrier of the railroad to the scenario sketched.

Ms. Green asked that easements be added to show additional green space on the map. It was noted that this information is present on the open space map in the environment chapter.

Mr. Keesecker outlined the process he goes through as he analyzes a project for his clients and how that process might be useful moving forward.

Ms. Green pointed out that schools are community focal points as well as commercial areas.

Mr. Haluska summarized by noting that it would be helpful to overlay mapping data to show where commonalities exist and where centers are located. This could lead to some new opportunities. The “concept diagrams” could be used as companions to the land use map.

Mr. Keesecker presented a diagram that aided him in understanding how the individual changes proposed fit into the bigger picture. This diagram included the “C” shape path noted above, centers and ½ mile walking circles.

Mr. Rosensweig asked Mr. Keesecker, Ms. Galvin and Mr. Haluska to further explore the “concept diagram” idea.

Mr. Keesecker noted that it could be helpful to the public to provide 3-5 bullet points for the community vision which could be supported with a visual.

Mr. Rosensweig moved discussion back to the memo and focused on the general changes outlined. Everyone was okay with the Low Density residential classification, there was interest in exploring another name for Business-Technology, and there was one concern raised about designating open space for PUD’s as green space on the maps and how that might affect future development. There was a brief discussion concerning the differences between Mixed Use and Business Technology classifications.

Comments on the General areas are summarized as follows:

- Agree with Low Density Residential Designation
- Mixed Use – Generally okay
- Open Space – There was concern from Mr. Rosensweig with adding PUD open space into this designation where the open space was small. There was question as to how this would affect the ability to develop in the future.
- Neighborhood Commercial Designation – Generally okay
- Business /Technology Zone – There was interest in exploring renaming this “Charlottesville Innovation Zone” or something similar. Do all the current industrial areas fall into this category?

The discussion then moved to comments on the specific parcels noted in the memo. The following comments were made in reference to those as well as areas of consideration added for future discussion:

- #5 – Expressed concern

- #7 – needs more clarity but some feel mixed use works there. There is a class at UVA working on a project in that area.
- #12 – Dan felt this should be high density residential.
- Parcel across from #11 – The trapezoid property – it was felt this should be more intense than low density.
- #20 – After discussion it was determined to leave it like it is shown
- City Yard – Should we look at this?
- #11 – agree with the high density proposal
- Delavan – Why is it noted as high density when there are no connections?
- Low Density around MJH – what direction should these parcels go?
- #17 – this is really two items – the west side backs up to parking lots and the east to Locust
- Fontaine area – Should the mixed use/business area expand west?
- 5<sup>th</sup> Street Extended – Should think about the possibilities.

**Public Comment** – No Comments occurred.

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm.