

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSESSION

TUESDAY, June 22, 2010 -- 5:00 P.M.

NDS CONFERENCE ROOM

Planning Commissioners present

Mr. Dan Rosensweig

Mr. Jason Pearson

Mr. Mike Osteen

Mr. Kurt Keesecker

Ms. Genevieve Keller

Mr. John Santoski

City Council present

Ms. Kristen Szakos

Ms. Holly Edwards

Mr. S. Huja

Staff Present:

Ms. Missy Creasy, Planning Manager

Ms. Angela Tucker, Development Services Manager

Mr. Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney

The meeting began at 5:00pm.

The order of the agenda was changed to accommodate the schedules of the City Councilors present. A briefing on the status of the CIP was provided and discussion moved to critical slopes. Brian Haluska provided the background and the commissioners asked questions for clarity. Mr. Pearson clarified that the materials he sent in advance of the meeting were to be a synthesis of the options for consideration rather than an additional option. The discussion then focused on the purpose and intent. Ms. Keller noted that a broad statement on ecosystems and special features should be included. Mr. Rosensweig was not convinced this was the correct place to protect green infrastructure. He felt bullets 2 and 4 from the staff's June 14th memo should be used for the purpose and intent. He also noted that "critical" should be identified coherently in the Comprehensive Plan and the ordinance written to protect what we want to protect. Mr. Pearson asked for legal advice on protection of environmental resources. Mr. Harris reiterated the enabling legislation for critical slopes and noted that he would need to look at the environmental question. Mr. Keesecker asked if conditions could be placed on waivers which was answered in the affirmative. Conditions can be placed in addition to the legal requirements. Mr. Pearson asked for input from the commission on the purpose and intent information. Mr. Osteen and Mr. Rosensweig agreed with bullets 1, 2, and 4 while Ms Keller and Mr. Santoski agreed with all but bullet 4. Mr. Pearson noted that the purpose and intent indicates what we would like to achieve. Discussion occurred about additional language to bullet 3 to encompass the appearance and character of a site. It was decided that "character" and "habitat" would be recognized in bullet 3. The discussion on purpose and intent concluded with agreement to keep it broad and make sure that individual criteria address each of the 4 bullet points with the ability to narrow it later. Ms. Szakos commented on the value of cultural and natural history in regards to slopes

Mr. Haluska then oriented commissioners to the potential options for moving forward with the ordinance. Mr. Huja noted that he was in favor of keeping slopes for consideration at the current 25% prior to leaving the meeting. Mr. Pearson clarified his understanding that in a tier process that one tier would be "critical" and the other tier would contain everything else. Mr. Rosensweig noted that he would not support a hard and fast rule based on just a percent of slope, there would need to be criteria involved. He would like additional information on what the ordinance is trying to preserve. Discussion occurred about creating an additional tier for very critical slopes due to concern about changing membership of public bodies. It was noted that each slope deemed "critical" would be reviewed using all criteria and it would be difficult to determine a difference between those two levels. Mr. Pearson asked for input on the following question: Are there areas of the city that should not be disturbed for any reason (meaning no waiver provision should be provided)? All commissioners agreed that there should be a waiver provision for all circumstances. There was interest in having additional criteria to measure areas which were deemed "critical" and these criteria need to be specific and objective so they are easy to interpret.

Public Comment on Critical Slopes

Keith Woodard (Woodard Realty) – Noted that he would support a review of the location of the slope on the site (whether internal to the site or on the edge of the property). He also requested clear guidance on what would be considered a “waterway” under the code.

Jay Waller (representative from the Home Builders Association) - Was encouraged by the discussion in support of clear criteria so developers are aware of the specificity of the regulations.

The discussion then moved to Sidewalk Priorities. Angela Tucker provided an overview of the item through the use of a power point. Mr. Santoski asked how crosswalks linked to this process and that information was provided. Holly Edwards asked how low income areas were addressed in the criteria and that it was an important criteria. Kristen Szakos agreed that both school proximity and low income areas need to be reviewed simultaneously. Mr. Osteen inquired about the leveraging of funds and asked for areas where sidewalks are not needed. Ms. Keller agreed, adding high usage, destination as well as crosswalks to access them and also suggested looking at an on line “walkability index” application. Mr. Rosensweig wanted to make sure to look at links for residential to commercial nodes in addition to income disparity. Mr. Keesecker also wanted to add traffic counts. Mr. Pearson added that he did not like using the school proximity and random input, that there should be a more systematic method of integrating the additional input. He liked the residential to commercial linkage and wanted to also make sure that something is done to address the current listing. Ms. Keller requested that JABA be contacted concerning aging population needs. The work on the process to date was acknowledged and it was noted that any information that could be posted on line would be helpful for public input purposes.

The final agenda topic was the commercial matrix review. Commissioners had been tasked with reviewing materials and providing input to determine what issues needed further discussion and which could move forward as housekeeping issues. This discussion occurred and time was given to provide comments up to one day following the meeting. Agreement was gained on the following: 1. leave convenience stores in B-1 as a use by SUP and 2. No change needed to the private clubs allowances in B-1 at this time. The Commission also agreed with keeping with guidance from the residential review meaning that group housing for all districts will be handled comprehensively at a later time and the educational uses will be updated based on earlier guidance. Mr. Rosensweig wanted to make sure that

consideration for the creation of separate districts for Harris Street and River Road Industrial areas is on the table. He was also interested in looking at more uses by SUP in the Emmett Street Corridor (private clubs, medical office, microbrewery, bowling alley, catering businesses, and small theaters for example). Ms. Keller noted that it might make sense to look at the purpose of B-1 and B-2 and see if that language needed updating.

There was no additional public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 pm.