

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION
TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 2008 -- 5:00 P.M.
NDS CONFERENCE ROOM**

Planning Commissioners present

Mr. Michael Farruggio
Ms. Cheri Lewis
Ms. Genevieve Keller
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Mr. Michael Osteen

Staff Present:

Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Missy Creasy, AICP, Planning Manager
Mr. Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner
Ms. Ebony Walden, Neighborhood Planner
Mr. Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner
Mr. Jim Herndon, GIS/Mapping

The meeting began at 5:05pm.

Multi-zoned Parcels

Mike F. began by noting that the multi-zoned parcels and parking garage items will be taken first. Jim Herndon provided an overview of the history of many of the parcels which have more than one zoning classification. Mike F. noted that there was potential for a situation similar to the Grove Street application for a number of parcels. Gennie was curious to know if design review could be extended to the full parcel if it was present for part of the parcel. It was noted that most of the multi-zoned parcels were not in design review areas and those regulations could only apply where the code noted it was allowable.

Jim noted that if there was a desire to rezone these parcels, in a short time there would be a number of new multi-zoned parcels due to subdivisions. In most situations it was noted that the developer would have to rezone the parcel to create a development. Grove Street is an unusual situation. There was a request to look at setbacks but it was noted that this is not unique to multi-zoned parcels. Cheri noted that the owners of these properties would have difficulties finding lenders for development. She also noted that she would like to have a future discussion about why we have M-I zoning in the City.

Parking Garages

Ebony provided a staff report to the commission. She concluded by noting that there are a number of options for discussion and that the most viable solution could be to require a SUP for stand alone parking garages in some districts to allow for additional oversight. Mike F. noted the difference between landscaped buffers for clarification. There was not consensus that buffers would fully address the concern.

Cheri thought perhaps incentives should be offered to encourage mixed use of the garages. Many commissioners noted that they did not see a down side to allowing stand alone parking garages by SUP in most zones. It was noted that this would create an unknown factor for developers. There further discussion concerning Grandmarc and Grove Street garages. Consensus was that staff propose a parking garage/structure definition and proposal to change the matrix for stand alone parking garages in MI, IC and B3 from by right to SUP. Thanks was given to Ebony for a through response to the garage issue.

Application Review

Subdivision

Cheri noted that she did not recall requesting that all major plats with site plans associated come forward to the commission. She would like to review her notes to outline the discussion. The Commission determined there may be interest in reviewing this in the future.

Steep Slope Waivers

Staff provided an overview of the man made slope consideration. Cheri noted that she thought different criteria could be explored such as % of the site that has slopes, how much of the site to be disturbed has slopes, how much of it has been disturbed in the past and how much of the slope is to be disturbed. If there is only a small amount of disturbance than administrative review may make the most since. She also noted that she is interested in assisting with rewriting the critical slopes ordinance. Applicants feel they need to meet all 4 criteria and most can not. The narrative is not as effective as other measures may be. One criteria for consideration may be if a plan of development is associated as well as evaluations based on the before and after conditions on site. It would be helpful for evaluation criteria to be more objective.

Mike F was interested in having staff review the percentage of slope that was critical for each of the presented applications. Mike O was not confident this was the best measure and Gennie did not want the evaluation to be based on a points system. Cheri noted that it would be great if staff could review some of these administratively. Ebony added that a criteria consideration should be the amount of vegetation on the slope. If a certain amount of vegetation was to be disturbed, then it would need to go to the Commission. Dan noted that this felt more like an art form and difficult to evaluate.

It was noted that staff will look at how the following criteria would have affected the applications in 2006-2007 and bring that information back for additional discussion:

- Percentage of the site that has slopes,
- How much of the site to be disturbed has slopes
- How much of it has been disturbed in the past
- How much of the slope is to be disturbed
- Associated plan of development
- Percentage of slopes with vegetation

Mike F. also felt it would be okay to have man made slopes without vegetation looked at administratively. Gennie felt that an important criterion was the association of a plan of development but Mike O was okay with some sites not having a plan at the time the slope waiver was presented.

Entrance Corridor

After the staff presentation, there was a discussion concerning the King Lumber site and how the BAR looks at design in more detail than the site and many of the preliminary thoughts about the site during the Reids discussion have not been accomplished. Mike F. noted that perhaps a new group should be formed of Commission and BAR members to review Entrance Corridor applications. Discussion continued about the BAR, the Commission and a new committee reviewing the applications. Staff noted that there are staffing constraints on the formation of a new group. It was noted that Mary Joy's attendance at Planning Commission meetings would be replaced with attendance at the new committee meetings.

Commission directed staff to look at the implications for the formation of a separate ERB with potential membership to include Commission and BAR members. Appeals from that group should come to planning Commission but otherwise a report of the outcomes would be forwarded.

PUDs

It was determined by the Commission that all site plans associated with PUDs should come forward to the commission.

Site Plans

The Commission accepted staffs recommendations for thresholds for site plans not associated with other applications to be handle administratively if all the following apply:

- No new land disturbance is taking place
- Six stories or less
- Projects under 43 DUA
- 10,000 square feet or less of commercial space
- No waivers are requested
- No significant impact on low density residential

It was also noted that Commission would be favorable to the option for ERB reviews not associated with new construction to be handled administratively.

Public Comment

It was noted that a step back for parking garages would likely be impractical because of the spacing needed and the SUP process for stand alone parking garages makes since.

The meeting ended at 7:00pm.