

CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE

PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSESSION

TUESDAY, July 27, 2010 -- 5:00 P.M.

NDS CONFERENCE ROOM

Planning Commissioners present

Mr. Dan Rosensweig

Mr. Mike Osteen

Mr. Kurt Keesecker

Ms. Genevieve Keller

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, Director

Ms. Missy Creasy, Planning Manager

Mr. Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Brian Haluska, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney

Mr. Mike Smith, Planning Assistant

The meeting began at 5:10pm.

The meeting began with Jim Tolbert providing an overview of the mixed use corridors with the use of a power point presentation. Commissioners ask questions and provided comments through the presentation as follows:

- Ms. Keller asked if this would be a time to change the intent listed for each corridor classification. It was noted that the intent of the area should be correct prior to addressing any changes to the uses in each category. If this concern is just in reference to making the language for each corridor similar, that can be done.
- Concerning the Cherry Avenue Corridor, Ms Keller noted that an addition to the intent of this corridor should be added to reflect minimizing conflicts between pedestrians and auto uses. Mr. Tolbert noted that this was appropriate, especially if the commission supports shrinking the corridor to just the area on Roosevelt Brown and Cherry Avenue.
- In reference to High Street Corridor and North downtown areas, there needs to be language to address Martha Jefferson Hospital
- Ms. Keller would like to make sure that alternative modes of transportation are noted in the intent of the Urban Corridor.

Mr. Tolbert concluded the overview noting that he felt there were two major land use issues for consideration: Martha Jefferson Hospital properties and potential UVA student population growth.

Dan Rosensweig noted that in 2007, the Torri Gallas materials were not included in the Comprehensive plan revision and he wanted to know why that was not included. It was noted that the Commission in 2007 decided to go in another direction from 2001. Discussion on this continued and it was noted that it would make sense to look at modifying the data since time has passed. The UVA growth will have an impact and we need to figure out where the growth should go. A brief discussion on the differences in the 2001 and 2007 plan occurred.

Ms. Keller wanted to make sure that transportation issues were addressed in mixed use corridors. Uses allowed in areas should take into account if the area is pedestrian, auto or multi modal oriented.

Mr. Tolbert noted that review of the mixed use matrix should focus on housekeeping issues and look at more significant use considerations following the comprehensive plan review. The Cherry Avenue and Avon Street studies may be a good model for how to proceed. He also noted that the land use comprehensive plan issues could be framed similar to this example: Where do we want West Main to be? then work on how to meet those objectives through the zoning ordinance. The progression of the University High Density areas is a real example of how this has worked.

Ms. Keller noted that during the comprehensive plan review it would be great to have a work shop on where we were 10 years ago (including Torri Gallas materials) and review what is still valid. Council, PC, designers, as well as the community should be invited. Mr. Osteen felt the exercise could be important as a way of finding out if this information is important or not.

This discussion led to the Comprehensive Plan discussion. Missy Creasy provided an overview and Ms. Keller asked commissioners to provide input on the questions staff noted.

Mr. Rosensweig provided the following comments:

- The housing chapter needs a rewrite to reflect the information in the HAC report. He would also like to see mixed use/mixed housing addressed (which is not currently in the HAC report. The HAC policy committee will likely have interest in providing input on the chapter
- The parks information should include an evaluation of the nature of parks and density and how they work together. There should be information on how parks can mitigate the effects of density in a community.
- Rivanna River planning needs to be included in the document.
- Mention of critical slopes should be made

Ms. Keller noted that inclusion of the value of trails for people as well as habitats should be included. Evaluation of migratory routes for animals through the trails system should be mentioned.

Mr. Keesecker left the meeting at 6pm.

Comments submitted by Mr. Keesecker and Mr. Pearson in advance of the meeting were reviewed.

Ms. Keller added that Martha Jefferson Hospital, UVA growth and the addition of alternative transportation information were important items she wanted to see in the review.

Mr. Tolbert noted that he would like to see a simplification of the community characteristics chapter. There will not be new Census numbers at this time and there are many extraneous items included in the plan. He felt the following questions should be asked for the inclusion of items into the plan: How will this item be useful? Who will it be useful to? Will it be relevant in a year? He noted the Land Use survey that we are planning to undertake and the ability to let that map speak for the existing conditions in the community.

Ms. Keller noted this was a neat time to undertake this review. It will be an opportunity to review what has been accomplished and where we go from here.

Commissioners discussed the neighborhood planning area map and agreed to place less focus on this during the next review while encouraging residents to continue to define neighborhoods in the way residents feel make the most sense.

Ms. Keller made the following additional comments:

- Need to look at underused and poorly used properties as well as vacant parcels in the city.
- Consider including the Entrance Corridor district listings in an appendix
- Transportation needs to have more discussion about multimodal considerations
- The Preservation chapter needs to include conservation districts
- The Environment chapter should mention “environmental subdivisions.” It was felt that principals of LEED-N would cover this.
- There was interest in looking at innovative techniques for working with density.
- In agreement with Mr. Pearson’s comment, look at ways to evaluate conflicts which exist in the document. It was noted that acknowledging that a balance needs to occur and the pros and cons of each would be a good place to start in the document. Example: there can be competing interests between creation of affordable housing and preservation. Consider including strategies which could be used to help evaluate these.

The discussion moved to thoughts about public engagement throughout the process. It was noted that it would be helpful to have something for citizens to react to rather than just asking for comments. It was noted that we need to think about ways to get people engaged.

Suggestions made include:

- Hosting a meeting centered around UVA growth. Invite everyone but target those neighborhoods right around the university
- Host a meeting centered around the Martha Jefferson Hospital area. Invite everyone but target those in proximity.
- Have a targeted transportation discussion
- Bring together preservationists, housing providers and designers to broaden perspectives. There may be other chapter areas to group together to allow for sharing of ideas

Potentially frame work for meetings

- Provide overview on what a comp plan is
- What happened in 2000 and what has changed since then.
- Note what changes we have made as a community over time (density, corridors, etc.)
- Link to our current challenges (list all but focus on the one specific to that evening)
- What do we need to do to address?

Ms. Keller noted that a kick off event would be helpful.

Nick Rogers concurred with the frame work noting the importance of the following questions

Where were we 10 years ago? Where are we now? How do we get to where we want to go?

Amy Kilroy, CRHA Redevelopment Director, stated that the topic based discussions sound like a great idea. She noted her experience at the CRHA meeting the night before where residents of Belmont were present but talking about issues which spanned a number of neighborhoods. She noted the importance of looking at things community wide. Ms. Kilroy also liked the grouping of chapters to get different groups together.

Mike Smith felt the community involvement aspects will be interesting. He noted the importance of engaging the university population to think about how we bring together the interests of students and the local population.

There was no additional public comment.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.