

**CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION PRE MEETING**

**TUESDAY, August 11, 2009 -- 4:30 P.M.**

**NDS CONFERENCE ROOM**

**Planning Commissioners present**

Mr. Jason Pearson

Mr. Bill Emory

Mr. Michael Farruggio

Ms. Genevieve Keller

Mr. Dan Rosensweig

**Staff Present:**

Mr. Jim Tolbert, Director

Ms. Missy Creasy, Planning Manager

Ms. Ebony Walden, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner

Mr. Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney

Ms. Khadija Abdur-Rahman, Civil Engineer

Ms. Jeanie Alexander, Traffic Engineer

The meeting began at 4:30pm.

Ebony Walden reviewed correspondence received on the slope waiver request for William Taylor Plaza and noted that Khadija Abdur-Rahman, Civil Engineer was here to assist with any questions concerning this application. Bill Emory presented additional information regarding the hydrography of the Wm. Taylor site and the course of water between the site and Moore's Creek. Mr. Emory wondered whether this information would effect Engineering's recommendation for a positive finding based on requirement 1e.

Ms Abdur-Rahman noted that the Army Corp of Engineers has review the site and noted that the waterway was intermittent and issued a permit. She pointed out that the Army Corps recommendation concerning the stream does not minimize the Planning Commission's ability to make a recommendation on the steep slope waiver.

Ms. Keller asked whether City Engineering's assessment existed anywhere in a written record. Ms. Abdur-Rahman explained that the assessment was based on data submitted by the applicant and based on what Engineering expects to see later. Clarity was made by staff that all materials for this application were included in the packet. Mr. Emory expressed this concern further noting that water quality was a

concern that should be examined. Ms. Abdur -Rahman further expressed that the run off on site is coming from adjacent properties and being piped into man made structures in to the public storm system. She did not see a concern with this situation and the slope waiver request. She felt that it will be possible to address the storm water requirements for this site. Mr. Emory asked about the sewer line capacity in this area. It was noted that data is not required at this time but utilities noted that there may be capacity issues in this areas and upgrades may be needed. It was noted that the water from adjacent properties flows to this site due to topography so there concerns of water onto adjacent properties is not a large factor. There was a short discussion on the aesthetic value criteria that applicants are asked to evaluate. It was noted that criteria are not set at this time and a review of the code noted that it should not be a direct factor in the determination process.

Jason Pearson asked for clarification on the sentence on page two of the report noting the removal of soil on site. Ms. Walden replied that the applicant has noted that the building will serve as the retaining feature. The stated amount of soil removal doesn't change either way but is irrelevant regarding the recommendation of plan. Mr. Pearson asked whether Engineering agreed with the applicant's assessment that by building into the slope they will create a retaining wall that renders the slope more stable than it would otherwise be. Ms. Abdur-Rahman replied that it will not be more stable than what is there now, but compared to other ways they could have built these buildings it was a fair statement.

Mr. Pearson asked if the tree replacement ratio made sense and if more trees should be planted? Ms. Walden noted that the commission could chose to increase the number of trees if desired. The tree discussion continued and commissioners supported having trees replaced with like specimens. Mr. Emory asked if there was a break down of natural versus man made slopes as was presented in the Davis Avenue application. Ms. Abdur-Rahman did not note a specific breakdown but noted that natural vs. man made is really previously disturbed vs. undisturbed. Mr. Emory also noted concern with the order of applications to which Ms. Creasy reviewed the process.

Discussion moved to questions about the rezoning application. Dan Rosensweig asked Jeanie Alexander for information concerning the traffic on 5<sup>th</sup> and Dice Street. She noted that a study had been done at the intersection of 5<sup>th</sup> Street and Dice Street and the warrants for the installation of stop signs on all 4 legs are not met at this time. She noted that the volume and speed on 5<sup>th</sup> St SW is higher than would be expected. There is a neighborhood wide study underway at this location and it is hoped that some of the concerns will be addressed through this process. Mr. Rosensweig asked if there were any proffers to address the impact of traffic on 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Ms. Alexander noted that no proffers relate to traffic at this time. Staff provided the standard of review for the rezoning process. Mr. Rosensweig expressed concern about the proffer that noted funds could go to affordable housing or to park improvements. Ms. Creasy noted that the commission can point out impacts during the pubic hearing process.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm.