

**Planning Commission Work session  
February 26, 2012  
Minutes**

**Commissioners Present:**

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

**City Council**

Ms. Kathy Galvin

**Staff Present:**

Missy Creasy  
Willy Thompson  
Brian Haluska  
Richard Harris

Ms. Keller convened the Charlottesville Planning Commission meeting at 5:00 pm and turned the meeting over to Ms. Creasy.

Ms. Creasy announced that a couple of chapters had been signed off on. The evening discussion would be on Community Facilities, Introduction and Implementation, Land Use and Community Values.

**Community Facilities**

**Willy Thompson** stated that not a lot of changes were made to this section. They mainly made to the Parks and Recreation section and the entire section that included public works was removed.

**Discussion**

**Ms. Keller** asked if there would be anything left in the plan that would reference public buildings. Mr. Thompson answered by saying that the buildings are referenced within the goals in a different section.

Ms. Keller would like to see the statement broaden and not totally removed.

Ms. Sienitsky would like to see the phrase “maintain and improve the quality” added to the vision statement.

Mr. Rosensweig would like to see something about soccer fields added. Ms. Creasy felt that things needed to stay broad since there is a section addressing rectangular fields.

Mr. Keesecker felt it would be better if soccer fields were called out specifically since they have been over looked. He feels that if they are called out it would help achieve the goal. If a developer knows what we are trying to achieve they may want to build a soccer field.

Ms. Keller suggested that maybe some language should be added to justify why soccer fields were added and specified.

Ms. Sienitsky preference is to accommodate the most number of uses on a field.

Ms. Keller would like the conversation that has taken place used and new language to accommodate smaller fields and multi-use fields.

Mr. Keesecker would like item 1.3 language changed to reflect that the fire department encourages every home to have a working fire alarm outside of every sleeping quarter.

Ms. Sienitsky feels that 2.1 should have some mention of mapping for priorities. Water and sewer, and Parks and Recreation references the importance of coordinating the Rivanna River water plan.

### **Introduction and Implementation**

Mr. Thompson stated that the introduction is a mix of what is in the 2007 plan and it is still a work in progress.

Mr. Keesecker would like to see the words “heritage tourism” added. He feels in the environment section that open natural space notations should be positive.

Ms. Sienitsky would like to see a different word than “centerpiece” used.

### **Implementation**

Ms. Creasy stated that this section can’t be finished until the rest of the plan is complete. She stated that information will be pulled from other chapters and put in one place.

Ms. Sienitsky feels the word ongoing can lead to a little fogginess of what is trying to be achieved and should be clarified.

Ms. Creasy stated that staff will see where references can be made more specific.

Mr. Keesecker asked if there could be a visual which shows all the activities underway that could be placed on the website.

Ms. Keller suggested that maybe a new bullet to encourage the creation of such a tool.

### **Land Use**

Mr. Haluska went over the changes. He stated that he had received a lot of detailed notes and comments from the Planning Commission. He only focused on the goals that had some changes.

Ms. Keller would like to add vitality and urban spaces to the land use chapter and the sense of space. She feels that the Comprehensive Plan is the location to note placemaking. She feels that not every area in the city is the same, but the process used to review them could have similar elements. She would like to find a way to work with existing conditions.

Mr. Rosensweig feels that urban vitality should be put into goal 1. He likes the work that has been done on goal 2 and suggested that taking out “protecting” and adding “respecting” would be better. He would like the word “plans” in 1.2 changed to “planning process.” He feels that we have some great ideas, but many can’t be implemented.

Ms. Creasy feels that urban and vitality should not be over used in the chapter. She stated that having everything together in the design manual is new and that we are starting to look at things differently.

Mr. Santoski feels that this chapter has to be written in a way that people will be able to understand the things in it. He feels that “urban vitality” are words that people are able to understand. He would like to change the word “enhance” in goal 2 changed to “encourage.” He feels that we don’t have to protect everything. He is concerned about PUDs and hopes there is another way to gain flexibility with development. He would like to see a process in place to see things work the way that they are on paper. He would like to see the developers be more creative when they are developing land.

Mr. Keesecker would like goal 3 and 4 combined. He would like 5.3 to say something in coordination with UVA. In goal 6 he would like to find a way to implement changes in the SADM manual.

Mr. Haluska confirmed that 6.1 and 6.2 had been combined. He noted that it is important for the comprehensive plan to remain broad.

Ms. Galvin said in looking at the current goal 6, the PUD is the only mechanism that is mentioned. She feels there is a need to explore new tools to get at the implementation of the vision. She thinks that more needs to be added to the tool kit and the design manual. In goal 3 we are protecting the City’s natural environment, but the word design is not mention. How do you protect it? Do you protect it by not touching it? She thinks the target industry study in goals 4.1 and 4.5 are excellent.

### **Community Values**

Ms. Creasy stated that she rewrote this chapter using the comments from the previous work session.

Ms. Keller would like to see the word “value” not used so much in the chapter.

The Planning Commission really like what they see so far and like the way things have been written.

Ms. Keller opened the session for public comment.

Bill Emory, 1604 East Market St, stated that he had sent the Planning Commission members a copy of a letter from the Woolen Mills Neighborhood sent in 2008. He feels that the City needs new tools to work with the public though he is happy with many activities the City has undertaken. He is not sure how target areas are helpful and he continues to not like the line between industrial and residential in his neighborhood.

Adjourned @ 7:19