

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
"A World Class City"

Department of Neighborhood Development Services

City Hall Post Office Box 911
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
Telephone 434-970-3182
Fax 434-970-3359
www.charlottesville.org



August 14, 2012

**TO: Charlottesville Planning Commission, Neighborhood Associations &
News Media**

Please Take Notice

A Work Session of the Charlottesville Planning Commission will be held on **Tuesday August 28, 2012, 2012 at 5:00 p.m. in the NDS Conference Room in City Hall (610 East Market Street).**

AGENDA

1. Discussion of potential Joint City/County Comprehensive Plan Goals – Community Facilities, Economic Development and Housing
2. Public Comment – 15 minutes

cc: City Council
Maurice Jones
Aubrey Watts
Jim Tolbert
Neighborhood Planners
Melissa Thackston, Kathy McHugh
Mary Joy Scala
Craig Brown, Rich Harris

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES



MEMORANDUM

To: Charlottesville Planning Commission
From: Missy Creasy, Planning Manager and Summer Frederick, Project Manager
Date: August 21, 2012, 2012
Re: August 28, 2012 Work Session on Potential Joint City/Council Goals

As discussed at the City/County Joint Planning Commission meeting, held on April 17, 2012, the Livability Project (the Project) has completed its first series of public workshops, whose purpose was to solicit community input on existing Comprehensive Plan goals. The Project's next phase includes both Planning Commissions working on several issues that have been identified as appropriate for the creation of joint goals. In order to have the most productive conversation possible at the next City/County Joint Planning Commission, Project staff is facilitating conversations focused on the identified issues with each Planning Commission, separately, over the course of the summer months.

The first meeting in this series was held on June 26, 2012. The following topic areas were discussed – Historic Preservation, Entrance Corridors, and Environmental Resources.

The second meeting was held on July 24, 2012 Planning Commission Work Session. The topics of Land Use and Transportation were addressed.

The third, and final meeting will be held on August 28, 2012, and the following topics will be discussed – Economic Development, Community Facilities with a focus on Parks and Recreation, and Housing.

Relevant background information relating to each topic includes the following (most located at <http://www.1-community.org/events.asp>):

- Public Workshop Posters with existing relevant City Comprehensive Plan goals;
- Public Workshop Summary Brief;
- Public Workshop comment transcriptions;
- Livable Communities Project Common Land Use & Transportation Map (http://www.1-community.org/?page_id=29); and,
- Joint City/County Planning Commission meeting memos (attached).

To help guide discussion, Project staff has compiled the information below on each of the three topic areas.

While reading this information, please keep in mind the following questions:

1. Are there any themes missing?
2. What specific issues are encompassed within these themes?
3. Are there further areas for the City and County to work together to create common comprehensive plan goals?

Economic Development

The City and County have similar goals, but some different objectives and strategies.

Similar Goals

- Targeting the same industries (with the exception of agri-business)
- Promoting tourism
- Participating in regional economic development
- Supporting start-up companies

Different Objectives

City

- Increasing the number of service jobs
- Promoting redevelopment of properties
- Expanding the downtown economic hub
- Increasing small business development

County

- Maintaining a diversified, sustainable economy, including opportunities for light industrial and strong agribusiness sector
- Working within the County's growth management policy

Benefits which the City and County provide each other include:

- County's commercial development helps to provide service sector jobs for Charlottesville residents
- City redevelopment activities help take pressure off of expanding the Development Areas
- City's downtown mall and County's rural areas provide benefits to residents of both localities

Areas City and County already work together:

- TJPED work
- Producing joint marketing materials based on a common message of community assets and attributes
- Cross referrals
- Joint presentations to state agencies, utilities, and prospects
- Providing opportunities for workforce development to further career opportunities and higher wages
- Supporting retention and expansion of existing businesses

Future ways in which the City and County could work together:

- County designation of technology corridors which lead into City technology corridors
- Taking a collaborative strategic approach towards shared assets/resources like the Rivanna River
- Continue to encourage multi-modal connections between the jurisdictions that link attractive amenities with residential and employment areas

Community Facilities - Parks and Recreation

The City and County have similar goals, but some different objectives and strategies.

Similar Goals

- Providing parks and recreational facilities that benefit the whole community
- Creating balance and accessibility for all types of parks and facilities
- Providing recreational programs for children and adults
- Promoting cost-efficiency in parks and recreational facilities
- Enhancing and upgrading existing facilities
- Adequately maintaining facilities
- Having trails through parks and natural areas and connections with the other locality's trails
- Partnering with the private sector to provide amenities for the community

Different Objectives

City

- Having public neighborhood parks and swimming pools
- Having parks standards that are individualized for City parks
- Developing and implementing program standards for core programs that include strong education and family ethics

County

- Having large rural parks and natural areas in the Rural Areas with public swimming opportunities
- Locating most public parks and recreational facilities (field space) in the Development Areas at public schools
- Encouraging private park and recreational facilities within residential and mixed-use developments
- Striving to use consistent parks standards throughout the County

Benefits which the City and County provide each other include:

- Greenways that connect the County to the City
- Service to the entire community

- Partnerships with programs and events which allow for non-duplication of specialized activities, such as the McIntire Skate Park

Areas City and County already work together:

- Co-sponsoring of programs
- Joint ownership of Darden Towe Park and Ivy Creek Natural Area

Future ways in which the City and County could work together:

- Taking a collaborative strategic approach towards shared assets/resources like the Rivanna River
- Continue to encourage multi-modal connections between the jurisdictions that link attractive amenities with residential and employment areas
- Increase the number of co-sponsored programs and joint building of facilities to expand recreational opportunities
- Regular meetings among staff of both localities to collaborate in more joint program opportunities.
- Create more linkages between City and County facilities.

Housing Policies and Initiatives

The City and County have similar goals, but some different objectives and strategies.

Similar Goals

- Have safe, decent, and sanitary housing for all residents
- Have affordable units in the urban areas
- Have a variety of housing types and affordability options
- Assist people with securing rental housing and authorized to have rental Housing Choice voucher programs (CRHA manages in the City)
- Have standing housing committees to provide feedback and input on housing policies and initiatives
- Have a proffer policy which strongly supports provision of affordable housing with new residential development approved as part of a rezoning.
- Have knowledge of affordable units through vouchers and proffered units

Different Objectives

City

- By Virginia Code, Charlottesville Redevelopment and Housing Authority exists to provide subsidized (public) housing.
- Maintaining information on existing affordable units by type of support mechanism
- Maintaining information on the level of housing need in the City
- Annual allocation to CIP for Charlottesville Housing Fund
- Majority of new affordable units the result of direct financial support both local and federal

County

- Majority of new affordable units are the result of proffers

Benefits which the City and County provide each other include:

- Interagency agreement (regional) which allows any voucher holder from any locality under the agreement to use that voucher in any of the other localities that are party to the agreement
- Assistance with inspections and rent comparability analysis for the Housing Choice voucher program
- Professional working relationship to collaborate and share ideas and best practices across jurisdictions

Areas City and County already work together:

- County housing staff and CRHA staff often share information re. rental assistance
- CRHA does required quality control inspections for the County and vice-versa
- City and County staff are included in each other's housing committee distribution lists.
- Involvement in the TJPDC's Housing Director's Council which meets monthly to
 - Discuss housing issues
 - Share information that may help others
 - Oversee federal HOME funds allocating them to priority projects on a rotational basis

Future ways in which the City and County could work together:

- Focus on maintaining affordable housing information (i.e. funding sources, available stock type, etc) in a consistent manner to facilitate ease of information sharing.

Planning Commission Joint Work session
City of Charlottesville Planning Commission/Albemarle County Planning
Commission
March 22, 2011
Minutes

City of Charlottesville Commissioners present:

Mr. Jason Pearson (Chairman)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Genevieve Keller
Ms. Lisa Green
David Neuman (UVA Architect-Ex –Officio)

Not Present:

Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Mr. Michael Osteen
Mr. John Santoski

City of Charlottesville Staff Present:

Missy Creasy
Brian Haluska
Richard Harris
Michael Smith
Ebony Walden
Deronda Eubanks

Albemarle County Commissioners present:

Don Franco
Calvin Morris
Linda Porterfield
Tom Loach
Duane Zobrist (Chairman)
Mac Lafferty
Julia Montieth, Ex-Officio

Albemarle County Staff Present:

Wayne Cilimberg
David Benish

Also present:

Stephen Williams (Executive Director-TJPDC)
Summer Fredericks (TJPDC)

Mr. Pearson convened the meeting at 6:30pm.

Mr. Pearson turned the meeting over to Ms. Creasy. She gave an overview of the purpose of the meeting and asked for a round of introductions. Ms. Creasy then turned the meeting over to Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams gave an overview of the purpose of the Grant and what items will be focused on in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that there are 5 issues of focus and stated that other agencies would provide input on certain issues such as, outreach, data analysis, research and mapping.

Mr. Williams stated that the Grant will have some basic focus such as Housing, Transportation, Environment and Economy.

Ms. Frederick gave the date, time and place of the first public kickoff event, which will be April 27th from 3-7pm at the Albemarle County Office Building.

Both the City and County would like their Plans to be available online in a searchable format.

Commissioners wanted both plans to be coordinated.

Mr. Keesecker wanted to know more about UVA's role in the grant and the role of other parties.

Mr. Williams stated that UVA is a partner and collaborator.

The City and County would like some focus to be on city/county edges such as the Rivanna River, MJH, 29 North and the Woolen Mills area. They would also like Entrance Corridors and their linages to growth areas in the County reviewed.

Mr. Pearson would like larger areas looked at for the plan to see what barriers we may face.

Mr. Lafferty wanted to know about coordination of planning with Jaunt, CAT and UTS.

Ms. Montieth would like natural areas looked at.

Mr. Benish stated that the performance measurements are valuable and that we are not relying on outside agencies to write the plan.

Mr. Pearson sees the potential for a shared vision between the city and county.

Mr. Lafferty would like the goals of the city and county looked at and see where they match up.

Ms. Keller proposed coordination on the city/county edges – particularly Woolen Mills, Pantops 29N/Hydraulic and physical planning solutions.

Mr. Pearson noted that 29 North, downtown and the UVA form a concentration of development which is the "L shape" area of density and the center of the community. He feels the Rivanna River should have a more active role in the community.

Ms. Green would like to see focus on transportation and trails. Mr. Lafferty agreed.

Mr. Morris would like some focus on the pedestrian bridge across the Rivanna River.

Mr. Pearson asked for Public Comment.

Tom Olivia, of the Piedmont Sierra Club, was pleased to see the goals. The club is really looking forward to this and would like to see natural areas addressed in the discussion.

Mr. Pearson closed Public Comment.

Mr. Pearson asked for any more comments. There were no additional comments.

The meeting adjourned at 8:00pm

JOINT MEMORANDUM

To: County of Albemarle and City of Charlottesville Planning Commissions
From: Elaine Echols and Missy Creasy
Date: July 14, 2011
Re: Joint Planning Commission Meeting – August 16, 2011 – Livability Project and Community Comprehensive Planning

Since the March 22, 2011 joint work session, staff has done significant work towards supporting the grant products as well as kicking off the Comprehensive Plan updates. At the August meeting, we will provide you with an overview of those activities as well as gain your feedback on next steps.

Joint City/County Community issues

At the March meeting, Commissioners provided staff with a number of issues to review as part of this process. Those items are listed below with a brief explanation as to the anticipated way they will be addressed in the process. Commissioners are asked to review this information and provide confirmation that these items are reflective of the March conversation and provide any feedback.

- The Rivanna River – *This will be discussed as part of the environmental session and the land use session to include study of the land uses on each side of the River to establish how the river relates to city and county land use.*
- Neighborhoods/amenities that straddle City/Co. line – *To be reviewed as part of the common future land use map.*
- Vision shared by both the County and the City. Show where city/county goals line up – *This will be presented by topic at the community meetings. A comprehensive searchable database of community goals is being developed as part of the grant and will be available later in the process.*
- ECs and linkages to growth areas – *Entrance corridors will be introduced in the Land use discussion and explored further in the Preservation public meeting.*
- L-shaped study area – 29 from North of City going south and east to include part of Pantops - *The Common Land Use map will allow for analysis of this concept.*
- Multi-modal coordination – *This will be addressed in a number of the public sessions but in most depth at the Transportation session.*
- Plans should be searchable on-line – *We intend to do this.*
- Land Use by geography: City for development/Co. for preservation – *Education will be provided to assure that community members understand the County growth areas. The common future land use map will provide guidance for discussion at various community sessions.*

Workshops held to date

Two public events have been held to date in association with this project. Materials provided at that event are located at <http://www.1-community.org/events.asp>. Members of the public took the opportunity to comment on materials at the events, at follow up events and have access to on line commenting opportunities. Comments received from each of those events have been organized and are included in your packet for review. As you review the materials, please prepare to identify issues that you feel the Commissions should explore further.

Public Input Process

The first round of the public input process will begin in September 2011 and include monthly workshops through March/April 2012. Meeting format will include a repeating one hour schedule from 4-7 pm with time allotted to review informational posters and hear a short overview presentation by staff followed by a Q&A period. The proposed meeting schedule and meeting format is included in your packet. These workshops are intended to educate the public about existing City & County policies relevant to each Comprehensive Plan topic area and obtain feedback about whether or not these policies adequately address current and future community needs. Commonalities in policies between the jurisdictions will be highlighted and questions posed regarding these linkages. We will capture this input by multiple written formats at the workshops and using online resources.

At the conclusion of this meeting series, staff is recommending that the Planning Commissions hold a joint meeting to review the input and take additional input from the public. That will provide an additional opportunity for members of the public to give input. Staff recommends that 3 minutes be provided for each speaker to accommodate as many speakers as possible, unless the commissions would like to provide additional time.

Preview of Public Input Meeting Series Material

At the August meeting, staff will provide you with a preview of the material on Greenways that will be used at the first public input meeting. In advance of that meeting and presentation, we are asking that you review the attached materials to provide direction to staff.

Commissioner assignments for the August 16, 2011 meeting

1. Review joint city county issues and be prepared to provide feedback
2. Review the comments from previous public meetings. Identify any issues you feel should be explored further by the Commissions.
3. Provide comments on the meeting format. Are we on the correct path concerning the meeting structure? Will this format be productive? What are we missing?

If you have limited time for review prior to the meeting, it is requested that you focus your efforts on materials related to the public forums first to be followed by review of the performance measurement materials.

Next Joint City County Planning Commission meeting: September 20 in the Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room in City Hall.

Attachments:

Attachment A: March 22, 2011 meeting notes <http://www.charlottesville.org/Index.aspx?page=3033>

Attachment B: April 27, 2011 Kickoff meeting comments

Attachment C: June 23, 2011 Performance Measurement meeting comments

Attachment D: Performance Measurement Posters (these are available on line. Please contact staff if you would like paper copies)

Attachment E: Where are we NOW? – Performance Measurement meeting handout

Attachment F: Many Plans One Community Fall meeting schedule and format

Attachments B-E are available at <http://www.1-community.org/events.asp>

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
JOINT CITY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
TUESDAY, August 16, 2011 -- 6:00 P.M.
County Office Building, Room 241

The Joint County/City Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Calvin Morris, Vice Chair– County and Genevieve Keller, Chair– City.

- Other County Commissioners present were Mr. Smith, Ms. Porterfield, Mr. Lafferty, Mr. Loach, Mr. Franco and Ms. Monteith (UVA Architect – Ex-officio). Mr. Zobrist was absent.
- Other City Commissioners present were Jon Santoski, Dan Rosensweig, Natasha Sienitsky, Lisa Green, and David Neuman (UVA Architect – Ex-officio). Kurt Keesecker and Michael Osteen were absent.
- City staff present were Missy Creasy, Richard Harris, Michael Smith and Willy Thompson.
- Summer Frederick and Matthew Weaver with Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission were present.
- County staff present were Wayne Cilimberg, Elaine Echols, Andy Sorrell, Greg Kamptner, and Sharon Taylor.

A review of the March 2011 Joint Work Session took place along with an update of activities which have occurred since that time. The citizen participation workshop schedule for the fall was reviewed and staff presented the greenways portion of the meeting in order to obtain input on the presentation material. The following sections indicate comments from Commission members during the meeting:

Comments following staff presentation for City/County

1. Look at City and County goals side-by-side to see how they line up or don't. Do this first.
2. Have City and County define and agree to the goals and objectives as early as possible in the project.
3. Make sure you have the right performance indicators to measure success of existing goals. Add performance measures as you can.
4. Identify trails that would likely never be built so that decision-makers can decide whether those trails should be included in the plan.
5. Provide for prioritization of projects.
6. Show where the land use plan comes into conflict with existing zoning that may prohibit trails and such uses from being realized.

For the Workshop

1. Show County Development Area boundaries on maps and include the Village of Rivanna.
2. Add landmarks and some street names to the map to help people better orient themselves.
3. Have a “context map” – one at a different scale than the up-close ones.
4. Differentiate between existing and proposed trails.
5. If you are showing side-by-side goals at the workshop, don't put the entire list of goals on the page. Provide a manageable number or “uber” goals for comparison. The public can't effectively provide feedback on long lists.
6. Have series of maps where similar items are clustered together to illustrate a topic, such as steep slopes with streams and parks with greenways, etc.
7. Goals and objectives should be reflected on the maps. For example, if the goal is to “promote significant natural or man-made corridors” identify the significant natural or man-made corridors on the map.

8. De-emphasize the roads.
9. Show conservation easements.
10. Provide a laptop computer for people to type in comments.
11. Have maps illustrate how well goals and objectives are currently met. For example, if linking the parks with greenways is done or already planned, show it.
12. Help ensure that the public knows that they did not need to stay for the entire length of the 3 hour workshops, just 1 hour.
13. Comment from Commissioner after the meeting: enlarge the “up-close” map even more to help people better orient themselves.
14. Comment from Commissioner after the meeting: when you are getting input from the public, make sure you have them write down enough information to understand what they are saying. Post-it notes don’t always convey what a person is really trying to say. Usually more clarifying language is needed to understand what was intended.

For the on-line version of maps and information

1. Put the maps on the county’s online GIS website and continue to provide on-line opportunities for comment.
2. Provide longitude and latitude for use with Google Earth. See if you can get the Google Earth function to work on the City/County maps that are put on-line.

The following public comment was received

Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, agreed with some of the points brought up with regard to goals and data being critically important. It is a question of chicken and egg and the need to have the data to go towards the goals. As he sees the process moving forward, it seems they are coming to meetings that seem to be planning meetings. He was concerned that he did not hear the discussion of the goals. There should be a substantive discussion because they have 67 pages of goals in Albemarle County. There are probably about 35 to 45 pages of goals in the Charlottesville. The community needs to have that high level discussion early rather than later to be able to understand both the Sustainability Grant and what they are trying to achieve.

The discussion adjourned at 7:30pm.

Charlottesville and Albemarle County Planning Commissions
Joint Work session
April 17, 2012
Notes

Charlottesville Commissioners Present:

Ms. Genevieve Keller (Chairperson)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Lisa Green
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky
Mr. David Neuman

Albemarle Commissioners Present

Mr. Calvin Morris (Chairperson)
Mr. Ed Smith
Mr. Richard Randolph
Mr. Bruce Dotson
Mr. Mac Lafferty
Mr. Tom Loach
Mr. Don Franco

Charlottesville Staff Present:

Jim Tolbert
Missy Creasy
Richard Harris
Michael Smith

Albemarle Staff Present:

Wayne Cilimberg
Lee Catlin
Elaine Echols
Ron White
Andy Sorrell

TJPDC Staff:

Steve Williams
Amanda Burbage
Matt Weaver
Summer Frederick

Ms. Keller and Mr. Morris convened the meeting at 6:00 p.m. and turned the time to Steve Williams, Director of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission and staff for the Livability Project provided a “big picture” view of how the four planning efforts are being worked on at the same time: City Comprehensive Plan, County Comprehensive Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and the Livability Project.

Amanda Burbage provided an overview of the workshops and conclusions from those workshops for environment, transportation, land use, economic development, entrance corridors, and housing. The Commissioners provided feedback and noted the following conclusions: there was a general desire to make sure that there is sufficient community representation in the identification of the issues that are important to the community, there appears to be underrepresentation of the full-spectrum of the citizenry, especially senior citizens and several suggestions were made on how to increase public input or confirm that the input truly represents a cross-section of the community.

Missy Creasy reminded the Commissions of the agreements to date on areas to study together: environment, transportation, and land use. She noted the recent regional Target Industry work that is providing for joint economic development efforts and that staff is still working on entrance corridor issues.

Elaine Echols reviewed the County’s Housing goals and Kathy McHugh provided a presentation on the City’s housing programs. Summer Frederick presented the current housing indicators for the City and County. She took comments from the Commissions on their thoughts about the indicators as well as observations about the programs. Commissioners commented on a variety of issues including, green building, housing availability and type and housing affordability. It was noted that some developers try to “buy their way out” of affordable housing and there is interest in having mixed income on sites rather than separation. It was noted that tax assessments do not link with “affordability” of a unit and that should be addressed. Discussion on aging housing stock as well as units that still do not have adequate plumbing and kitchen facilities occurred.

After the Commissions concluded their comments, Cal Morris, Chair of the Albemarle County Planning Commission opened the floor for public comment. Comments were received from the following seven individuals.

1. **Charles Winkler** – City resident representing the Jefferson Area Tea Party. Thanked the staff for the opportunity to attend and provide public comment at the workshops. Would like the opportunity for partner groups to review and comment on the final deliverable that contains public input before it is finalized. Also stated that the meetings were self-selective and those that attended were people who had a particular interest in the workshop topic. Commented that categories of comments need to be attached to the question to tie those comments to the line item on the poster.
2. **Charles Battig** – Stated that nothing he said was to criticize people. Stated that sustainability and livability are found in the 1998 sustainability accords. Population distribution is based on racial components and diversity is not well represented on councils and boards. Stated that the questions are stacked based on the existing plans. Stated that what has been missing from the conversation is a discussion of costs, and cost effectiveness and property rights. Communities with the highest amount of regulations also have the highest problems with unemployment and a lack of manufacturing.
3. **Edward Strickler** – Thanked staff for engaging in the process and using the community to help gather diverse comments.
4. **Scott Bandy** - Disagreed that bike lanes should be designated anything other than for recreational purposes (such as a means of transportation). Felt it was inappropriate to conduct the transportation workshop right before Mia Burke spoke because that likely stacked the comments in favor of bike advocates.
5. **Nancy Carpenter** – Living wages are needed for affordable housing especially from large employers like UVA.
6. **Dave Reddins** – City resident – Appreciates the One Community project and its outreach efforts. Stated that he does use his bike for transportation riding 40 miles a week. Would like to see more bike lanes and bike paths. Suggested options for co-housing with seniors so they can remain in their homes while a younger couple lives there too and helps maintain the home.
7. **Morgan Butler** – Southern Environmental Law Center – Thanked staff for the work that has been done so far. Stated that affordable housing has a transportation component and there is a need to recognize the overlap. Development patterns affect connections to other modes of transportation which effects affordability. Also stated that an affordability indicator is the percentage of household income that goes to transportation.

Next steps – Elaine Echols summarized the conclusions of the Albemarle County Planning Commissioners concerning public input. Generally there is a desire to make sure that there is enough community representation on the issues that are important to the community. There appears to be underrepresentation of the full spectrum especially senior citizens. Project staff needs to find a way to test whether we have an accurate representation of community opinion and desires. One suggestion was that the final product be taken out to the community for response to see if we captured the important community issues. Another idea was to take the results of the workshops out to community groups. A third idea was to have a survey (representing a cross-section of the community) to make sure we got the public opinion portion correct in relation to the goals and priorities.

Ms. Echols stated that next steps would be for Summer Frederick to work with the commissions individually over the summer on potential joint goals before bringing the commissions back together sometime in the fall.

It was the consensus of the Albemarle County Commissioners that they preferred to discuss housing issues in-house before coming together with the City again to discuss housing and it was recommended that city housing resources might be helpful for those conversations.

Meeting adjourned at 8:07 PM.