

**PLACE Design Task Force Minutes**  
**January 14, 2016 - 12:00 p.m.**  
**Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room**

**Members Present:**

Chairman Mark Watson, Rachel Lloyd, Ginny Keller, Fred Wolf, Gallon Byrd, Richard Price, Claudette Grant, Scott Paisley, Kathy Galvin, Carl Schwarz, Paul Josey, Andrew Mondschein

**Visitors Present:** Bill Emory, Emily Dreifuss

**Staff Present:** Carrie Rainey, Carolyn McCray (Clerk)

**Call to Order**

Mark Watson called the PLACE Design Task Force Meeting to order at 12:10 pm

**Agenda**

1. Friendship Court Resident Engagement Process Update – Claudette Grant  
**Principles of Friendship Court Redevelopment**

The Board and PHA staff has been working for close to 1 year on the vision for FC. The focus is that the plan will be developed in a working partnership with residents, neighbors, and public and private organizations, and will reflect the following four principles for redevelopment of Friendship Court:

- **HOME.** Current residents will be able to remain in affordable housing at Friendship Court and, to the greatest extent possible; we will preserve Section 8 project-based assistance. We will strive to minimize disruption and relocation during redevelopment.

- **OPPORTUNITY.** By design, Friendship Court will be beautiful, healthy, and a great place to live. New resources will increase access to economic opportunities for individuals and families.

- **COMMUNITY.** Planning will include real and substantive input from residents, neighbors, and our community partners. Redevelopment will promote connections to the neighborhood and the larger community. Together, we will promote improved infrastructure, public services, and education for families and their children at Friendship Court.

- **RESPECT.** Redevelopment will build upon the community's strengths, promote cultural and economic diversity, and encourage mutual respect among residents.

**Future for Friendship Court**

- Community Engagement
- Mixed – income residential (retain the current, low-income, 150 families who live in FC, workforce housing and some market - rate housing)

- Some non-residential (could be services pertinent to FC residents and the larger community)
- Improved community space (outdoor and indoor)
- Community garden
- Create economic opportunities for FC residents

#### **Future for Friendship Court**

- Community Engagement
- Mixed – income residential (retain the current, low-income, 150 families who live in FC, workforce housing and some market - rate housing)
- Some non-residential (could be services pertinent to FC residents and the larger community)
- Improved community space (outdoor and indoor)
- Community garden
- Create economic opportunities for FC residents

#### **City Funds**

- In the fall of 2015, the City of Charlottesville provided pre-development planning funds to help PHA move forward with the re-development of FC.

#### **Design week**

- Planning Team – Liz Ogbu, Marc Norman, David Dixon and Steve Kearney
- The week of December 14th we hosted the planning team and had somewhere in the order of 32 meetings, and met with over 100 members of the community. We met with some of the residents, and the some of the teens who live in FC. The purpose of the week was to listen and begin to understand how people feel about FC now and what do people want to see in a future FC.
- Some of the take away from the week were the residents I spoke with seem to be open to change. The teens certainly are (describe the post it note exercise). The community at-large seems to be very supportive and pleased to be a part of the process.

#### **Next Steps**

- Creation of steering committee. At the PHA Board's suggestion one half of the committee will be residents (7 members). The other 7 members will be various stakeholders in the community.
- We are about to begin an election for the residents to elect their 7 members.
- We are working on the next visit from the planning team, which will be in early February. We hope it is a time for them to say hello community this is what we heard you say. Did we get it right? We also hope the steering committee will get to meet the design team.

Rachel asked how it works with the SIA, planning, discussions etc.

Claudette said this is all part of the discussion; the design team has read the SIA and realizes that there are some things easy to do and some are not as easy to do. Looking at the SIA and Friendship Court we can say yes this something that came out of the SIA. This is how we think we can make this work at Friendship Court.

Rachel asked do you see anything like a big conflict between current residents as to what they want.

Claudette said there might be and we really don't know because we haven't engaged the residents fully as of yet. We do see some sort of green space and how that gets developed we are not sure because it is going to take money and are we talking about a public space or something for the residents. This subject s will have to be discussed with City Council.

Paul commented about Garrett having one of the best tree line streets in the city and asked how you will address the public spaces to be welcoming to the public.

Claudette said it is definitely one of the things we are talking about but have not gotten to that level of detail yet but we know that open space is important to speak to the fence and everybody hates the fence. In meeting with the residence they simply want to connect with downtown. The fence is a barrier not allowing them to connect with downtown.

Ginny said Friendship Court residents and neighborhood residents talked about the fence and around the second week thought that fence was coming down.

Rachel said when you have a more focused community with a bit more detailed design, it will be interesting to see how the sequential designs validate each other to diverge and if they start to diverge she said it is a good moment to analyze why we think they are diverging and how we can improve our process for these earlier bigger master plan level studies to help us get better answer, more accurate, more effective answers. Hopefully what you all do will continue to validate everything.

Claudette said we are seeing something in which they are wanted to diverge and we are trying to pull it back but it is difficult to try to make everything match so there might be times when things have to diverge.

She also said we are looking at the natural resources on that property and commented that commercial is certainly possible.

Councilor Galvin said a task force is not permanent so it is up to this group to decide if its charge is over.

The PLACE Design Task Force was charged with advising the council in eight specific areas, including urban design, landscape improvements and other elements of public infrastructure.

Rachel said there are so many ideas that we've come up with in every two-hour meeting, and I think getting from our discussion to some kind of implementation process is our big grey gap right now, however some of the group's members wonder if their charge should become more focused.

Adjourn at 2:00 p.m.