PLACE Design Task Force Minutes
October 12, 2017- 12:00 - 2:00
Neighborhood Development Services Conference Room

Members Present:
Mike Stoneking, Rachel Lloyd, Gennie Keller, Chris Henry, Scott Paisley, Fred Wolfe, Laura Knott, Andrew Mondschein, Melanie Miller, Andres Pacheco

Staff Present: Carrie Rainey, Alex Ikefuna, Carolyn McCray (Clerk)

Call to Order – Chairman Stoneking

Agenda

1. **Public Comment:**

2. **Old Business Updates**

Comprehensive Plan Update:
Keller: said Planning Commission has been meeting regularly, and irregularly, for extra meetings to move the land use portion of the Comprehensive Plan forward. She was hoping to have some sort of a map to share but they're still in process so it isn't quite ready yet. This is future land use, not zoning, but it will inform any zoning changes that are made. They know that the form based code process is going on for SIA, and that might lead to changes down the line. Right now they're going with future land use in the traditional sense of commercial uses and residential uses and mixed uses and that sort of thing. They have tried to massage this, and have three things different that they're considering at this point. One would be more opportunities for multi-family. They hope that that could be done in a way to address the missing middle. They're also hoping to address the missing middle through a new area of interest and concern which would be more of a low rise, lower density mixed use zone; in other words, a commercial ground floor with 1 or 2 residential stories above, but the residential unit would be necessary for that commercial to be there, the commercial would be necessary for the residential. They see it as perhaps a way to provide transition zone between our intensely commercial or mixed use zones and more traditionally residential, lower-density zones. Want to provide a transition between the intense commercial and mixed use corridors and our lower density R1 and R2 zones, because that's where we're getting push-back and pressure - where we get gigantic buildings of height and density right next door to R1 and R2. Have been through a process; looked at the annexation maps, the very first zoning map from 1929 to see what set the stage for the maps that we have now. She said we think of corridors as something that happened more recently, but the prime corridors were established in 1929 and became our commercial spines and our major thoroughfares in and out of the city. As long as we have automobiles and a development pattern, we need to work with that legacy and try to tweak it. Their main goal is to intensify the primary corridors and have these transition zones.
The other things they're exploring are purple areas that would be something that might be available in residential neighborhoods to provide those things we all like: the urbanity of being

able to walk to a corner market now in Belmont, but we don't have that in Greenbrier or much of Fry's Spring, for example. They're looking for ways that might happen on a more permanent basis, perhaps with some special permissions. Those would be pedestrian, other than perhaps a spot for drop-off for deliveries or universal accessibility, maybe a couple of handicap spots. They would not be where you'd be driving there; they would not have that potential.

Stoneking: said there's a lot of talk among planners that we over park in our ordinances and we should have less parking, yet it's not uncommon for when you propose a store or corner store in a neighborhood to hear concerns about how that will drive cars to that neighborhood and overburden its residential parking. He asked if the Planning Commission has wrestled with that dichotomy.

Keller: said they've wrestled with it in concept. They've talked about providing some guidance. If it's a restaurant or café that if you reached a certain capacity, maybe it couldn't be there anymore. We want businesses to start and be incubators and be successful, but at a certain point if you become too successful maybe you need to be in another location because you're no longer neighborhood friendly.
They're trying to provide opportunities for more housing at all price points, transition zones, and opportunities where small businesses could incubate or exist long-term. Might be live-work or might be independent of live-work. Hopefully can come up with something that will allow most people in the city to be in a walking shed where there would be some goods and services or some gathering-type place. All of that would have to be worked out in a zoning map, but this is laying the groundwork for that in a future land use map that has feasibly appropriate locations for where these things might happen in the future.

Henry: said the hard work starts in making the zoning and the code match the Comp Plan.

Keller: said first we have to get the Comp Plan, based on the community input and the constraints of our city ordinances and our Virginia code. Then we get to the serious business of working within the confines of 10 square miles. They have deliberately worked with a map that is not parcel by parcel, because our zoning and future land use decision-making has been driven for decades based on who owns what and where it was parcel by parcel. We need to look at the city holistically and areas holistically and the connectivity, and then we can let the people who own the parcels come in and fight for their vested rights and let the neighbors fight for theirs.

Stoneking: said we don't want to look at parcels from perspective of ownership you just described, but asked what about other characteristics? Like a corner lot on the edge of a residential neighborhood is a whole different kind of parcel than a mid-block lot two streets over.

Keller: said they haven't gotten to that point. Have been conversations about is an intersection something different, is a T-intersection something critical. That will have to be worked out later, not at this scale.

Lloyd: said there's a little store on Grady that must have been grandfathered in years ago. It has no parking and the street is wide enough that when they do deliveries they can double park. And it works fine. Everyone walks to it.

Keller: noted the ones that were traditionally in Belmont, and how some still remain like that. There's the one farther down at Druid and Avon that one of the commissioners is in love with. She grew up in that neighborhood so she remembers when there were houses next to it. It has expanded and now has all that parking. Looking for opportunities for low-density mixed use, might have some parking, might have some residential, and still have commercial. Primarily a pedestrian usage.

Mondschein: said that at a Comprehensive Plan level, and a city wide and area wide level, it's demonstrating that the city hopefully has policies in place to deal with parking. So if it is a problem that there are residential parking districts, or there are meters, or whatever it is. In order to allay the concerns. Because it can be managed. If it goes wrong there are techniques. It's that the city hasn't had a mechanism that worked very well in the past other than dealing with university overflow and things like that with residential. If that can be part of what's said - that the city has these tools available - then new things become possible.

Lloyd: said she was shocked when we did the West Main corridor. Half of that landscape is asphalt. It is shocking how much parking is there, and probably most of it under-utilized. It's not shared; everyone has their little piece.

Keller: said that concepts are strong. They have had fun being able to do proactive real planning and not just reacting and responding to applications that come in.

Stoneking: asked is there a timeline for wrapping up the Comp Plan?

Keller: said they have just now butted up against the point where they're not on schedule anymore. Now they have extra meetings to plan.

Stoneking: said he knows zoning comes later, but he can't help to see this dilemma. If it's easy to say at a Comp Plan level that it's great to have a neighborhood store, but you end up having thirty neighborhood stores too close to each other because everyone wants one, then you've changed the nature of the residential neighborhood maybe too far. Tend to do zoning in bigger strokes. He asked if it is possible to imagine spot zoning.

Keller: said the purple area is floating. It is not at this T-intersection or that corner - it is based on an application and would have to meet certain performance requirements.

Lloyd: asked if developing the performance standards for the crazy quilt of land uses going to be something that happens in that process or will you just define that it needs to happen?

Keller: said it would be defined that it needs to happen. Might have some narrative to provide guidance as that zoning is considered at a future date.
There is a lot of yellow on the map. That is low density residential. Just as we always have commercial owners and investors speaking up for their property rights, we've had a lot of pushback from low density residential dwellers as well saying that they like their neighborhoods. What are the ways that we can work with the yellow and provide these transitional zones,

provide more opportunities for some higher density housing within those. City grew by taking in established residential areas. Housing study shows that we need housing at all price points.

Lloyd: asked if we have heard from developers that they are unable to accommodate some of those nontraditional housing types like co-housing?

Henry: said it's not allowed by zoning right now.

Keller: said that there's a tremendous ground swell of social justice support and environmental justice support in our community right now. She would love to see every congregation of worship in this city look at its parking lots and ask, can we provide housing right here on site? It would be tremendously creative then to work with the zoning and see what we can do. Why should there be a parking lot to be used 6 or 8 hours a week? You could have structured parking and housing right there. The county is looking at its land on 29 and saying we don't need these parking lots. We can develop the parking lots. Where are most of our surface parking lots? They're probably at institutions, at churches and schools and civic buildings. Maybe that's our found space.

Henry: noted that at one point Kurt came in and gave PLACE an update and said there were 150 people who had participated so far. He asked is there an update on that number in terms of getting community feedback?

Ikefuna: said between 300 and 500 people have participated.

Henry: said one thing that would be helpful to discuss would be the fact that in order for a Comp Plan to really be embraced by a community we have to in some way verify that we have community buy-in. He asked what are the metrics that that is measured in? One could be participation. He doesn't know if 300-500 is good or bad, he's just posing the question if it's something that's worth trying to measure.

Bennis: said that unfortunately, she thinks there needs to be pro-active outreach. If it's passive, like who shows up or who speaks up, you're limiting buy-in. She thinks the people who are less likely to show up, there's a reason. It's because they're working two jobs, or they're not on social media. That's the group that needs more proactive outreach to really have a full voice. That's hard and legwork, but it's real.

Henry: asked what's the timeframe?

Keller: said there's always a public process, because nothing can be changed without having two hearings.

Ikefuna: said in terms of citizen engagement, one of the problems is that the city doesn't have a defined public engagement plan. For you to have a good public engagement, it needs to have a beginning and end and some kind of indicators or what you need to engage. We don't have that now. The process so far that the Planning Commission has undertaken has been reasonable.

Stoneking: said they are writing a community engagement chapter now, which will be more useful in the next Comp Plan. The crafting of that chapter could set the table for a whole different future of community engagement than we've ever had. He said what if nothing could move forward on a citywide level unless all 19 neighborhood associations or the consensus-hand version of 19 approved it.

Lloyd: wondered if maybe there's some way that they can frame the Comp Plan that lights a fire under it in a way that makes it seem more relevant to people in their daily lives. Maybe you do the "what ifs" with the worst case scenarios that freak people out enough that they show up.

Henry: said the Comp Plan is going to impact the entire city's property, so why wouldn't we mail something out to every resident and a packet that explains what's going on and how to get involved. Of course there's a cost to it, but is it not worth the price?

Friendship Court Update: Charrette with Sunshine & Others

Stoneking: said the Piedmont Housing Alliance and the work at Friendship Court is nowhere near ready to turn into a presentation to anybody, because there's another engagement process that has to occur first so this is just an update about how that process is going on.

Mondschein: said that this was last Monday and Tuesday. There was a day and a half charrette at Grimm + Parker architects who are the architects that PHA has hired to do the Friendship Court design. There was a master planning process that the community had significant engagement in and came up with a drawing. It's a master plan, so it's not meant to actually represent what is going to be built. It basically looks like 4 boxes on a grid with a central green area. That represents the community's desires for maintenance of green space, the availability of better housing, the fact that in order to finance the reconstruction of Friendship Court PHA needs to look at mixed income. This meeting was about bringing Grimm + Parker on board. The City was represented. Brian Haluska was there, PHA board members and staff. I represented PLACE, Liz Ogbu of Studio O who dealt with the engagement of the first round. What we explored was the potential for implementing what the master plan discussed and promised. This involves the types of housing provided (multi-family, townhouses, how does it look, etc.), what kinds of open space can you provide, what kinds of parking are necessary. They looked at different alternatives. There was a significant discussion of process. How are we going to do this? How are we going to make sure that what gets built, the physical design and new development, is actually reflective of the needs of the people living in that community? A lot of the community's asks were not physical, but were services like childcare and workforce development. It was an interesting discussion about providing housing to some of the lowest income residents in Charlottesville and how you make the physical things we all care about actually integrated with a social program and how much scope there is for that. There is a timeline issue. There is a question at the federal level of whether Section 8 funding will be available. What Sunshine wants to do and the board and staff of PHA is bring this to the residents group that was engaged in hiring Grimm + Parker and have them, as much as possible, go through this design process. There has been a lot of discussion about people not having time to engage and how you make time for them to be able to do that. The next steps are on PHA's side to engage the residents, to get them to understand, based on our discussion, what the parameters of the possible are and then have it driven as much

as possible by the residents. In the next month or so there will be a more public presentation from Sunshine coming to us.

Stoneking: said it will be after the residents' process. He asked do we have an understanding of how many meetings or how much calendar is established for that process?

Mondschein: said they should have already had a meeting by now. His understanding is that they should have a better sense by doing a similar charrette type process with the residents in the next month or so.

Lloyd: asked is the developer committed to providing some of the facilities that are associated with this additional program that the residents are interested in, like the daycare and the workforce development?

Mondschein: said that was all on the table as possibilities: providing day-care on site, expanding the program of their existing community center, looking at accessibility issues whether its shuttles to food or bringing food to people. One of the other things that has been discussed but is far from actually being implemented is how can there be ladders of tiered housing, low-income housing but not Section 8 housing, to allow people to remain on site. Some people have lived there since the beginning, even though it's supposed to be transitional housing. In some cases it isn't, but in some cases it is.

Stoneking: said that from an urban design perspective, the depiction of the project in the master plan drew some criticism in terms of the scale of the buildings. They cut the parcel into 4 blocks. When you overlay the figure ground of the downtown on that, it would suggest 9 blocks. He asked if he is correct in that, because the master plan work is done, it is going to be the 4 block version, but the scale of the buildings remains on the table.

Mondschein: said the master plan showed that grid, the 2x2. The goal that PHA has in order to remain responsive to an existing community engagement process which resulted in a master plan is to build from that. If the residents feel that there can be changes or tweaks that can provide benefit and make sense, evolving from what was done, then that is the approach that everyone wants to take. There is a lot of question about whether there could be a denser grid and if that grid be bike-ped. That's all really open. There's a great sensitivity to making sure that it evolves naturally from where the community left off. The size of those buildings may be out-sized to what could be built and to what could be financially feasible for PHA. The promise is to accommodate everyone who lives on that site now to not have to be relocated during any period of the redevelopment.

Henry: asked if the developer paid the city back, would they release that requirement then?

Ikefuna: said that the city invested its money, so they expect the developer will do that.

Keller: said that's a remote possibility - that if people can't agree, funding can't work out, things happen, you could end up losing it all.

Stoneking: said there are commercial spaces mixed in with all of this. He asked what are the processes to make sure that those are viable. Is that also part of the residents process or is there a broader discussion with the people that understand commerce and how that works? How is that being handled so that we don't have a bunch of open storefronts?

Mondschein: said the discussion came up, and it's relevant to Friendship Court and everywhere else. He posited, what is retail turning into? If there's an idea that retail could be part of the income-generating aspect of this development in order to fund better housing for the low-income group that's already living there, what would that look like? Is it possible to provide a grocery store? What are the hurdles to that? The economic analysis has not been done yet, but it will be. The idea is to keep that as flexible as possible so that those spaces could be used for community uses or commercial uses, depending on what the demand is. There was a lot of discussion of parking and how parking needs to be flexible for the same reason.
The idea was to find what the right amount is, but it doesn't have to be overly commercialized. One of the discussions was how do you build a community that's mixed income so that the different housing unit types and the different income levels are actually more integrated within one another. There's at least a desire to make that possible. With commercial, it was a question of what the market will bear. It has to be commercial that is financially feasible but, also if and as much as possible, is useful for the people living on the entire site. That's unresolved – it's an ongoing conversation. What's positive is the architects got a view of what the issues are, what the city concerns are, what the board's concerns are, how to integrate with the SIA. They have interests and desires in making this a place where our discussions of parking are actually realized. Right now, Friendship Court is way over-parked because many of the residents don't own cars. Knowing that, do we need to provide as much parking as may be required, or are there mechanisms to provide additional parking to the city but not necessarily through structures. He noted that nothing was decided.

Henry: asked what is the timeline on this?

Mondschein: said in terms of the financial side, they do have a ticking clock. The master plan was 7 phases. Part of the strategy of having architects and designers and planners there was to figure out how to shorten that process significantly. In terms of making it a 3 phase project where you can get it done in 6 years, rather than 7 phases that took 14 years that was a significant priority of the physical exploration that we did. Everyone was fairly satisfied that it could be shorter than 7.

Bennis: asked how was it communicated to the community, the people who live there, how much influence they would or wouldn't have over the final project? And how much do they have?

Mondschein: said in terms of engagement for the master plan process, everyone feels that it did bring people in as best as you possibly could. They're dealing with people who have to work all the time or they just don't have time. What happened with the hiring of the architect to take it from master plan to actual reality was that a residents committee did actually select that architect. The PHA is the owner, but the residents committee gave the final decision of 3 firms.
The question is how do you get from selecting an architect to not feeling - and this is what always happens, you hire the architect and then suddenly they come back in with drawings that

don't look like what you remember. It has to be a continuous process where they feel like, as they have been promised to be, they are the client.

Bennis: said she's trying to differentiate between engagement and influence over the product.

Mondschein: said Sunshine, the executive director is committed to that. The PHA board is committed to that. That means timelines are tight. You want to get people engaged. How do you get the client up to the architect they selected to do what professionals do is actually a big ask, so there was a lot of thought about how you do that.

Lloyd: said it seems like one of the interesting things is that if it's going from a community that shares a lot of similar characteristics to something that might become a bigger financial hodgepodge, then the needs suddenly get a lot more complicated.

Henry: said it's also important to keep in mind that there are a lot of needs there and possibly some of them can't actually be solved by the construction of a building – education, job opportunities. He asked what can you do through construction and lease arrangements and all that?

Pacheco: asked what is the ultimate vision, from the city standpoint, for the site?

Ikefuna: said that in the city's vision, the most important singular interest is the preservation of the 150 existing units for low-income residents, and as we speak that is the city's primary interest. They also envision integration of that development into the city grid, which the existing plan does. The City Manager, prior to discussion of the project and request for funding, one of his interests is to have child care there.

Pacheco: said the city's got a vision in the SIA plan to and in the Comp Plan there's a 300 page report with details of the vision.

Long Range Planner Position Review

Stoneking: reminded members that they sent a memo from PLACE endorsing that move and describing how we saw it should be handled. He said they even requested that the selection of a person, if that's how it should start, include PLACE in some form on a committee. He hasn't heard anything back from Planning Commission or City Council or the City Manager. Since then, Chris Henry had a meeting recently about this topic.

Henry: said it was less of a meeting and more just informal talking with a lot of stakeholders. He drafted a memo that he has been asking for support on that he will read to them. What he would like to ask is if PLACE would consider signing on and he'll write what he's written which he think reflects what our memo stated a long time ago and some various other conversations he's had along the way. Mixed use transit-oriented development is complicated. It takes collaboration, problem-solving, and can do attitude from the public and private sectors. It also requires careful planning and codification of a community vision for itself now and in the future. The city of Charlottesville is growing quickly, and the need for proper planning coordination of

this growth has never been greater. Properly coordinated and codified long range land use planning can help create a more sustainable, equitable, and desirable city for all of its residents, now and in the future. Currently, land use planning in Charlottesville is performed by ad hoc teams of volunteer private-sector stakeholders, like us, volunteer Planning Commissioners, like Ms. Keller, part-time city councilors, and city staff. The heavy lifting is done by outside consultants on expensive contracts, like SIA Plan, West Main Street, etc., which require significant management effort from staff as well as rework to familiarize each new consultant with our community. The results are predictably slow and disjointed, with frustration on all sides. There is a better way. Cities across the country are recognizing the need for the consolidation of expertise and authority in long range land use planning to guide community centric, smart growth efficiently and effectively. Charleston started the design center, Nashville has a community design department within its NDS, and there's probably a number that I didn't reference. Charlottesville is not immune to this need. The concept of a long range planning capability within City Hall has been recommended a multiple occasions. It was April 3rd that it was on a City Council agenda. Our PLACE Design Task Force 2017 Annual Report recommended this. This memo serves to reiterate the acute need for additional long range planning capacity at Charlottesville City Hall and recommends that this new capacity have multi-departmental decision making authority within the City Manager's office. Barring the expertise and authority described in the April 3, 2017 Council agenda, it is virtually certain that Charlottesville will continue a haphazard growth pattern that is detrimental to current and future residents, and especially at-risk communities.

He said he's been sharing this with decision-makers and stakeholders around town. So far, PLACE has expressed interest in it. The BAR is going to be discussing it this week. He's had sign-on from the Free Enterprise Forum, CADRE, Belmont Neighborhood Association, Martha Jefferson Neighborhood Association, North Downtown Residents Association, and Fry's Spring Residents Association is discussing it this week. There is a long list of individual stakeholders who have also agreed as signatories to this memo. He said he's going to be reading it to City Council if this item goes on the agenda. He believes the funding has already been allocated for this position, and now the debate is circling around what this position should be and where it should go.

Stoneking: asked to confirm that that memo came about after you had conversations with Maurice and Kathy, is that right?

Henry: confirmed that was correct. He had the idea of writing a memo after a meeting with Maurice, Kathy, Mark Rylander, and Heather Hill to talk about long range planning. What he's discovered through this path is that there's actually a really broad consensus from groups who often are at odds at the site plan and project level, agree that if we had some better long range planning in place then that would eliminate some of that friction.

Lloyd: said way back at the beginning of PLACE, we had a presentation from Virginia Beach where we talked about these kinds of issues. They identified growth areas and then worked with economic development to purchase them and develop transportation plans for them and work with developers and developed the land. They land banked the land. They identified the need, put all the plans in place, got a developer, and implemented it.

Keller: said they were chosen not necessarily because Virginia Beach is so comparable to Charlottesville or doing the best job, but it shows that this could work in Virginia under the codes of Virginia.

Bennis: said it required this multi-departmental cooperative effort and long range planning. It was design plus economic development plus transportation planning.

Henry: said from experience with multiple projects in the city, if you're forward with a complicated infill project, you have to go to five different departments and none of them talk to each other so there needs to be some way to get that communication happening. And also the planning is 10, 20, 30 years out so there's a road map. He looks at site plans all the time, that's his business, and in most cases there is no road map for what to do, which makes it extremely hard for everyone to do their job.

Lloyd: asked when you say there's no road map, do you mean there's no set up process for you as a developer?

Henry: said no, there's a process but there's no vision. He noted that there's a site he's doing right now in Belmont and it's a light industrial parcel in the middle of a residential neighborhood and he wants to do a corner store with apartments on top. But he dreamed that idea up. With the lack of that, there was no road map of anything. That parcel could have had a gas station on it, and he thinks we need to be able to tease those things out a little better, and the city really needs to be in front of them so that someone doesn't come along and put a gas station next to a bunch of single family houses.

Stoneking: said so we've recommended this as far back as March, you're reiterating it and have had recent meetings –

Bennis: asked is part of this reiteration also to clarify that this is separate from the idea of community engagement? She asked if this is just helping to define.

Henry: confirmed. He said the broad interdepartmental authority and decision making and planning that needs to be happening that isn't currently. And whether you call it a city architect or a long range planner –

Stoneking: asked if anyone knows what the current status of this is. Does anyone know if there's a proposal coming out of the City Manager's office or a resolution being drafted for Council?

Keller: said it's in Council.

Bennis: said she was puzzled by the list of qualifications that was showing up in what she understood to be the last job description. She said it included things like expertise in community engagement and writing code and all kinds of other stuff that she felt like seemed not essential.

Henry: said the date set to define a job description is Tuesday.

Keller: asked Alex if they have a copy of what Council's vision for this is.

Stoneking: said they wrote a preliminary one back in January.

Ikefuna: said Council directed the City Manager and himself to figure out what the position will do.

Stoneking: said Maurice told him that he was going to present options to Council, but he does not know if that has occurred.

Lloyd: asked if they made a recommendation about where this person should be located in the org chart of city government.

Stoneking: said that PLACE said "PLACE members think a new or revised assistant city manager might be the right path."

Keller: said she thinks that when they discussed that, they talked about it being in the City Manager's office. She is not sure that they all agreed that this person should be an assistant city manager.

Stoneking: opposed, saying they all agreed.

Keller: said she thinks it's beyond their scope to be asking for an assistant city manager position to be created. She thinks having something housed in the City Manager's office is very different from being an assistant city manager and she thinks they overstepped.

Wolfe: said the intention was to give it broad discretion as an umbrella that didn't get caught in –

Stoneking: said their memo went on to say, "Others have put forth this is best resolved via an additional assistant director within NDS." And then they finish that paragraph with, "However the city moves forward, we urge that the new position has the necessary support, financial backing, and authority to implement the vision." They're basically saying do what it takes to get it done, whatever that is.

Henry: said he's asking PLACE to sign on to this memo that he drafted, and asked to have a motion on that.

Motioned by Henry and seconded by Lloyd to adopt this memo serves to reiterate the acute need for additional long range planning capacity at Charlottesville City Hall and recommends that this new capacity have multi-departmental decision making leadership within the City Manager's office.

Keller: said she thinks he used the word authority and asked if he could define what that is.

Henry: said decision-making authority.

Keller: said some decision-making authority doesn't rest in staff, it rests in the Council. So she's a little nervous about using the word authority - which it could step on somebody's toes. Certain things have to be done legislatively and administratively.

Wolfe: said the person in this position wouldn't necessarily get to change the rules. They would still have to follow the proper path.

Keller: said she thinks they should be sensitive to the fact that they don't have any authority and they're making this comment.

Henry: said his sentence and the important one where they're recommending something says, "This memo serves to reiterate the acute need for additional long range planning capacity at Charlottesville City Hall and recommends that this new capacity have multi-departmental decision making authority within the City Manager's office."

Keller: said okay, and this isn't saying it's an assistant city manager, it's just saying it would be housed within that office. She can go along with that. She recommends changing "authority" to "leadership."

Stoneking: asked, with that change, do they have a motion to accept the memo?

Voted unanimously, Miller abstained

3. **New Business**

Accessory dwelling units
Roanoke community engagement
Code audit
      Building height
      Mixed use
      Parking
Land Use map
3D modeling update

4. **Announcements**

Stoneking: relayed that Kathy Galvin would like as many PLACE members as possible to attend the Planning Commission City Council joint session on October 26 from 4:00-6:00 which will be at Carver. It's talking about Form Based Codes and the SIA.

He's going to open a Drop box account for PLACE. It's meant to be an archive warehouse for things that they've shared.

Emily Dreyfus: introduced herself as a community organizer with the Legal Aid Justice Center. She said that s really appreciated their conversation about the impact of public comment and the need to really find ways to be responsive, because she thinks that's been a major issue for a lot of

low income people. There were several people who put extensive time in on the SIA planning process and their input was really not included in the plan, which does significant damage to the relationships that should be formed between the city and community members. She also wanted to suggest that when they're looking at neighborhood associations that they include the Public Housing Association of Residents (PHAR) as a neighborhood association and also the Friendship Court Residents Association. Even though that group is part of a broader neighborhood group, they don't really participate in the broader neighborhood group. PHAR represents many people who don't participate in the broader neighborhood groups but are very active with PHAR. PHAR is a HUD designated city-wide neighborhood association and so every public housing resident who is an adult is technically a member of PHAR and gets the opportunity to vote on the board election and that sort of thing. She also wanted to add that when Legal Aid did a door-to-door survey of Friendship Court they had a high response rate, even though an alarming number of people said very hopeless and disconnected things to her, but they did get responses from about 30% of the residents, and the residents are very opposed to streets going through their neighborhood. Three-quarters of the responses said "no streets." And the Form Based Code Institute didn't understand why that is and represented it as a sort of concern about appearances or convenience or that sort of thing, and it's really not. It's really bottom-line people are worried about their kids' safety. She feels pretty confidently that PHA has heard that message and that Sunshine Mathon seems to be a very responsive executive director, so she thinks there's a good chance that that part of the master plan will be changed, but she just wanted to make sure they all know about that.

Bennis: asked if they could be pedestrian streets?

Dreyfus: confirmed, absolutely.

Bennis: elaborated, like no car, but still divided. Because she thinks that the form based code is looking at "how does it feel to be in that space." And big massive buildings and big massive blocks don't feel good, but if it were pedestrian ways.

Dreyfus: confirmed, yes, people want more connectivity. She said for instance residents really hated the fence for many years, but really it's the streets and their kids' safety. If it's going to be divided there would probably only be one community center, and going from one corner, like 2nd and Garrett, to a community center that might be where it's located now and having your kids cross streets just feels too dangerous.

Bennis: said she doesn't know if PLACE is the right group to get that information to, but asked if they know who should have that? Or has it already been given to them?

Many: said Sunshine.

Dreyfus: said PHA definitely already has it, and they've shared it at city council meetings but they keep bringing it up so it doesn't get lost in the process.

Stoneking: said that sort of goes against what Alex just said about putting that whole area back on the city grid. He wonders what Alex meant by that. He took it to mean streets.

Dreyfus: said right, and that's the SIA plan is to break up that mega block that is Friendship Court by putting 4 streets straight through.

Stoneking: asked if that 4 street version is satisfactory to getting back on the grid and not too many streets?

Dreyfus: said they haven't responded.

Stoneking: said streets are funny because streets being public increases safety on one way of measuring safety – eyes on the street, defensible space, all of those notions that pedestrian alleys don't provide – but on the other hand if a kid's going to run after his ball, a car's a car.

Bennis: noted that its right downtown, people are getting to work. Then there's more incentive to cut through.

Mondschein: said it's all how you design the street too.

Stoneking: noted that Avon Street is crowded every single day in the morning, but if you get off into Belmont it's empty. No one's using Belmont as cut-through because it's inconvenient; there are too many stop signs. So everyone just uses Avon. So that pattern of streets and blocks and a primary thoroughfare work beautifully together.

Lloyd: brought up that the report on the Daughters of Zion Cemetery made a note that it was so isolated because there no through streets through it. So it was this quiet little corner that led to vandalism and other problems because it's so isolated, because it's cut off.

Stoneking: said that's the other side of the coin. It's a tough balancing act.

Keller: said here are ways to use the form based code with streets and alleys so that alleys are pedestrian and not vehicular and that sensitive uses, like daycare and other things, might be to the interior of blocks and serviced by alleys.
She'd like to exhort everyone here to attend as many civic meetings as they can if their schedule allows and they feel that they can sit through a Council meeting or a Planning Commission meeting or a BAR meeting or whatever kind of meeting they can come to, because it's really important to have residents who understand government and support an orderly process to be present. It's an instructive process to be there and see what's going on in our city right now. Even if you are a diligent viewer by streaming or watching at home, it doesn't substitute for the process of being there. In her personal opinion, she thinks those who hold any sort of appointed city office have an exceptional responsibility right now to share that and to behave responsibly when they go to meetings. And that doesn't mean that she want to shut down protests or free speech in any way, but she does think there's a higher duty of responsibility for those who accept an office. At the Planning Commission meeting the other night, there were at least two people who have been appointed to and sit on city entities who participated in the disruption of the meeting, and that disturbed her and she is going to pursue that.

<u>Next month's agenda</u>
Community Engagement
Parking
ADU
3-D modeling