

**MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2002 -- 7:30 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was held on this date with the following members present:

Mr. Craig Barton STAFF PRESENT:

Ms. Nancy Damon, Vice-Chair  
Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director  
Ms. Kathy Johnson-Harris  
Mr. Ron Higgins, AICP, Planning Manager  
Ms. Cheri Lewis  
Ms. Tarpley Vest, Neighborhood Planner  
Mr. Kevin O'Halloran  
Ms. Claudette Grant, Neighborhood Planner  
Mr. Eldon Wood

CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Maurice Cox  
Mr. Kevin Lynch  
Ms. Meredith Richards  
Mr. David Toscano

Ms. Damon called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. She stated she would be presiding over the meeting due to a family tragedy of the Chair, Mr. Key.

**A. PRESENTATION OF ANNUAL PLANNING AWARDS**

Ms. Damon announced that four awards would be given. The voting had taken place at the January meeting.

The Award for Outstanding Examples of Access for the Disabled was a tie. The first recipient was the University of Virginia, for Scott Stadium, a national example for providing access to the disabled. The recipient expressed thanks to the City and a desire

to work on similar projects of bigger and better magnitude.

The second recipient for this award was the First United Methodist Church at 101 East Jefferson Street. The renovations and additions now taking place are comprehensive as well as architecturally appropriate in the downtown historic district. The recipient

expressed thanks for the award.

The Award for Outstanding Citizen Planner was presented to Evelyn Jones. Ms. Jones was recognized for her work in the Rose Hill neighborhood. She thanked the Planning Commission and expressed her joy in working with the Rose Hill Neighborhood Association.

The Award for Outstanding Plan of Development was given to the Belmont Neighborhood Association. After thanking the Planning Commission, the recipient then presented the award to the developers and architect.

The Award for Outstanding Neighborhood Effort was presented to the Kellytown Neighborhood Association. The recipient expressed gratitude especially to Ms.

Damon, Mr. Higgins and Mr. Tolbert.

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

There were no matters raised by the public.

## C. MINUTES

Ms. Damon asked for questions, changes, or comments regarding the January 15, 2002 minutes. Mr. Wood moved for approval of the minutes as submitted. Ms. Johnson-Harris seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## D. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING

Ms. Damon stated that the first two items of the Joint Public Hearing would be taken together because they relate to the same piece of property. These also relate to number one of item E on the agenda, the site plan.

1. ZM--01-11-19: A petition to rezone from R-2 Residential to R-3 Residential Multiple Dwelling the property at 11th Street NW along the rear of 1101 and

1105 Little High Street at the rear 12' of 1107 and 1109 Little High Street and at the rear 50' of 1115 Little High Street. The general uses allowed in the R-2 zoning are single and two-family dwellings. These properties are further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 54 as portions of parcels 106, 107, 107.1, 110 and 111, having collectively 50 feet of frontage at 11th Street NW and containing

approximately 12,329 square feet of land or .28 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for one and two-family residential at a density range of seven to twelve units per acre. This item was deferred from the December 11, 2001 meeting.

2. SP--01-11-20: An application for a special permit for higher density residential at the combined properties at 1111 Little High Street. This would allow for reconstruction and addition to the present apartment building of 24 units into a configuration of 43 units of mixed sizes, at a density of 38 units per acre instead of 21 units per acre allowed by right. The general uses allowed in R-3 Residential

Multiple dwelling zoning is multi-family development of 12 to 87 units per acre. This property is further identified as City Real Property Tax Map Number 54 as

combined parcels 107.2 with portions of parcels 106, 107, 107.1, 110 and 111, having 50 feet of frontage at 11th Street NW, 60 feet of frontage at Little High Street and containing approximately 50,069 square feet of land or 1.15 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are multi-family residential at a density range of 12 to 87 units per acre and two-family residential at a density range of seven to 12 units per acre. This was deferred from the December 11, 2001 meeting.

Ms. Damon called on Ms. Vest to make the staff report. Ms. Vest stated that the property was 1111 Little High Street, Tax Map 54, Parcel 110. Rezoning is sought for the portion that fronts on 11th Street to allow the applicant to provide a driveway access and parking. The higher density special permit is sought to allow more residential units. There are 24

units on site and the applicant requests 40 units. The applicant indicated that access from 11th Street is a better solution in terms of traffic circulation and impact on the neighborhood. They are proposing a 20' wide access point instead of the City standard of

24' and seek approval for that in the special permit. The apartment complex is zoned R-3 while the portion along 11th Street is zoned R-2. The adjacent zoning is R-2 Residential; properties across High Street are B-1. The property was zoned for multi-family

residential use on the 1958 zoning map. In 1973, surrounding Little High Street property was down-zoned to R-2 to prevent large apartment complexes in the neighborhood. There have been numerous B-1 rezonings in the area. Special Permit approval criteria include that the proposed use not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood in terms of traffic congestion, noise, lights, odors, displacement of residents or businesses. Staff agreed with the applicant that the 11th Street access would improve the traffic situation. The applicant is proposing fewer bedrooms

than they could build by right. The Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan calls for the main portion of this property to be used for office. The site provides seven more parking spaces than required by the City code. The renovation to the existing 24 apartment units will increase the value and possibly the rent which may displace residents. A preliminary site plan conference was held in

November 2001. Concern was expressed at that time about the impact on the character of the neighborhood and also about the location of the dumpster. A preliminary agenda review meeting held at the end of November raised concerns of the public. Issues raised included: the impact of the increased density on the character of the neighborhood, the impact of the building mass as viewed from Merriwether Street, the possible, future construction on the existing access drive. Interest was expressed in developing green space, recreational space or neighborhood park on the existing Little High Street access. Deferral was made at the December meeting to allow the applicant to get together with the neighbors to discuss the issues and reach consensus. The applicant held many meetings and the proposal was revised. The length of the proposed addition was reduced, allowing existing pines to remain. Reduction of the 11th Street entrance allows for a sidewalk. Staff recommends approval of the rezoning because it is in harmony with the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, it would not significantly impact the neighborhood, it would preserve the street frontage on Little High Street as residential property. Staff recommends approval of the special use permit with final administrative approval of the site plan.

Ms. Damon recognized the applicant, or his representative. Jim Grigg, Architect, had no comment but would answer any questions the members would have.

Ms. Damon then recognized members of the public who had signed up to speak.

Ms. Laura Devault, representing the Little High Street Neighborhood Association, stated that they had had many meetings with the applicant and architect. The Association appreciates the compromises that the applicant has agreed with. With these changes, and

the applicant's further working with a proposed advisory committee, the Little High Street Neighborhood Association supports approval of the proposed application.

Ms. Faye Pace, 1211 Little High Street, agreed with what Ms. Devault had said.

Mr. Bill Weaver supports the proposals fully.

Ms. Carrie Taylor, 1212 Merriwether, supports the rezoning with the recommendations from the Little High Street Neighborhood Association.

Ms. Kathleen O'Brien, 1104 Little High Street, supports the rezoning with Association input.

Mr. Mark Haskins, 1140 Merriwether, Co-Spokesperson of the Little High Street Neighborhood Association, asked that the density issues and number of bedrooms be noted.

Ms. Elizabeth Margutti, 1128 Little High Street, concurs with the prior statements.

Mr. John Kessler, 1125 Little High Street, agrees with what has been said by the Association and hopes that the applicant will follow through on the agreement.

Ms. Damon asked for additional comments.

Mr. Jim Grigg, architect for the applicant, wanted to clarify issues which had been mentioned. A 20 foot wide block of the apartment building had been eliminated from the plan and replaced with a 12 foot wide, two and-a-half story high saddlebag, rather

than four stories. The proposal is for 22 studios and 18 two-bedroom units.

Ms. Damon called for additional comments. There being none, the public hearing was closed. She then called for questions and discussion from the Planning Commission and City Council.

Mr. O'Halloran wanted clarification whether all of the Association's requests were in the new plan or if that was a consideration the Planning Commission would have to add. He was informed that through negotiations with the Association there was a reduction in the units and in the density.

Mr. Barton asked if the parking calculations were based on 59 bedrooms. Ms. Vest confirmed that and stated that it would need to be adjusted in the final site plan approval.

Mr. Barton wanted confirmation that this complex would contain only studios and two-bedroom apartments. The applicant concurred.

Ms. Damon wanted to know if the proposal was the compromise with the neighborhood or if there were still discrepancies. The applicant negated the possibility of discrepancies. He further stated that in the new proposal with a smaller, shorter building, some of the existing studios could become two-bedroom units. The special use permit would allow for 40 units, 22 of which would be studios with 18 two-bedroom units.

Ms. Damon wanted to know if there was anything that still needed to be worked out and if the Planning Commission needed to look at it anymore. Mr. Barton was concerned that the Commission did not have an up to date document which included the agreed on changes. Mr. Higgins pointed out that an updated drawing was on the wall.

Ms. Vest mentioned that the neighborhood was requesting an advisory committee to oversee implementation issues as a condition of the Special Permit. She further stated that the City Attorney had told her that was not something that staff could recommend legally, but staff would be thrilled if the applicant would offer to do that.

Ms. Damon wanted to know what issues still needed to be worked out. Ms. Vest's understanding was that there would be a final administrative approval of the site plan, looking at all Code requirements, landscaping, and details. Mr. Tolbert sought

affirmation from the neighborhood that their letter stated that the issues that concerned them included final design of fencing, exterior detailing and the pathway; the Association was okay with them being fenced and the density, but they sought some say-so and review as those items went forward. That was where an advisory committee was sought, and if the Planning Commission could not recommend that as a condition of the Special Use permit, the second best thing would be a nod from the architect saying they would be included in the process. Ms. Damon requested that the record reflect nodding from the neighborhood and from the applicant.

Mr. Tolbert further stated that his understanding was that there is compliance, agreement, and compromise. He also stated that there had been a question about

the units but it appears that there are less units and one less bedroom. Ms. Lewis clarified that the plan showed five fewer studios and two more two-bedrooms.

Mr. Barton asked if the Planning Commission could, as a part of the Special Use permit, place conditions on a property that is not included in the terms of the Special Use permit. The City Attorney said no.

Ms. Lewis asked for clarification on what was needing approval since there was no site plan before the Commission. Mr. Higgins said the site plan would be revised in accordance with the conditions placed on the Special permit.

Ms. Lewis moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of ZM--01-11-19, an application to amend the City's zoning map to rezone the property from R-2 to R-3 on the grounds that public necessity, convenience, general welfare, good zoning practice

and good hygiene requires this amendment. Ms. Johnson-Harris seconded the motion.

Ms. Damon called for discussion.

Ms. Lewis stated that she was impressed by the neighborhood involvement in forming their neighborhood association. She also applauded the applicant and architect for responding to the neighborhood's concerns.

Mr. Barton was concerned about reducing the access drive by four feet especially if that would hinder access by emergency vehicles. Mr. Higgins explained that City Code only says adequate access, which can be 12 feet to 24 feet. He further stated that City Council is willing to accept 18 feet as a two-way street without parking on it.

Ms. Damon called for additional comments; there being none, Mr. Higgins called the vote. The motion for rezoning passed unanimously.

Ms. Lewis moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Special Use permit to increase the number of residential units from 24 to 40 on application SP--01-11-20 on the grounds that public necessity, convenience, general welfare, good zoning practices, good hygiene require this amendment. Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion.

Ms. Damon called for discussion. Mr. Higgins called the vote. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Lewis requested that the letter of January 29th be included in the approval of the site plan.

3. ZM--02-01-01: A petition to rezone from R-3 Residential Multiple Dwelling to R-1A Residential the property located at 336 Parkway Street. The general uses allowed in R-3 zoning are multi-family residential development of 12 to 87 units per acre. The general uses allowed in R-1A zoning are single-family detached residences. This property is further identified as City Real Property Tax Map

Number 53 as parcel 8, having 50 feet of frontage on Parkway Street and containing approximately 7,000 square feet of land or .16 acres. The general uses

called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for multi-family residential at a density range of 12 to 87 units per acre.

Ms. Vest presented the staff report. The property currently contains a single-family residence. There would be no changes in site, the applicant seeks to lower the zoning down to the current use so the use could not be expanded in the future. The property

was designated R-1 on the 1958 zoning map and was designated R-3 in 1976. There were no impact considerations. The neighbor immediately to the west supported the applicant and was seeking information to apply for rezoning for his property. Staff recommends approval because the property is located near the boundary between multi-family and

single-family and it will protect the existing residential character of Parkway Street.

Ms. Damon called for comments from the public or the applicant; there being none, the public portion of the hearing was closed. She then called for discussion by the Commission or City Council.

Mr. O'Halloran congratulated the applicant on doing something to preserve the residential character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Wood wanted to clarify that all of the neighboring properties, excluding the one already mentioned by Ms. Vest, were R-1. Ms. Vest told him they were R-1A.

Mr. Barton moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of ZM--02-01-01, an application to amend the City's zoning map to rezone the property from R-3 to R-1A Residential on the grounds that public necessity,

convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice require this amendment. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Halloran.

Ms. Damon called for further discussion, there being none, Mr. Higgins called the vote. The motion on ZM--02-01-01 passed unanimously.

Ms. Damon clarified that this would next go before City Council.

4. SP--02-01-02: An application for a special use permit to use the property at 1013 Grove Street as a private noncommercial recreation/group facility for the Growing Youth Ministries (GYM) organization. The general uses allowed in the R-1A zoning are single-family dwellings at a density range of 3 to 7 units per acre. This property is further identified as City Real Property Tax Map Number 23 as parcel 2, having 106.7 feet of frontage on Grove Street and containing approximately 24,524 square feet of land or .56 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for single-family dwellings at a density range of 3 to 7 units per acre.

Ms. Grant gave the staff report which stated that the Growing Youth Ministries plans to operate a recreation facility for an average of 18 local children. Their primary goal is to provide a secure place where children can improve computer skills and receive help with homework. In 1992, zoning changed from R-2 to R-1A. The children arrive by bus or

walk. The applicant has requested a waiver for paving off-street parking. A site plan was submitted in September. Staff finds the proposed use to be generally compatible and appropriate to the site and surrounding neighborhood. Staff recommends approval

of the Special Use permit because the use will have minimal impact on the neighborhood, hours of operation are three to four hours daily primarily during the after-school hours, site activities include tutoring. Although a residential property, the proposed use is a much needed service in the neighborhood. Recommendation is subject to administrative approval of the final site plan and pending a decision on the waiver of request to pave off-street parking lot.

Ms. Damon recognized the applicant to speak.

Mr. Alton Carver, a member of the Board of Directors for Growing Youth Ministries, stated that the ministry has been in effect for six years. The ministry had been located adjacent to a church. This residential property was closer to the schools. There have been no complaints from the neighbors. The only issue seems to be the paved parking lot. A neighboring site is offering use of their parking area.

Mr. Herb Stahl, 1014 Grove Street, spoke in opposition of the proposal. While he appreciated that they were helping children his concerns included the timing of the application since the facility has been in use for almost a year. Grove is a one-way

street and the kids sometimes play in the street.

While the kids may arrive by bus or walking, they are picked up by cars which end up blocking the street which seems problematic.

Ms. Damon called for additional public comment. There being none, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Johnson-Harris sought clarification about changing the property to R-3 and, should the center close, did the Planning Commission have the right to change it back to R-1. Mr. Higgins stated that the Commission was not rezoning. The City Attorney explained that once a special permit was approved that becomes the zoning of the property. If the use ceases, a new owner would have the right to make that same use of the property. If the new owner did not want to use the property as a child education center, then the Special Use permit would expire.

Ms. Damon asked if that were a category the Planning Commission had. The City Attorney stated that it fell within the category of uses for which a Special Use permit could be granted. It is in the category of private schools and daycare centers. She referred the Commission to Code section 34-139-5.

Ms. Damon asked if there were restrictions on the number of children who could be served and on how much play area needed to be provided. The City Attorney stated that was for the Planning Commission to discuss as part of possibly imposing conditions on the permit that would mitigate any adverse neighborhood impact.

Ms. Damon recalled Ms. Grant to ask about the address sign and about the fact that it had already been in operation. She reported the applicant had not realized he needed a special permit. The sign ordinance would not have applied. Mr. Higgins stated that an R-1 is allowed one square foot unless it is a church.

Mr. Barton asked for the threshold before needing a special use permit. Mr. Higgins stated that threshold was more than five children.

Ms. Damon wanted to know how many kids are being served and their ages. Ms. Grant informed her there was an average of 18 kids; the age range was unknown.

Ms. Damon inquired if there was still a residential use for the building by any of the GYM staff. She was told no one lived there.

Ms. Damon asked if there were outdoor activities for the children in addition to the tutoring. None had been mentioned to the staff.

Ms. Johnson-Harris wanted to know how many adults were on site. She was told there were two to three.

Mr. O'Halloran wanted more information on the parking situation. The preliminary site plan shows four parking spaces being put in. Two of the spaces would be occupied by staff vehicles and one space by their van. That would leave one space for pulling in to pick up a child.

Ms. Damon asked the applicant about the ages of the children. He stated that all were school age; the majority of the children were nine, ten or 11, with some six or seven and a few as old as 16. He then went on to state that if the sign was a problem, it would be pulled down.

Ms. Damon asked him to give more information on pick up and drop off of children. Mr. Carver stated that he had not realized there was a problem with cars because his understanding was that very few of the children's families had vehicles. He said that, wanting to be a good neighbor, he would be happy to talk with Mr. Stahl.

Mr. Carver explained that they had not known they needed a special use permit until after they had started up in this new location.

Ms. Damon asked about the arrangement with the Technology Center regarding parking. Mr. Carver said that an offer had been made at the site plan hearing. Nothing was in writing yet.

Mr. Barton wanted to know how many children were served. The applicant said there was no enrollment. The average is 18. During the summer there are more children since there is no school.

Ms. Damon asked if they were there all day during the summer. The applicant said, no, the program is longer, running from 12 to 5. Ms. Lewis said the application showed 11 to 6. The applicant said the extra hours were staff time.

Mr. Toscano asked if all property owners had been notified. Mr. Higgins affirmed that they had been. The adjacent owners had been notified for the site plan hearing, and everyone within 500 feet had been notified for the preliminary agenda meeting.

Mr. Toscano then asked if lot number 1007 on the diagram was the parking lot or a separately owned lot. Mr. Higgins said that was a parcel that City Council rezoned at the applicant's request.

Mr. Toscano then asked if the adjacent properties were rental or owner occupied. Mr. Carver said they were mixed. Mr. Higgins clarified which were owner occupied.

Mr. Toscano wanted clarification on if the Special Use were granted, who could use it in the future. Ms. Kelly informed him it could depend on the wording of the permit approval. The ordinance could be drafted in such a way that approval is for a child

education center with a definition given that would tailor it to the specific needs of this applicant. Mr. Toscano asked if it should include hours of operation and a capacity limit. Ms. Lewis asked if it could also be limited to a non-profit use. The City Attorney said it needed to focus on the nature of the use and not the character of the person proposing the use.

Mr. Barton expressed concern over whether staffing levels increase for summer use. The applicant explained that at least one volunteer was added to help the two staff members during the summer or any other high volume time during the school year.

Mr. Cox was concerned about the size of the house to the number of students. The applicant explained that the Building Inspector and Fire Inspector had been to

the site before receiving an occupancy certificate.

Mr. Cox asked if the staff had any recommendations as to the maximum occupancy. The applicant stated that the City inspectors had made a recommendation but it is not posted.

Mr. Barton suggested that there is a lack of information for the Planning Commission to make a decision. He recommended the decision be deferred until the next meeting. He would like to see more about the operations including the occupancy load and the FDA approval for summer lunches, especially since there was a need of specificity for the wording of the permit.

Mr. Barton then moved that this be deferred until such time as sufficient information was provided for specific wording. Ms. Damon asked if there were a second. Ms. Johnson-Harris asked if it were possible to put a time limit on it. Mr. Tolbert stated that

he had a list of some of the existing questions and wanted to see what other information was needed by Planning Commission members and Council members.

Ms. Johnson-Harris and Ms. Lewis seconded Mr. Barton's motion for deferral.

Mr. Tolbert stated the following would be needed from the applicant: a good description of exactly what they do, specifics on the numbers they intend to serve each season, the Fire Marshall's building limits, the information on the square footage of what would be there, finalization of parking information. Mr. Barton wanted identification of any exterior recreation areas and, if any, whether they were enclosed. Ms. Damon wanted information about the adequacy of restroom facilities. Ms. Lewis sought more information on building and lighting requirements.

Mr. Wood wanted more information and a comparison of the activities offered on Sunday. The applicant stated they were a faith-based organization which provided opportunities for those who wished to come back on Sunday for a Bible study.

Mr. Higgins called the vote on deferral. It passed unanimously.

5. ZT--02-01-03: An ordinance to amend and reordain Section 34-671 of the City Code (Zoning Ordinance) relating to applicability to the Entrance Corridor



Historic Overlay District to add the McIntire Road Corridor from Preston Avenue to the 250 Bypass. This would cause properties contiguous to that corridor to

be subject to additional standards of the ECH Overlay District.

Mr. Tolbert stated that this was before them due to a project recently started by the County. The assumption had been made that McIntire was an entrance corridor to the downtown area. There is no overlay district there. The rule for an entrance corridor is that it lead to a historic district. Preston was added a year ago. Mr. Tolbert believes

that McIntire meets the criteria. It has been put on the agenda, advertised as a public hearing, and property owners along the corridor were notified. Mr. Higgins added that the design review element applies to anything that would be developed on the corridor that would require a building permit.

Ms. Damon called for public comment.

Ms. Ann Joseph, 610 McIntire, although not pleased with what the County is doing with the ball field, she sought information as to any limitations as to what she could do to her property.

Mr. Tolbert stated that the County has agreed to put up a black vinyl fence instead of the silver and will screen the fence. Mr. Higgins explained that requirements would apply to site plan development. This would not hinder residential maintenance but if there were any addition to be built on the residence, they would have to sign off on the design. Ms.

Joseph sought further clarification as to colors or landscaping. Mr. Higgins assured her that only those things requiring a building permit would be affected.

Ms. Damon closed the Public Hearing and called for discussion or questions.

Mr. Barton asked if this would cause review of materials being used on a new project. Mr. Higgins affirmed that. Mr. Cox asked if this would allow regulation of jobs in progress. Mr. Higgins said this would only affect future development.

Mr. Wood wondered if there was a good reason to include the Ridge/McIntire area. Mr. Higgins thought that area was better as a candidate for inclusion in the downtown historic district.

Ms. Lewis asked when property owners had been notified. Mr. Higgins explained the notification process.

Mr. Wood asked what would be done beyond what was being considered. Mr. Tolbert explained that an ordinance would be sent to City Council.

Mr. Wood moved that the Planning Commission recommend the approval of ZT--02-01-03, an application to amend the City zoning regulation to designate McIntire Road

from Preston Avenue to the Route 250 Bypass an entrance corridor Overlay District on the grounds that this significant route of tourist access to the city requires protection and the public necessity, convenience, general welfare, good building practice requires this amendment. Ms. Johnson-Harris seconded the Motion. There being no discussion, Mr. Higgins called the vote. The motion passed unanimously.

#### E. SITE PLANS

The site plans were combined with related Public Hearings.

#### F. OTHER MAJOR PLANNING ITEMS

Charlottesville Capital Improvement Program (CIP) FY'2002-2007 Presentation

Ms. Damon recognized Linda Peacock.

Ms. Peacock informed the CPC that they had received the five year Capital Improvement Program which had been approved by City Council April 15, 2001. It had been updated to include FY '07. FY '03-'06 is the five-year plan with the addition of a contribution to

the SPCA. The SPCA had approached the City and County for a capital commitment to their new building project. The SPCA serves as the animal pound for the City. An allotment of \$250,000 over five years was made. The County will make a like contribution.

The only other change is an addition of \$350,000 to the Capital Fund from the General Fund.

Ms. Peacock further stated there were seven categories into which expenditures are programmed. For capital projects, 22 percent of the funds are for educational purposes, 14 percent for economic development, 23 percent for neighborhoods, 20 percent

for public safety and justice, seven percent for transportation and access, eight for Parks and Recreation, and two percent for general government.

She also stated the practice on revenues has been to transfer money from the County Revenue Sharing Agreement to the Capital Fund. Interest income, if available, is transferred from the general fund to the capital fund. Bonds are issued every other year.

Mr. Wood asked about where the work being done on the courthouse buildings would fall. Ms. Peacock informed him that the Court Square initiative was not included in this project.

Mr. Barton asked if the repairs to the Park Street bridge over the 250 Bypass was included in the budget. Ms. Peacock explained the City/State matching of funds.

Ms. Damon asked why some of the total available revenue totals were negative at this point. Ms. Peacock explained that that had to do with issuance of bonds.

Ms. Damon also asked about projects at the schools and the downtown recreation center. There is \$1.4 million currently available. The school has a CIP committee.

Mr. Barton wanted to know what role the Planning Commission had in reviewing this information. Ms. Peacock explained that it had been submitted for their information and comments.

Mr. Wood asked if QCC and Region Ten were being phased out. Ms. Peacock stated that City Council had agreed to fund two more years, and that at that time QCC would be self-sustaining. The Region Ten was a specific contribution for a capital project they had.

Ms. Johnson-Harris questioned whether any of the funds in public safety and justice went to the detention center. Ms. Peacock stated the detention center was funded through a per diem charge.

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

Ms. Damon asked for questions and comments.

Mr. Barton asked if staff had reviewed the Lane Ball Field fence replacements. Mr. Tolbert stated it was reviewed after the fact. The County saw this as a maintenance activity. They did not think about the visual impact of going from eight feet to 25 feet.

Ms. Damon wanted to know if the division of lot 8, University Place on University Circle, was to build another house. Mr. Higgins explained it was not.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the subdivisions and site plans approved administratively from January 1st to February 2nd. Mr. Barton seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

#### LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

1/1/02 to 2/1/02

1. Division of Lot 8, "University Place" One new residential lot

1883 & 1885 University Circle Robert Brugh

File No. 1267 Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 1/7/02

2. Redivision of TM 57, Parcels 124 & 123.55 No new lots

301 & 305 Carlton Road Community Services Housing

File No. 1268 Michael S. & Linda K. Drotos

Preliminary & Final

Final Signed: 1/15/02

#### LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

1/1/02 TO 2/2/02

1. File No. 167 Merchants Tire Store – Amendment 1321 Long Street

2. File No. T-01-000021 Manning Apartments – 3 Units 1407 Grady Avenue

3. File No. T-01-000012 Sprint Building 845 Estes Street

4. File No. 1285 Midtown Auto Sales-Addition 740 South First St.

5. File No. 530 Lane Ball Field – Fence Replacement McIntire Road

Landscaping Addition

#### H. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Ms. Lewis has not yet had a Board of Zoning Appeals meeting. The Historic Preservation Zoning Amendment Sub-Committee has had interesting discussions on demolition and archaeology.

Ms. Johnson-Harris stated the CIP Committee was postponed. The Neighborhood Committee met and discussed the budget. The Ridge Street Task Force met for the final time.

Mr. O'Halloran had a University Precinct meeting which agreed to look at the precinct in the Venable neighborhood separately from the JPA neighborhood. He was unable to attend the MPO meeting.

Mr. Barton had been unable to attend the Urban Design meeting.

Mr. Wood attended the University Precinct meeting. He attended the QCC Open House and monthly business meeting.

Ms. Damon stated the Planning District Commission hired a new executive director. They prepared an orientation packet which she gave to Mr. Tolbert to give to the Planning Commission.

#### I. CHAIR'S REPORT

Due to Mr. Key's absence, there was no report.

#### J. DEPARTMENT/STAFF REPORT

Mr. Tolbert informed the Planning Commission that the Comprehensive Plan and Neighborhood Plans for the City of Charlottesville were finally on CD. They are in the process of being burned so distribution should be at the next meeting. Interns are working on a 25 to 30 page summary of the Comprehensive Plan. Comprehensive Plan slide shows are also being worked on. Each neighborhood had a two page executive summary in the works.

He would like to have an update on the status of the neighborhood plans on the next agenda.

Merle Grimes will be at the next meeting to present the final draft of the Greenways Master Plan.

The permit parking committee has been meeting to deal with University and neighborhood parking.

The Neighborhood Leadership Institute started February 9th. There will be three more meetings.

Staff will be putting together a synopsis report on the zoning committees for the Council and Planning Commission.

An urban design study is being done. The consultant will be in Charlottesville in March. Mr. Tolbert offered the option of meeting with them in a public forum or a private meeting. Mr. Barton suggested a smaller meeting would be more efficient. Other

members of the Planning Commission concurred.

Bill Morrish extended an invitation to Mr. Tolbert and the Planning Commission to attend his class at UVa regarding development around the arena and Barracks Road areas. The class will be meeting February 25th at 2 p.m.

Better and more frequent conversations are being had with the University about development issues and especially the arena and parking lot.

Ms. Lewis moved that the meeting be adjourned. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

James E. Tolbert, Secretary

APPROVED:

---

Nancy Damon, Vice-Chairman

