

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2008 -- 5:00 P.M.
NDS CONFERENCE ROOM**

Planning Commissioners present

Ms. Cheri Lewis
Mr. Dan Rosensweig
Mr. Jason Pearson
Mr. Michael Osteen
Ms. Genevieve Keller
Mr. Bill Emory
Mr. Michael Farruggio

Staff Present:

Mr. Jim Tolbert, Director
Ms. Leslie Beauregard, Budget Manager
Mr. Ryan Davidson, Budget and Utilities Analyst
Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney
Ms. Missy Creasy, AICP, Planning Manager
Mr. Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner
Mr. Brian Haluska, AICP, Neighborhood Planner

The meeting began at 5:05pm.

Leslie Beauregard provided an overview of the budget process and Ryan Davidson provided a power point presentation. It was noted that information on the current CIP balances will be included in the public hearing packet to allow for time to clarify the numbers.

The Commission then discussed the feedback that needs to be provided to Council. Bill Emory noted that as a part of the ranking committee for CIP that it might be good in the future to allow for negative points for categories if a project did not meet certain criteria. Cheri Lewis asked for clarification of the bonding process for which Leslie provided an explanation to the Commission.

Funding for the acquisition of park land was not recommended at this time by the budget committee. Commissioners expressed some concern about this. Mike Farruggio asked what projects with higher rankings were recommended for funding. Staff reviewed the listing of projects and ranking values. Mike F. followed up by asking about accounts with remaining balances and having staff provide explanations for those balances. Jason Pearson was interested in seeing criteria that would balance public benefit per dollar spent. Dan Rosensweig asked about the match for the Parkway and Interchange projects and if that funding was need at this time. It was noted that if the match was not present, all federal funds would be removed but they were going to check on the timing of allocation of the funds. A copy of last year's motion on the CIP was reviewed for the Commission. It was noted that a number of the recommended changes were put into place based on the Planning Commission recommendations.

Dan asked about the involvement of other localities Planning Commission in the CIP process. Was their involvement similar to Charlottesville's? It was noted that most work is likely done by staff with

committee support. At this point the Commission needs to provide input. Mike F. was curious about how much input the Planning Commission actually had. Bill noted that he was new to the process but he noted that he did not want park acquisition to be cut. Jason asked staff to provide the rationale for why park acquisition was cut from the CIP so it is clear what factors were used. There was concern that if a process is in place, something should not be arbitrarily cut without basis.

Mike F. asked if the Planning Commission could suggest changes and it was noted this is a possibility. Mike O. noted that we should review the role of the PC in the CIP process earlier for the next round. Jason asked if the Planning Commission could work with Council in March to continue this process discussion. Cheri also thought it would be helpful for the Commission to note which items should remain if more cuts were to occur. Mike O thought it would be best to have the funds distributed to as many locations as possible to stimulate business rather than in one location. There may need to be consideration for re-ranking existing projects. Leslie noted that CIP projects are reviewed regularly and a process is in place to put projects on hold if priorities change. It was noted that any further questions could be directed to staff prior to the hearing in December. Cheri noted that the process has changed dramatically for the better though her time on the Planning Commission. Gennie noted that if the Planning Commission is to play a large role in the city budget process, it needs to be contributing to the process on a regular basis and not come in at the end revising departmental priorities developed by staff

The discussion moved to the next item on the agenda: Development Review. Jason solicited Commissioners thoughts on Entrance Corridor applications. Cheri asked if design reviews were ministerial or legislative. Would the standards need to change and could it be delegated to staff? She also asked if the City is more protected if applications are reviewed by an Entrance Review Board. Dan feels a deliberative body should do this work but felt it did not have to be the Planning Commission. Mike O agreed that another board would make sense.

Cheri did not think the outcome of applications would be different but felt the public transparency was important. She noted that most EC applications are for signature projects. Mike F. thought that the Planning Commission should continue to do this work.

Jim Tolbert noted that the creation of a new board would involve new staffing responsibilities that would need to be addressed. It was noted that staff would look at other communities to see how they address the Entrance Corridor function. Jason reiterated that if the PC keeps this duty, that members have the qualifications to do this work. He also noted that if there is a more efficient body to handle this application with both PC and BAR overlap that conceptually, that type of model could work.

Gennie felt a review of the original legislation would be helpful since the original intent as she understood it was to protect and enhance the approaches to historic sites and districts. It was noted that staff would do research and share that information with the Commission in the near future.

This meeting concluded at 7:20pm.