

**Planning Commission Work session
October 22, 2013
NDS Conference Room
Minutes**

Commissioners Present:

Mr. Dan Rosensweig (Chairperson)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Lisa Green
Mr. John Santoski

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert-Director NDS
Ms. Missy Creasy
Ms. Ebony Walden
Mr. Michael Smith
Mr. Brian Haluska
Ms. Lisa Robertson

Mr. Rosensweig convened the meeting at 5:04 pm.

Mr. Rosensweig announced that there would be a lunch meeting of the Planning Commission on October 30 at 12:00pm in the NDS conference room. He stated that it would be a workshop on how to run the meetings more efficiently. He would like commissioners to think about a meeting they have attended and try to remember what made that meeting a great one.

Mr. Rosensweig turned the meeting over to Mr. Tolbert.

Standards and Design Manual

Staff has been reviewing the document and outlined a number of items in need of updating. Many of these items would be framed as “housing keeping” as the updates are required by changes in regulations since it was last reviewed. There are also considerations for the S A D M which are more policy based and will need further discussion. The Commission has expressed interest in this portion of the review in terms of street requirements. This is an opportunity for the Commission to provide feedback on overall ideas to include in the review based on the update of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Tolbert began review of the S A D M process stating that street section design has been of concern. He informed the commission that staff has asked our current street design consultant to take a look at a broader scoping of work and a request for additional funding will go before Council in November. In addition, a steering committee would be assisting and include members from the Planning Commission. Mr. Tolbert stated that the process would take at least 6 months and the Planning Commission will review and make recommendations to City Council.

Question and discussion

Ms. Green asked if the consultant would be focused on research or design. Mr. Tolbert stated that they would be providing general guidance for design of streets in different situations but not designing specific streets in Charlottesville. The “character of streets” information could then be adopted and provide guidance for specific situations.

Mr. Keesecker asked that a clear process be outlined to include ideas for consideration in the S A D M. Can a clear path/criteria be identified for inclusion in the document?

Mr. Santoski noted that departments should focus on obtaining equipment which fits into our urban environment.

Mr. Rosensweig noted that the update should focus on new roadway specifications as well as retrofit situations.

Ms. Green expressed concern about the utilities and Mr. Tolbert presented information on how those are addressed.

Mr. Keesecker asked if there would be a plan to identify the future character of the street.

Mr. Tolbert outlined the current thought on how this may be implemented. He also noted that criteria could be written into the manual to allow flexibility.

Mr. Santoski asked why the City of Charlottesville couldn't go to a European style truck to accommodate some streets. He stated that we need to think about buses, fire engines and sidewalks. The equipment should fit the environment.

Ms. Green stated that she still has a problem with “complete streets”, including crosswalk placement and how we place different design features. She would like to see more paintings added in the streets to calm traffic like the one in Belmont. Mr. Tolbert stated that it can be added.

Mr. Rosensweig summarized by noting the following as important considerations during the review: intersection radii, grades of roadways, Shared Streets vs. Complete Streets, looking at different standards for infrastructure not deemed to be required, driveway standards, and plantings in the right of way.

Ms. Creasy stated that Mr. Santoski has agreed to be on the Free Bridge Congestion Committee. It was also noted to make sure to outreach to Bill Emory who has interest in this topic.

Planned Unit Development

The Commission approved housekeeping changes to the PUD regulations in the summer of 2013. As a next step, the Commission wanted to take an in depth review of the ordinance to evaluate if it is helping to reach community goals and what might be done to update it to better

meet those goals. At the June 25, 2013 work session, the Commission discussed data which would be helpful in that review and staff has been working to collect that data.

Mr. Haluska recapped where things stood and noted that City Council has approved some housekeeping measures.

Mr. Rosensweig stated that the Commission would review the questions Mr. Haluska had prepared for them in the staff report to assist in organizing the conversation.

1. What are some of the physical characteristics of the existing PUD's in the City that you find appealing?
 - Meaningful public space green space such as that at Burnett Commons
 - Not really convinced the PUD does what it is intended. Most developments could have been done in a by right manner.
 - The early 2000s PUD approvals fit better with the character of surrounding neighborhoods.
 - Connections, level of enclosure, preservation of open space and reduction in road frontage are important.

2. What are some of the physical characteristics of the existing PUD's in the City that you find less than successful?
 - Space in PUDs that does not work as open space – it looks like private space.
 - Cherry Hill is not in context with the surrounding area.
 - Rock Creek Village didn't need a parking lot.
 - Width of the roads causes concerns for PUD's, lack of connectivity.
 - Not enough thought went into better plans
 - Tree removal, topography degradation, primacy of the care, too much density in some places, density for density sake are all concerns.

3. What are some of the aspects of existing PUD's in the City that positively contribute to their surrounding neighborhoods?
 - Affordable housing
 - Connectivity
 - Green space
 - Size and types of homes built.
 - Response to the specific site.

4. What are some of the aspects of the existing PUD's in the City that negatively contribute to their surrounding neighborhoods?
 - Not a lot of walkability
 - Lack of programming

- After thoughts, not unique
 - Places that don't have connectivity
5. Which PUD's do you think most successfully fulfilled the PUD ordinance's intent and why?
- Sunrise- it adds the element of mix use
 - Burnett II
 - William Taylor Plaza, Riverbluff, Lochlyn Hills-they addressed the pedestrian space.
6. Which PUD's do you think least successfully fulfilled the PUD ordinance's intent and why?
- Lochlyn Hills without the connection
 - Avon Terrace
 - Cherry Hill, Johnson Village
 - Brookwood
 - Huntley
 - Willoughby and Longwood has too much pavement.
7. Did these PUD's implement the vision outlined in the Comprehensive Plan? If not, what was envisioned?
- A PUD should add something to the community that couldn't be added with the current zoning.
 - More focus should be on mixed use.
8. If the PUD ordinance is not implementing the vision outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, what areas of the code should be reviewed?
- They would like to see some flexibility in a PUD

Ms. Creasy noted the limitations we have with the state code as it is currently but there is always opportunity for change in the future.

Speakers

Justin Shimp expressed concern with the street frontage requirement for single family lots. He also noted concerns with utility separation requirements and the conflicts with landscaping requirements which can occur. He agrees that flexibility would allow for better projects.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:12pm