

**Planning Commission Work Session
June 26, 2012
Minutes**

Commissioners Present:

Ms. Genevieve Keller (Chairperson)
Mr. Kurt Keesecker
Ms. Lisa Green
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Mr. John Santoski
Ms. Natasha Sienitsky
Mr. Michael Osteen

Staff Present:

Jim Tolbert
Missy Creasy
Richard Harris
Michael Smith
Willy Thompson
Ebony Walden

Ms. Keller convened the meeting at 4:00 p.m. and turned the meeting over to Ms. Creasy

Ms. Creasy gave an overview of the next three work sessions. She gave an outline of each item which will be discussed and noted that the County and City Planning Commission would be coming together following separate work sessions to talk about areas where joint goals may be possible. She then turned the meeting to Summer Frederick from TJPDC to facilitate.

Ms. Frederick provided an overview of the areas for discussion and outlined questions pertaining to each of the topic areas for this evening. Three categories were discussed and areas for potential collaboration of goals noted below.

Discussion

Question posed:

- 1. Are there opportunities for City and County to create joint goals related to historic preservation?***

Historic preservation

- There are a lot of historic districts in the City of Charlottesville and the County of Albemarle, but each locality has different approaches to their programs.
- Would like to see acknowledgement of the two world heritage sites, UVA and Monticello, and look at potential corridor links to these sites.
- Feel that there is not adequate protection of the heritage historic sites.
- Historic information interpretation is needed

- Feel that all City of Charlottesville ideas about historic preservation can pertain to the County of Albemarle except for regulation.
- Economics, viewsheds and access to sites are important
- There should be additional acknowledgement of the heritage industry in our two communities.
- There is a tie-in with entrance corridors – approaches to historic sites/districts – and that tie-in should be acknowledged and reflected in goals/regulations.

Entrance Corridor

Ms. Frederick presented slides of three of the entrance corridors that the city and county share which included 250 East, 250 West and 5th St extended as visuals for this part of the conversation.

Discussion

Questions posed:

- 1. Is having two different approaches to maintaining and enhancing entrance corridors appropriate?***
- 2. Are there opportunities for joint goals related to entrance corridors?***

- Consideration of a goal to link/coordinate design standards would be valuable. This should look at both structures and streetscape.
- Standards should be consistent with the guidelines.
- The approaches both communities take should be similar and appropriate.
- Coordinate standards related to the intensity of use.
- Standards for streetscape connectivity, safety and pedestrian orientation should be included.
- Acknowledgement of the rural to urban to rural transect from County to City to County needs to be acknowledged and considered.

Environment

Discussion

Water

Question posed:

- 1. Are there opportunities to create joint goals to ensure high water quality within share waterways?***

- How will TMDL affect water issues? We don't currently know what those regulations will be.
- Look at improving water quality – consider goals related to maintaining same water quality as water flowing into City.
- City of Charlottesville does not have water conservation as a stated goal and that can be clarified.

Air Quality

Question posed:

1. Is a join goal related to air quality appropriate?

- Acknowledge impact of City actions on County and vice versa
- Understanding that density in the City helps to protect rural land and air quality in the County
- Look into efficient buses and trolleys for better air quality
- What is the role of local government in monitoring federal and state protections?
- Is there a measure of air quality improvement with cars being taken off the road
- Look for walksheds/centers that can cross the boundaries to encourage multimodal behavior.

That portion of the meeting ended and Ryan Davidson, Budget Analyst, presented the CIP item.

Capital Improvement Projects

Mr. Davidson presented the new process and timeline for Capital Improvement Program submission. He explained which projects would automatically go to the top of the list and how they are prioritized. The commission discussed the proposal and provided the following comments on the process to be forwarded to City Council for their review:

- The Economic Development Criteria should be added back in (it was confirmed that this had been done.)
- The Planning Commission priorities should be added back in but scored at a different weight. The current priorities will be used for this CIP and in June 2013, the Commission will use their work session to provide narrower priorities for the next CIP.

The meeting ended at 6:15pm.