

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSESSION**

**TUESDAY, February 23, 2010 -- 5:00 P.M.**

**NDS CONFERENCE ROOM**

**Planning Commissioners present**

Mr. Jason Pearson

Mr. Bill Emory

Mr. Mike Osteen

Mr. Dan Rosensweig

Mr. John Santoski

Mr. Kurt Keesecker

**Staff Present:**

Ms. Missy Creasy, Planning Manager

Mr. Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner

Ms. Kathy McHugh, Housing Specialist

Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney

Ms. Mary Joy Scala, Preservation Planner

Jason Pearson opened the meeting at 5:00pm. Mary Joy Scala provided an overview of the entrance corridor guideline process. She noted that it would be helpful for the commission to talk about the scope of revisions and then determine the process. Mr. Pearson asked if this would be the time to consider additional corridors. It was noted that could be a recommendation and it could be addressed following the guideline review. There was a discussion about how this review fits into the development review process. The current process is outlined in the code but the guidelines should be updated to reflect that process. Dan Rosensweig asked staff if there were areas of concern that they wanted

highlighted. Ms. Scala noted that the principles meet the intent but she has some concern with the specific corridor guidelines. Mike Osteen expressed concern with principle relating to masking the utilitarian. It was determined that should be reworded to provide flexibility for incorporating the utilitarian into the design where appropriate. Kurt Keesecker noted that additional examples throughout the guidelines of preserving natural character would be a benefit. He also mentioned that references to the tree preservation manual and day lighting stream guidelines would be important. Mr. Keesecker highlighted 34-368 in the zoning ordinance as potential language to consider for entrance corridor districts.

Mr. Pearson asked the Commission if the format and schedule proposed was workable and if they were okay with doing work independently and submitting comments. Commissioners agreed. They also requested that a public participation similar to that for the zoning matrix be integrated into the process. Mr. Rosensweig asked why 5 years was set as the timeframe for review. It was noted that would be a logical time period to work with the guidelines to discover if any changes are warranted. Mr Osteen thought this timeframe made sense due to his experience in using the guidelines. Mr. Pearson felt the comments submitted would reflect the level of review that would need to be undertaken more will be known as the process moves forward.

The meeting then moved to discussion of the zoning matrix. Missy Creasy provided an overview of where the process left off and noted that since we missed the Feb 9, 2010 meeting that the Matrix 101 presentation would take place at the March 9<sup>th</sup> regular meeting so we would have it recorded and that tonight would be the opportunity to categorize the proposed changes in the residential matrix. This would put the discussion back on the schedule outlined last month. Commissioners agreed on that process. Discussion began by categorizing the list of proposed changes.

#### Additional Discussion needed

Accessory Apartment changes – Dan

Convent/monastery - as well as definition discussion

Private Clubs – Jason

Property Management offices – Dan was okay in MHP but concerned about the other proposed changes

No Discussion needed

Accessory structures in MHP, adult assisted living, Adult daycare, criminal justice, home occupation, residential treatment in high density, Laundromats, libraries, government buildings

In addition to those presented by staff, commissioners noted additional items for inclusion:

Bill Emory reminded the group of concern with the boarding house definition

Mr. Rosensweig noted that the B&B allowances were changed by Council to not allow them by SUP in low density residential. He would like to discuss in context of a the full review

Mr. Emory noted that no unrelated allowance is noted for MHP

Mr. Keesecker noted that daycare and universities are by SUP in residential areas but Elementary and High Schools are by right. The impacts are similar so should they all be by SUP.

Mr. Keesecker also noted that there should be an allowance for daycare in MHP

John Santoski noted there was no allowance for utility lines in MHP and that should be added.

Mr. Keesecker noted that he did not see any concern with moving forward with all requests for changes to MHP as noted by staff and the commission tonight. To recap those changes they were okay with #16, 52, 61-64 as proposed by staff and added by right allowance for 3 and 4 unrelated, day care and utility lines. All commissioners felt these could move forward.

With time remaining in the work session, the commissioners move forward with the discussion of individual items.

Accessory Apartment changes – Ms. Creasy recapped the discussion that occurred in January about this item. Mr Pearson noted that he felt it would be a way to educate the public on the requirements for internal accessory apartments. He noted an example in his neighborhood where additional education may have been helpful. It was noted that this was an item the Commission wanted to talk about at the regular meeting to assist in educating people about the requirements.

Bed and Breakfast – Mr. Rosensweig noted that there were areas of the City where the PC felt that a B&B could be appropriate in a low density residential area. That is why they recommended these by SUP. Council changed that in the approved version and he would like to discuss that again in the context of this review.

\*resources needed for discussion – PC staff report and minutes, Council staff report and minutes

Boarding House/Convent and Monasteries – Mr. Emory reminded the group about Ms. Keller’s concern about the boarding house definition. He suggested that perhaps there should be review of limiting the number of people who may reside in these units. Mr. Pearson noted that there are a number of uses that fall under group housing and there is concern about those definitions and what they look like. It would make sense to have a discussion about all of these including definitions and parking requirements. The Commission agreed to put the discussion of all group housing on hold until after this process occurs and look at it holistically in a separate process.

Private Clubs – Mr Pearson noted that this should be discussed because there may be times when this is appropriate. Staff noted that through the SUP the impacts could be addressed but clubs could change hands to different groups without going through any additional process if the group was following the approval. Commissioners were leaning toward staff recommendation but first wanted to know if any SUP’s had been issued for private clubs in low density residential areas.

Schools – Mr. Keesecker felt schools and daycares should be treated the same. After a brief discussion on the possibility of different regulations for public and private schools, it was determined that the

impacts are similar and that Elementary schools and High Schools should be by SUP to mirror daycare and universities.

Property Management – Mr. Rosensweig noted that he could see situations where property management could be by ancillary use in R-2 and R-2U. He mentioned the Longwood Drive development. Prior to the PUD designation, it could have been useful to have this use on site due to the number of units. Discussion occurred about whether it would be feasible to have that use limited to only that site or would people from other developments be driving in to drop off rent checks. Ms. Creasy outlined recent discussions about model homes and how that was to be handled. It was noted that consideration of property management in R-2 and R-2U by SUP might be an option.

The meeting ended at 7pm.