

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSESSION

TUESDAY, November 27, 2007 -- 5:00 P.M.

NDS CONFERENCE ROOM

Planning Commissioners present

Mr. Bill Lucy (Chairman)

Mr. Michael Farruggio (Vice-Chairman)

Ms. Cheri Lewis

Mr. Michael Osteen

Ms. Genevieve Keller

Staff Present:

Ms. Missy Creasy, AICP, Planning Manager

Ms. Amy Kilroy, Grants Coordinator

Mr. Brian Haluska, AICP, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner

Ms. Leslie Beauregard, Budget Manager

Mr. Ryan Davidson, Budget Analyst

Ms. Ebony Walden, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney

The meeting was called to order at 5:00pm.

The work session began with a presentation from the budget office on the CIP.

Gennie Keller asked about the inclusion of a state grant from the schools. Leslie noted that it was uncertain if that grant would be received and therefore it was not included in the budget at this time.

Mike Farruggio asked how the amount of 24 million compared to other locality's CIP. Leslie noted that it was based on percentage of the budget as well as the cost of bonds, affect on debt service and if this was in line with other localities.

Mike F. also asked if the 1.5 million for the Fontaine fire station road was the entire cost of the project or if other entities would be including funds. Staff noted that they would find out details. He further expressed concern that UVA associated projects including South Lawn and Valley Road closure did not include items that the City desired and that that awareness should be present with this project.

Cheri Lewis requested details about the lump sum provided for facilities and buildings. This info will be forwarded to them. Mike F. followed up with a question pertaining to the amounts given to the schools and city buildings for projects and staff reviewed the current procedure. Mike Osteen noted that he would be interested in seeing the square footage of city and school buildings to understand funding. Mike F. wanted to be sure that balanced funding was provided for other city owned buildings.

Gennie asked how buildings were evaluated for maintenance. Leslie noted that information could be provided.

Cheri asked what amount was expended for economic development. She was interested in amount for the last 5 years. Leslie noted that information could be made available. Cheri also asked where the proffer funds for Biscuit Run would show up in reference to the Old Lynchburg Road project. Leslie noted that since the proffer funds will not be available for a while, they can not be included at this time.

The presentation continued to the Parks budget where Mike F. noted that we need to continue to acquire property for parks to serve community needs long term. Leslie noted that this is still a priority but this is not the best time due to other needed expenditures.

The presentation concluded and the commission continued with questions.

Bill Lucy noted that he had talked with the School CIP committee about green roofs for the pending school replacements. He noted that staff told him that they had not considered them due to cost and feasibility. Bill noted that green roof technology is under research at Penn State and that will be a great resource for future application. Mike O. noted that roof retrofits can be really difficult and that green roofs made more sense for new applications. The Commission agreed that the City should have one point of contact for these technologies.

Bill asked about the status of the Fire services agreement with the County. Leslie noted that it did not appear positive for a continuance of that agreement. Mike F. further asked if the Fontaine site for the fire station made sense if that was the case. Bill asked the implications of moving this project back a year. Leslie noted that additional info could be obtained.

Under transportation and access, Bill asked if the ITS notation included the intelligent bus stop program. It was felt that it did not include that but a status on the bus project would be obtained.

Cheri asked for additional details on the wayfinding program. There was discussion about using Economic Development surplus to pay for this as well as additional parkland.

There was interest in additional details on the tree preservation plan and what amount of planting would be promoted as a part of it.

Bill noted that he was concern about utilities. There was discussion about the timing of setting the rates for utilities and how that links to the budget process. Bill noted his main concerns are assuring adequate utilities to serve development and cost controls and tax implications. Leslie noted that additional information on this will be acquired. It was noted that the rates do tend to increase every year and will likely do so this year.

Cheri asked for clarification on the amount of funds put towards CAHIP. Leslie explained the funding methodology.

Bill observed that few projects did not get funded. He wondered how effective the ranking process is. Leslie noted it was helpful to understand the applications but is likely not the best way to go. Many projects that did not rank as high are important to the city and will move forward. It might be an option to only have new projects go through a ranking process. Cheri noted that there could be concerns with that since checks and balances could be lost. Bill noted that a few categories on the ranking sheet did not make much of a difference in the rankings. He further asked for information on what constituted a legal mandate and was provided some information on that topic. Mike F. recommended forming a committee to review the ranking system to address concerns. Mike O. thought it would be helpful to add categories to the final chart noting what was funded and non-funded and the amounts funded.

The Commission moved to a review of the draft proffer policy. Richard Harris presented an overview. Cheri requested copies of other localities policies. There was discussion about the creation of a work group to assist developers and staff with the worksheet. There were also suggestions of categories missing in the draft. Gennie want do make sure that the citizens were a part of this process. The information should also contain a notation that though proffers are in discussion that the rezoning may not be approved. Due to the number of comments voiced and submitted, this item will be removed from the December agenda for consideration in January following an additional work session.

Mr. Farruggio asked about the possibility of reallocating money from Economic Development to park land purchasing for Economic Development.

At 6:55 the commission entered into closed session. The closed session concluded at 7:35.

The meeting adjourned at 7:36pm.