

**DRAFT MINUTES  
CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2005 -- 6:30 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Ms. Cheri Lewis, Chair                        | <i>Staff Present</i>                              |
| Mr. Kevin O'Halloran, Vice Chair              | Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director of NDS            |
| Ms. Kathy Johnson Harris                      | Mr. Ron Higgins, AICP, Planning Manager           |
| Mr. Craig Barton                              | Ms. Lisa Kelley, Deputy City Attorney             |
| Mr. Bill Lucy                                 | Mr. Paul Chedda, Director of CRHA                 |
| Mr. Jon Fink                                  | Ms. Missy Creasy, AICP, Neighborhood Planner      |
| Ms. Karen Firehock                            | Ms. Ashley Cooper, Neighborhood Planner           |
|   | Mr. Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner           |
| <i>Ex-Officio</i>                             | Ms. Lisa Li, Grants Administrator                 |
| Mr. David Neuman, UVa Office of the Architect | Ms. Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner |
|   | Ms. Ayana Conway, Weed & Seed Director            |
| <i>City Council Members Present:</i>          |   |
| Mr. David Brown, Mayor                        |   |
| Mr. Kevin Lynch, Vice Mayor                   |   |
| Mr. Blake Caravati                            |   |
| Ms. Kendra Hamilton                           |   |
| Mr. Rob Schilling                             |   |

**I. REGULAR MEETING**

Ms. Lewis called the meeting to order at 6:31 P.M.

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

Ms. Lewis called for matters from the public not on the formal agenda.

Ms. Susan Pliese, president of ACCT, advised the Commission that a grant had been received from Blue Moon.

**B. MINUTES**

February 8, 2005 -- Regular Meeting

Ms. Lewis called for discussion of the minutes. Ms. Lewis noted the presence of a broken sentence on page 12 and asked that it be moved up into the last paragraph.

Mr. Barton moved to accept the minutes as amended. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. The motion carried with Ms. Johnson Harris and Ms. Firehock abstaining.

**C. LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY**

Mr. O'Halloran moved to approve the list of site plans and subdivisions approved administratively.

Ms. Johnson Harris seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**LIST OF SITE PLANS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY**

2/1/05 - 3/1/05

1. File No. 377 Weatherhill Homes 703 E. Jefferson Street Offices & Parking Amendment
2. File No. T-04-000029 Wertland Square Apartments Wertland Street & - 50 units 216 14th Street, NW
3. File No. T-03-000024 Rugby/McIntyre Apartments 611 Rugby Road - Revised Parking Spaces
4. File No. T-03-000001 Harris Street Commercial Center 1225 Harris Street
5. File No. 1234 "The Terraces" Amendment 100 West Main & 1st Street, S

**LIST OF SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY**

2/1/05 - 3/1/05

1. "Willoughby Townes" 46 new townhouse lots  
Harris Road & 5th Street NW Southern Property, LLC  
File No. 1334 Final  
Final Signed: 1/27/05
2. Redivision of TM4, Parcels 225-229, No new lots  
231, 232 and TM 31, Parcels 136, 137, Piedmont Housing Alliance  
139 & 140 with multiple owners  
Intersection of 10th Street, NW & Page St. Preliminary & Final  
File No. 1335  
Final Signed: 1/28/05
3. Division of TM 26, Parcel 97 Four new commercial lots  
(Parcels A, B, C & D) Paladin, LLC  
1501 6th Street, SE Preliminary & Final  
File No. 1336  
Final Signed: 2/14/05

**D.COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Mr. Barton had no report.

Mr. Fink stated the multijurisdictional road task force had met.

Mr. O'Halloran stated the BZA had not met again. The CDBG had met and would be making a presentation.

Mr. Lucy had no report.

Ms. Johnson Harris had no report.

Ms. Firehock stated the Parks and Recreation Committee had met. The street committee had also

met and would be receiving a report from a consultant.

## **E. CHAIR'S REPORT**

Ms. Lewis had attended the TJPDC meeting.

Ms. Lewis asked Ms. Kelley to explain the new street closing policy.

Ms. Kelley stated the policy was divided based on whether streets and alleys were created prior to 1946 which was when Virginia adopted a comprehensive state law governing the recordation and substance of subdivision plats. For those prior to 1946, the process requires vacating a previously recorded subdivision plat as provided by state Code. The City Attorney's Office has the bulk of the review authority, under the administrative review process, to ensure that all interested parties have had an opportunity to be aware of the proposed vacation. Ms. Kelley further stated there was a state Code provision for Fair Market Value and the Contributory Value to adjacent property.

## **II. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Ms. Lewis convened the Joint Public Hearing at 7:01 P.M.

### **F. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**1. Closing a portion of Thirteenth Street, Northwest, north of John Street:** A petition to close the 40 foot right-of-way of Thirteenth Street, Northwest a distance of approximately 286

feet from its end at the Venable School property, north of John Street. (DEFERRED FROM THE FEBRUARY 8, 2005 MEETING)

Ms. Cooper gave the staff report. The proposed closure is adjacent to Venable Court Apartments. The Fire Marshal had no problems with the width of the proposed 22 foot travel aisle; however the Fire Marshal had ordered the removal of on street parking during site plan approval. The Voter Registration Office had opined there would be no impact on the polling station by the closure of the street. Closure of the street would afford the applicant additional development rights. The Fair Market Value of the property was assessed at \$8.50 per square foot; the total value of the land \$95,240. No properties would be landlocked by vacation; however, most access to the Venable fields would be cut off. The property lines would be adjusted to center. One letter expressing concern about the street closure had been received. The idea behind cleaning up the parking on the street was great; unfortunately staff was uncomfortable with the effect on Venable field. Staff could not support the petition as it was not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as it describes the playing field which was a public amenity and a treasure of the neighborhood.

Ms. Lewis called for questions of staff from the Commissioners.

Mr. O'Halloran sought clarification that the existing site plan would eliminate all public parking spaces. Ms. Cooper concurred.

Ms. Lewis recognized the applicant.

Mr. Jim Grigg, of Daggett & Grigg Architects, 100 Tenth Street, Northeast, explained the goal of the project was to develop as much parking as reasonable along Thirteenth Street. He felt the special use

permit application was a reasonable way to use the 60 feet of space comprised of the 40 foot right-of-way and the 20 feet of already proposed parking in front of the building.

Ms. Lewis opened the public hearing. With no one wishing to speak to the matter, Ms. Lewis closed the public hearing and called for discussion from the Commissioners.

Mr. Fink expressed concern about the possible additional development rights.

Mr. Lucy felt there was an absence of compelling reasons to change access to a major public facility.

Ms. Johnson Harris could not support the closing because Venable School has been an anchor in the community since it connects two very different communities.

Mr. Fink saw the closing as being for the pleasure of the applicant with an adverse impact on the public.

Mr. O'Halloran thought it was possible that, by closing the street with the understanding that there would be right of ingress and egress and ten spaces reserved for users of the ball field, they could be better off than they were with the current site plan that eliminates all of the public parking adjacent to the playing field.

Mr. Barton stated they were asked to review street closures with respect to the potential in the future for the street in question to be part of a more complete or better network. Given the Comprehensive Plan mandates for higher density in the neighborhood, he was inclined to deny the applicant's request.

Ms. Firehock concurred with Mr. Barton.

Ms. Johnson Harris moved to certify that the proposed vacation of a portion of Thirteenth Street Northwest, north of John Street, south of Venable School, would not be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and to be recommended denial to City Council of the application to vacate the street by ordinance. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion passed, 6-1; Mr. O'Halloran voted against.

**2. SP-05-1-4:**An application for a special use permit for higher density residential development with reduced setbacks and increased height without the 15 foot step back after 5 stories on the property at 416-428 Monroe Lane. This would allow for the construction of 50 units in the main building on this site instead of the 30 units previously approved (87 units/acre instead of 64 units/acre). This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 11 as parcel 17, having 93 feet of frontage on Monroe Lane and containing approximately 37,461 square feet of land or 0.86 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for "University Precinct" uses such as student housing, classrooms, and similar uses.(DEFERRED FROM THE FEBRUARY 8, 2005 MEETING)

Ms. Cooper gave the staff report. The primary application for Special Use Permit was based on the requested density of 87 units per acre. The building height is approximately 68 feet, which is eight feet over the by-right height allowance for the District. The applicant also seeks the following modifications: a reduction in the side yard setback from 17 feet to 8 feet; a reduction in the front yard setback on Fifteenth Street and Monroe Lane to allow for a 10 foot minimum setback; the building separation be modified so that it would be consistent with Building Code standards versus what is required of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant proposes to build a five-story building on Monroe Lane that is 58 feet tall; due to the topography change, it measures 78 feet on Fifteenth Street. The applicant also asks that

the 15 foot step back after five stories of the building along 70 percent of the building be eliminated on the Fifteenth Street frontage. The applicant had submitted a substantially changed proposal from the February submission. The applicant had taken out two stories of the building and had changed the setback requests.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward the application to City Council with the recommendation for approval subject to staff approval of the final site plan.

Mr. Barton sought clarification whether the University would be able to build anything on the adjacent land. Ms. Cooper stated they could not assume UVA would not use the property.

Ms. Lewis stated the applicant wanted the prior site plan amended. Mr. Tolbert explained the submitted site plan was part of the Special Use Permit.

Ms. Lewis recognized the applicant.

Mr. Jim Stultz, owner of Piedmont Hospital, LLC, stated they had an approved site plan for 75-bedrooms, 30 units; they were requesting this building to be 50 entry-level condominiums. There would be less bedrooms with the condominiums.

Ms. Lewis opened the public hearing.

Ms. Janette Lancaster, of Pavilion II, East Lawn, Dean of the School of Nursing, stated the School of Nursing was, in effect, the new owners of the vacant piece of land adjacent to the proposed structure. The School has woefully outgrown the current Nursing School. Private funds had been raised which would only allow for the construction of a three- or four-story building; Dean Lancaster expressed concern about being dwarfed by the adjacent building.

Mr. Lucien Bass, a resident of Crozet, was present as the Chair of the School of Nursing Advisory Board. Mr. Bass spoke in support of Dean Lancaster's comments. He expressed concern about the safety of the students with an increase of traffic on Fifteenth Street.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Ms. Lewis closed the public hearing.

Mr. Barton clarified that the submission which had been reviewed prior to the meeting had dimensions which had been modified. Mr. Barton clarified that the correct dimensions were: five stories at Monroe Lane; approximately 58 feet to the midpoint of the sloping roof; 65 feet to the ridge; and 70 feet to the top of the uppermost part of the Fifteenth Street portion of the building. The applicant confirmed Mr. Barton's clarification.

Mr. Fink moved that the Planning Commission approve a Special Use Permit-05-1-4 to allow for a special Use Permit in the R-UHD, Residential-University High Density district for 87 dwelling units per acre and added building heights up to seven stories at 416-428 Monroe Lane subject to the following conditions and exceptions or modifications:

- a) Staff approval of the final site plan,
- b) Elimination of the 15 foot step back requirement along Fifteenth Street,
- c) Exception (a) Reduction in building setbacks from 7 feet to 8 feet for the side yard on the southern side of the building,

- d) Exception (b) Modification in the building separation from 34 feet to 20 feet, 6 inches,
- e) Exception (c) Reduction in building setbacks from 5 feet to 10 feet for the front yard on the Fifteenth Street frontage, and
- f) Exception (d) Reduction in building setbacks from 14 feet, 2 inches to 10 feet for the front yard on the Monroe Lane frontage;

This approval is based on the finding that the proposal meets the criteria for a Special Use Permit and would serve the interest of the general public welfare and good zoning practice. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Barton offered a friendly amendment that the conditions contained in the motion, and duly seconded, would be conditioned by the submission that the applicant as well as their amendment from dimensions articulated at the meeting today. Mr. Fink and Mr. Lucy accepted the friendly amendment. Ms. Lewis called for discussion.

Ms. Firehock stated her support of the motion because it promotes livability downtown near the University and provides a more attractive building. Citing the trend of graduate students to begin purchasing property which can be sold at the end of their term, Ms. Firehock felt it promoted students being able to live closer.

Mr. O'Halloran concurred with Ms. Firehock. He felt this was an exceptionally positive use in this section of the City which warranted giving a Special Use Permit. He commended the applicant for modifying the project which was a stronger project than the one seen in February.

Mr. Barton felt the safety concerns expressed by Dean Lancaster should be taken into consideration on balance providing the opportunity for students or hospital employees to live at a place where they may walk to work or school.

Mr. Lucy felt it would be a safer area and would enhance the safety of the residents and the general safety of the area.

Ms. Lewis was persuaded by the fact that the project offered home ownership in an area where more home ownership was needed. The scale of the development was within the context of the buildings around it; it was appropriate and would be an asset to the immediate environ.

Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

**3. Community Development Block Grant and HOME/ADDI Funding** -- Second Year Action Plan, 05-06: 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/ADDI funds for the City of Charlottesville. In fiscal year 05-06 it is expected that the City of Charlottesville will receive approximately \$619,580 for Housing and Community Development needs and \$121,114/\$6,753 in HOME/ADDI funds for affordable housing. CDBG funds will be used in the City to conduct housing rehabilitation, assist low and moderate income home buyers, and improve access and housing for persons with disabilities, as well as to fund several programs that benefit low and moderate income citizens and the homeless population. HOME/ADDI funds will be used to assist first time home buyers and rehabilitate housing.

Ms. Li gave the staff report. The Task Force has recommended housing programs similar to those in prior years including substantial rehab to be performed by AHIP. They have recommended funding for revitalization, handicap access, small home owner.

Ms. Lewis sought clarification behind the Weed and Seed program not being included in the Task Force minutes provided by Staff. Ms. Creasy explained the federal application had required a match from the City for administration funds. Ms. Ayana Conway, Director of the Weed and Seed program, explained the program had been inactive for the last year due to a lack of funds. She further stated they had recently found out that the grant had been renewed. Ms. Conway then explained that Weed and Seed, a national grant strategy, is a crime reduction strategy started in 1990 which is meant to weed out drugs, violence, and guns and seed in positive prevention programs. The Charlottesville Weed and Seed had started in 1999.

Ms. Lewis opened the public hearing.

Mr. Paul Chedda, Executive Director of the Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority, read a prepared statement on behalf of his staff members and 2000 residents. The CRHA has the responsibility to clear slum and blighted areas and to operate public housing programs. Their efforts are focused on providing safe, decent, and affordable housing. A physical needs assessment had been done which showed they needed approximately 20 million dollars. The Funding budget did not allot any monies toward CRHA. Mr. Chedda asked the Commissioners to reconsider the recommendation of the Task Force.

With no one else wishing to speak to the matter, Ms. Lewis closed the public hearing and called for discussion by the Commissioners.

Mr. Fink wanted to know if Staff offered any kind of working support with regard to helping organizations submit their grant applications. Ms. Creasy explained there were trainings available; this information was provided with the application.

Mr. Barton sought clarification as to whether the CRHA application, if correctly submitted, would have met the prioritized list established by City Council and whether Mr. Chedda's entreaties might be better suited to be made directly to Council. Mr. Tolbert stated Council could say there were needs in the Housing Authority and funds should be made available as a priority. Ms. Creasy stated the City Council priorities for the year were clearly stated on the application.

Mr. O'Halloran, having sat on the CDBG committee, stated the Task Force had done a very fine job and had been very fair and thorough.

Mr. Barton felt the CDBG should be part of the affordable housing strategy. He recommended the Commission recommend to Council that they review their priority for what they recommend funding.

Ms. Firehock stated her empathy for the Housing Authority in terms of their trying to provide high quality living experience. She felt the Commission needed to take a long-term strategic look at how they were funded.

Ms. Firehock made a motion to approve the budget as submitted and congratulate the Committee on its excellent work. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. Mr. Barton reiterated Council should review its priorities for '05-'06. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

### **III. REGULAR MEETING ITEMS (CONTINUED)**

#### **1. Entrance Corridor Guidelines - Frazier & Associates**

Mr. Tolbert stated that Mr. Bill Frazier would give a PowerPoint presentation and overview of the organization of the Entrance Corridor Design guidelines. Mr. Tolbert explained that Mr. Frazier would provide more detail at the 29 March work session.

Mr. Frazier then gave the PowerPoint presentation.

Ms. Lewis thanked Mr. Frazier for the presentation.

Ms. Lewis called for a brief recess, whereupon the meeting stood in recess at 9:37 P.M.

Mr. Neuman left the meeting at 9:37 P.M.

Ms. Lewis reconvened the meeting at 9:42 P.M.

### **H. SITE PLANS**

#### **1. Avon Street Townhouses (PUD) -- Northeast corner of Avon and Palatine -- Six new townhouses**

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The property had been rezoned to PUD on 3 January 2005. A two-story structure exists on the property. The PUD would have eight units, four fronting on Avon and four fronting on Palatine. Due to the width of Palatine, the applicant would be responsible for improving 15 feet from the midpoint of the existing paved area. No public comment was received at the site plan conference on February 2nd. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Firehock sought clarification as to whether the proposed pond on the site was a wet pond or dry pond. Mr. Haluska did not know. Mr. David Collins, of John McNair & Associates, stated the pond was intended as a dry pond.

Mr. Barton queried why there was no lighting plan as part of the site plan. Mr. Haluska believed it was forthcoming.

Mr. Barton moved that they approve the site plan as submitted for the Avon Terraces Project and would ask that they condition it by the submittal of a lighting plan as required in ordinance 34-828(b)(9) that would be reviewed administratively by staff with respect to all applicable ordinances and approved and that their approval would be conditioned by the approval of the lighting plan by staff. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

### **I. ENTRANCE CORRIDOR DESIGN REVIEWS**

#### **1. Avon Street Townhouses (PUD) -- Northeast corner of Avon and Palatine**

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. Ms. Scala explained that only a portion of the parcel was within the Entrance Corridor. The Commission would only be looking at the four units fronting on Avon Street. The proposed buildings were consistent with development along Avon Street and were compatible with the single-family character of the Belmont area. Staff recommends approval subject to staff approval of the siding, foundation, and roof color samples, staff approval of the final design of the drainage swale treatment, and that the windows facing Avon Street should have simulated divided lights with muntins



on the exterior as well as the interior, and that the shutters should be wood or a similar composition material and should be sized to fit the windows.

Ms. Firehock expressed concern about what standards Staff would use for reviewing the ditch. Mr. Barton stated that since the front yards were a significant part of the site and part of the Entrance Corridor, the Commission should discuss how the ditch would be treated. Mr. Tolbert stated there were landscaping guidelines which would provide a standard to discuss the appropriate ditch design.

Mr. Barton also expressed concern about the visitability of the site since the slope was at 1/10 rather than 1/12; 1/12 being the nominal handicap standard. He hoped every effort would be made to make the pedestrian access meet the visibility standard.

Mr. Barton asked that, in the future, applicants draw or collage their building into the site in the Entrance Corridor so the Commission could look at them more specifically. Ms. Lewis and Mr. O'Halloran stated this had been asked of staff with prior applications also. Mr. Fink recommended that any application in the Entrance Corridor show that.

Ms. Lewis commended Staff for the thorough detail in applying all applicable guidelines to the application.

The applicant, Mr. Jim Moore, stated the ditch had been planned as a grass ravine; Engineering required rip-rap which was unacceptable to the developer.

Mr. Fink moved that they approve the Certificate of Appropriateness for the corner of Avon Street and Palatine Avenue, Tax Map Parcel Number 59, Parcel 361, with staff recommendations as conditioned in the proposal, 1 through 4. Ms. Johnson Harris seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **J. SUBDIVISIONS**

### **1. Division of Lot 13, Block II, "Southgate Terrace"**

528 Valley Road -- One new lot

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This site is in the R-2U zoning district with historic district overlay in the Oakhurst Circle area. The legal standard of review was that a subdivision that complies with the requirements of the City Subdivision Ordinance must be approved if it meets all the requirements; if the Planning Commission determines there are grounds on which to deny approval of the subdivision, the motion must clearly identify the deficiency of the plan which are the basis for the denial. The applicant has submitted a minor subdivision plat for a single- or two-family residential development located off Valley Road. The plat would divide an existing lot which contains a rental unit. Staff is requesting the Planning Commission determine whether the lot layout meets the intent of the subdivision ordinance. Section 29-40(a) states that all lots shall contain a satisfactory building site which meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and shall front on a dedicated, accepted, and approved street. Proposed access would be from another part of the lot. Ms. Scala also cited Sections 29-40(d) -- All residential lots shall have a minimum frontage of 50 feet at the street right-of-way except lots fronting on the turnaround portion of a cul-de-sac shall have a minimum of twenty-foot frontage at the street right-of-way and an average width of at least fifty (50) feet; 29-43(a) -- Existing natural features which would add value to residential development or to the city as a whole, such as trees, watercourses, other irreplaceable assets shall be protected wherever practical; 29-81(d) -- Whenever any stream or

important surface drainage course is located in the area being subdivided, provision shall be made for a ten-foot easement along each side of the stream or drainage course.

Although minor subdivision plats are routinely approved administratively, the proposed lot layout is unusual; staff asks the Commission to determine if the proposed layout meets the intent of the subdivision ordinance. If the Commission finds the layout acceptable, staff will approve the plat administratively subject to all staff review comments being met.

Mr. Barton felt it would be worth seeing the configuration of the lot in conjunction with the adjacent lot, parcel 71.

Ms. Lewis sought clarification that the applicant was the owner of record of Tax Map 11 Parcel 71, the adjoining property. The applicant, Mr. Craig Pickering, affirmed that he was.

Mr. Barton suggested the proposal be brought back before the Commission configured with Parcel 71.

Mr. Tolbert reiterated that if the applicant brought a proposal which met the Subdivision Ordinance, it could be approved administratively.

Stating that the proposal did not meet the spirit of the ordinance, Mr. O'Halloran moved to deny this application for approval of a subdivision. Mr. Fink seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

## **2. Division of Tax Map Number 56, Parcel 116 618 East Market Street -- Two new lots**

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The lot has 150 feet of frontage. Proposed lot C meets all requirements of the ordinance. Proposed lot A is at issue with Section 29-40(b) -- Side lines of lots shall be perpendicular to straight street lines and radial to curved street lines, unless a variation from this regulation will provide a better street or lot layout. If the property were divided in 50 foot intervals, one of the side lot lines would go straight through an existing house. Although minor subdivision plats are routinely approved administratively, the proposed lot layout is unusual; staff asks that the Planning Commission determine if the proposed lot layout meets the intent of the Subdivision Ordinance. If the Commission finds the layout acceptable, staff will approve the final plat administratively, subject to all staff review comments being met.

Mr. Will Kerner, of 1618 East Market Street, owner of the property was present as was Robert Nichols, the architect.

Mr. Nichols stated the project began as the owner's interest to build a new home and to try to realize some of the appreciation of property which has accrued.

Mr. Fink felt access was not an issue to lot A.

Mr. Barton felt there were strengths to the application.

Ms. Lewis felt this application was different than the previously heard application.

Mr. Fink moved to approve the proposed subdivision plat at 1618 East Market Street subject to staff approval of the plat content based on the finding that the lot layout meets the purpose, intent and specific requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Ms. Johnson Harris seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**K. ANNUAL PLANNING AWARDS -- 2005**

Mr. Higgins presented the Commissioners with written nominations.

Ms. Lewis explained her desire for private balloting had been because she did not want the Commission to discuss the merits of applicants on the public record.

Ms. Lewis recommended they create an Eldon Fields Wood Award for a design professional to be awarded annually as merited. Mr. O'Halloran seconded this motion. Ms. Johnson Harris suggested a letter or some type of recognition be provided to Mrs. Wood that this award was created in his memory. Mr. Barton suggested they ask City Council to issue a proclamation dedicating this award; the proclamation could be given to Mrs. Wood.

Ms. Lewis also asked that the Access to the Disabled Award be renamed the Herman Key Access to the Disabled Award. Mr. Barton asked that City Council be asked to issue a proclamation for that award also.

Mr. Fink excused himself from the meeting at 11:01 P.M.

Ms. Firehock asked that the media be present for the proclamations and presentations of the two new awards.

**M.FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**1. March 29, 2005** -- 5:30 PM -- Work Session on Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines

**2. April 12, 2005** -- 6:30 PM -- Regular Meeting -- Fontaine Avenue Design Options

Ms. Lewis reminded the Commissioners of the future agenda items.

Mr. Barton moved that they adjourn and reconvene for joint public hearings as needed, April 12, 2005.

Mr. O'Halloran seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 11:03 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted:

\_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Jim Tolbert, Secretary

Approved:

\_\_\_\_\_

Ms. Cheri Lewis, Chair