

**City of Charlottesville - City Planning Commission - Minutes: March 8, 2001**

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET  
THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 2001 -- 7:30 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Ms. Nancy Damon, Chair

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Ms. Kathy Johnson Harris Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director

Mr. Herman Key

Mr. Ron Higgins, Planning Manager

Mr. Marshall Slayton

Ms. Lisa Kelley, Asst. City Attorney

Mr. Eldon Wood

Ms. Ali Cheesman, Econ. Dev. Spec.

Ms. Claudette Grant, Neigh. Planner

Ms. Missy Naylor Creasy, Neigh. Planner

Ms. Susan Thomas, Neigh. Planner

Ms. Tarpley Vest, Neigh. Planner

**CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Mr. Blake Caravati, Mayor

Mr. Kevin Lynch

Ms. Meredith Richards

Mr. David Toscano

Ms. Damon called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. She also announced that no one would be refused time to speak at any of the three public hearings scheduled for that night, but that they would prefer that comments be limited to a length of three minutes.

**A. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA**

Ms. Damon called for matters not on the formal agenda. No matters were raised.

**B. MINUTES**

Mr. Wood moved the minutes be approved, seconded by Mr. Slayton. The motion carried unanimously.

**C. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS**

1. Charlottesville 2025 - Comprehensive Plan: This Comprehensive Plan is proposed to provide a "...framework for establishing or modifying local policies, improving existing conditions and maintaining adequate coordination of public

programs..." This plan includes: Discussion of the planning process stages

used to develop the plan; explanation of the neighborhood involvement process;

inventory and assessment of existing conditions; goals, policies and

recommendations; implementation procedures and actions, and various

appendices (Community Survey, CATS Interim update, Parking Study, Corridor Study, 18 Neighborhood Plans, Traffic Calming Report).

Ms. Damon announced that Mr. Tolbert would introduce the first Public Hearing and make a few remarks, after which the public discussion would begin.

Mr. Tolbert presented a brief overview of the plan, saying that the Comprehensive Planning process had begun in February with that kick-off meeting. He mentioned that Mr. Ian McHarg, who had spoken at that meeting and gotten them off to a good start, had recently passed away, and expressed regret that they could not have gotten the plan adopted prior to his demise. He stated that they had been through a process during the past summer of doing the comprehensive plan independently and concurrently with the neighborhood plans. They had met on June 3, 2000 about the comprehensive plan, again on December 4, 2000 at the Jefferson School, with a further public hearing on December 12, 2000, and a "kickoff" meeting on February 13, 2001. He indicated that at this public hearing they had much of the same material as at the December meeting, but now had more defined land use information for discussion, and that was really the only difference between what they had had in December and where they were now. The plan contained, he said, an introductory section, a discussion of community values, demographic and housing information, a combination of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats that had been done in the various neighborhoods, and the community survey, Chapter Five. He noted that some present might have been called by the group that did the survey in an attempt to determine community needs and wants, which information they had factored into the plan as it was developed. Chapter Six, which dealt with the economy, he said, had been drawn primarily from the corridor study that was done concurrently with a firm called Robert Charles Webster & Associates, with which many of those present had been involved. He praised that company's efforts and the excellent market information they had developed for the area. Chapter Seven concerned historic preservation, and an attempt had been made to roll into this plan the historic preservation plan done several years ago. In Chapter Eight the focus was existing land use; Chapter Nine was concerned with urban design issues, primarily commercial, another piece which had come from the corridor study. Chapter Ten dealt with Transportation, Chapter Eleven dealt with Community Facilities, Chapter Twelve with Natural Resources, Chapter Thirteen with Issues, Goals and Objections, and Chapter Fourteen dealt with Implementation. He stated that if anyone had been at the February 12th meeting, they would recall they had talked about developing ideas of what an ideal community was.

The Planning Commission had taken that information plus information from the June 2000 meeting on guiding principles, and had formulated a list of a dozen guiding principles upon which they felt the plan should be based. All these, he said, keyed back

to visions created in 1995, as the Planning Commission felt those visions were still valid and did not need to be revisited, but only to be built upon with the guiding principles, which spoke to things they all felt Charlottesville ought to be: Strong neighborhoods; accessible safe transportation; alternative transportation; the value of parks, trees, green spaces and open spaces; diversified economy; balance between natural and built environments; sustainability when making decisions; and diverse individuals.

Concerning implementation, he explained that the things they would like to accomplish were broken down into categories, the first being transportation, which dealt with primary recommendations to complete the six-year plan projects they had with VDOT, to focus on bike pedestrian transit more than on roads, and to coordinate with the ongoing transit development plan. The second category was land use, with several key recommendations: to add two categories, one being for mixed use for the corridors and the other being the "University Precinct" concept; two, to implement down-zonings from the last few years; to provide incentives for alternative transportation use; and to review the Four Unrelated Rule, which states that no more than four unrelated persons may live in a single unit. He indicated that the down-zoning and proposed land use changes had been looked at extensively, and he referred everyone to a map to give them an idea of the extent to which they had looked at properties. The Commission, he noted, felt two things should happen: First, that land use and zoning should agree as much as possible, and two, that zoning and land use should reflect as much as possible the actual use in the neighborhoods and areas. Five different maps had been posted on the wall, and he indicated which map depicted which area, showing what was needed in each area of the City. Other key implementation points he mentioned were the corridor study recommendations, these being very basic and general at that time, and primarily concerned with urban design criteria to implement

themes for the different corridors (Downtown Mall, West Main area, Ivy, Emmet, etc.), each of which had a different sort of development theme. Parking was also addressed, for implementing the recommendations for the parking study and taking a serious look at permit parking, especially around the University. If the plan was adopted, the next step would be to move ahead on the actions and then begin to look at the zoning ordinance, mainly to implement the zoning text change and the corridor standards, those being the key points of review. He acknowledged there had been much confusion about what to do if the plan was adopted, but stated that if it were adopted without alteration, nothing would change regarding zoning or ordinance text now. The zoning would be reviewed, the process would take months to go through, and they would come up with new zoning maps and new text for the ordinance. He suggested the formation of a series of working groups around the various interest areas, to determine what the different corridors would look like, considering setbacks, buffer requirements and so on. The same thing would apply to

the University area, to downtown and the other areas. Status of neighborhood plans was discussed also, to make sure they understood that the Commission had recommended this plan to City Council a couple months ago. The Council requested some revisions in the plan, particularly in regard to resolution of an issue in Johnson Village so that projects and recommendations in that area could be addressed as to which were doable and which were for the future. This was scheduled to go back to City Council in April. The Comprehensive Plan's next step was that the Commission was holding a Work Session on March 29th to talk about what the present meeting's discussions generated, what they wanted to do with those suggestions and how to present them to City Council. He reminded those present that the Planning Commission itself did not adopt the Comprehensive Plan, but only recommended it to City Council, which would actually get the plan on April 2nd. They would then schedule Work Sessions of their own, and the final plan might not be exactly what the Council received in April, depending upon what was brought forward at the present hearing, what the Commission wished to do with that, whether there would be further public hearings regarding the plan and, finally, what the Council decided. That, in essence, was where the matter stood, he said, and he then turned the proceedings back over to Ms. Damon.

Ms. Damon requested again that participants confine their remarks to three minutes' length. She also reiterated the fact that no decision would be made that night, but that this was the time for input which would then be used by the Commission and,

subsequently, the City Council, in their respective Work Sessions. She asked that those in the audience who agreed with the content of a speaker's remarks raise their hands, or say "Hear, hear" or some such, so the Commission could get a feel for the levels of agreement or disagreement on various issues, and she expressed the hope that people who wished to speak on similar issues would group their remarks together so that they would not be hearing the same thing over and over. No one, she assured them, would be prevented from speaking, whether they had signed up to speak or not. After announcing that Ms. Johnson Harris would serve as Timekeeper, the Chair recognized Peggy Van Yahres of 1700 Chesapeake Street.

As the new Chair of the Parks and Recreation Board, Ms. Van Yahres congratulated the Commission, on behalf of that Board, on their "Herculean task" in producing what appeared to be a very innovative document. The Board had not had a chance to look at

it yet, she said, nor to review the parts which dealt with their particular area of interest, so they were delighted to hear of the upcoming Work Session. She noted that their next meeting was to be on March 14th, the whole of which they planned to devote to the sections of the plan dealing with parks, natural areas, etc., and to their own goals, to see how these would dovetail with those of the Commission. She indicated their desire to then get back to the Commission with their recommendations and have the Commission consider these. In conclusion, she expressed the Board's great interest and their desire to be a part of this process.

Ms. Nina Barnes, of 12 Gildersleeve Wood in the City, stated that on the previous Sunday, she had attended the get-together arranged by Kevin O'Halloran so that her neighborhood, JPA and Venable could come to this night's meeting better prepared.

She noted that if the recommendation that the neighborhood planning office was proposing for the JPA area was based on the latest Comprehensive Plan review, the corridor and economic studies, then she would like to request a joint meeting with those who would develop the high-density concept, and interested resident homeowners, as she

thought it was important for them to know how the Commission had arrived at their proposal. She remarked that the recent JPA Comprehensive Plan review stated that that neighborhood "must strive to find ideal balance of single-family, student and graduate student housing." She said that, in reading the goals set out for JPA, she had believed that the neighborhood planning office would be working with them on their ideas presented in the sessions they had held to "create the ideal balance." In November of '97 another neighborhood study was completed; a number of neighborhoods, including JPA, were feeling threatened, and the City developed the neighborhood protection task force, whose two-year charge was to identify ways to enhance and protect neighborhoods from changes that could affect their character. Both Planning Commission and City Council had accepted the recommendations and the City was to have begun their implementation. Housing, she said, had been a big topic in the report and the value to the City of home ownership was emphasized as this gave increased commitment to the community, better maintenance, more stability to neighborhoods, increased savings and equity to homeowners. Suggestions to bring back home ownership included implementing house bank programs that would reevaluate zoning in order to halt, or slow, conversion of single-family homes to rentals, and encouraging the City to work with UVA to provide more on-Grounds housing. She hoped that the homeowners in JPA could meet with the Commission to discover what was driving their proposals for high-density development of that area, given that the Comprehensive Plan review and the neighborhood protection task force pointed toward more managed growth for their area. She thanked the Commission.

Ms. Jane Foster, of 6 Gildersleeve Wood, introduced herself as the secretary of the JPA

Neighborhood Association. She read a letter from the President of her neighborhood association, Ms. Liz Kutchai, who lived on Valley Road and who was out of town that night:

"I am writing this letter because I am unable to speak in person on March 8, 2001. I am sure my neighbors will do a good job of expressing our many concerns about the proposal to create large zones of higher-density housing intended for students in our neighborhood. We are upset that these zones were drawn on a map without any input from the permanent residents, and we want to be sure that we do have input and are included in every step of the process of considering and planning these zones. Among our many concerns, there are two that I would like to address here: Mr. Tolbert said in a meeting with residents on March 4th, 'You can't do University precincts without also changing permit parking.' However, when pressed for details about permit parking, he kept saying, 'I don't know how it would be done.' He admitted that what has been done on University Circle does not work. I believe that the reason Mr. Tolbert cannot describe a permit parking system that might work is that there is none. If higher-density zoning with reduced off-street parking is adopted in the hope that the permit parking rules can be worked out later, the result will be disaster.

At the March 4th meeting, a homeowner in the WS zone between Stadium Road and JPA asked, 'Are we the sacrificial lamb? Do you care at all about homeowners in the green area?' Mr. Tolbert's reply was, over time, single-family homes would disappear from these areas. This would be another disaster for the City. Although our neighborhood is only seven percent owner-occupant, this tiny minority of people with a long-term stake in the neighborhood makes a contribution to the quality of life that's way out of proportion to our numbers. We are the ones who are constantly working to ensure that trash is picked up from front yards, that pockets of crime don't develop, that peace and tranquility are maintained. We do this both by calling appropriate City authorities and by cajoling our student neighbors to behave better. The City needs people like us sprinkled through every neighborhood. A neighborhood that lacks residents with a long-term commitment to the community is a neighborhood that will inexorably spiral into a slum. Elizabeth Kutchai."

Ms. Foster stated that she had copies of the letter for the Commission and the Council members present.

Dr. Gene Foster, also of 6 Gildersleeve Wood, remarked on the proposed establishment of the so-called University Precinct in large areas of the City adjacent to the University. His understanding of the proposal, he said, was that this would be devoted eventually almost entirely to high-density student housing in an attempt to meet the ever-increasing number of students looking for places to live. He stated that conversion of owner-occupied single-family houses into relatively low-density student housing had reached an advanced stage in several neighborhoods around the University, with the unfortunate effects being already evident. It seemed clear, he noted, that the present zoning ordinance encouraged this conversion, yet the number of units still did not meet the demand and, assuming high-density were allowed, this demand could more

easily be met. He was, however, strongly opposed to the proposal for a number of reasons: First, he stated that from examples all over the country it was apparent that high-density student housing around universities, etc., was the first step to

deteriorating, crime-ridden slums which would eventually not be occupied by students. Second, the proposal flew in the face of policy espoused by the Neighborhood Protection Task Force, the Planning Commission and the City Council, namely promotion of an increased proportion of middle-income, owner-occupied homes. If increased owner occupancy was good for the City, he ventured, it should also be good for each of that City's neighborhoods. Third, the proposal ran counter to the developing belief that mixed-use neighborhoods provided benefit for both their own residents and the community as a whole. He inquired if there could be increased owner-occupancy, high-density student housing and commercial activity all at the same time within the University Precinct. He stated that he thought it could be done, given thoughtful and imaginative planning, and that the end result would enhance the quality of life for all residents, but a few things needed to be kept in mind as the planning process proceeded. Uniform density throughout the area was unnecessary: There could be high-density zones for single students, alongside much lower density areas for single families, both owners and renters. He voiced the opinion that low-density student housing, where four or more students occupied a house intended for a single family, contributed more to neighborhood deterioration than true high-density housing. Ways of re-converting homes to owner-occupancy status should, he felt, be explored. Open space and commercial zones could provide the needed buffers between the different kinds of residential zones. Before considering any density increase, he said, there must be found and developed workable solutions for the problems surrounding parking and traffic patterns and volume. He stated that the University must be made to understand that it had a great stake in the neighborhoods surrounding it, and that repeated and persistent efforts should be made to enlist its cooperation and collaboration. He also thought that one or more planned urban developments should be considered, and that, finally, close consultation with residents of involved areas, as well as with current landlords and potential developers, was essential at all stages of the planning process.

Ms. Damon indicated that the Commission had a copy of his remarks. She then recognized the next speaker and reminded her to ask for agreement with her remarks by a show of hands at the end.

Ms. Ellen Contini-Morava, of 225 Montebello Circle in the City, acknowledged that she would be repeating some things which had already been said, but that she did not think it hurt to repeat them. She also wished to speak against the University Precinct concept, and to begin by questioning the neighborhood involvement process. She said they had been to many meetings about the Comprehensive Plan in which they had raised their concerns about the future of the neighborhood. Now she found that the map was already drawn, and had discovered last Sunday (March 4th) that since their neighborhood was already mostly rental, they should just go with the flow. She felt that the Planning Commission was trying to present them with a fait accompli and though she knew it was just a proposal, not a plan, still once a map was drawn it began to take on a life of its own, and that was already happening: That, instead of getting to question the entire premise upon which the map was based, they were being asked for suggestions on how to implement the proposal with the least amount of pain. She questioned whose vision of the future was represented on that map where her neighborhood was colored green. ("Hear, hear!" from the audience.) The owner-occupants, she stated, wanted to lower the number of rentals per acre, and they viewed the high-density development full of teenaged, transient residents as a major source of noise, traffic, garbage, drunken parties and parking problems. All the developers wanted, she said, was to maximize the number of rental spaces per acre. She remarked that they had been told that increasing student density in the immediate University area would take the pressure off in other areas and decrease the need for student cars because of the rule of one parking place per bedroom would be relaxed and the on-street permit parking rules strengthened. However, she pointed out that students did more than go to classes -- they had doctor appointments, they shopped, they went various places for entertainment, they traveled outside Charlottesville, and there was no supporting evidence that students who lived within walking distance of their classes would rely less on their cars. (Several cries of "Hear, hear!" from audience.) That was the result, she said, of either wishful thinking or deliberate misleading, because students liked to have cars and that would not change unless the public transportation system altered drastically. Students, she went on, who cannot park in their backyards will just park further away somewhere; relaxation of the zoning laws would serve only to worsen the situation.

She submitted that nurturing a student ghetto was not the best model for the future of the City, and that constructing high-rise apartments was a sure way to drive away both current and prospective owner-occupants and destroy their sense of community

(another "Hear, hear!"). The need, which had been stressed many times previously by neighborhood residents, was to find ways to encourage owner-occupiers to stay and for others to move in. High-density rentals in mixed residential areas was, she stated, destructive and should be an exception to be considered on a case by case basis, not by right, and not the rule. They could not, she maintained, accept the University Precinct plan as a starting point for discussion, as it did no good for anyone but the developer. She thanked the Commission.

Ms. Jeanne Biltonen, of Oakhurst Circle in the JPA neighborhood in the City, expressed her concern with the draft of the Comprehensive Plan, specifically with the University Precinct. She had several questions. First, in what way did the Planning Commission factor in the neighborhood input and the recommendations from the Neighborhood Protection Task Force in the proposing of high-density housing? Second, what was the current population of the proposed University Precinct contrasted with the potential maximum population of the high-density area? Third, what statistics were gathered regarding the current number of automobiles in the proposed University Precinct and what projections were made using the proposed "one car/one bedroom" rule? Also, what plans were there to implement and enforce the 24/7 parking recommendation, and were there numbers to show how this would impact current area parking problems? Fourth, was it realistic to think high-density dwellings were suitable for mixing undergraduates, UVA staff, faculty and non-UVA adults? Had such a thing been successful in other places? Fifth, what safeguards would be in place to prevent further expansion of high-density housing into neighborhoods adjacent to University Precinct areas? If there were in fact answers to these questions, she indicated that it would be most helpful to have them. She thanked the Commission for its time.

Mr. Kevin O'Halloran, President of the Venable Neighborhood Association, and resident of 1847 Edgewood Lane, began on a positive note by thanking the members of the City Staff and Planning Commission for involving the neighborhood associations' members, and others, in the Comprehensive Planning process. He said that many of them had gone to many meetings over the past year and he thought the result had been very positive outcomes from the meetings. He said the Venable neighborhood now had a much better dialogue between homeowners and landlords than had been the case previously. They had also begun an interesting discussion concerning a couple of potentially beneficial tools, which still needed fleshing out: The University Precinct and the economic corridors. He and his neighbors had a number of concerns regarding both concepts in their neighborhood. Though he did not wish to state strong opposition per se, especially to University Precinct as outlined in the 14th and 15th Street area, they were concerned that those concepts had been painted with too broad a brush and expressed his surprise at seeing the map and its level of detail. In their opinion, the University Precinct and its level of density, he said, was not always a bad idea but they needed to review, case by case, properties that would be affected by it. As well, case by case along Emmet Street as it affected their neighborhood was something they would like to see regarding proposed mixed use in that economic corridor. He thanked the Commission for bringing the neighborhood groups together in structured ways over the past year, but cautioned against their painting with too broad a brush within the Comprehensive Plan. He had been heartened by Mr. Tolbert's mention of the planned working groups for zoning and land use changes, so that citizen input could continue.

Mr. Jim Stultz, a property owner in the W3 (14th and 15th Street) area and also in W6 area of Brandon Avenue and Monroe Lane, stated that he had brought detailed reports to hand out, at the end of his comments, among those present. He addressed specifically the zoning and land use changes as they related to areas W3 and W6. Area W3, which comprised the 14th, 15th and Wertland Street area, was currently 99.8% student rental. Of the 150 parcels in that area, 147 were investment properties with a market value of One Hundred Million Dollars, of which the City received over One Million Dollars in taxes. The remaining three parcels were single family, generated only Eight Thousand Dollars yearly, and held 1,300 students and three non-residents, two of whom were over eighty-five years of age. He declared that the area was a zoning nightmare, being a combination of B1, B3, B5, R3, R2 and seventy-five non-conforming homes. None of this property, he stated, would ever be sold for single-family homes because their use made their value 35% to 40% more than a comparable single-family home anywhere else in the City or County. This value, he said, was established by the rental income, not the beauty or condition of the house, and little money was spent on these properties because it would not increase their cash flow. He supported rezoning to allow high density, small apartments to be built in this area, removing some of the "old eyesores" and eliminating the majority of traffic and parking. It would also, he said, stop student migration into surrounding single-family areas, in some of which there were newer, existing apartment buildings which he was sure would consider trading off large parking areas for additional apartments, thereby eliminating the cars.

He indicated that either the zoning would change there or the area would continue on its present downhill course toward decay. The W6 area, quite different from either JPA or 14th Street, was adjacent to and totally encompassed by the University, being next to the nursing school, Student Health, Brandon Avenue Dorms, UVa parking and the new 80-bedroom dorm which was at present under construction. Zoning there was R3, 100% student rental. He mentioned a new dorm that had eighty tenants but only two parking spaces, saying that the University could get away with that but as a builder he could not because of the present zoning laws. New zoning would also open the door for the University and the private sector to do joint projects, thus keeping that property on the City's tax rolls. Currently, according to him, the University could build whatever it wanted whenever it wanted to do so without any zoning restrictions. He said the University's only options were to purchase the property from the landowners, or threaten them with a take or eminent domain so they could build what they wanted and purchase it. The new zoning, he said, would allow the private sector and the owner to enter into a joint agreement with the University to either lease the land or build the building and lease it to them. This would keep the property on the City tax rolls, which was not a current option because of the City zoning requirements. He maintained that the proposed zoning changes for W3 and W6 had a major impact on the future City tax base, the upgrading of the neighborhoods around the University, and the elimination of automobiles and huge parking lots to help preserve the single family neighborhoods by creating a student migration to the neighborhoods.

Mr. Marty Broan, of 500 Valley Road and a member of both the Venable and JPA Neighborhood Associations, commented that single-family neighborhoods were being lost to renters, parking and traffic were major problems, and the question was how

to solve these problems. He said he had attended all the meetings with the Planning Commission and wanted to commend the City Council, City Staff and the Planning Commission on their efforts to find solutions. He stated that the Venable and JPA

neighborhoods were over 90% student rental, since students wanted to live close to UVa, and he felt that by allowing high density development, surrounding neighborhoods would be saved and new developments diversified by making it feasible to build units with other than four bedrooms. He said the new developments, requiring fewer parking spaces, would reduce the number of cars as they would not be needed since both neighborhoods were adjacent to UVa. He echoed that rezoning would reduce the spread of students into other areas and permit undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty to live in the same area. He thanked the Commission.

Mr. Earl Thompson, of 308 Montebello Circle, strongly supported the efforts of the Commission to draft a plan for the City, having full awareness of the difficulty of such a task, but he expressed concerns. He commented that all properties in the proposed green area along JPA should not be lumped into a "one size fits all" situation, which was the approach used. Oakhurst Circle, Gildersleeve Wood, part of Valley Road, Montebello Circle and Observatory and Washington Avenues still retained a majority of residences which should be preserved to maintain a desirable diversity within the neighborhood ("Hear, hear!" from audience), and a mix of family housing in the University area, as was represented along Alderman Road, Kent Terrace, Thompson Road, Lewis Mountain Road, etc. He stated that the loss of the family residences in the above-mentioned areas would do irreparable harm to the University and to that portion of the City. He felt that as many residences as possible along other streets in that area should be reclaimed for single-family use. He recalled that, thirty-four years ago when his eldest son turned twelve, the boy began delivering papers on Monroe Lane, Valley Road and Brandon Avenue. His younger sons also had paper routes all through the area, from Twyman Road, along Alderman Road, to Brandon, Valley and bordering on Maury Avenue. He stated that he had watched what had happened in those locations. He entreated the Commission to please not treat Montebello Circle and the other areas mentioned as had been done in some places which had been totally devastated. He continued that he was not anti-development, stating that we must have planned development that protected individual property rights and allowed for needed growth. But he challenged the Commission to go back into the land records and read the deeds of conveyance to some of the properties they proposed to funnel into University Precinct, saying they might discover legal difficulties with deeds. Many of the problems in the affected areas, he noted, were beyond the scope or responsibility of the Planning Commission as assigned, but the real challenge to the Council and the neighborhoods consisted of helping to clean up and maintain the affected areas, enforce existing garbage and parking regulations, strengthen and enforce the occupancy codes currently in effect, and help the neighborhood watch groups rid the affected areas of drugs. All these, he said, were

the real challenges for livable neighborhoods, and nothing they did as the Planning Commission was going to help without addressing all of the problems. As to parking, he suggested that students as they arrive must be made aware of the parking regulations and after that they must be enforced. He gave a copy of his notes to the Commission.

Ms. Sally Brown, of 110 Shamrock Road, stated that she had been listening attentively to others as they spoke and thus would not read her entire prepared statement as some of it was repetitious. She hoped that the parts of her remarks which were new would make sense out of context. She pointed out that there were two historic houses in that neighborhood, one being Montebello, which was built in part by Mr. Jefferson's workmen and remained a beautiful home to the present day. She said the idea of its being encroached upon by high-rise development was not a happy thought. The second property, already developed to some extent, was Harmon Hall, at 2005 Jefferson Park Avenue. She said she and her husband had initially been attracted to that neighborhood years before because of its diversity. They wanted to live in the city. The W6 area, so diverse in number of dwellings and their size and use, she termed unique in that regard, and noted how many of these homes were still owner-occupied. She questioned whether the City really wanted this residential section written off completely for the abatement of the student housing problem, although the proposed plan suggested this might be the case. She then brought forward a proposed compromise: Although they preferred that no high-density development encroach upon their neighborhood, she suggested that they experiment first on a small scale and a trial basis. Specifically she proposed that Brandon Avenue and Monroe Lane be identified as appropriate sites for higher density development. These streets, she noted, were immediately adjacent to the University and had no owner-occupants in the present houses. Over a five year period, the City should monitor the success or failure of this initiative and then decide what other areas, if any, might be appropriate for higher-density development. Particularly observed, she concluded, should be the impact upon parking and traffic. She pleaded that they not at this time change a residential neighborhood that was both viable and, as attested by those who had already spoken, greatly loved, into a high-density area for use by only one segment of the population. ("Hear, hear," from the audience.)

Mr. Charles Weber, of 601 Locust Avenue in the City, echoed the sentiments of congratulation already expressed by others regarding the job the Commission

and Staff had done in involving citizens in the Comprehensive Plan process, especially complimenting Tarpley Vest, from his own neighborhood, on her skill and patience. He indicated he would not speak about the University Precinct problem per se, but about residential use in general, and referenced a letter written by his wife in her capacity as President of the Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Association, copies of which had been distributed to those present. Also referenced was an email he had received from a neighbor who lived in one of the four houses mentioned below, which he was not sure everyone had received. Ms. Damon assured him that they had a copy of that email. He continued by commenting that the undercurrent here had to do with the interplay between the economic corridors and the neighborhoods themselves. He said they were not displeased with the designation in the eastern sector of an economic corridor along High Street, feeling that this served well both the neighborhood and the City. The issue really concerned four houses on Locust Avenue, outside that corridor but even so earmarked for business use when in fact they had historically been used, and continued to be used, for residential purposes. He said they had heard an undercurrent throughout this process of rather a "quid pro quo," wherein heightened land use and zoning protection for residential areas would be traded off for higher density in the corridors. He wanted to know what sort of public policy was being served by the continued designation of "business use" upon properties not only outside that corridor but which had always been and continued to be residential. He requested the Commission take a hard look at that. In addition, he said they understood that the wild card in this equation was the hospital and whether or not it wanted those properties, and while he did not speak for the hospital he would say only that, in particular, the property at 520 Locust Avenue had changed hands twice in the past two years and the hospital had declined to purchase it. In fact, the hospital had conveyed to them that there was no intention to purchase any more property on that side of Locust Avenue. He indicated that they were in consultation with the hospital and had identified three areas actually within the corridor which were on hospital property and that there was adequate room for the hospital to grow even though they had chosen not to do so at this time for certain technological and financial reasons. He felt that all indications pointed to the re-designation of these four properties to residential use. He thanked the Commission.

Ms. Carolyn Silver, of 5 Gildersleeve Wood in the City, stated that her house, which was adjacent to Valley Road, had been built in 1920 by her parents. She said that at that time they were not bothered by loud, outdoor music, etc., and that Valley Road had not even existed at that time. But she mentioned sadly the lovely older houses, some still



owner occupied but many with absentee landlords, which were now, as she put it, "infested with noisy, party-animal students." She declared herself gladly associated with her neighbors who had already spoken and with Carl and Judy Whitlock who could not attend, but who had given her a brief statement to read:

"We who live in Gildersleeve Wood definitely do not want an increase in student density in Valley Road. We already have our share, or more, of noise, trash and traffic generated by the multitude of students currently living on Valley Road, Brandon Avenue, Oakhurst Circle, Maywood Lane and JPA. We suggest that the Planning Commission, City Council and the interested student landlords look to areas in the City other than ours to increase student density. Judy and Carl Whitlock."

Ms. Silver then thanked the Commission.

Mr. Rick Jones, an investment property owner in both the Venable and JPA neighborhood associations, congratulated Mr. Tolbert and his staff on the incredible job they had done. He said he had missed only one out of all the JPA and Venable meetings, and had attended every entrance corridor meeting, the charette, and the introductory meetings. He stated that he had met almost all the JPA people and that they actually had agreed on many things, among them 24/7 parking and ordinance enforcement. He was not, he assured them, an absentee landlord, but that he lived and breathed his business, and one of his locations in the University area was Woodard Apartments on the corner of JPA and Stadium Road, into which he had just recently put a lot of work. He praised his all-student tenant population, and declared that he was very much against what the Commission was proposing for that area, saying that it was economically unfeasible and that he would not touch for fifteen years what was presently in place. The tough job, he stated, was that the Commission was looking twenty years ahead and attempting to solve some monumental problems. He sympathized with those who were concerned about student housing growth but felt that, on looking at the sector maps, there was a lot of down-zoning going on as well. He said that he and others in the apartment business had "bought off on that wholeheartedly" as a means of initially addressing these problems and concurrently trying to protect the neighborhoods, and that he looked forward to being on some committees where problems were addressed on a case by case basis. However, he noted that not everyone could be made happy. He expressed his enjoyment in working with Staff and with the neighbors and said he hoped to continue. He thanked the Commission.

Mr. Jack Wilson, of 317 Monte Vista Avenue in the City, stated that he had been asked by the Fry's Spring Neighborhood Association to make some comments which he felt fit very closely with those from Venable and JPA. He presented a hypothetical scenario: With his teenaged daughter, he sat down before the school year began and they tried on what she had to see what still fit, made lists of what clothes she needed, mended what leftover usable items needed mending, and then he surprised her by giving her \$20.00 and saying, "Now go out and do a good job of getting all your school clothes with this." He likened her probable reaction and subsequent mood to the mood of the Fry's Spring Neighborhood Association upon hearing the proposal of only \$30,000.00 to do all the things that needed to be done. There were, he stated, eighteen separate neighborhoods identified by the City, each of which was allotted only \$30,000.00 with which to do all the items identified in the planning process these neighborhoods went through the prior year. Of these eighteen neighborhoods, one-third would receive additional monies based upon their CDBG status. That these \$30,000.00 allotments were from a City budget of nearly Eighty Million Dollars pointed up some dramatic discrepancies which, he felt, must be addressed by the Planning Commission, the City Council and in particular the neighborhood planning department: First, all neighborhoods were allotted identical amounts regardless of their size. Venable, the largest, had 5,452 residents; the smallest, Starr Hill, had only 173. This meant \$5.53 per capita for Venable, but \$173.41 per person for Starr Hill which, incidentally, would get extra funds due to its CDBG status whereas Venable would not. Nor was need a factor considered in the allotment – large neighborhoods with significant infrastructure needs were given the same amount as small ones. He used Fry's Spring as an example, citing the extreme need for sidewalks, the fact that it would take twenty years of the current allotment to pay for that one thing on Stribling Avenue alone, where over \$600,000.00 worth of work was needed. He also mentioned the target areas such as Longwood Drive and Azalea Park, "the City's most neglected park." By contrast, he noted that Johnson Village had completed sidewalks throughout the neighborhood, mostly underground utilities, no target areas, that Johnson Elementary School was getting complete sidewalks outside the \$30,000.00 fund, and was, with only 771 residents, one of the smaller neighborhoods, receiving five times the per capita funding that Fry's Spring received, and ten times that of Venable.

In the interest of fairness, he stated, the Planning Commission needed to address not only population but miles of roadway and other factors before these funds were allocated. He thanked the Commission.

Mr. Keith Woodard, whose office is at 304 14th Street in the Venable neighborhood, stated that he owns property in the University area and two other properties identified on the maps as SC4 and SC8. On the issue of higher density in the University area, he stated he thought it was a good idea conceptually and would help other neighborhoods, as any time you could provide housing near where people work or play or go to school you decreased the need for other infrastructure, particularly roads, by providing housing close by where they wanted to go. Regarding the proposed down-zoning in the areas of Fifeville and of Willoughby where his properties were, he asked that the Commission read the letter he had sent them. He then summarized the seven points he had made in that letter: First, concerning the area around Tonsler Park, he had done much planning work with the neighbors already and considered this very important. He did not feel that zoning there needed to be changed at this time since it was compatible with current uses on neighboring properties. He noted that many residents of Charlottesville would be here only for a couple of years, or were anticipating a change of lifestyle, perhaps planning to purchase their next residence, but who for many reasons needed to rent at present. He also stated that down-zoning reduced affordability and mentioned as well that some property, such as the SC8 piece in Willoughby, was not physically suited for a development type of use. Down-zoning would, he remarked, also reduce property values. He thanked the Commission, saying that the neighborhoods had done some good work, that they had a lot of common ground, and that he looked forward to continued work with them.

Ms. Mary Wilson, of 317 Monte Vista Avenue in the City, stated that she had served as secretary of the Fry's Spring Neighborhood Association for three years, and represented that association's executive board as no one else could attend in person. She informed the Commission, for the record, that they did not support the process for the neighborhood planning and that, though they appreciated this opportunity to express their opinions, they felt they had been given neither adequate funding nor sufficient time to determine what to do with their \$30,000.00. She thanked the Commission.

Ms. Wynn Stewart, of 2002 Stadium Road in the City, stated she was a resident owner of property in the JPA Neighborhood Association area. She commented that she wanted to add an item to Ms. Biltonen's list of items for which she wanted to get numbers, namely the upper class housing vacancy rate in the University area. Since it had been stated that housing needed to be built in the private sector, she thought they needed to know first what the vacancy rates were. Secondly, regarding the statement that the suggested development would favor all sections of the University area population, she pointed out that it was not the staff, faculty or graduate-student populations which were increasing in any consistent way, but rather the undergraduate population which was ballooning. That being the case, she took issue with the concept that the increased density would provide potential for attracting a large number of non-undergraduate residents to balance out the equation. She said that she had moved into that area as a graduate student, and that, though in a rhetorical way it had been made to sound as though this would improve the balance of faculty, staff, graduates and undergraduates, that mix already existed to some extent; but the largest number of renters were undergraduates. She stated she had been an owner-resident there for twenty-two years and a resident for twenty-three years. She opposed the creation of the University Precinct as currently proposed and made three points: First, she believed the current proposal would have the long-term effect of reversing the City's goal toward home ownership with regard to that area, since high density required multi-family dwellings and many people were interested in owning, and living in, single-family dwellings. Certainly it would not encourage anyone to buy a property presently single-family if the current proposal were passed. Numerous multi-family units would, she said, push out the current owners, not only on the affected streets but in the neighborhood as a whole since the character of that neighborhood would be changed. She declared that, as a faculty member at UVa, she felt the plan worked

against the City's goal of using alternative transportation for those who lived and worked in that area. She stated that now, most residents who were employed at UVa either walked to work or used University Transit. However, if the environment changed so drastically that they were forced to sell homes they have owned for decades in order to preserve their sanity, and move from the area, they would be unlikely to be able either to walk or use alternative transportation to get to work. Finally, she brought up an educational issue with the University zone as proposed. She acknowledged the difficulties inherent in a mixed situation such as they presently had, but stated that there were students occupying former single-family homes who did act as neighbors, who profited and learned by having the permanent residents as their neighbors. She remarked upon the good relationships she had had, to a certain degree,

with the students. If they made too much noise, she said, she would go to their door and remind them that there were those who had to get up the next morning, and the response in her area had been quite good, especially considering that one of her neighbors was a fraternity house. She thought this relationship increased the students' awareness of how they needed to behave. She urged the Commission not to adopt the proposal as currently stated.

Ms. Damon asked Ms. Stewart if she would like to have the literature. It was agreed that it would be sent to her. Ms. Damon then asked if there were any others who wished to discuss the Comprehensive Plan, and recognized Ms. Judy M. Johnson.

Ms. Johnson stated that she represented the City Market vendors and also, perhaps, the shoppers who supported them. She had invited other vendors to attend but the meeting had been cancelled and no other vendors were in the audience. She thought she spoke for all of them, however, in requesting that the Planning Commission include in the Comprehensive Plan itself a statement of support and advocacy for the City Market, and the establishment for it of a permanent home. She expressed hope that they all had received their copies of the plan which the vendors, in conjunction with many community members, had developed in 1994, as well as a copy of Professor Kent Schuette's plan presented in 1996. She noted that the plans spoke of including the City Market within the concept of a permanent home, not simply defining it as a location within the corridor plans. She felt that it was very important that they listen to a Farmer's Market expert as well as to those who employed this as a way of making their living in the community, and expressed again her hope for inclusion of City Market in the Comprehensive Plan. She thanked the Commission.

The Chair then called for further comment.

Mr. Wyatt Johnson, of 1005 Ridge Street in the City, stated that he was President of the Ridge Street Neighborhood Association and served on the task force. He indicated that although he had come chiefly to listen, there were some things he had heard which disturbed him and to which he wished to respond. He said he had gone to nearly every meeting of his association, and had lived in Charlottesville all his life except during his years of military service, and was excited about what the Commission was doing although he did not necessarily agree with all of it. He was speaking, he said, as a person who had been denied in this City. Referring to Mr. Wilson's comments about the \$30,000.00 being insufficient for his area, he remarked that they couldn't have gotten \$5,000.00 for their neighborhood, so he favored the plan's being worked out, and the funds being distributed. He acknowledged that giving equal amounts to each area meant some would get more than others, but he noted that in his neighborhood there was no sidewalk on either side of the street and had never been in the past fifty years. Though he would not be here to see the entire plan brought to completion, he urged that the Commission "keep on" and declared that everyone should continue to work with it.

The next speaker, Ms. Ann Benham of 116 Observatory Avenue in the University area of the City, read a letter about the proposed rezoning:

"As a resident of Observatory Avenue for over twenty years, I have seen that

development and higher population density have brought some undesirable changes to the neighborhood which have all been cataloged tonight -- more cars, traffic, loud drinking parties, yelling in the streets at night and garbage left outside. So for me the proposed rezoning raises the prospect of only intensifying these negatives. I have some questions for the Planning Commission and Mr. Tolbert: What if any process has the City used to evaluate the environmental impact of the development that could result from the proposed rezoning? How might greater density affect the water supply and the quality of the water, the traffic and the parking problems, the availability of green space and soil and air quality? Number Two, is there a provision in the rezoning proposal for hiring more police and City inspectors to higher population density in this area? If problems accompany an increase in student population in the JPA neighborhood, will the neighborhood, or the landlords who rent to the students, then be willing to address complaints from homeowners regarding student-related parking, noise and garbage issues? What about the possibility for more drug activity that could accompany a higher

student population? Number Three, why weren't the homeowners/residents given notice that this proposal was to come before the Planning Commission? The JPA neighborhood association, in my understanding, found out by accident only two weeks ago about the proposed re-zoning. One email, phone call or note to the president of the

neighborhood association would have been all it would have taken to get the word out. I respectfully request that the City (a) make available to the public minutes of the Planning Commission and planning department meetings relating to the proposed rezoning so that residents may know all issues and players involved and (b) delay this proposal for at least a month more until the information is available."

Ms. Benham requested that the City post the names and contact information for all Planning Commission members on the Monticello Avenue website. Currently,

she said, only the City Council member information was on that site.

In response to the Chair's call for other speakers, Mr. Ben Ford, of 117 Amherst Common in the Kellytown neighborhood area, came forward to speak about zoning of a different sort. He said he wanted to thank Mr. Tolbert and Staff for their great work

on the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that he had been encouraged to find that archeological resources were mentioned. As an archeologist and member of

Preservation Piedmont and the Archeological Society of Virginia, he was personally and professionally interested in the City's archeological resources and was aware that many citizens shared that interest, as evidenced by the night's comments. He felt that

missing from the Comprehensive Plan was any study as to how the City could protect and manage its archeological resources. He deemed that a significant need, citing as examples the new McGuire, Woods law offices, and the new Marriott on West Main

Street, where significant archeological and historical resources had been lost forever because they were not talked about so that the public could address the issues of whether they could afford to be lost. He added that Charlottesville's archeological resources were a public resource, and often represented people of this community who were not represented in the documentary record and did not often have economic and political forces and powers representing them. He pointed out that though much had been said that evening concerning the University and its environs, no one had mentioned the area of Venable Lane or the historically African-American neighborhood called Canada, both perfect examples of archeological resources in this City which, he felt, needed to be protected. The two sites mentioned in the Plan were University-owned, and he thought therefore this was an issue with the University as well. He thought that protecting archeological resources, far from being anti-development, was rather simply doing what was right, and that as they already had zoning which protected the City's unique architecture, he saw no reason why they could not come up with some kind of money through the State or the City to study whether it was worthwhile to protect the City's archeological resources and, if so, how that could be accomplished. He stated that history was important to this area and that archeology was history, a huge economic draw to the area, the preservation and management of which would enhance the Charlottesville area's attractiveness to its visitors. He thanked the Commission.

Mr. Robert Bruner, of 817 Fendall Terrace, thanked the Commission for the chance to hear the discussion that evening and expressed his appreciation for their listening to his remarks. His concern was the magenta corridors on the maps; he felt that the stress they would place on surrounding neighborhoods would be greater than was projected in the earlier comments concerning them. He said he and his neighbors in the Venable area and acquaintances in the Lewis Mountain Road area had discussed the probable results of these corridors in terms of noise, air and light pollution and more garbage floating around, and they all felt that in the large, overall plan insufficient attention had been paid to the collateral effects of these corridors upon the old established neighborhoods. His second concern was the question of the Commission's dedication to the preservation of green space within the City, especially along the corridors. He said he knew how much pressure there was to build up the City, but if the Commission was not dedicated absolutely to the preservation of existing green space, it would only compound the problems of density in future years. He gave the example of the small wooded area on Emmet Street right in the middle of an economic corridor which was very important to him and his neighbors, as it acted as a needed buffer, greatly enhancing their quality of life and protecting them from, among other things, Barracks Road Shopping Center. He urged the Commission, if it was indeed going to impose a corridor on Emmet Street, to let them have an opportunity to revise,

roll back and build in a truly substantial buffer, as that would make a big difference to them in that neighborhood. He thanked the Commission. ("Hear, hear!" followed his remarks.)

Ms. Damon called for any other speakers on the subject of the Comprehensive Plan. Hearing none, she closed the public hearing on this matter and reminded everyone of the Work Session on March 29th at 5:30 in the Conference Room, adding that although it was not a hearing, it was a public meeting to which all were welcome. She thanked all the participants.

2. Community Development Block Grant and HOME Funding: Approval of One Year Action Plan for year two of the 2000-2003 Consolidated Plan, and an amendment to the 2001-2003 Consolidated Plan to address non-housing community development issues outlined in the Comprehensive Process. The Planning Commission and City Council are considering the second year Action Plan of the multi-year Consolidated Plan which sets forth projects to be undertaken utilizing CDBG and HOME funds for the City of Charlottesville. In fiscal year 01-02 it is expected that the City of Charlottesville will receive approximately \$708,000 for Housing and Community Development needs and \$104,250 in HOME funds for affordable housing. CDBG funds will be used in the City to conduct housing rehabilitation and assist low and moderate income home buyers, as well as to fund several programs that benefit low and moderate income citizens. HOME funds will be used to assist first time home buyers and rehabilitate housing.

The Chair recognized Ms. Claudette Grant, who made a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Grant explained that this had to do with the proposed budget allocations for the year 2001-2002 for CDBG with its Community Block Grant and HOME program. These had been approved by the Community Development Block Grant Task Force and the Ridge Street Neighborhood Task Force. She recognized the members of these task forces who were present that evening, stating that they would be available to answer questions afterward, and thanked them for their hard work and commitment. She stated that she would present the budget and then Ms. Missy Creasy would describe several projects which might be new to those present. The first area was housing. Ms. Grant explained that she was going to just go through the line items and give the dollar amounts. For Substantial Rehabilitation, the task force proposed to allocate the sum of \$191,759. For the Housing Opportunity Partnership, a program for first-time home buyers, the allocation was \$80,000. \$10,000 was allocated for Weatherization, and \$45,000 for Habitat for Humanity. Within other neighborhood physical improvements she mentioned a new program which Ms. Creasy would explain, which was a water conservation plumbing program and had an allocation of \$20,000. \$10,000 was allocated for the Family Investment Center, a proposal which came to the task force from the Housing Authority for the development of a resource center for public housing residents. The Ridge Street neighborhood allocated funds for their target neighborhood of \$90,000 for substantial rehabilitation, \$85,000 for physical improvements to the Barrett Baker Center and \$25,000 for paint rehabilitation. Social programs chosen included the Neighborhood Child Care Program, \$30,000; Power of Word and Sound, \$20,000; Financial Council for AIDS/HIV Individuals, \$15,000; and \$6,016 for the Outreach 2001, a literacy program in which about \$600 would be left since there were some people who still used that program for testing. \$109,215 was allocated for Administrative and Planning. She explained that the list of reprogrammed funds were from funds for this year on projects that were mostly ended, and this list comprised the amounts left over. She stated that another list would show where these monies would go. For the most part, she said, the accounts would be zeroed out with the exception of the Security Lighting Program, in which they would leave about \$600 since it was still used. The programs where this leftover money would go, and the amounts, were \$70,000 to lead-based paint; \$80,000 to sidewalks in CDBG target neighborhoods; and about \$11,300.43 for contingencies. The grand total, she said, was \$899,300.43. Their entitlement amount for the year would be \$708,000; the re-programmed funds totaled \$161,300.43, and they anticipated that they would receive \$30,000 this year in program income. The HOME program budget, she indicated, was described on the screen: Basically \$60,000 for down-payment and closing cost assistance for first-time home buyers and \$44,250 for substantial rehabilitation. She then introduced Ms. Missy Creasy who, she indicated, would describe the programs she had just listed.

Ms. Creasy indicated she would describe not only newer programs but also some from previous years that had been modified. She invited any questions. The Habitat for Humanity program was proposing to purchase three lots for the Habitat Homes in the

Fifeville and/or Belmont areas. Next was a line item for lead-based paint to be funded with re-programmed funds. HUD regulations, requiring additional testing and treatment of lead-based paint for all rehabilitation projects, made

this program necessary. Ms. Damon asked if, whenever a house was rehabilitated, the lead level in the paint had to be checked. Ms. Creasy replied that this was indeed the case, not only to check the paint per se but any surfaces disturbed had to be checked for lead and those surfaces treated. She stated that this was a costly operation, which is why the task force had set up this account to fund it. The Water Conservation Plumbing Retrofit was a program proposed by the Public Works Department, which entailed replacement of high-consumption use fixtures with lower-consumption use fixtures in low to moderate-income homes for the dual purposes of water conservation and lower utility bills. The Family Investment Center and Research Room was a program proposed by the Housing Authority as an aid in providing handicapped access and remodeling of the basement conference room in Westhaven, which space would be used as a resource room including computer facilities and other mentoring activities for public housing residents. The Ridge Street Neighborhood had provided funds for the physical renovation of Barrett Day Care and also had created a new program entitled Paint Rehabilitation, which would pay painters to paint the homes of recipients of the Free Paint Program. Currently, she stated, such recipients would have to find someone to paint the home, which could be a challenge. The Free Paint Program had been created to address that problem. Neighborhood-Based Quality Child Care was a social program proposed by Children, Youth and Family Services, providing business and childcare training and ongoing mentoring to low and moderate-income women interested in becoming daycare providers. The thrust of this project was to increase the number of daycare providers with expanded hours. The Power of Word and Sound program was proposed by the Music Resource Center, which would comprise three different workshops for students attending the Music Resource Center and include composing, music history and other areas of music education. The AIDS Services Group had added a financial component to their short-term housing program which they had funded for the past two years, providing emergency funding for those who, for instance, had been evicted for inability to pay rent; the new financial component would help them become more financially independent. She indicated that these were all of the new programs, and invited questions.

Ms. Damon asked if there were any public input or comments.

Ms. Foster expressed surprise at the number of projects that seemed to be ended, such as Teensight, and others that seemed to be ongoing but for which there was no more money.

Ms. Creasy explained that those latter were projects which had not requested any funding this year.

The Chair, having heard no public comment, then closed the Public Hearing portion of this section, but called for questions from the Commission and Council.

Mr. Key said he had no questions but wished to thank the task force, and expressed appreciation of their hard work and devotion. He stated he was aware of the amount of work, effort and difficulty associated with coming up with these funding recommendations, and he thought they had done an excellent job in addressing the wide range of needs which existed.

Ms. Damon added her thanks to the task force, and remarked that they always did a tremendous amount of work and did it very well. She added a couple of questions of her own. How many people, she asked, would be served by project with the Music Resource Center?

Ms. Creasy suggested she go on to her next question while she looked up the answer to the first one.

Ms. Damon then inquired if there were a particular reason for not funding the Blue Ridge ESL Council and tutoring.

Ms. Creasy responded that they had tried to look at how the different proposed programs were working collaboratively with existing programs, and also at how effective they thought they might be. That particular project, she said, was over a two-year period, and had needed "some real flushing out." They had made comments, and requested Staff to provide those comments to the RSP submitters with the thought that, next year, if those issues had been addressed, they might be better able to fund that kind of project. Regarding the previous Music Resource Center question, she said there were forty-five students in the associated program.

Ms. Johnson Harris commented that the Music Resource Center kept kids off the street, in addition to opening up the area of Fine Arts to children who otherwise might not have the opportunity for such exposure.

Ms. Damon called for further questions or comments from Council or Commission. None being heard, and with further thanks to the task force and to the Staff, she invited a motion to recommend the CDBG proposals to City Council. Mr. Slayton so moved, seconded by Ms. Johnson Harris; the motion carried unanimously.

3. Closing of Delevan Street, West of 7th Street, SW: A petition to close the 30' street right-of-way known as Delevan Street a distance of approximately 384', running west from 7th Street, SW.

Ms. Damon recognized Mr. Ron Higgins, of the Planning Staff, who made a presentation on this item.

Mr. Higgins, who laughingly insisted he lived in his office "right down the hall" although his address was Lexington Avenue, drew attention to the two small maps on the right of the audience, both of which showed a survey plat of the property around Delevan Street, a street approximately 400 feet long running west off 7th Street, SW which in turn was off West Main Street south of the CSX Railway; the top map, he said, showed this plat in the larger context of the Fifeville neighborhood. The property owners, he stated, had assembled a great deal of land, on what he called the old trainmaster's house -- the big house which used to stand in the middle of the large parcel south of the tracks, plus the equipment yards of Chisholm Construction Company and a few other properties -- for redevelopment as part of the transition zone. The owners had discovered, he went on, that a portion of Delevan Street ran into the middle of, and was completely surrounded by, several pieces of property they had assembled. Thus, they had requested the Planning Commission and City Council to vacate it so they could begin a master plan for redevelopment, possibly with different access points. He said they had reviewed this the same as any other street closing request, providing the Council and Commission with the information that the policy required. Additionally they had provided some per-square-foot value information which, he noted, might be somewhat misleading because the amount turned out to range between \$18,000 and \$20,000 for this approximately six thousand square foot area. However, he said, this did not take into account that the access would still be provided on at least three other frontages and that this property would probably result in other dedication of land as street access back to the City as streets were developed within the project, providing some trade-off. They had reviewed this in light of policy and with the City engineering staff. He remarked that they would have to retain easements to maintain the utility lines, to the extent that these would remain in place, which were located in part of this right-of-way. Given the redevelopment, it was possible that they would be relocated and, if so, the easements would of course follow the utilities. He stressed that though the street was about 400 feet long, only the western end, about 200 feet in length, was being closed, which would neither land-lock any parcels nor prevent access to buildings, structures or business on the eastern half of Delevan Street. He recommended that City Council close this right-of-way since no public benefit inured from its remaining open, and requested as well a twenty-foot easement be allowed for any utilities to the extent they would remain in place.

Ms. Damon called for comments from the public. Hearing none, she closed the Public Hearing on this issue and requested questions or comments from Council or Commissioners.

Mr. Wood reminded them that several years ago when they were discussing the property west of this, in the block where the UVa Child Care Center, among others, now stands, the hope had been expressed that someday it might be possible to put a street from there through the property now under discussion and connect it with Delevan. He termed that contingency ideal, mentioning that they were trying to get parallel streets to help with traffic flow and that there appeared to be an advantage in allowing that connection to be developed.

Mr. Tolbert responded that they were working closely with the developer on the entire access issue, and the preliminary plans they had seen so far would provide some access and roadways and connectivity in there in a number of ways. He said they desired this particular closure to give them some flexibility of design so that it might not be in

the same place it had been. They were also working from the other end of Estes to clean that up so 9th and 10th could be got to in a better way. He said they were very aware of the need for access and did not think anything was being given up in the process of ensuring flexibility for the developer to do a better design.

Mr. Wood reiterated that he simply wanted be certain that there was a means of developing a connection through there.

Mr. Tolbert mentioned the importance of the developer's being able to go either direction, and that they were spending a lot of time with them trying to establish that access.

Mr. Higgins stated that it was important to remember that the 200-foot eastern portion of Delevan was not being closed and still existed, so that Estes could still be connected to Delevan even though by a somewhat different route.

Mr. Wood said this was true unless they decided to develop the area in some other way and not make that connection at all.

Mr. Tolbert reminded him that there was still a piece of this property where there was absolutely nothing, including no streets, and they still had to deal with that. He admitted that there could conceivably be a plan with no connectivity, but said that they had gone sufficiently far down the road with the developer that he did not think that would happen.

Mr. Slayton commented that they did not have a whole lot of control as they could not force the developer to do the site plan in any particular way, to which Mr. Tolbert replied that after all there was that whole piece with nothing on it. Mr. Slayton replied that he understood that but that "nothing" could always be taken over by condemnation, and still have no access. He remarked that it was a terrible option but the option existed. He asked if there were no way they could assure the developer that it was all right to close that but that they wanted to be certain of access in some form to connect that area with Estes, pointing out that it did not have to be in a straight line. Could they, he queried, make that a condition?

Mr. Tolbert termed that assurance quite appropriate but doubted they could make it a condition.

Mr. Higgins noted that he was not sure they could close one right-of-way and then in effect ask them to dedicate one to the west of it. During the ensuing general discussion Mr. Slayton recommended that the developer be charged for it. The following points were raised: That the one thing over which they did have some control was access issues in the site plan process, and that access did not necessarily mean flow-through; that this area was highly traveled even now; that the developers had been talking with the neighborhood, and assisting them in dealing with this, for about a year at this point, and had been very interested in providing the connectivity.

Mr. Key agreed that this had been going on and that a year ago possible access to the site had been discussed along with hope for the provision of flexibility and some sort of development that would be advantageous to the neighborhood.

Mr. Slayton suggested making it a condition that they would hold in abeyance charging the developer the fair market value for Delevan Street and not charge them for it if they made sure there was flow-through connectivity.

Concerning the City's street closing policy, the City Attorney stated that the property in question was presently owned by the City and had a right-of-way over it. She said before they made a recommendation for it to be closed they needed to decide, among other things, whether it had a potential in the future to be used as a street or to complete a better network. The other question, she said, was what the public benefit would be if it were closed, and whether they would be giving up whatever right they might have to complete a street straight through that area. She stated that if they felt they might gain a public benefit from having the property developed as well as some alternate connection to be made in the future, they could approach the issue that way. In any case, she suggested they follow policy and if the consensus was that they did not wish to give up any right they might have to complete a through street there in future, they should vote accordingly. She did not, however, recommend that they make that type of decision.

Ms. Damon requested other comments or questions. Hearing none, she invited a motion on the issue.

Mr. Wood moved that the recommendation to close Delevan Street be denied. There was no second.



Mr. Slayton inquired if Mr. Wood's motion were dead.

Ms. Damon asked if Mr. Slayton intended to second it. He replied in the negative, and she declared the motion officially dead.

Ms. Johnson Harris questioned whether in fact the developer had worked with the neighborhood.

Mr. Tolbert replied that this was certainly the case, that the process would continue, that theirs was a good faith effort if he had ever seen one by a developer, and that enough units were planned in that area that the connectivity on either side was needed and this fact was known.

Ms. Damon again invited a motion.

Mr. Slayton moved that the street closing be approved and the developer be encouraged to continue their work with the neighborhood and to their best ability ensure connectivity between Delevan and Estes Streets when the site plan was proposed. He did not recommend that the developer be charged for the value of the street land.

Mr. Slayton moved that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council

approval of the 30' right-of-way of Delevan Street a distance of approximately 200'

between parcels 20 & 34 on Tax Map 30 since no public benefit will be realized by

having it remain open. This approval is conditioned upon the provision of 20'

easements for any City water or sewer lines that are to remain in the right-of-way.

Furthermore, the developers should be encouraged to continue working with the

neighborhood and the City in providing connection between Delevan Street and Estes

Street as part of the development concept. Mr. Key seconded the motion. The

motion passed with the following recorded vote: AYES: Damon, Harris, Key, Slayton,

Wood. NOES: None."

#### D. OTHER MAJOR PLANNING ITEMS

##### 1. Dymond Property Development off Stribling -- Preliminary Discussion.

Mr. Tolbert reported on the preliminary plan. This was, he stated, a unique way of doing things, that they had not done before. He said that several weeks ago he had been approached by Mr. Tom Hickman, one of the developers for this property, who told him the developers had had a lot of meetings with the Fry's Spring neighborhood to discuss its development, and wanted to bring the issues worked out in those meetings to the Planning Commission before they invested more money in engineering, etc. Mr. Tolbert had then met with the neighborhood and Mr. Hickman for discussion of issues, and decided it was easiest for Mr. Hickman to formulate a preliminary plan, which would be brought before the Commission for their input, and then appear before this meeting and explain what he would like to do as well as clear up and deal with any issues they might have. Then they could move on to attempt finalization of a plan he felt would combine the desires of the Commission and the neighborhood so that some point of closure could be reached regarding this property. He stated that Mr. Hickman would present his proposal first, then Ms. Susan Thomas from their Staff would briefly go over the issues that Staff had raised. He then introduced Mr. Hickman.

Mr. Hickman stated that he lived on Stribling Avenue and, in fact, on the property in question. He explained that the property, a 20 acre parcel, had been purchased two years ago, with an additional three acres, containing the historic Huntley mansion,

attached. He confirmed that there had been meetings and work with the Fry's Spring neighborhood for two and a half years and that Ms. Damon had attended some

of those meetings. The proposal, he said, was for approximately 119 residential units over some three phases of construction: First, the top portion, the second portion off to the right and the third portion being Huntley and the homes wrapping around that.

These homes, he said, would be in the area of \$200,000 to \$400,000. Mr. Hickman added that they were just coming to the end of the Kellytown project on which they had been working. He reported wonderful meetings with the neighbors; that there was

a great deal of natural area; and that the property borders Moore's Creek and Sunset. He indicated he would be available to answer questions.

Ms. Damon next introduced Ms. Susan Thomas of Staff.

Ms. Thomas pointed out that in the illustrative drawing, North was not at the top, but that the top orientation was more likely South or Southeast. The road shown at the lower left, she said, was Sunset Road, winding down to Sunset Avenue and the now-closed bridge. She stressed that this was a very preliminary review, and that they had tried at the applicant's request to raise any flags -- red or otherwise -- early on, so that he would not waste valuable resources on something which would only have to be redesigned. She stated that the owners, Mr. Beyer and Mr. Hickman, would need feedback and guidance, before they began any specific engineering, on road design, number of access points, length and grade. She stated that in a sense, the number of lots was affected by other factors, and this road design was intended to serve this number of lots with as little disturbance as possible to the property. She mentioned that on the first plan they had seen there were utilities going away from the road, down ravines, etc., which they felt were causing more non-useful disturbance than necessary. She termed the terrain "challenging," and noted that there were some exceptional trees and natural areas. She stressed their complete sympathy with the neighbors' desire for a single access point, which she thought arose from a concern about not causing impact to any more local streets than necessary. They would not know, she said, what the traffic impact would be until they got numbers that reflected the reality of the nine months when students were there. Staff's concern was that a single access point complicated delivery of emergency services. Also she feared the single access point did not represent the kind of connectivity they wanted to other neighborhoods, plus the fact that it still might not save the rest of the neighborhood from traffic, since once there was a backup at key intersections, local residents would find alternative ways to get around the bottleneck. They would not really know, she said, until the model was redone. She reiterated their sympathy with the neighbors' desire to save their neighborhood from traffic, because there would be a lot. The ITE manual stated, she said, that an average of ten trips per single-family house was normal. That, multiplied by about 120 houses, was 1200 new trips, not to mention factoring in traffic generated by delivery services, repairmen and the multiple cars of the affluent. The applicant, she said, was very willing to go back and get the new count and plug that into the computer model. She stressed that though there was no involvement with the Burr property which lies adjacent on the right, they hoped that in the future that might also become housing, whereby it would become an important access point to that property. They wanted to do as much planning and preparation as possible, she stated, so that when the time came, that connection could be made. She then invited questions.

Mr. Wood inquired exactly where the old mansion was located. Ms. Damon invited Ms. Thomas to come up nearer the maps so that she could better orient them.

Ms. Thomas pointed out Moore's Creek at the top, where Stribling Avenue was, and Sunset Road and Sunset Avenue, which would be extended. Then she pointed out where Huntley Hall was, saying that the applicants were very interested in working with the neighbors to find a profitable use for the historic structure that would also fit well with the neighborhood. She indicated where there would be a small loop road going from Stribling back to Dymond's Road, and those were all new roads. There was mention of possible "driveway access" and of a higher density area with some single-family attached eventually. Perhaps of most concern, she noted, was the long loop

road. She commented that the loop was a really positive thing, because it provided a way to feed back, but it was quite a feat in terms of length, etc. She thought a portion of the property fronted on Sunset Road and that had been considered as a possible second access or emergency access point. The fire department was not enthusiastic about that, as they did not like to come over access ways that were not fully developed as roads since their vehicles were either seventeen tons or thirty-four tons and needed a good base to avoid getting mired down. It still might be a solution. There was also frontage on Sunset Avenue, once again challenging due to terrain and, while perhaps not actual flood-plain, certainly some of it was low-lying, adding to the challenge. If the cul-de-sacs remained, they would be designed so the fire trucks could turn around, because they could not back up on these streets.

Mr. Key asked if they had identified a point that would be a better access point.

Ms. Thomas replied that so far they did not have a lot of topographic information from the applicant, so they did not have the information they needed at this time to make that determination. She said that looking at the land, it did not seem so challenging,

but she had a feeling that it might be harder than it looked.

Mr. Slayton asked if they would be getting that information any time soon. Ms. Thomas answered that that evening's meeting and the opportunity to speak to the issues was an attempt to get some answers before they went to that level with information.

Mr. Slayton wanted to know what questions they needed to have answered. Ms. Thomas listed road design, road length and layout.

Mr. Key brought up the matter of another access point. He said if that was one of the questions, he would be in favor of that, at least to explore the possibility a little more in depth.

Mr. Slayton declared that dumping 1200 new trips on Stribling Avenue would be an awfully difficult thing for the residents of that street, and that was a concern that he had. He said before he gave his blessing on that he felt he did need to see a topographical map or have a Work Session where they went out to walk the property.

Mr. Tolbert suggested that an appropriate course of action might be to make a determination that a second access, if possible to build, was something they would like to see, which would put the on us upon the developer to determine if one could be built reasonably or not.

Ms. Damon agreed that they wanted more access, and asked whether a second access would possibly even out the traffic distribution.

Mr. Tolbert said the model would help to determine that.

Ms. Damon agreed, and expressed her hope that traffic would not then decide to all go either one way or all the other way.

Ms. Thomas said she thought there was a rational reason for wanting to avoid sending traffic down Sunset Road to Sunset Avenue, that being that Sunset Avenue was very curvy, steep and narrow, and not a lot could really be done with it. She thought if

people were just coming back to the development, even with the one access at Stribling, at least some of them might figure out to cross JPA onto Sunset Avenue, come down Sunset Road and cut in that way. She said Ms. Angela Tucker had raised this question as well. She added that just because it was not an ideal road did not mean people would not take it anyhow. She made the point that perhaps the development could be designed so that fully half or more of the trips could be discouraged from coming out there, funneling others to Stribling. She said it would be interesting to see what happened with the new numbers, as the current traffic study came in with numbers just barely below the point where a serious upgrade was necessary for intersections, etc.

Ms. Damon asked if her mention of upgrading intersections referred to Stribling and JPA. Ms. Thomas replied that those were the main ones.

Ms. Damon asked about a stoplight there, but Ms. Thomas said she did not know, that had not been really addressed because current numbers showed current roads handling the traffic, although just barely.

Mr. Slayton said they had a consensus that they'd like to see another access, to see if that were possible, to look at the trip numbers and see where that would go. He asked what the other question was to which an answer had been desired.

Ms. Damon re-introduced Mr. Hickman and announced that a neighborhood representative would also speak briefly to neighborhood issues even though this was

not a public hearing.

Mr. Hickman said in response that the present plan had come about through the process of meeting with the neighbors who had told him they did not want to see Amherst and Cabell connected; thus he, as the developer, had not made that connection. It was his view, having lived on Stribling for two years and having gone all around that area to see what was going on, that whether there were a second access or not, the traffic would come to equalize itself out. His question was, if the traffic impact study came back indicating that that was probably what would happen, then they would tend to look at the second way in as being for emergency purposes, and he wanted to know if there were an opportunity to discuss a second way in that was not in fact a road. He explained that putting in a road would necessitate moving off the top of the bluff and encroaching more upon the natural area, taking a lot more of it out than was the case with the present design. He referenced remarks by Ms. Thomas concerning the co-housing PUD off St. Charles Street, which had no streets to the homes there, but which had a pedestrian path that had to be able to handle the load of a fire truck or an emergency vehicle. He indicated that he wanted to see if there was that same opportunity in this case. Another question he had concerned the length of the second road that went over to the Burr property. He indicated it was over 750 feet, probably about 1,000 feet, but the number of houses he could put on a by-right road with a cul-de-sac at 750 feet was approximately forty homes. He pointed out that in this instance, it was a longer road, with fewer than 40 homes. Before they went into engineering they just wanted to hear some comments on how the Commission, etc., felt about those things so they could start solving them.

Mr. Slayton wanted to know if they were bound by the 750 foot road or if they could provide a variance.

Mr. Higgins responded that he was not sure they could. He stated that that was one of the concerns they had raised in reviewing it. Subdivision ordinances, and particularly the PUD ordinance, gave flexibility in certain areas such as standards and setbacks, and addressed streets specifically in terms of width. He indicated that adding costs to the City's maintenance was an important concern, but he believed that length was not subject to flexibility.

Mr. Slayton inquired if that meant they were bound by the 700 foot length. Mr. Higgins said he thought that would be a problem.

Mr. Slayton asked whether Mr. Hickman had spoken with the City Attorney, and if the City Attorney had an opinion on the matter.

The City Attorney agreed that they could look into it.

Mr. Slayton continued that he felt it was something which needed to be discussed between the City Attorney and the developer before they all weighed in on it, because if it were out of their hands there was no point in their talking about it further.

Mr. Higgins pointed out that there were design mechanisms to deal with the problem, such as providing a break or an intersection at certain points to insure that no segment by itself would be more than 700 feet long.

Mr. Slayton voiced the opinion that that was not what they had there.

The Chair introduced Dr. Mooney, who was there representing the Fry's Spring neighborhood. She asked him to be brief.

Dr. Mooney expressed appreciation at the opportunity to represent his neighbors, saying that he considered Mr. Tolbert brave to bring the matter forward in this format. He commented that he understood the position of the Commission, having had dumped in their laps something the neighborhood had been talking about for the past two years. He agreed it was a very difficult issue, but they had faith that Mr. Hickman and Mr. Beyer were making a good faith effort to do the best they could with the development in terms of working with the neighborhood and coming up with a plan which would be best for them and the City alike. He indicated that they were all trying to work together but the fact was, there were no simple answers. He said they had hoped the simple answer would have been a single access on Stribling Avenue as originally planned, but that Staff had shot them down on that with their report. He mentioned that Staff came forward saying it was not trying to disagree with the neighbors and the developers, but that it was doing that anyway. Despite the time commitment involved, he heartily endorsed the idea of their going and walking the area -- the triangle of JPA down Stribling, across Sunset Road, and up Sunset Avenue -- since, being so hilly, twisty and confusing, it was a difficult one to visualize. He thought walking through would give them a better idea of the engineering difficulties Mr. Hickman faced and why he had requested preliminary guidance. Such guidance and its result, he felt, would benefit everyone, and give them the confidence born of knowing precisely with what they were dealing. He mentioned that, to him, the idea of a second access had two parts which had come up in their discussions with the City over the past year: First, with a development of this sort, theoretically with connectivity of two exits and parallel roads, you expected half the traffic to go one way and half the other way. But when in this instance you walked Stribling and then Sunset, you realized that one was not all apples nor the other all oranges, but both were both, so trying to make this a fair decision between the two was extremely difficult. He said what they had heard was that there really was not money available to improve either Stribling or Sunset to handle the burden of traffic, which pushed them in the direction of saying, "Why ask for improving two roads, when we don't have any money to build one? Let's do one, and see whether we can do that right, and at least get a sidewalk on Stribling, which those folks badly need." And that, frankly, he said, was the deciding factor because the neighbors were divided. He stated that he knew this for a fact because he lived on Sunset and was thus himself a "biased" party. They felt that safe streets were very important but they were being told that there was no money to make either of these streets safe. That was something, he said, which their re-budgets would have to take into account. But he urged that Stribling be done as had been planned and the money found to make it a safe street. He thanked the Commission.

Mr. Key inquired if that was the only type of design at which they had looked. He said he assumed they had looked at others but maybe there was a better way to distribute the houses within the area.

Ms. Damon responded that the difficulty in placing the houses was the extremely challenging terrain.

Mr. Key acknowledged that the area was challenging but reminded her that there was a motivation to accept that challenge.

Mr. Tolbert said one thing the developers had done was to work to preserve some of the more sensitive areas. He said that some of the siting of streets and houses looked funny on paper because of the topography of the area. He stated that the neighbors had worked diligently with the developer to try to work out something sensitive both to neighborhood and environment. He said he was hearing an idea of "let's sit down again" with the developer and the neighbors to explore some alternatives to a street and to dual ways in and out, hoping that when the traffic study came back with new numbers they could run that through and bring it back in the forum of another informal meeting, when they would have more information, and could try to resolve the issue of whether or not they could vary the cul-de-sac length.

Mr. Slayton expressed a desire to see a list of pros and cons from Staff after the new data was in hand: one street versus two, for instance, as well as issues of street access and legal interpretation of the length question. He said he wasn't familiar with the land in question, so maybe that would help, and he did not want to plan another meeting.

Ms. Johnson Harris spoke in favor of a push for emergency access; being a person who lived on a single-entrance street, she stated that was a big concern of hers.

Mr. Slayton replied that that would be another alternative under "street access," that if they did not have two, there would be sort of a "one and a half" situation.

Ms. Damon remarked that what they needed was more data before making a recommendation.

Mr. Wood agreed, and brought forward a question for either Mr. Higgins or Mr. Hickman: Was the topography such that they could not get a connection at the beginning of that loop? He indicated on the map what he was talking about, and mentioned that he personally had no problem with one-entrance communities. General discussion followed on the placement, merits and problems of having a continuous oval loop.

Ms. Damon summarized the feeling that they needed to get more information prior to recommendation, and added that they would be happy to walk around the area, something they had offered to do many times. It was mentioned that this should be done on a day that was warm, but not too warm.

She then thanked the presenters and announced the next item on the agenda.

#### E. LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS AND SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Ms. Damon called for questions. Mr. Slayton moved approval.

Ms. Johnson Harris asked what was meant by the Region Ten Blue Ridge House Amendment.

Mr. Higgins explained that when the final grading was being done on that property, it sat at an angle to the street, so that it had to be shifted a little bit and a retaining wall had to be built at the back bank so that it would not jeopardize access to a future

35-house subdivision. He termed it a minor amendment.

Mr. Slayton renewed his motion, seconded by Ms. Johnson Harris. The motion carried unanimously.

#### LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

2/1/01 TO 3/1/01

1. Redivision of Lot 12 "Robinson Woods PUD" No new lots

and the Harris Properties RAE Development, Lewis Junior

Robinson Woods & Preston Avenue Harris & Sallie Harris

File No. 1170-C Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 2/23/01

2. Vacated Sewer Easement & New 20' Easement No new lots

at Lots 12, 13, 14 & The Common Area – RAE Development Corp.

"Robinson Woods PUD"

Robinson Woods

File No. 1170-D Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 2/23/01

LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY  
2/1/01 TO 3/1/01

1. File No. 854-A Clark School Playgrounds 1000 Belmont Avenue &  
Renovations/Improvements Monticello Ave./Tufton Ave.

2. File No. 372 Cavalier Beverage Building Garrett St., & 2nd St., SE  
Addition/Alterations

3. File No. 1254 John Street Place – 6 Apts. 1310 John Street  
Units Addition

4. File No. 533-A Preston Plaza Commercial 917 Preston Avenue  
Space Renovation

5. File No. 1269 1815 JPA Apartments (30 units) 1815 Jeff. Park Ave.

6. File No. 1062-A Journey Communications 418 4th Street, NE  
Offices – Addition to "Parker  
Currier House"

7. File No. 1256-A Region Ten – Blue Ridge Elliott Avenue  
House Amendment

E. LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS AND SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Ms. Damon called for questions. Mr. Slayton moved approval.

Ms. Johnson Harris asked what was meant by the Region Ten Blue Ridge House Amendment.

Mr. Higgins explained that when the final grading was being done on that property, it sat at an angle to the street, so that it had to be shifted a little bit and a retaining wall had to be built at the back bank so that it would not jeopardize access to a future

35-house subdivision. He termed it a minor amendment.

Mr. Slayton renewed his motion, seconded by Ms. Johnson Harris. The motion carried unanimously.

LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

2/1/01 TO 3/1/01

1. Redivision of Lot 12 "Robinson Woods PUD" No new lots  
and the Harris Properties RAE Development, Lewis Junior

Robinson Woods & Preston Avenue Harris & Sallie Harris

File No. 1170-C Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 2/23/01

2. Vacated Sewer Easement & New 20' Easement No new lots  
at Lots 12, 13, 14 & The Common Area – RAE Development Corp.

"Robinson Woods PUD"

Robinson Woods

File No. 1170-D Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 2/23/01

LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

2/1/01 TO 3/1/01

1. File No. 854-A Clark School Playgrounds 1000 Belmont Avenue &  
Renovations/Improvements Monticello Ave./Tufton Ave.

2. File No. 372 Cavalier Beverage Building Garrett St., & 2nd St., SE  
Addition/Alterations

3. File No. 1254 John Street Place – 6 Apts. 1310 John Street  
Units Addition

4. File No. 533-A Preston Plaza Commercial 917 Preston Avenue  
Space Renovation

5. File No. 1269 1815 JPA Apartments (30 units) 1815 Jeff. Park Ave.

6. File No. 1062-A Journey Communications 418 4th Street, NE



Offices – Addition to "Parker

Currier House"

7. File No. 1256-A Region Ten – Blue Ridge Elliott Avenue

House Amendment

#### F. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Ms. Damon called for Commissioners' Reports. There were no reports from Mr. Key, Ms. Johnson Harris, Mr. Slayton or Mr. Wood.

#### G. CHAIR'S REPORT

Ms. Damon reported that that night the first meeting of the Greenways committee, now called the Bike-Pedestrian Network Study Committee, had been held at 6:30 p.m. She stated that she and Mr. Higgins had had to leave before it was over, but that in any case it had been "get acquainted night" and she would keep them posted.

#### H. DEPARTMENT/STAFF REPORT

Mr. Tolbert reminded everyone of the Work Session with supper on March 29th at 5:30 p.m.

Ms. Johnson Harris interposed that she had forgotten to report that the Court Facilities Study had been presented to the County the previous day and should be presented to the City Council on March 19th.

Mr. Tolbert continued that he, Ms. Grant and the Chief of Police were to meet at 7:00 p.m., March 20th at Buford School with the residents of the Johnson Village and Prospect areas to discuss the bridge issue. The new Chief, according to Mr. Tolbert, had been doing an incredible amount of work: He said that they had met for a briefing on the situation two weeks before the Chief took office, and that on Monday night just past the Chief had informed him that he had his detectives working on two years' worth of crime history, and that other people were looking into it as well. He announced he was meeting

the Chief a week from Monday to discuss what they should present at the neighborhood meeting, and urged the members of Council and Commission to attend. Ms. Grant, he said, was sending out notices to everyone in both areas who had been participating. They would then, he stated, schedule it on the Commission's agenda and the Chief would come and present his ideas to them, not only concerning the bridge but the issues from those two areas in general. He expressed his excitement about the Chief's attitude, saying

that it was going to be a real help.

He announced that what he had distributed to them were copies of the changed format for the Neighborhood Implementation Sections about which they had talked a number of times. The Council, he said, had asked that they do two things with the neighborhood plan: First, that they address and meet with the Johnson Village residents concerning the

Johnson Village connectivity issue, and they had done that, and had revised the language, having already sent the language out to the residents and received comments back from them. There had been only one negative comment. He also mentioned a letter from

Mr. Bruton, stating his position, copies of which had been distributed. Second was to change the implementation section, not to remove anything, but Council wanted to make sure that they had language that made it really clear what it was they were doing, what they could not do at this time and what would be done in the future. So they had changed the format and broken down the implementation into four sections: Neighborhood Initiative, things the

neighborhoods wanted to do that were their own responsibility to accomplish; Proposed CIP Activities for fiscal year 2002, the neighborhoods' prioritized

"things to do" with their \$30,000; Additional CIP projects, really everything else the neighborhoods have said they wanted to do, which would have to be re-prioritized every year; and Policies, Ordinance and Operational Changes, things that weren't necessarily CIP items but operational issues that they would like to see happen. He said what the

Council wanted to do was to ensure understanding, to make certain they didn't have people reading this list and thinking that the City was going to begin on every single one of them next year. He said he had sent an email and a letter out to everyone who had

participated and the lists would be available by the following Monday on the website.

He wanted to know if everyone had come in to change over their copy of the draft, followed by general discussion. He also mentioned the new maps, saying that they had found mistakes and had re-run them, so that everyone should now have an up-to-date corrected set.

Ms. Johnson Harris reported an email from a Johnson Village lady resident who wanted to meet with them, and general comments followed concerning that.

Ms. Damon invited all those not fortunate enough to be going to New Orleans to attend the Festival of the Book, whereby they might go anywhere in the world without ever leaving the safety and comfort of Charlottesville. She then recognized Mr. Slayton.

Mr. Slayton moved they schedule a Joint Public Hearing for April 10, 2001 at 7:30 p.m. Ms. Johnson Harris seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.

Whereupon, the meeting concluded at 10:51 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

---

James E. Tolbert, AICP  
Secretary

APPROVED:

---

Nancy Damon, Chair