

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION

TUESDAY, 9 MAY, 2006 -- 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. Karen Firehock (Chairman)

Mr. Jon Fink (Vice-Chairman)

Mr. Craig Barton

Mr. Michael Farruggio

Ms. Cheri Lewis

Mr. Bill Lucy

Mr. Kevin O'Halloran

Commissioners Not Present:

Mr. David Neuman, Ex-officio, UVa Office of the Architect

City Council Members Present:

Mr. David Brown, Mayor

Mr. Kevin Lynch, Vice Mayor

Mr. Blake Caravati

Ms. Kendra Hamilton

Mr. Rob Schilling

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, AICP, Director NDS

Mr. Ron Higgins, AICP, Planning Manager

Mr. Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner

Ms. Ashley Cooper, Neighborhood Planner

Ms. Mary Joy Scala, Preservation & Design Planner

Also Present:

Ms. Lisa R. Kelley, Deputy City Attorney

I. REGULAR MEETING

Ms. Firehock convened the meeting at 6:31 p.m. She stated items 1 and 2 of the public hearing had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

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

Ms. Firehock called for matters not on the agenda. There were none.

B. MINUTES

April 11, 2006 -- Regular Meeting

Ms. Firehock called for discussion of the 11 April minutes.

Mr. Farrugio stated that the fourth paragraph down on page 7 of 13 should be Rob Archer, not Ron Archer.

Mr. Fink stated that the address in the Entrance Corridor Review on page 10 should be 2101 instead of 201.

Ms. Firehock stated the word "noted" in that same paragraph on page 10 should be "noticed."

Mr. Barton stated "process" from the sixth paragraph on page 6 of 13 should be "ordinance." He also clarified that the second sentence of the fourth paragraph from the bottom of page 8 should note as the next generation of buildings developed they should follow the example of moving parking to the rear.

Ms. Firehock asked that, in the third line down of the third paragraph up on page 9 of 13, "catercorner" be changed to "catty-corner." She suggested the words "in understanding" be added after "Mr. Fink stated he was having difficulty" on page 12; she also asked that "density" be added after "by right."

Mr. Barton moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY

Ms. Lewis sought clarification of what had been amended in the Gray Television matter. Mr. Tolbert stated the landscaping details had gone before City Council and finally come before staff. Mr. Fink asked if the CPC-recommended fence had been on the plan approved administratively. Mr. Tolbert stated that had not been included by City Council.

Ms. Firehock asked if there was a motion. Ms. Lewis moved to approve them from April 1st to May 1st of '06 as submitted. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

D. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Ms. Lewis stated she had not made it to the last Thomas Jefferson Planning District Committee meeting. She stated the Route 250 Interchange Steering Committee had cancelled a public hearing and would meet next on 22 May. She stated the Master Planning Council would be meeting 10 May; she would not be able to attend.

Mr. Farrugio stated he would be attending an Interchange meeting in the next week. He stated the Parks & Rec Committee had met and discussed plans for paths to be put in another part of McIntire Park.

Mr. Lucy stated the Board of Architectural Review would be having a work session on 23 May to discuss plans for a nine-story building next to the Wachovia building on the Mall. He stated he would attend part of that meeting before coming to the CPC Work Session that same evening. He suggested the other Commissioners may want to attend part of that meeting as well.

Mr. Fink stated he had attended the MPO Tech meeting; discussions had included the future development along the 29 corridor with parallel roads/connector roads, looking at future residential and commercial development trends.

Mr. Barton had attended the PAC Tech meeting at which the Places 29 Study was discussed. He stated the University had presented the Grounds Framework Strategy Plan which had identified six categories of study and review used in developing the University's Master Plan. Mr. Barton stated that, on 27 April, he had met with Mr. Tolbert and two members of the Martha Jefferson Hospital administrative cadre to discuss designing a participatory process to review the options available for the in town Martha Jefferson Campus.

Mr. O'Halloran stated the Board of Zoning Appeals had met and considered a number of cases including one which would be considered by the Commission during this meeting.

E. CHAIR'S REPORT

Ms. Firehock stated none of her committees had met. However, a temporary committee on green building she had formed did meet. They had looked at a program -- Building Green, Building Smart -- Arlington has.

Mr. Lucy sought information from Mr. Barton regarding the University's plans for the South Lawn Project as to whether it would be of interest to the City. Mr. Barton stated his knowledge of the project was limited to what he had read in the paper. Mr. Barton stated Mr. Neuman would be a better source of information. Mr. Tolbert stated that the University had recently applied for Federal Highway money and that City Council had endorsed the bridging of Jefferson Park Avenue. Mr. Tolbert stated this was in Area B; projects in Area B will be submitted to the City for review and done in accord with the City Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Tolbert stated Mr. Neuman had been informed of this by letter and a return letter from Mr. Neuman stated they did not want to follow that process. Mr. Tolbert stated the University had had more neighborhood involvement with this project than with any other.

Ms. Lewis sought clarification from Mr. Tolbert as to a "New Traffic Pattern Do Not Enter" sign which had appeared on Fourth Street heading towards Garrett Street in conjunction with the opening of the Fourth Street crossing of the Downtown Mall. Mr. Tolbert confirmed that there had been concern about Fourth being used not just for Mall circulation but also as a north/south cut through for people trying to avoid the Avon bridge. Mr. O'Halloran stated he had looked out his office window the day Fourth was opened and had seen a lot of angry people who had not been able to go straight across Water Street and down Avon. Mr. O'Halloran stated the notification process for opening Fourth Street had been deeply flawed.

II. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

F. JOINT PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. ZM—06-3-3: A petition to rezone from R-1S Residential to Planned Unit Development (PUD), with proffers, the property at 1000 & 1002 Grove Street & 10th Street, SW. The application is to increase the density to allow single family dwellings of different types. These properties are further identified on City Real Property Tax Map #23 as parcels 51 & 52, having 105 feet of frontage on Grove Road, 120 feet of frontage on 10th Street, SW, 37.5 feet of frontage on King Street and containing approximately 12,850 square feet of land or .29 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Single Family Residential of 3-7 units per acre. Report prepared by Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner.

This item was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

2. ZM-06-3-4: A petition to rezone from R-1S Residential to Planned Unit Development (PUD), with proffers, the property at the east side of Franklin Street, just north of the CSX tracks. The application is to increase the density to a townhouse style development. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map #56 as parcel 114.2, having 214.6 feet of frontage on Franklin Street and containing approximately 36,469 square feet of land or .84 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Single Family Residential of 3-7 units per acre. Report prepared by Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner.

This item was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

3. SP-06-3-5: An application for a special use permit to use the property at 830 Monticello Avenue (Belmont Baptist Church) to operate a school for 49 students per day in the existing facilities. This property is further identified on City Real Property Tax Map Number 58 as parcel 219, having 144 feet of frontage on Monticello Avenue, 128 feet of frontage on Meridian Street and containing approximately 18,432 square feet or 0.42 acres. The general uses called for in the Land Use Plan of the Comprehensive Plan are for Single Family Residential of three to seven units per acre. Report prepared by Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner.

Mr. O'Halloran recused himself because his older son is an alumnus of the school and his younger son still attends this school.

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The property is zoned R-1S. Day care centers are allowed by Special Use Permit only. A "day care center" is any facility that is used for the education of students that is used for children under a certain age. Even though the applicant is known as The International School, they fit the definition of a day care center. There was a prior Special Use Permit which expired in 2004. The current facility has a capacity of 55 students; the applicant suggested 49. Staff recommended visitor parking and drop off be moved. The Traffic Engineer felt there would be no problems for stacking or turning. Staff recommends the application be approved with the following conditions: a maximum enrolment of 50 children per day without amendment; the hours of operation be limited from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday.

Mr. Farrugio wanted to know if there was any anticipated use for an early morning program or for night programs. Mr. Haluska felt that was a question for the applicant.

Mr. Fink sought clarification behind the expiration of the previous Special Use Permit. Mr. Higgins stated the application had come from the Methodist Church which was undergoing a renovation to their facility and they asked for a limited permit to borrow the Baptist Church's building while they did their renovation.

Ms. Firehock sought clarification as to whether the hours of operation ended at 5 or 5:30. Mr. Haluska stated he should have said 5:30.

Ms. Lewis stated the staff report used "day care" and "school" interchangeably; however, a school is permitted in this district. Mr. Haluska read the definition of day care from City Code: "day care facility means a facility where, during the absence of a parent or guardian, a person or organization provides supervision and care to a child under the age of thirteen (13) for less than a twenty-four-hour period, and where such care is offered to (i) two (2) or more children under the age of thirteen (13), in a location that is not the residence of the provider of any of the children in care; or (ii) to thirteen (13) or more children at any location. For purposes of this zoning ordinance, the term includes facilities commonly known as childcare center, day care, day care center, nurseries, playschools, preschools and nursery schools. The term excludes the following: school extended-day enrichment programs; family day homes; an educational facility (other than preschools and nursery schools) unless such facility is providing day care center outside of regular classes; and care provided by a religious institution or organization." Mr. Haluska stated the applicant is licensed by the Department of Social Services as a day care center.

Ms. Sibylle Rotach-Hunt, of Free Union, Director of The International School and Mr. Tom Nachbar, Chair of the Board of Trustees, were present.

Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated the proposed day care center would be a positive thing for the neighborhood because it would provide early childhood education in a neighborhood that doesn't have any. She stated it would be a good use for an underutilized building. There has been no negative impact on the neighborhood by having a day care in the building. She stated they would like to be open from 8 to 5:30. She stated teachers would get there before 8 but there was no anticipated use for earlier times.

Mr. Farrugio asked if there was any anticipation to have more than 50 students in the near future. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated she was not sure how many students the building would hold. Mr. Nachbar stated they could possibly add eight more children.

Mr. Farrugio sought clarification of whether this was a day care of a school. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated the center currently had students ranging in age from 32 months to 6 years. She stated there were afternoon classes for the alumni children. In the past there had been summer camp programs for children aged 6 to 8; she would like to do this again.

Mr. Farrugio wanted to know if there was a rise in enrolment during the summer. Mr. Nachbar stated enrollment usually went down in the summer. Ms. Rotach-Hunt confirmed that enrollment consistently went down during the summer.

Mr. Fink wanted to know how long the current school had been in operation. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated it had been since 1998; however, since 2001 at 2416 Jefferson Park Avenue.

Mr. Barton wanted to know if the alumni children were included in the total number of students. Ms. Rotach-Hunt confirmed they were included. Mr. Nachbar explained the preschool program ran until noon and kindergarten until 3 which meant most of these children were gone before the alumni children arrive.

Mr. Barton wanted to know how many people comprised staff. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated that would be based on enrolment; currently there were 11 people on staff.

Mr. Fink asked for the current teacher/student ratio. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated that depended on the age, but it is an average of 7:1.

Ms. Lewis explained the Special Use Permit would be based not only on hours of operation but also on actual arrival of staff. Ms. Rotach-Hunt thought perhaps the hours should be 7:30 to 6 to allow for teachers to open and close the school.

Mr. Farrugio asked if there was any neighborhood support or opposition. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated she had not heard anything.

Mr. Caravati asked if the applicant had spoken with the Neighborhood Association. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated they had not. Mr. Nachbar stated the entire church congregation had to approve the lease. Mr. Martin Thomas, a member of Belmont Baptist Church, stated he had talked to the Neighborhood Association and there was no opposition from the neighbors.

Mr. Caravati wanted to know if the children arrived individually or in car pool situations. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated most arrive individually; however, as the year progresses and the children become friends, the car pools increase.

Mr. Caravati wanted to know if there was a need for a recreation facility. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated there was a big field which belonged to the church which could be used. Mr. Tolbert stated there was no requirement for the applicant to provide anything.

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

Mr. Barton wanted to know the current enrollment. Ms. Rotach-Hunt stated they currently had 42 children at the current location.

Mr. Farrugio stated the building did seem to be underutilized and that this seemed good for the area. He suggested the time be 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. so they could get in and out of the building. With no neighborhood opposition, he felt he could support this application.

Mr. Lucy moved to recommend approval of this application for Special Use Permit in the R-1S zone for The International School of Charlottesville, a proposed day care use at 830 Monticello Avenue to permit a day care center serving no more than 50 students per day with the conditions listed in the staff report as amended for hours of operation from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday. Mr. Farrugio seconded the motion. The motion carried, 6-0-1; Mr. O'Halloran had recused himself from the matter.

4. ZT-06-3-6: An ordinance to amend and reordain the following sections of the Code of the City of Charlottesville, 1990, as amended (Zoning Ordinance):

a.) Section 34-480. Use Matrix -- Commercial Districts, to add animal grooming and kennels to B-3, M-1 and IC districts by special use permit.

b.) Section 34-580(a). Density, to allow for up to 200 dwelling units per acre to be requested by special use permit in the Downtown Extended Corridor.

c.) Section 34-600(a). Density, to allow for up to 87 dwelling units per acre to be requested by special use permit in the Downtown North Corridor.

d.) Section 34-796. Use Matrix -- Mixed Corridor Districts, to: add "schools" & "day care facilities" to Downtown and other Mixed Corridor Districts; to correct the line for "88-200 DUA" to indicate that it is possible in Downtown Extended and West Main South (not North) by special permit; to allow for up to 87 dwelling units per acre by special permit in the Downtown North Corridor, and; to add animal grooming and kennels to the Downtown Extended Corridor by special permit.

Ms. Cooper gave the staff report. Almost all of the amendments had been discussed previously either in Work Sessions or meetings. The amendments correct existing oversights or have come from actual proposed projects in the new Mixed Use Districts. Ms. Cooper stated schools and day care are already allowed by right in the residential districts and staff felt this was an important part of any Mixed Use District. She stated the density amendments would not change the existing height or bulk allowed in the districts; these would only allow more density. Ms. Cooper stated it had been approved to have a density increase of up to 200 units per acre with a Special Use Permit in the West Main South Zoning District; somehow the matrix was approved with that in the West Main North Zoning District. She stated they would like to correct that mistake and put that as a Special Use Permit in the West Main South Zoning District.

Mr. Barton sought clarification that the proposed increased density would not allow additional mass or bulk because of the existing zoning envelope which does not allow for the number of units to fill up the envelope. Ms. Cooper confirmed Mr. Barton's understanding of the issue.

Mr. Fink asked if the same number of parking spaces per unit would still be conditioned. Ms. Cooper agreed, stating that was inherent to the Zoning.

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

Mr. Fink moved that they adopt ZT-06-3-6, an ordinance to amend and reordain the following sections of the Code of the City of Charlottesville, 1990, as amended:

Section 34-580(a) -- Density, to allow up to 200 dwelling units per acre to be requested by special use permit in the Downtown Extended Corridor;

600(a) [sic] -- to allow up to 87 units per acre to be requested by special use permit in the Downtown North Corridor;

and Section 34-796 -- Use Matrix -- Mixed Corridor Districts to make a correction in the matrix where it has "m" instead of "b," add schools and day care facilities to Downtown and other Mixed Corridor Districts; to correct the line for "88-200 DUA" to indicate that it is possible in Downtown Extended and West Main South (not North) by special permit; and to allow for up to 87 dwelling units per acre by

special permit in the Downtown North Corridor. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

5. ST—06-3-7: An ordinance to amend and reordain Section 29-126 of the Code of the City of Charlottesville, 1990, as amended (Subdivision Ordinance) to make reference to a schedule of fees and charges associated with implementation of the Subdivision Ordinance Chapter.

There was no staff report.

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

Ms. Lewis moved to amend and reordain Section 21-126 [sic] of the Code of the City of Charlottesville to make reference to a schedule of fees that will be enacted and adopted by Council from time to time about charges associated with implementing our Subdivision Ordinance Chapter. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

III. REGULAR MEETING ITEMS (Continued)

G. ERB ENTRANCE CORRIDOR REVIEWS

2101 JPA Apartments -- 2101 JPA -- ERB design review for new apartment building

Ms. Scala gave the staff report. This is a request for a three-story with basement, four-unit, 16 bedroom apartment unit and rear parking lot for 11 spaces. The applicant was not present for the 11 April meeting; the matter was deferred unanimously with a request: to see a perspective drawing in context, a sample of the over sized brick to be used on the main portion of the building, a cut sheet for the windows, and a change in the foundation to brick rather than the concrete masonry units previously proposed. The applicant is complying with these requests. Nina Barnes of the JPA Neighborhood Association had called staff to express concern about the asymmetry of the roof as depicted in one drawing. The windows will be aluminum clad wood double hung windows, which is preferred. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Emily Novi, of Daggett & Grigg, had nothing to add to the staff report.

Mr. Barton sought clarification that the windows would be two-over-two. Ms. Novi confirmed they would be.

Ms. Lewis wanted to know if the door shown on the subterranean floor was for an outside stairwell. The applicant explained it was a patio door for that unit; there was no stair.

Ms. Lewis asked if there were any samples of the railings that were being erected on the three floors above. She also asked if there were material examples of the doors. Ms. Novi stated the door was by the same manufacturer of the window. Ms. Novi also stated she did not have a sample of the railing. Ms. Scala stated the rails were painted steel; a sketch had been included in the April packet.

With no additional questions, Ms. Firehock called for comments from the Commissioners.

Mr. Farrugio stated his original concern had been with the size of the brick; he was satisfied with the sample of the oversized brick which had been brought in.

Mr. Farrugio moved to approve the Entrance Corridor Certificate of Appropriateness subject to changing the split faced block foundation to unpainted brick to match the garden wall and to ensure aluminum two-over-two windows and aluminum clad doors as well. Ms. Lewis seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis asked the applicant's representative to try to be present when the Commission considered plans of development since this matter had to be deferred from the last meeting since no one was present to answer questions. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

H. SLOPE WAIVER

314, 316 and 318 Valley Road, Extended -- Habitat for Humanity -- six single family attached units

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. This was a slope waiver and a waiver of off street parking for 314 and 316 Valley Road Extended; 318 was pulled from the waiver request due to the BZA's action. The BZA did grant a waiver of variance for the front yard setback to 30 feet on these two lots. The applicant proposes to remove the fill back to the natural slope. As the rocky slope is removed, the slope would move back to the back of the property. City Engineering staff recommends approval because the fill is substandard and does not support very good vegetation; going back to the natural slope would allow for water control as well. Staff recommends approval with the agreement that the back 35 feet of each lot not be disturbed in the construction. The site does not meet the criteria for a waiver of off street parking. Staff recommends denying the application for the parking waiver.

Mr. Fink asked if there would be a common driveway. Mr. Haluska stated his belief that the applicant would be using the existing crossings.

Mr. Overton McGehee, of Habitat for Humanity, stated they were proposing four owner occupied homes to be sold to people who earn between 25 and 60 percent of area median income.

Mr. Steve Driver, of Terra Engineering and Land Solutions, stated they were assisting Habitat for Humanity with the development of these lots. Mr. Driver gave a presentation to the Commission.

Ms. Firehock asked if anything would be done to stabilize the existing pipe crossing since it did not appear to be very well done or safe. Mr. Driver agreed and stated Habitat would dress the area up so it would be a little more aesthetically pleasing. He stated their desire was to do as little as possible since it was a live stream.

Mr. Fink asked if they would be prepared to remove the culverts if City Engineering found they had been installed illegally. Mr. Driver stated he would defer to Habitat on that matter. He stated there had been a meeting with the City Engineer who did not have a problem with the existing culverts. Mr. McGehee stated they would take them out if Engineering said they needed to.

Mr. Farrugio stated this was an opportunity for affordable home ownership that would be very good for the City and that area. Being familiar with the area, he felt there was a need for more parking. He stated putting in a sidewalk along the property up to the guard railing would allow nine spots for parallel parking.

Ms. Firehock stated she had no problem with removing a slope that had rubble fill. Restoring the natural slope would reduce the erosion potential.

Mr. Lynch asked if parallel parking would affect Rock Creek. The applicant stated biofilters were always an option as well as porous pavers.

Ms. Kelley clarified for the Commission that when considering a waiver they should consider whether there is adequate on street parking available -- in its current condition, there was not adequate on street parking available. She stated the applicant was volunteering to improve an area of the public right of way so there would be spaces.

Ms. Lewis moved to approve the off street parking waiver for 314 and 316 Valley Road Extended with the following conditions: one, that the applicant improve the right of way on Valley Road Extended with at least eight parallel parking pads using pervious surface; two, that the applicant plant materials between the parking spaces and their property that are riparian in nature; and that furthermore the parking spaces be located, of course, in the right of way and adjacent to the actual physical current road. Mr. Lucy seconded the motion. Mr. Farrugio considered offering a friendly amendment to allow a ninth parking space; however, a ninth space would block the existing culvert which allows access to and from the site. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Farrugio moved to approve the steep slope waiver for 314 and 316 Valley Road Extended with the conditions set forth in the staff report including the rear 35 foot setbacks. Mr. Fink seconded the motion. Ms. Lewis stated she had appreciated Ms. Firehock's distinction between a natural slope and a man-made landfill rubble slope; not having a copy of the steep slope waiver at hand, she wanted to be sure that would be in the ordinance. Ms. Firehock noted the applicant was improving the grade of the site back to natural conditions. Mr. Higgins called the question. The motion carried unanimously.

I. PRELIMINARY PUD APPLICATION DISCUSSION

"Brookwood" PUD – Brookwood Drive, Raymond Road and Brookwood Lane – 31 single family detached dwelling

Mr. Haluska gave the staff report. The site plan and one part of the subdivision had previously been approved. The applicant met with the neighborhood following the site plan approval and discussed further possibilities for the site. From those discussions, the applicant is proposing to change a section of townhouses to single family detached dwellings. They will need to reduce setbacks to get the units in.

Mr. Fink wanted to know if staff had received any feedback from the neighborhood; they had not.

Mr. Tolbert clarified that the reason for the preliminary review was for the Commissioners to raise any issues to and ask questions of the applicant.

Mr. Frank Ballif and Mr. Charlie Armstrong, of Southern Development, clarified which units would be changed to single units. Mr. Ballif stated this was being done at the request of the neighborhood. He stated they would be losing seven units by doing this.

Mr. Armstrong stated they would be pulling the houses and lots away from the creek. Not only would this increase the buffer, this would also allow the Rivanna Trail to go through open space rather than through any of the lots.

Ms. Firehock suggested doing some creative engineering of the green space so it could still be used as a picnic area, but would also provide filtration. Mr. Armstrong stated they had considered that. He stated that central area was the highest area.

Ms. Firehock, having attended previous Neighborhood Association meetings about Brookwood, was pleased to see this moving in a direction the neighbors wanted as well as the effort to preserve more trees. She wondered if there were some other things they could do with storm water.

Ms. Firehock stated a skinnier sidewalk would be of less impact to the creek. She would not support widening the sidewalk.

Mr. Armstrong stated the neighborhood had asked that they put sidewalks on both sides of Raymond Road. This had been a feasibility issue. He stated they would offer to coordinate the engineering and coordinate the installation if the City was interested in installing this.

J. DEPARTMENT OF NDS/STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Tolbert had no report to give.

In the absence of a report, Ms. Firehock asked if any Commissioners had questions for Mr. Tolbert.

Mr. Farrugio sought confirmation that the project status report for 3 May 2006 showed approximately 569 attached dual units versus 84 single family detached. Mr. Tolbert stated he had not counted them, but had no reason to doubt Mr. Farrugio's math.

Ms. Lewis asked for an update on PODS. Mr. Tolbert stated the information was with Ms. Kelley awaiting her preparation of the ordinance draft.

Mr. Barton sought the status of the Wayfinding issue. Mr. Tolbert stated they had interviewed five consulting firms in order to select a firm to take the work.

Ms. Firehock stated the McGuffey Park plans were proceeding and suggested it be considered for the Wayfinding as well.

K. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. May 23, 2006 -- 5:30 p.m. -- Planning Commission Work Session

2. June 13, 2006 -- 6:30 p.m. -- Planning Commission Regular Meeting

3. June 27, 2006 -- 5:30 p.m. -- Planning Commission Work Session

Ms. Lewis wanted to know what would be covered in the work session on 23 May. Ms. Firehock stated they would discuss the Comprehensive Plan, how to do the Strategic Plan process.

Mr. Fink asked if they would consider, as Mr. Lucy suggested, sitting in on part of the BAR meeting that same evening.

Mr. Barton stated he would be unable to attend on the 23rd.

Mr. Tolbert suggested the Work Session be moved to 30 May. With the Commissioners having no problem with that date, Ms. Firehock stated the Work Session would be held on 30 May.

Mr. Tolbert stated the BAR meeting would be held at 111 East Main Street.

Ms. Lewis expressed her thanks for Ms. Kelley preparing the memo on vested rights.

Ms. Lewis stated Mr. Caravati would be leaving City Council soon. She stated he had served two terms on the Planning Commission. Mr. Fink stated Mr. Caravati had also been on the BAR. Ms. Lewis suggested they do something either as a group or individually to recognize his service. Mr. Higgins stated that between Council, the BAR and CPC, Mr. Caravati had served 20 years.

Mr. Fink moved to adjourn until June 13. Mr. Barton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously whereupon the meeting stood adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Jim Tolbert, Secretary

Updated and Approved by Planning Commission 6/13/06