

Planning Commission Work session
February 5, 2013
Minutes

Commissioners Present:

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

City Council Present

Mayor Huja
Ms. Kristin Szakos
Mr. Dave Norris
Ms. Kathy Galvin

Staff Present:

Missy Creasy
Brian Haluska
Kathy McHugh
Richard Harris
Hollie Lee
Chris Engel

Ms. Keller convened the Charlottesville Planning Commission meeting at 5:30 pm and turned the meeting over to Ms. Creasy.

Ms. Creasy announced the three main objectives for the evening and how each item would be discussed. She also reviewed the future meeting schedule.

Economic Sustainability

Ms. Lee, who is updating the Economic Sustainability section of the Comprehensive Plan, stated that she took the comments from the Planning Commission and the public and incorporated them into the chapter. Goal 5 from the 2007 Plan was removed at first because most of the objectives have been met, but it was reinserted due to comments presented. She then opened the discussion for questions and comments.

Discussion

Ms. Szakos felt that Goal 5 encompasses “heritage” and if “organizations and meeting” were added that would encourage tourism. The wording in the title of Goal 6 is very confusing and should be rewritten. She would like to see some form of retraining for mature workers reflected in the document.

Mr. Engle stated that in Goal 5, historic attraction is leverage from a tourism perspective. He stated that Objectives 2.3 and 2.7 are from the existing plan and should remain to highlight ongoing relationships with UVA.

Ms. Keller feels that heritage and culture tourism should be used to clarify the meaning of the goal. She would like to see “heritage base” taken out and “traditional foods, winery and bed and breakfasts” added to 5.2. She doesn’t really like the wording in 2.5 and suggested adding the word “strategy” to it. She would like some wording added to Goal 6 that would protect the City’s long term investment in downtown.

Mr. Rosensweig feels that music should be added and that we should be focusing on food, music and hospitality. He feels that financial literacy counseling should be for all ages.

Ms. Sienitsky wanted the statement made in 5.2 concerning heritage based hospitality clarified. She would like to see the old 53 road used as a walkable park way to Monticello. She would like to see some form of educational training added to this section of the plan as well as clarification on 2.3 and 2.7.

Mr. Keesecker would like to see some form of pedestrian access from Downtown to Monticello and feels that this themed trail could play a big part in Economic Sustainability. He feels that Objective 3.6 should mention PVCC.

Mr. Norris would like to see the path that Mr. Jefferson took from Monticello recreated. He feels that the Target Industry study missed out on how to train low income residents to climb the economic ladder.

Mr. Osteen likes seeing the chapter more organized. He feels that Goal 1 is great, but sub goal 1.1 is really the first statement restated. Sub goals 1.5 and 1.6 are excellent and should be located higher in the list.

Ms. Lee stated that items can be flipped around and 1.5 and 1.6 will be moved higher on the listing. She stated that training for low income families is actually discussed in 1.3.

Ms. Galvin would like to see 4.7 kept and the addition of 6.7. She wanted to know if the City’s zoning ordinance was impeding on businesses that we want to see come to the area.

Housing

Ms. McHugh, who is providing the update and rewrite of the housing section, gave an overview of how she undertook the review. She stated that staff started with 3 questions and took the answers and responses to help update this section.

Discussion

Mr. Norris feels that public housing should be called out more specifically and mention the Resident’s Bill of Rights.

Ms. Keller would like to see a goal and strategy put in place for public housing. Sub section 3.2 needs to be broaden to mention “no expansion or creation of concentrations of poverty.” She would like to see 1.3c deleted or the wording changed.

Ms. Szakos said that Section 3.2 could talk about public housing and there should be some sort of partnership with CRHA.

Mr. Huja feels that public housing needs to be mentioned.

Ms. Creasy asked if public housing could become a separate goal?

Ms. Sienitsky would like Goal 1 “subdivision ordinance” looked into more carefully. Let 1.2A apply to both single family and multi-family too. She asked if we are trying to have onsite affordable housing as part of larger developments- is that really our goal?

Mr. Keesecker noted that Objective 2.3B references promoting self reliance and 3.2 notes a decrease in student vehicle use. He questioned whether students should be referenced.

Land Use

Mr. Haluska provided an overview of the updates made to the Land Use Chapter since the last work session and opened the floor to questions.

Discussion

Ms. Keller feels that a new goal 5 is needed that deals with small area plans.

Mr. Rosensweig feels that there are two new economic activities and lumping them into one category is confusing.

Ms. Galvin stated most localities have a process in place for review of land use issues that is consistent for all areas of the locality.

Ms. Creasy stated there will be a narrative that gives an overall description and concerns noted about land use for the small areas indicated in the plan. She provided details on the Fry’s Spring example to note that some projects are ordinance based while others may involve more study.

Ms. Szakos feels that the document needs to be accessible to the greater community. It should be written in a way that a layperson can understand.

Mr. Keesecker would like to see some process in place for small area planning.

Wrap Up

Ms. Keller stated that we really don’t have a process in place yet and things should be more specific. There should be new goals between 2 and 3 and things should be done on all levels, not

just neighborhood specific. She likes the way it is written and would not like to see that lost. She suggested that maybe we need to start with a blank land use map and come up with some ideas and match it up with zoning and land use map.

Mr. Haluska wanted to discuss a piece of property located behind the Riverside development which is privately owned, zoned for low density and can't be built on due to lack of road frontage. He also mentioned a parcel that is near the Linen Building, currently zoned business and technology, with community interest in a land use designation of neighborhood commercial.

The Planning Commission agreed to keeping keep the land use designation for the property on Riverside the way it is shown and change the designation on the parcel near the Linen Building to Neighborhood Commercial.

Public Comment

Bill Emory, 1604 East Market St, would like to refer back to the Standards and Design guidelines. He feels that urban design is made for people and not for automobiles and there should be a process in place.

Victoria Dunham, Chesapeake Street, really enjoyed the telescope presentation from Mr. Keesecker. She feels that neighborhoods have character and people generally enjoy living in them.

Adjourned at 7:49