

**Planning Commission Work session
June 25, 2013
City Space
Minutes**

Commissioners Present:

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

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert-Director NDS
Ms. Missy Creasy
Mr. Michael Smith
Mr. Brian Haluska
Mr. Rich Harris

Ms. Keller convened the Charlottesville Planning Commission meeting at 6:05 pm and turned the meeting over to Mr. Haluska.

Discussion

Mr. Haluska went over the two processes staff is requesting in order to update the PUD (Planned Unit Development) Ordinance. Housekeeping items will be forwarded to public hearing in the next few months with the knowledge that additional discussions on complex issues in the coming year. He then reviewed the PUD information handout.

Ms. Keller asked if the blue box on the handout was a summary of changes provided to the PUD ordinance. It was noted that it reflects current standards.

Mr. Osteen wanted to know what the blue box was missing.

Mr. Haluska provided background on the items contained in the blue box.

Mr. Osteen feels a PUD should be a development type where one could experiment with road widths.

Ms. Keller feels the blue box will be a very helpful tool when someone wants to apply for a PUD.

Mr. Keesecker would like the first sentence in 34-491 reworded. Maybe a developer should provide their own matrix.

Mr. Haluska stated that this was suggested after the Sunrise PUD but had not been noted since then.

Ms. Keller asked if there was ever a time a PUD application was denied or kept from coming to the planning commission because it only contained 2 acres (not over 2 acres)?

Ms. Creasy stated that we have never had any projects on that two acre mark. She stated that this allows for flexibility when there is two acres of land for the overall proposal.

Mr. Haluska stated that Johnson Village, Cherry Hill and Village Place had four phases and they weren't contiguous to each other.

Mr. Osteen likes the idea because he feels it brings neighborhoods together.

Mr. Haluska provided descriptions of other proposed changes contained in the document.

Mr. Keesecker asked how to get ideas across without a 3D presentation.

Ms. Creasy stated that it gives examples of how an applicant can present the material.

Mr. Keesecker feels there is a simple visual way to do this.

Ms. Creasy suggested stopping the sentence at "this visual".

Mr. Harris feels that the word "acceptable" should stay.

Ms. Green would like to be careful with the wording. She would like to see the criteria listed in language that everyone can understand. She also wanted clarity on 34- 515.2.

Mr. Haluska stated that this indicates the pre-application review process.

Ms. Keller asked if there was a requirement for the narrative to extend to the pre-application.

Mr. Rosensweig asked how people interpret the language and do people need some sort of visual concept to provide clarity.

Mr. Haluska stated that it is factual based. It will be clear that the applicant has taken proffers into consideration since if there are no proffers offered, a letter must be submitted stating such.

Ms. Creasy stated that if they sign the letter it eliminates the discussion about whether proffers were considered.

Ms. Keller asked if there was a flip side to having them sign a letter if they wanted to offer proffers.

Mr. Santoski wanted clarification on whether a land owner can cut down trees and do things to their property if it's "by right".

Ms. Creasy confirmed yes - they have the legal right to clear property with the proper permitting.

Ms. Sienitsky asked if a developer should have a concept plan before they present an application and Mr. Haluska stated yes.

Mr. Haluska provided additional information on utilities. In 34-517(6)-9 the phasing plan, the fire department could request any information deemed necessary. He stated that it is better to confirm capacity at this stage of the project.

Mr. Santoski asked what if the utilities do not meet capacity.

Ms. Creasy stated that they would have to come up with plan with the utilities department to address the upgrades needed.

Ms. Creasy stated that she would like to get the housekeeping issues to public hearing as soon as possible.

Ms. Green would like to see data added so that we will know what we approved is what is on the ground.

Mr. Keesecker would like to know the advantages and disadvantages of the PUD process. It would be nice to anticipate what the future holds.

Many PUD items were tabled for future discussion. Planning Commissioners were encouraged to forward any additional information to Mr. Haluska by email.

Public Comment

Bill Emory would like to see the formal process feed information into the MPO. He would like to see the railroad crossing on Meade Ave included into the Long Term Transportation Plan.

Don Franco feels developers should be given credit for what they present in their presentation. The blue box should be used to let the developer know what staff would like to see. He would like developers to have a chance to sell the concept plan to staff. He feels there is a lot of back and forth in the process and would love to see an internal process.

Meeting adjourned at 7:21pm