

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
December 13, 2022 – 5:30 P.M.
Hybrid Meeting

I. COMMISSION PRE-MEETING (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 5:00 PM

Location: City Space

Members Present: Chairman Solla-Yates, Commissioner d’Oronzio (Virtual), Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Schwarz, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Habbab

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, Remy Trail, James Freas, Lisa Robertson, Tito Durette, Mike Rogers (Fire Department), Alex Ikefuna, Javi Gomez Jacome, Mike Rogers (City Manager), Sam Sanders, Krissy Hammill

Chair Solla-Yates called the meeting to order. He noted that we will provide 2 minutes per speaker for all public comment this evening. We will repeat that instruction throughout the meeting. He asked that commissioners think about the language to use for CIP related comments to assist with that discussion. It was noted that the Commission typically provides comments about recommendations for increasing or decreasing CIP funding but does not get detailed on the amounts. Commissioner Mitchell noted it is important to identify a decrease if an increase somewhere else is proposed.

Chair Solla-Yates asked if there were questions on the Comprehensive Plan. It was confirmed that the Climate Action Plan was to be included in the Plan as part of this discussion. Commissioner Stolzenberg asked if additional information was needed concerning manufactured housing and Ms. Robertson confirmed that the consideration meets the requirements. Commissioner Stolzenberg asked about the existing lots and critical slopes for the Azalea application. Ms. Creasy provided information. Chair Solla-Yates circled back to the CIP and asked if the amount provided to affordable housing is based on inflation. Ms. Hammill noted that increases in funding needed for projects are for inflation increases but there is not additional funding being placed in the CIP based on inflation in general. Commissioner Stolzenberg asked if funding for the Stribling project needs to be moved to earlier years in the CIP. Ms. Hammill noted that is something that could be provided as a recommendation. Commissioner Mitchell asked about the parking deck. Ms. Hammill noted that there would be more bondable capacity in the budget since that project is not moving forward. The draft CIP is full and there are still many budget unknowns.

Chair Solla-Yates noted that there are many important projects not funded. How are we going to address? Ms. Hamill provided some budget history and noted that we are okay with capacity, but that affordability is a concern. There are large expenditures planned for schools and housing and they have more needs. Priorities have to be considered. Commissioner Stolzenberg noted that we received 7 new housing project applications. Is there a plan for how those will be funded? Mr. Sanders noted that was a good question as there is not dedicated funds at this time. Those applications will be packaged and presented to City Council. We plan for at least ten million for housing each year but know that there are additional items and decisions will need to be made. Commissioner Stolzenberg asked if we received any bondable requests and Mr. Sanders noted that it does not appear so. Commissioner Stolzenberg suggested a separate pot of funds to support LI HTC projects.

COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order by Chairman Solla-Yates at 5:30 PM

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: City Space

A. COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Commissioner Stolzenberg – The MPO Technical Committee met. I had COVID and attended remotely. The VDOT cost estimates for upcoming smart scale applications are in. They are brutal. The Rivanna Pedestrian Bridge came in at over \$42 million. It was expected to cost \$16 million. There has been some severe cost escalation.

Commissioner Mitchell – There was a meeting with Parks and Recreation. The Heywood Community Trails is a 150-acre property near Ragged Mountain. We manage it. The objective of the expansion and updates is to increase the bandwidth to allow more people to bike and walk those trails.

Commissioner Schwarz – With the BAR meeting, there was a demolition request for a servant's quarters behind a house on Ridge Street. It is one of the only remaining on the street. It was an interesting conversation about what is valuable to preserve. By appearances, it is just a nice looking shed. It is a servant's quarters. It is a rare structure. We are also looking at 300 Court Square, which is adjacent to the Monticello Hotel. It is on the southeast corner of Court Square. They are looking to turn it into a boutique hotel. For the Bike & Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the Piedmont Environmental Council announced an active mobility summit on February 24th. It will be here. We received some updates on some quick builds for Rose Hill and Walker Upper Elementary to solve some of the dropoff/pickup issues that are happening. It is going to be some paint buffers and trying to get parents to go on a one-way loop through the neighborhood to try and control traffic and give kids a place to walk. The city is hoping to get the bike counters up and running. They have a plan to better maintain them and collect data from them. I met with Anthony Woodard of Woodard Properties last week concerning a project that we may see in the future. It was just a look for red flags.

Commissioner d'Oronzio – The HAC will hold its last meeting of the year tomorrow.

Commissioner Habbab – I had two meetings. The first meeting was the Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee. We met November 16th. We looked at an overview of the long-range Transportation Plan 2050, which is now going to be called Moving Towards 2050 to make it easier and more palatable. We did some brainstorming on how to conduct public outreach. The first round of public engagement will be conducted by June of 2023. We set a goal of about 1 percent public engagement, which is ambitious but possibly achievable. The main goal of the long-range transportation plan is to set up projects for smart-scale applications. They must be included in the plan to be eligible for smart-scale applications. My second meeting was the Tree Commission on December 6th. We looked at the downtown tree removal. The timeline for that is going to be around mid-January. The lumber is going to be kiln dried. There is going to be some public outreach to determine what the lumber should be used for. The arbor committee is going to meet with the Tree Commission and Parks & Recreation and schedule sessions with interested parties in using it. There is a new tree planting list of around 150 trees to be planted around schools next year. \$50,000 is going to be planted in the spring. The rest is going to be planted in the fall. Any leftover money is going to be used for watering the trees. RELEAF planted 50 trees in the 10th & Page Neighborhood. A series of nominations for heritage and specimen trees were made around the city by the Tree Commission. There were some comments from the Tree Commission. Comments have been received by the Planning Commission for the critical slope waiver and CIP.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Palmer – We had a Board of Visitors meeting last week. There was an approval for an Olympic Sports Building. It had previously been approved. The design had changed enough that we felt that we needed to go back to them with that. There was a review of the Karsh Institute for Democracy at the Ivy Corridor. It

will be the 3rd building to go in there. We got a lot of good feedback on the design so far but not an approval. That should come hopefully in March.

C. CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Solla-Yates – I have been looking at some spreadsheets.

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Ms. Creasy – We are getting to the end of the year. We will not be having a work session in December. We are set for the first 4 months of 2023 for work sessions related to the zoning ordinance. We are going to be busy doing that as things come forward.

1. Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Update: Schedule and Draft Districts

James Freas, NDS Director – I want to draw your attention to the memo that was in your packet, provide an update on the zoning ordinance rewrite project. One of the things we wanted to do was give you guys a more detailed schedule as we are looking forward to the rollout of the draft zoning ordinance. We are looking at a process that is measured twice and cut once. Over the course of the summer, we were looking at the diagnostic report that laid out how we were proposing to move forward with rewriting the zoning ordinance to implement the Comprehensive Plan. There was a report focused on the inclusionary zoning provisions and how the ordinance might play out in the housing market. That work was completed. The Planning Commission and City Council discussed it in September. We received the 'go-ahead' to move forward with the project. We are now looking at releasing the draft zoning ordinance itself in 3 chunks/modules as described in the memo. The first of those modules will arrive during the week of January 30th to February 3rd. That one is going to be detailed information on the zoning districts. That will include the zoning map, use table, and all the district standards (measurements, rules, height, lot coverage, lot size). The second module will arrive in the week of March 13th to March 17th. It will include the development standards. That includes landscaping, parking, and lighting. The final module is zoning administration. That includes the review processes associated with the zoning ordinance. That will arrive in the April 3rd to April 7th week. With all those weeks, I am reserving the right for it to take longer. Zoning is a complicated and large body of rules. There is a lot of review that needs to happen as we move each of these modules forward coordinating between us and the city attorney's office and other departments. These are our targets. We are going to work hard to achieve these targets. We have some work sessions on the zoning ordinance scheduled. January 24th is going to be a 'grab bag' of topics. I have listed critical slopes, floodplains, and entrance corridors as the primary ones. On February 28th, you will be discussing Module One, March 28th, Module Two, and April 25th, Module Three. We are aiming for a public hearing in June and adoption in June or July. The other thing included in the memo was draft zoning districts as they stand today. Our current zoning ordinance has about 30 zoning districts. The new zoning ordinance is proposed to have 17 districts. Five of those are residential districts, implementing the General Residential Medium Intensity Residential, and High Intensity Residential land use designations in the Comprehensive Plan. We have 10 mixed-use districts, which are replacing all our commercial districts. The final 2 districts, as proposed now, are a civic district (all public uses) and a campus district, which would cover large scale single owner uses, like UVA, medical campuses, large private schools, or maybe a large church.

Commissioner Schwarz – At the end of this process and when it is approved, is there a period between when it becomes implemented? Would architects planning a project be required to immediately follow the new ordinance? Is there some sort of buffer?

Mr. Freas – That is something that we need to be discussing as we get closer to adoption. If we were to go down that road, we would have to put an effective date into the ordinance. Otherwise, an ordinance becomes effective on the date of the Council decision.

Commissioner Schwarz – You have that all residential lots will have the same minimum frontage area. Did you learn anything about the sub-lot idea? Is that working? Is that still up in the air?

Mr. Freas – That is something that we are still discussing.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I have a question about the civic designation. It is about whether that locks those civic uses in place or whether normal uses or development would be allowed. Have you talked to the county about how they feel about it?

Mr. Freas – The civic use is intended to offer a certain degree of flexibility for public uses. There are a lot of details to be worked out. If we were aiming to reuse a parcel that is a civic use, that would involve a rezoning. Right now, the focus of that civic use category is to create a designation that is specifically for public uses, which tend to operate outside of how we regulate privately owned parcels. The decision making about publicly owned parcels are to be used are already subject to public review and process by the nature of the fact that they are public use.

Ms. Creasy – If they want to redevelop their site, there would be a public process to rezone/review that if it did not fall within a civic use.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If they were in a regular zoning category, there would be a public process within the county for the county to decide what to do with their land. In this scenario, there would have to be a process for them to come up with a plan then come to the city for a city public process for them to get approval.

Ms. Creasy – That would be on them for their public process. We would have that process within our jurisdiction and effects our residents. Our process would exist and how they determined they wanted to move through their public process.

Commissioner Habbab – I had a question on the first level of medium intensity. I was looking at how the base was 2.5 stories. I was wondering why that wasn't 3 stories since it is medium, and it is higher.

Mr. Freas – We can get into these later. That is going to come up and be part of the first module of work that comes in. I am going to refer to the idea that we are intentionally trying to ensure that we meet the Comprehensive Plan as an expectation that we are identifying opportunities for new housing construction but also keeping that housing compatible with its existing context. We use the term 'house scale' development frequently in reference to these zoning districts. That is what these rules are there to attempt to accomplish.

Chairman Solla-Yates – A concept that we have discussed in the past because there are many code sections we are discussing as part of the rewrite; would it be possible for some of these sections to move forward before June or July?

Mr. Freas – I would prefer to answer that question when I have more 'meat on the bone' than what we have here today. I am also more hesitant because we are looking at a significant rewrite of the existing zoning ordinance. It is less of a tweak and more of a significant rewrite. The zoning ordinance interrelates in so many ways across the whole thing, I would hate to move forward with something and realize that there is something in another section that is important to realizing the objectives that we have brought forward, it does not work. It does not achieve our objectives as laid out in the Comprehensive Plan.

E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA

Peggy Van Yahres – We strongly oppose the critical slope waiver for Azalea Springs. We are dismayed about losing one of the few remaining large mature forests in the city when our tree canopy is rapidly declining. It has declined to 40 percent just over 4 years. As we look at the rapid pace of development and the other critical slope waivers that have been granted, we know it is now probably down to 35 percent. We feel the public benefits of denying this far outweigh what the developer has proposed. The developer has proposed a man-made stormwater management system that will have to be maintained by the homeowners. We have a natural forest, a natural system that does not have to be maintained. The developer proposes a tiny park. I bet everyone would love to have that mature forest instead of that tiny park and only 2 affordable homes. As we look at the public benefits listed in the critical slope ordinance, one is to protect loss of natural features such as forest and wildlife habitat. One is to protect streams. This stream goes into Moores Creek, which depends on water going through natural soils and forests. Other public benefits are public health, reducing heat, energy savings, storing carbon. We think it is the Planning Commission’s job to protect the public. Just do it. As a landscape architect, I wonder about NDS speculating that more trees would be lost by right. They base this on lot layout and not engineering requirements such as sewers.

Genevieve Keller – I agree with the comments of Ms. Van Yahres. I would refer you to the excellent letter that was sent to you by Kay Slaughter, an environmental attorney by experience and education. She has been committed to the wise use of our environment and its appropriate development and redevelopment for several decades. I have good and expert advice and consultation coming to you from these 2 committed citizens. I ask that you take their advice seriously in your deliberations tonight and not over engineer projects but to work with the natural environment that we have and use it to the best advantage.

Brian Day – I wanted to make a statement about the decisions about low-income housing. I think it is a very wise policy decision to move forward with standardized approaches to request LI HTC funding. PHA has been working very hard to make 2 projects. I represent the Park Street Christian Church project. If we are going to move forward with the city’s goals of making affordable housing take place, continuing with the commitments that have been partially made to full decisions so that applications can get in on time for this next round because it is still years before we can open the door.

Linda Chauvin (Monte Vista) – I have lived here for about 12 years. I have noticed how heavy the traffic has become on Jefferson Park Avenue. Those of us who like to walk dogs and walk with children find it challenging today to cross Jefferson Park or Harris. Keeping in mind the heavy equipment that would be brought in to fill in tons of dirt to fill in that valley once all the trees are gone, it is going to be impossible. It is already dangerous here. The traffic backs up especially at rush hour. We now have so many children walking to Jackson-Via School. I hope that you would take into consideration that our neighborhood will be destroyed by this development and all that it will take to make it happen.

F. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Minutes – Planning Commission/City Council Joint Work Session – September 27, 2022

Commissioner Schwarz moved to approve – Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg – Commissioner d’Oronzio offered two amendments to the minutes. Motion passes 6-0 with amendments to the minutes.

Mayor Snook called Council to order.

II. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION AND COUNCIL

Beginning: 6:00 PM

Continuing: Until all public hearings are complete

Format: (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing, (iv) Discussion and Motion

- 1. **Charlottesville Capital Improvement Program FY2024-2028** – Consideration of the proposed 5-year Capital Improvement Program in the areas of Affordable Housing, Education, Economic Development, Public Safety & Justice, Facilities Management, Transportation & Access, Parks & Recreation, and Technology Infrastructure. A copy of the proposed CIP is available for review at: <https://www.charlottesville.gov/budget> Report prepared by Krisy Hammill, Office of Budget and Performance Management.

i. Staff Report

Krissy Hammill, Office of Budget & Performance Management –

Next Slide

We are going to talk about a few challenges of this CIP, the revenues, the 5-year draft specifics, and open it up for questions and discussion.

Next Slide – CIP Challenges

In looking at the CIP, there are always challenges when we work on the CIP budget or any operating budget. We always have the mission to balance all the revenues to the expenses or vice versa expenses to available revenues. With that, we always have more needs than we have available revenues. The same is true for the CIP. We always have competing priorities as well. We have issued an RFP to begin updating Council’s Strategic Plan, which will be coming forward. From schools, they have a lot of needs. We have one big project in the CIP right now. There are others as they look to the future. We have an aggressive affordable housing program. With transportation and access, there is always more room for sidewalks and trails. With the Climate Action Plan, you will be talking about that tonight. We have a backlog of capital maintenance for existing infrastructure that must be part of the CIP. With this year, we have some significant inflationary increases that we are looking to address. Construction costs are through the roof. There is the potential for our cost of borrowing to increase. We recently have been issuing bonds. We have been very fortunate to have historically low interest rates. Every year, we come to Council when we are ready to sell bonds. We have sustained those low rates for several years. That time will come to an end. Those are some challenges that we working to address with this budget.

Next Slide – CIP Revenues

We have few financial policies that we always address. We have our 3 percent pay go policy. It says that 3 percent of the General Fund Budget is dedicated to cash transfer to the General Fund. Several years ago, Council dedicated the mall vendor fees to go to the CIP to help pay for Downtown Mall infrastructure. The other large revenue source is bonds. In between, there is a lot of new stuff. Anything that you see in green in these next slides are changes from the 23 plan to the 24 plan. Mr. Sanders has been talking to you about the changes in the housing program. For any applications that were previously submitted through the Vibrant Community Fund that are housing initiatives, they will now be going through the CAHF process. We took an average of the CVF money that are allocated to housing programs, which was about \$575,000, we are diverting that to the CIP. That is an increase. The schools have received some construction grants from the state, which they have agreed to help offset some cost increases to the school reconfiguration project. At the next Council meeting, our Finance Director will be coming before Council to present the FY22 year-end results. We know from that that the schools have had a surplus. There is an existing gain-share agreement. They are asking and staff is requesting that Council appropriate that towards the CIP. In the past, we have also used cash from the CIP contingency fund to help offset some of those costs. We are using that for this budget.

Next Slide

With our 5-year plan, we are looking to transfer just under \$50 million from the General Fund. In general obligation bonds, we are looking at \$125 million. We are looking to use \$9.5 million in year-end surplus. We will receive about \$3.5 million from the schools and \$3.1 million in Other. The largest portion of that \$3.1 million is related to the Stribling Avenue funding agreement.

Next Slide – One-Time CIP Revenues

Some of these revenues are 1-time. The gain sharing is a 1-time thing. The construction grants from schools are a 1-time thing. The Stribling Avenue funding agreement is a 1-time thing. Technically, the contingency fund is a 1-time thing. How did the contingency fund get such a large balance?

Next Slide – CIP Contingency

Our Contingency is funded by year-end surpluses. We do have a policy and a practice that anything at year-end that is more than our 17-percent fund balance policy is transferred to our capital projects. We currently have a balance just under \$13 million in the contingency. If we take a step back, in FY20, we had \$3.9 million of surplus. In FY21, we did not fund any cash projects in the 21 CIP. We set that aside for a COVID reserve. Council has not yet programmed that. As part of the FY23 budget, Council approved \$1.9 million to go into the CIP, which we put in the contingency in anticipation of the school project. Those 3 things are what is leading to a larger contingency balance. We are looking to program most of that this year to balance out the expenditure side of the CIP.

Next Slide – General Obligation Funds

I don't think we will have to spend much time on this chart. The numbers that you see here are basically the same chart with no changes to where we ended the budget cycle last year. We are in FY24. If we estimated that the General Fund would grow about 1.5 percent and if we estimated that we were going to issue these bond issues on the side, you can see that we are well within our 9 percent target policy. Capacity is not an issue for this year. All these things are subject to change. If we talk about that, the bond issue amounts are estimates. You will see in FY24, 25, and 26 that those numbers represent the drawdown amounts for the school project. That is why they are slightly different. We estimate that we will average about \$15 million for other projects. Those amounts will change. They are not exact. Those numbers in black are the exact bond issue amounts from prior years we issue on a cash needed basis. The timing of the bond issue is subject to change. The interest rates can change and how much the General Fund grows. If it grows a lot, we have more capacity. If it shrinks, we have less capacity. Those are the relationships on that table.

Next Slide

Here is where the issue is (Affordability). If we look at our policy of the General Fund transfer, the yellow line is FY23. That is what we included in the budget. Part of the budget discussions with Council at the end of last year was that they discussed the opportunity to use some of the anticipated surplus from FY22 to put in the debt service fund to buy down some of the increases. What we discussed was about \$3.8 million. I have added that in the additional column. You will see that adds to the debt service fund balance. It allows us to buy it down. We are still required to increase on an annual basis almost \$1 million for the General Fund transfer. The more debt we issue, the more bonds we must pay back the higher debt service. Even though we are planning to put in more money in the debt service fund, we are not still out of the woods, even with the CIP plan that has been put forward.

Next Slide – AAA Bond Rating

We are lucky, as a city, to have a AAA bond rating. It allows us to get cheaper borrowing. It allows us many things. One thing that it provides us is an independent review of the city's ability and willingness to repay our debt. The 4 key factors that they look at are the economy, management, financial, and debt. All these things

matter. They play into the bond rating. From a financial standpoint, they also look at our practices. They look at how much debt we have and what our future obligations look like.

Next Slide – Proposed 5-Year CIP

This is the draft. This is the 5-year summary summarized by the large groups. If we were to do priority-based budgeting, which is where you put your money, you would see that our 3 priorities that are the most funded are education, affordable housing, and transportation & access. We have a total 5-year plan of \$191 million. The FY24 budget is just under \$100 million. That big swing is because of the Buford project.

Next Slides – Comprehensive Plan Alignment

With all the submissions this year, we asked that every project be linked to the chapters of the Comprehensive Plan. This slide and the next slide are intended to be a visual of where those projects landed.

Next Slide – Education

For education, the FY24 budget has \$76.8 million in it with \$97.7 million over the next 5 years. Anything in green is a change from the 5-Year Plan from last year. Anything highlighted in yellow is something that was new. It was added and was not in the plan at all last year.

Commissioner Mitchell – Just about everything in Education is bondable?

Ms. Hammill – That is correct. We break out the bondable and non-bondable projects. That is intended to be a plan. It does not mean that things that are listed as non-bondable aren't bondable. That is the plan for how we are planning to spend them. There is a \$200,000 a year budget for small, capped items for schools that we typically do not sell bonds. Those are small things like painting, handrails, doors, etc.

Commissioner Mitchell – We have \$79 million in bondable projects for this coming fiscal year and 76 of that 79 is going to Education.

Ms. Hammill – That is correct. We have the full amount of the school project in 24 and all the bonds in 24. They will not be issued until we need them on a cash basis. If you recall our discussions last year, VMDO provided us with a spend rate or a draw down basis of the project. If you remember that debt table, you never saw \$72 million in one year. It is because we are issuing the bonds based on how we spend them. It does not mean that by the time we get there, depending on the environment, we might find that we can do this project and be finished in 2 years. We must put it in the budget. We must have the expense there to encumber the contract. We must put in all the revenue in one year to balance the expected expenditure.

Next Slide – Facilities Capital Projects

We have a little under \$1.8 million for FY24 and \$7.8 million over the 5 years.

Next Slide – Public Safety & Justice

We have \$1.3 million for FY24 and \$5.5 million for the 5 years.

Next Slide – Transportation and Access

We have a little over \$7 million for FY 24 and \$30 million over the 5 years.

Next Slide – Parks and Recreation

We have \$1.9 million for FY24 and \$6 million over the 5 years.

Next Slide – Affordable Housing

We have \$10.6 million for FY24 and \$42.7 million over the 5 years. These are all non-bondable and bondable projects. You can see the CRHA at the top, which is bondable, and everything else, which is non-bondable.

Next Slide – General Government

We would zero that out in 24, 25, 26, and 27. With Economic Development and Strategic Initiatives, it is zero in all 5 years in the draft. The Technology Account is funded by the PEG fees, which is \$40,000. The citywide IT strategic infrastructure remains at \$250,000. It did add \$250,000 in FY27 and FY28.

Next Slide – What is Next?

We are having the public hearing tonight with questions and discussions from you all and the public. You will take that into account and make a recommendation to the City Manager. We will work with all of that. An official proposed CIP will go to Council in March.

Commissioner Habbab – You mentioned the contingency. How much money is there in the contingency?

Ms. Hammill - \$12.7 million.

Commissioner Habbab – We can draw from it what we need.

Ms. Hammill – That is where we will be pulling the \$9.5 million that is in the budget. Most of it is in 24. Just under \$900,000 is programmed for 25. That would reduce that down to about \$3 million.

Commissioner Habbab – I know that staff is working on the priority list for the sidewalks and bike lanes. Do we have an idea when the tool that they are developing is going to be ready?

James Freas, NDS Director – The timeframe for that is at least 1 to 2 months out from final delivery of that program. That tool is going to be used to prioritize our entire list of sidewalk and pedestrian projects. At this point, we are anticipating using it for next year’s CIP conversation.

Commissioner Habbab – I had a question on the small area plans. There is ongoing funding to that. I was wondering if there are any ongoing small area plans.

Mr. Freas – There are no ongoing plans. That is something that we will be discussing with the Commission. The intention is that once we wrap up the zoning ordinance rewrite, we will be teeing up small area plans for the future. I have been putting together a schedule for that work. The first step of that, as called for in the Comprehensive Plan, is to agree on a standardized process/format for those plans so there is a certain degree of consistency for those plans as they go forward in the future, and we know what we are anticipating receiving in terms of outcomes. We can focus those in on a defined set of achievable outcomes.

Commissioner Habbab – We are building up this fund for when we need it. We do not have something specific for this next fiscal cycle.

Mr. Freas – We do. If we stay on schedule, the zoning ordinance will be wrapping up within this fiscal year. For that first project that I was talking about, defining what a new small area plan looks like and teeing up the first one of those small area plans within that program. It would begin work in this upcoming fiscal year.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I am following up on an email exchange about CISRAP. I am curious about data for that and how many of these vouchers we are pushing out. My understanding is that the CRHA says that they are not going to be needing the suggested funds. We have repurposed some of those funds. What is the state of the numbers?

Alex Ikefuna, Director of Community Solutions – There are currently around 62 residents. 27 of those residents are in the county and 35 are in the city.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – The output for that is the \$500,000 that they are talking about.

Mr. Ikefuna – That is correct. The good thing is that the CRHA requested and is working with the Deputy City Manager, Mr. Sanders, and followed up with City Council. City Council agreed for the CRHA to use some of the unspent money to acquire permanent housing, which is sustainable. There was a question that Commissioner Stolzenberg asked. That activity essentially accomplished that question. It also provides some flexibility to spend that rental assistance fund.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I understand they have the capacity administratively to push out more vouchers. They are at the point where they do not have places to put these people. The problem is getting the vouchers.

Mr. Ikefuna – In terms of capacity, when City Council approved the last agreement a few months ago, one of the issues that the Housing Authority requested was to increase the admin fee to 10 percent. The City Council reaffirmed that request. In terms of capacity, they have the funding that they need to enable them to meet their needs. Based on the feedback we are getting from the Housing Authority, the number of people on the wait list is coming down. What it means is that either the program is working, and people are finding permanent housing on their own. They are moving on or there is something else going on.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If they have the staff capacity, extra money, and the wait list is dropping, what is the holdup? Why aren’t they giving out more vouchers?

Mr. Ikefuna – That is something we will have to follow up with them. As far as I am concerned, I know they requested an increase administratively to meet the administrative needs. City Council reaffirmed that request. In terms of the city supporting that need, the city does not have a problem there. However, we need to follow up with the Housing Authority so they can provide additional information. In terms of the city’s responsibility, the city is living up to that creed in terms of helping them to meet the administrative capacity to deal with the needs of the program.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – They want this funding drop to \$500,000.

Sam Sanders, Deputy City Manager – They are not asking for it to be taken away. They are asking for it to be reduced in this line item. The request is for that amount of money to be made available to them for use in a different way. That is to be determined by City Council. We use that this year for the surplus that had been generated because we were concerned about how little of it was being spent, and it was building up. That was the item that we brought forward for Council to consider. For the long term, that \$900,000 is more than what they are saving in need. That would mean that we would have to reconcile that. I do not want to speculate on behalf of CRHA as to what they need to speak to for themselves. As was presented to me, the concern was that they do not need that amount of money for the current number of people who are presented in need of the rental assistance. They are using their vouchers at a faster rate than they have been at one point. There were 2 different wait lists. It appears that is no longer the case, which is why they were able to reach the conclusion that the reduction was possible. The request was whether we can deploy those funds in a different way.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – When you say that they are meeting the need, does that mean for the people who currently hold the vouchers?

Mr. Sanders – Those that are presenting in need of assistance. The only way to spend the money that they currently have is to increase the fair market rent percentage. They have declined requesting that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – The city-funded ones are 110 percent.

Mr. Ikefuna – There was an issue in terms of increasing it to 125 percent. The issue is that if City Council decides to do it, it cannot be something that the city must do one time. It is like setting a trap for the beneficiaries. After the 1-year, what happens? The city must do it at one time, then it must be sustainable. The Housing Authority requested that. If it is not going to be sustainable, then there is no need for doing that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What is the deal with Friendship Court? Why is there all this new funding for new years when we had previously not had any future spending for infrastructure improvements? Was there a change of scope in what those are?

Mr. Ikefuna – There are some cost escalations. When you have a massive project like that, it was bound to have some kind of cost increases, some unseen circumstances that warrant cost adjustment. If you are in the construction industry, that does happen from time to time. Those are some of the expenses that they are having. Even the CRHA is having some of the same experiences. South Street Phase II had considerable financial challenges. They were able to get additional funding from the state. The city was able to provide more than \$400,000 in additional funding to help leverage the gap. The cost escalation that has occurred is a result of several factors, which includes COVID. Every other thing has affected the project.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I did have some questions about CISRAP. What is preventing you from issuing more vouchers to more people? Is it because people cannot attach them? Is there nobody on the wait list who needs them?

John Sales, Executive Director – The problem started in 2020 during the pandemic when agencies were not referring families. The agreement called out using the HCV wait list, which we zeroed out at the end of 2020. We opened up the wait list in 2021. We are going through that wait list quickly. We had 1100 families. We are down to less than 500. We put out a lot of vouchers. We plan on issuing about 100 vouchers per month until about March from the HCV program. That cleared out that wait list. HUD had an issue with us utilizing our voucher wait list for CISRAP. It was hurting the voucher program. We would lease up with families with CISRAP. It took longer to lease up because we had to do the entire process. HUD had an issue with that. As a federal program, they wanted it separate. We were working with TJPDC and family self-sufficiency program through this CRHA and PVCC. We did not receive any referrals for a long time. We started receiving referrals this year. We are assisting families again. We were serving about 50 families because they were moving off the CISRAP program onto HCV and we weren't receiving any referrals. We are now starting to receive referrals from both programs. We recently received 5 from PVCC. We have been consistently receiving about 10 for the last 1.5 months for our homeless referrals. We are starting to lease up those units again. The city approved having the fair market rents, payment centers set at 125 percent of the fair market rents in the city and 110 percent in the county. It has already been done. The concern was raising it to 150 percent, which was what some of the other agencies or organizations outside of what CRHA was asking for. That is an issue that we should not get into because it would drastically impact, not only the number of landlords that will serve HCV families because a lot of them will raise their rents to maximize the CISRAP rents, which will make it so that HCV vouchers cannot be utilized. That is the larger program we are serving; over 450 families currently. It is close to 500 families through the voucher program, while only serving about 60 in the CISRAP program. There is a big difference. We do not want to negatively impact the HCV program, which is our 'bread & butter' when it comes to serving families in traditional housing units.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – How are you running through the wait list so quickly with only about 500 vouchers total? Is it because people are getting them and not attaching? Is it because people, who had vouchers or who had attached, then gave it up because they went to other housing?

Mr. Sales – Some individuals circle out of the program. We have also received a lot more funding. When I took over the Housing Authority, we had about \$600,000 or \$700,000 in funds that HUD was slated to take unless we leased up. We did a huge lease up. We issued a lot of vouchers, and we received even more money this year. With the way that HUD works, the more you spend, the more they give you. We have a voucher cap of around 650. We never get enough money to max out the 650. As we continue to get more funding, we will be able to max out that 650. We have added additional vouchers to the emergency housing voucher program, which was 15 vouchers. The mainstream program was 40 vouchers and additional funds. That all played a part into being able to issue more vouchers. We are slated to get another \$700,000 this year in federal funding for the voucher program.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What would you like to see happen with this CISRAP line item? You would like to see it reduced and the balance into a new and separate account that is more flexible.

Mr. Sales – Yes. I believe, as we continue go through the program, we are going to have some families come off CISRAP and go to HCV. That will continue happening because we are encouraging families to join that program because that is a more permanent program. The city program is a program that is year-to-year, even though there is a commitment in the CIP. That could change every year. We have been encouraging families, when the HCV wait list is open, to get on that wait list as well, even if they want CISRAP. I think the money sitting in a more flexible account is a good idea and allows us to adjust to what is happening in the market. It allows us to assist more families if that is what the need is when it comes to CISRAP. I think we came up with the \$500,000. If we look at the number of families we are serving at the level, that is the amount that is needed for 12 months.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In this CIP, we showed the last \$3 million commitment for redevelopment in FY26, which is fulfilling the \$15 million request. Does that get you where you need to be for your redevelopment plan? Are you going to be coming back and making more requests?

Mr. Sales – We will be making another request. The \$15 million does not consider Westhaven, which is our largest site. It is probably the most challenging site. We are working on the dollar amounts of what it will cost to complete that site through our sustainability plan, which was required by City Council. We are going to present that hopefully at the beginning of 2023. I think it is going to be around \$15 million. We still do not have a firm number. When we have looked at the projection and plugging in gaps, I think we are at about \$15 million, which is what is going to be needed for Westhaven. The residents are currently working through their plan. We plan to submit a LI HTC application for funding in March of 2024. That is probably going to be a 3- or 4-phase project consisting of single-family homes, some townhouses, hopefully a senior apartment building, recreation centers, community centers, and some commercial spaces for residents to grow businesses and producing other revenue for the Housing Authority to offset the debt service that is going to be needed to complete the redevelopment.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I have a question about the significant cost escalation for Friendship Court, including infrastructure improvements and for all the phases. At the retreat, we talked about having a work session to talk about all this stuff and set out the long-term plan for housing commitments. That would be very helpful.

Sunshine Mathon, Executive Director – The original numbers that we put forth to the Planning Commission and City Council were based on late 2018/2019 estimates. Those numbers are old and ‘stale’ in today’s world.

With earlier city projects, cost escalation has been dramatic and pervasive across every form of construction including the work that we do at Friendship Court and other affordable housing projects. The increases in numbers reflect that cost escalation as best as we know it right now. One of the aspects that is also slightly confusing is that when we originally submitted our requests and estimates for Friendship Court 2 to 3 years ago, we were directed by staff to lump together the infrastructure and the housing subsidy numbers. In the interest of trying to bring more clarity and transparency to that in the last couple of years, we pulled that apart. A certain portion of the funds go to subsidize the housing just like the affordable housing. A certain portion of the funds are dedicated to the extension of 4th Street and public streets as well as a new future city park that will be owned and operated by the city in phases II and III as they get finished. The bottom line is that the escalations we are seeing are no different than any other industry in what the construction industry is seeing. There are some additional state and federal resources that have started to emerge. Those resources are insufficient on their own to close the gap. We need the city to be cost participants in that to get us across the finish line.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is the city covering its pro-rata share of that gap like increasing the proportionate to the cost increase? Are we covering more of the gap from that? For your future LI HTC applications, won't that be reflected in the LI HTC awards? I know you got supplemental LI HTC for phase I. Is that going to be available as well?

Mr. Mathon – There are points and questions in there. We did not get additional supplemental LI HTC on phase I. Public housing got some additional LI HTC for one of their projects. The increases in costs, the amount of money that we are asking from the city is a lower percentage than the pro-rata share because the federal and state resources make up more of that percentage. It is a lower than pro-rata share in that regard.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do you expect the LI HTC allocation to increase in proportion to costs?

Mr. Mathon – Unfortunately, that is not the case. The reason for that is because there is a limited amount of LI HTC nationwide. There is proportionate limited amount for Virginia specifically. Inside of Virginia, Virginia Housing, the state Housing Finance Agency breaks up their allocation into various regions. The region we exist within is a relatively low population compared to some of the other regions. There are maximums each year on how much each region can absorb. We are already assuming the maximum. There are no additional LI HTC resources that can be pursued in that regard. At the federal level, there is continued advocacy nationwide to increase the total allocation across all states. In this current congressional environment, it is unclear whether that will pass. If that does pass, the calculus may change in the future. Now, that is not what we are seeing.

Councilor Payne – Beginning in FY27, the amount is roughly \$4.3 million. Would it be an accurate statement that our budget currently plans to begin in FY27 to spend less than half of our formerly adopted yearly affordable housing commitment? Over this 5-year period, are we going to spend about \$10 million less than our formerly adopted affordable housing commitments?

Ms. Hammill – This is just the CIP budget. There is other money in the General Fund and other money that help make up that commitment. This is just the plan. Those out-years will most certainly change as projects and things come up. Right now, in the CIP, it is showing less.

Councilor Payne – With the existing budget, is that gap made up for outside of the CIP?

Ms. Hammill – We only plan the General Fund one year at a time. It is dependent on the projects that might come forward. In CIP right now, we are balanced and there is a gap.

Councilor Payne – I would interpret that to mean that we don't have a plan for how to match the commitment of our affordable housing strategy. As discussed earlier, would it be an accurate statement that the city currently has no plan for how to pay for the Westhaven phase of public housing redevelopment.

Ms. Hammill – According to what Mr. Sales said, that is not in the money that is currently allocated.

Councilor Pinkston – With the contributions that we are making to the jail, those are captured through the General Fund?

Ms. Hammill – The jail be issuing their own bonds for that project. They will bill us for operating and debt service. That will come out of the General Fund.

Councilor Pinkston – What about the library?

Ms. Hammill – We received a request from the library for renovations to the downtown branch. That is not currently in the plan. That would be a joint project with the county. They are behind us in terms of their CIP. It is unclear what they are working on. We have been in contact with their budget office. They are currently evaluating the request.

Councilor Pinkston – It is a large request. It is something that they have been asking for several years. We should have that conversation with the county and the library. We cannot continue to put it off. I would appreciate it if we had those conversations about that. I am not saying that it will be in this plan. We need to be good partners with the library and the county.

The amount of money that is set aside for the Downtown Mall is \$80,000 a year. Is there any sense if that is a good number? It seems low to me.

Mr. Sanders – The assumption is that number won't stay. The work that must be done by the Downtown Mall Committee that has been assembled by the City Manager will spend its energy trying to figure out what the priorities are. There will be recommendations that will come along with that.

Councilor Pinkston – My concern is the same with the sidewalks. It is fantastic that there is a new tool that is being developed. If we must get through these tools that we are putting together lists, we end up 18 months from now still having the same conversations. I am wondering that even if we don't have a firm number, could we double or triple it, so when you have the tool ready, the budget is approved, the money is there? I feel the same way about the sidewalks.

Mr. Sanders – That is a matter of choice. You can do that and put more aside. It will be available when we are there, and we catch up from a capacity standpoint. I am not submitting to you that we will not make progress in 2023. We will make progress in 2023 in getting more production in the space of producing sidewalks and all the various things we continually get feedback for not doing.

Councilor Pinkston – The money that has been set aside for sidewalks that is allegedly not being spent, that is sitting somewhere in an account and accumulating?

Mr. Sanders – It is sitting in the CIP. We have 3 line items within the CIP under the ADA label. We are working through that. There is still more coming to you and Council. The desire is to produce more sidewalks. We don't produce any new sidewalks outside of a big project.

Councilor Pinkston – One of the pieces of feedback that we are getting is that we spend \$2 million a year on sidewalks, which I think is fantastic. When you add up a number of these line items, it is more than \$100,000 a year. You have been accumulating funds over the years that has not been spent. The limiting step is having the personnel to get this work done.

Mr. Sanders – That has been my message. You heard that from me a couple of weeks ago. It is continually what I am focused on. We do not have a money problem today. We have a performance problem, process problem. We are fixing that. Then I will need more money. We will be asking for more money because we will have the processes in place to ensure that we can spend it.

Councilor Pinkston – That is helpful for the public to know.

Mayor Snook – You have indicated that our current contingency funds balance is about \$12.7 million. You have allocated about \$9.5 million in here leaving about \$3.2 million in the contingency fund. Is that a typical amount yearly? Does that get us back to normal?

Ms. Hammill – It does. If you go back and look at the history of the contingency account, we have been all over the place; Three million has typically been about our high. This is not normal. Those 3 things are contributing to that. We do not have a policy about how much money should be in there. At some point, it was as low as \$600,000. We have usually hovered around a couple million dollars.

Mayor Snook – Ultimately, the purpose of a contingency fund is to be available to be spent for something we do not now foresee. Would it be fair to say that if there is some unforeseen circumstance that gets us to needing another \$2 million, it would not be irresponsible to say that we could put that much more into a project this year.

Ms. Hammill – That is correct. Keep in mind that the contingency by policy is funded by any yearend surplus. You have an opportunity for replenishment each year. It is not like a one-and-done thing.

Mayor Snook – I never want to get to the position where we have spent our whole contingency fund. Leaving \$1 million in the bank, for example, would be a responsible position.

There are 3 roof replacements in this schedule. Is there any plan to coordinate with replacing the roof and adding solar panels or something like that. Is that in here? Is that simply when that plan is developed, we can add it?

Ms. Hammill – Solar panels are not part of the numbers. They are simply roof replacements.

Mike Goddard, Project Manager – We don't have funding for the solar component right now. We will be designing those roofs with the intention of making them solar ready. If in the future we can identify some funding for those solar installations, we will be ready.

Mayor Snook – I am looking at the budget for the CHS roof replacement. You have designated \$4.8 million between FY24, FY25, and FY26 to be spent on that, plus \$1.2 million in this fiscal year, suggesting a total of about \$6 million. I am a little surprised that it is a 4-year project. I think it would be something that would be completed faster than that. Is there a reason for a 4-year project?

Mr. Goddard – There are a couple of reasons. One reason is that there are some supply chain issues in the roofing industry right now. That is causing it to be difficult to get that quantity of roofing material. Another reason is that there is a limit to how much we can accomplish in one summer. That is not something we can do

with an occupied school or part of a school. It is responsible to phase it that way. Another reason is to make it easier to swallow financially.

Mayor Snook – It seems that right now is the time to be making plans for solar on those roofs, not some point down the road.

Mr. Goddard – Right now, we are making plans for the roof, which includes making the roofs solar ready. In that sense, we are planning for it. In another sense, we do have our colleagues in environmental working on a plan to find an alternative funding method for that. That is happening. I cannot report on where they are in the process with accuracy.

Mayor Snook – A couple of questions on the Transportation & Access portion. We are looking to be spending in the next fiscal year \$3.7 million on traffic signal infrastructure replacement and \$1 million a year thereafter for the next 4 years. What is driving that?

Ms. Hammill – There is a study that has been commissioned. We are awaiting the results. We know that we have a lot of aging infrastructure as related to the traffic signals. There have been 3 intersections that have been deemed emergencies. They are in severe shape. With supply chain issues and the cost of that equipment that has skyrocketed, the \$3.7 million is to immediately address those 3 intersections. The \$1 million a year is to have a replacement plan in place to do that. We have not done that for a long time.

Mayor Snook – There are a couple of different places where we have some money set aside. It is written in green. That is a change. Citywide ADA improvements, sidewalks, and curb cuts were zeroed out of the non-bondable and put into bondable.

Ms. Hammill – That is what happened. There are some existing balances in those accounts. Mr. Sanders and his team are working on an ADA plan, which will be coming forward to Council.

Mayor Snook – I appreciate the fact that we talked last year during the budget process about the need to get additional construction capacity and project managers so that we can start spending some of the money that is allocated. This is how that is going to be happening.

On the next page, there was a sly reference to the Economic Development & Strategic Initiative being zeroed out. What is happening there?

Ms. Hammill – There is a balance there. We decided to not add any new funding this year.

Mayor Snook – On the CAT Transit Bus Replacement Match, you are asking for \$100,000 next year. How is that number figured? Is it based on a certain number of buses?

Ms. Hammill – CAT maintains a bus replacement schedule. That money is only the city match. Most of that purchase price is covered by the state or federal. We budget the city's match in the CIP and is transferred as those buses are purchased.

Mayor Snook – There is \$100,000 allocated for neighborhood transportation improvements, which is an increase from 50 years before. What are neighborhood transportation improvements?

Ms. Hammill – Those are generally specific projects that our transportation engineer has laid out.

Mr. Freas – Neighborhood transportation improvements are improvements aimed at neighborhood safety. They are intended to be of the quick build variety, not dissimilar from what we have been doing with The Safe Routes to School Program. It is recognizing that a lot of the improvements that we would like to make in terms of transportation improvements, neighborhood safety, pedestrian safety tends to be expensive sidewalks. We have seen what the costs are for sidewalks. One of the things that we can more quickly do on a wider scale across the city, with the focus on Safe Routes to School. That is what those funds are targeted for. The transportation planner and that team we are forming are going to be the ones spearheading that effort with other agencies to implement.

Mayor Snook – One of the broad concerns, although we don't yet have a plan to deal with the issue, we can reasonably anticipate that at some point in the next 6+ months, we will develop a plan to try to do something about the unhoused people. That is likely to involve a capital expenditure. If we get into a situation where we don't have any flexibility to address that problem, we may be 'kicking ourselves' 6 months from now. That is a problem that we know is important. We know that we are not addressing it anywhere else in here whether that qualifies as a use for the contingency fund. It is something that I hope everybody on City Council and Planning Commission will keep in mind.

Councilor Pinkston – Are you thinking about including a line item?

Mayor Snook – I would be reluctant to include a line item that is purely 'a stab in the dark.' It is likely to be a 7-figure 'stab in the dark.' I want everybody to keep in mind that must be a priority for us once we identify a possible solution.

Ms. Hammill – One of the themes with this CIP budget is that it is holding the line. There are a lot of things that are unknown. We do have capacity. We still need to figure out the affordability piece of it. All the inflationary increases and the increases in the CIP we are seeing because we are fortunate enough that we have the CIP contingency, we can cover those increases. Last year, our bondable dollar amount was 119/121. We are at 125. We have added 2 more years. That was the thought process that we hold during this inflationary time and give us some flexibility to look at other things.

Mayor Snook – For FY24 and 25, we are projecting to spend nearly \$11 million for the first year and over \$11 million in the capital fund and \$9 million out of FY26. It is in FY27 and 28 that things begin to fall off. We have \$42 million allocated out of the capital budget towards a \$50 million commitment.

ii. Public Hearing

Peter Krebs – I would like to applaud the staff for a great job with the quality of the materials and frank, candid, and mature discussion about what is going on. The city's bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure is short. We know that there are serious and legitimate constraints. Those were articulated. Two issues are that a large amount of funding is properly dedicated to reconfiguring the schools and a lack in project management expertise and staffing. I have a few creative ways to deal with those two situations. I applaud the effort to staff up the project management capacity. Let's keep our eye on the ball and see it through. We should allocate (millions of dollars) for sidewalks and bike lanes in the out years once we have the capacity and once, we are past the reconfiguration. That is what the county did. I would like to applaud the commitment and please increase and continue the neighborhood transportation projects that are making it safer for kids to get to school.

Mark Rylander – I wanted to thank Council and Planning Commission for your continuing support for tree-related issues over the past years. We have been working with the city's new urban forester and have identified top priorities. There are 4 line items. One of them is to mitigate the loss of trees that we talked about in our state of the forest report: funding for planting approximately 200 new trees to offset the accelerating decline of the

tree canopy. There is a line item for ash trees, which we are losing at a great rate and have become a safety hazard. That request will span several years. These trees will be eliminated except for the ones that are protected. The 3rd category is for taking care of Downtown Mall trees. We need a strategic plan for a lot of these trees, which have been declining. Most of these tree items have been defined as a backlog of capital maintenance and existing infrastructure. There is a new item: invasive plant control and containment. A lot of our parks and schools are being overrun with invasive species. They need a push to retake those areas.

John Semmelhack (1515 Chesapeake) – The proposed CIP is a significant step forward for Charlottesville. It prioritizes equality, school facilities, and the city should be commended for its funding of affordable housing initiatives. Even as Charlottesville’s housing crisis seems to be getting worse, the CIP keeps funding for affordable housing flat and the supplemental rental assistance program. We recommend increasing the funding for both programs to help meet the city’s housing need. Where the CIP falls short is in improving pedestrian, cycling, and accessibility infrastructure. We strongly recommend progressively increasing funding over the course of the 5-year CIP so that by FY28, the city is annually spending \$2 million for new sidewalks and bike infrastructure. The proposed \$100,000 for new sidewalks and bike infrastructure for each of the next 5 years are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s vision to make Charlottesville a city that is accessible to all people. Providing safe, reliable, and accessible bike and pedestrian infrastructure is essential to meeting the city’s climate and safety goals. It is essential to the Comprehensive Plan for more affordable housing in Charlottesville as quality bike and pedestrian infrastructure go hand-in-hand with allowing more people to live close to jobs, schools, and amenities. We recognize that increased revenue may be required to pay for these projects. We support revenue enhancement and do not believe money should be pulled from projects.

Brandon Collins – I wanted to put in another vote of planning ahead to meet the needs of Charlottesville community and its affordable housing needs. The redevelopment of Westhaven has begun as we have begun working with residents. That site is a large site. It has many opportunities. CRHA is going to find many funding opportunities that we are not going to be able to fund without city support. It is wise to start thinking about 5 years down the road when we will be ready to spend some money to fundamentally alter the situation of affordable housing and public housing in the city of Charlottesville. In 1954, Charlottesville created the Housing Authority to steal land at Vinegar Hill, Garrett Street, and Hartsman Mill. The only thing given in return was the housing authority. It is now performing and providing additional affordable housing while significantly improving the quality of life for our current residents. If we want to do that and we want to be a city that can make amends that can provide ample affordable housing for the entire community, we need to plan and be thinking about where we are going to find that money for Westhaven redevelopment.

Bob Roach – I keep hearing about the funding for the ‘paint and plastic versus concrete.’ One of the things that we have tried to do over the years, mostly for safety reasons, is to get a 4-way stop at an intersection in our neighborhood at Trail Ridge and Shamrock. We have been rebuffed time and time again and that it is not needed. The truth is that it is needed now more than ever. We finally got our neighborhood association going again. We are going to be coming back to the city to get this 4-way stop. They put in the paint and plastic. It is a temporary solution. They are helping and we are glad to have them. We have been given a long list of reasons why we shouldn’t have it there. I can give you reasons why we should have it. I wanted to bring that up as part of the CIP. I imagine that it would be inexpensive to put in a 4-way stop. It is something that you will be hearing from us in the future.

Sunshine Mathon – Up for discussion this evening is the 5-year CIP with requests for substantial investment in the development of housing that will be affordable to families and individuals below 30 percent AMI and those who rely on the stability of safety net housing of up to 40, 50, 60, and even 80 percent of the area median income. Those families who want to live in the city, who are often striving to break free from cycles of generational poverty and cannot afford to live in free market housing. The call to action is clear. Over the last few years, the city has stepped up and done its part by funding Friendship Court and public housing

redevelopments. The time for action is renewed. Our regional housing nonprofits, CRHA, Habitat, and Piedmont Housing Alliance have invested 100s of hours of staff time 1000s of dollars in pre-development planning efforts to put additional affordable housing opportunities in front of you. Historical thresholds of city investment and affordable housing have been commendable. We operate in an entirely new development cost environment. I know from peer housing organizations that inflationary pressures are delaying or killing affordable housing projects. Though some state and federal resources have increased during the pandemic, they are insufficient on their own to close the funding gaps. City funding unlocks other potential subsidy sources. These housing opportunities have no chance of moving forward without substantial city support.

Michelle Heimgartner – I want to second what a previous commenter said about Johnson Village. I am an engineer. I have been working for the DOT as an engineer for 22 years. When I moved here, I tried to get speed bumps put in on Shamrock because people speed in and out of Johnson Village. It is one way in and one way out. Because of that, they could not put in speed bumps. I agree that a 4-way stop is necessary for that intersection. We have had pedestrians get hit on Shamrock. We have had students walking to Johnson Elementary.

Kay Slaughter – I have written you about West Main Street. I would like to speak about it for the CIP. I ask that you allocate some money to redo plaques on the Drury Brown Bridge, purchase flag holders for existing lights, and flags silk-screened faces of the 37 bridge builders that can be put in. This would be a great memorial if it was more visible to these 37 people who contributed to the civil rights of the city, to working for justice and equality for citizens in Charlottesville. I presented this plan in the past. I had always been waiting for the entire street to be redone. Existing plaques have rusted. Some have been removed. Many other cities have done this. I would like to propose the city look at this and consider it in the current CIP.

iii. Commission Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Mitchell – One thing that I would like to continue to remind staff to do is to get the Chair involved earlier than we do. A couple years that I have chaired, I had to remind staff to invite me in. It would be very helpful if we could get the Chair involved earlier. The Chair can begin coaching the rest of his colleagues about what is on the way. This is my 6th CIP meeting. This is the most complete, thorough, well thought out, well presented, and well-organized piece. I really appreciate the way staff ‘married’ this with the Comprehensive Plan. I really appreciate the tools staff provided us to navigate through this. I recognize the wrestling staff did with the number of tradeoffs. I am not going to second guess anything that staff suggested that we do. I have watched what staff have done. I have read the documents completely. I will defer to my colleagues. The only thing I ask that we do is that we respect our fiduciary responsibility. We respect the importance of our bond rating as we make recommendations. We respect the importance of balancing the budget. We respect the importance of making this as revenue neutral as possible. Don’t recommend things that is going to force Council to go back and ask for another increase in revenues.

Commissioner Habbab – I would like to hear on how the CIP is aligning with the Climate Action Plan. Are we meeting our target or our goals? How does the CIP help us meet our climate action plan goals?

Mr. Sanders – Council is currently prioritizing items as action items for implementation in FY24. As that information comes together, we will be sharing that with staff for them to begin to integrate that into their work plan. That will be part of the budget assessment as well.

Kristel Riddervold, Director – There are projects within the CIP that align with key actions in the climate action plan. There are always opportunities to add more things depending on what the pace is that we are looking for. It is my understanding that there is some work that could be done to make the CIP reflect climate as a priority. As presented in the climate action plan, there some specific strategies that will help us make progress,

particularly on the municipal side where we have facilities that use energy. We have fleets that use energy. Those are some places that we could select to put some funding towards to start making progress sooner rather than later. 2030 is not that far away. 2050 is going to be here. There is some foundational work that could be done to get us moving.

Commissioner Habbab – With the solar panels on the roofs, if there is a way to communicate beforehand and try to make those part of the projects that we are looking at.

Ms. Riddervold – I appreciated Mr. Goddard’s answer. His team and the environmental team are co-located. We do a lot of brainstorming together and trying to sequence what must first happen. You need a viable roof before you can put solar on it. Getting the roof projects funded is critical to moving the solar piece forward. If there is no strategy to fund solar with bondable or un-bondable funds, we are being given the direction by alternative to use a funding method like a purchase agreement. We have initiated the progress to try and look at some cooperative procurement options. We will ‘light a fire under’ that process based on our discussions tonight.

Commissioner Habbab – With the invasive species control, they had a request for \$75,000. Is that enough? Where does that take us?

Steven Gaines, City Arborist – A lot of the funding with the invasive containment goes hand-in-hand with how we are trying to restructure our canopy. We are investing a lot of money in planting trees. We have a lot of areas throughout the city that are overrun with invasive plants. The idea is getting rid of the invasive plants and getting room for more plantings. I think that \$75,000 would be a good start. Overall, they should probably be about equal. If we are putting \$100,000 towards trees, we should put \$100,000 towards having more places to put those trees. We are losing the battle with the invasives.

Commissioner Mitchell – We use less toxic ways of digging those plants up. That is why it is going to cost us as much as it is going to cost to get the invasive species out.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What does that \$75,000 go to? Is that paying for the pesticide? Is it for manpower? Can it be replaced by volunteer labor from organizations?

Mr. Gaines – Volunteer labor goes a long way. I spent a long time with the state. I worked for the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation. Our approach was to do some sort of chemical treatments initially to knock back what is there, and then use a hydraulic boom that will shred a big multi-flora bush in a short amount of time. If you go to some of these larger acreages and you talk the upper trails, it is probably 10 to 12 acres of nothing but vines. You are not going to be able to do that with a couple of volunteers with some loppers. The idea is to go in with these mulchers, mulch them down, and probably do some spot treatments. We will need to plant quickly and thick with small spaces and get shade on the ground. We will need to plant them in rows so you can mow in between to knock down residual invasives and give the trees a chance to put some shade on the ground so it can start grow without other constant maintenance. Machinery and contractors are what we would be paying for.

Commissioner Habbab – My thought would be to find a way to move some money. It would go a long way to maintaining our tree canopy and help us reach our tree preservation goals.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I am content right now.

Commissioner Schwarz – Is Transit a General Fund thing? There was a line item for bus replacements. Our Comp Plan is trying to put in a lot of density. We have a big problem with parking and traffic. Are we planning for increases in transit?

Ms. Hammill – The answer to that is ‘yes.’ Transit is its own fund. It is not part of the General Fund. It is only part of the CIP in as much as the city contributes to the capital purchases for transit. It is largely funded by federal FTA money. As we are looking at the regional transportation planning, and they have lots of ideas and plans for the future. You will see that there are several requests that came forward on that list that is in your packet. Those are to be discussed and decided as to what we do with those, how much of that is if we are doing a regional authority, how much of that is city money. There is lots to discuss there.

Commissioner Schwarz – In our current budgeting plan, do we have room for that to be added in the near future?

Ms. Hammill – We have room. To what capacity and varying degree, that depends on how we align those priorities. We have capacity to add.

Commissioner Schwarz – It would be nice to see some planning ahead to make sure that we can meet our transit needs.

Mr. Sanders – As pointed out on one of the slides, one of the CIP challenges was labeled transportation and access. It is coming. The alternative fuel study that CAT is doing right now is going to bring forward several recommendations. They are going to come at considerable costs. The desire to shift the fleet to electric is going to come at a very high cost. Those are expensive decisions to be made there. All of CAT’s items that appear in the CIP are related to the local match. The local match over the next few years is going to dramatically increase. That will begin with FY25. We will be making those decisions for what kind of recommendations to bring forward in the next fiscal year. They are expecting to get the study back early part of spring. From that, we must develop an implementation plan and submit to the FTA, then give us approval as to how we can move that schedule forward. That is when we start scheduling what the costs are going to be. It is hard to tell you how much and how fast. There are still some decisions that must be made with Council as to how fast they want us to go. We are going to be able to tell you what it is going to cost soon.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In the vision plan beyond the fuel study, the hope was that we would get that in a one quarter sales tax for the regional transportation authority that Richmond has. Hopefully, we get that. I agree with what Commissioner Mitchell said. This is a well put together CIP with lots of helpful resources. I am going to recommend few changes. I have heard this talk floating around after we do this Downtown Mall Study and putting money into the Mall beyond the tree lifecycle management. I have heard the number of \$5 million. Has there been talk about that in your future planning?

Mr. Sanders – We are not sure what it is going to cost at this point. The committee’s purpose is to define the scope. From that, we will determine what series of recommendations we want to bring forward. They will come with cost projections. There are several conflicts with the Downtown Mall. The trees are just one. Our prior urban forester identified challenges. If we do not move quickly, they will fall. We want to prevent that from happening. Getting that taken care of is one piece of it. There are all kinds of conflicts, ADA conflicts, and things of that nature that need to be addressed. There is going to be some costs. I don’t know where \$5 million came from.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There is no room for it. For that, it might be worth talking about a business improvement district, like a special tax. Most recently, it was shot down because they did not know what they were going to do with it.

Mr. Sanders – Nothing has been taken off the table. I have been asking questions like that. I assure you that we will look at that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I had a question about the street light convergent LEDs that is in the unfunded list. In the Climate Action Plan, I think you guys write that it would pay itself back in 3 to 4 years. It seems like a good investment. What drives the low priority? Why fund it if it is going to pay itself back?

Ms. Hammill – I do not have a specific answer for you. What I would say is that those things are payback. They are a variable to that. It isn't free. It does count as part of the debt capacity and all those things. Is that material in this case? No. We were trying to hold the line on this CIP and 'nibble' around the edges on the things that we thought were substantial that needed to get in. I don't have an answer on that one.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is the thought that maybe next year you would be including things like that?

Ms. Hammill – Perhaps. As we are working to develop the Climate Action Plan, to come forth with a more comprehensive idea and figure out where we want to put all the money to be the most impactful.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – On sidewalks and pedestrian things, I get the reluctance to fund it without the capacity to spend it. We are planning to have that capacity in the future. I appreciate Mr. Sanders modesty of not wanting to ask for the money before we know that we are going to be able to spend it then. I have confidence in staff. The idea of increasing funding in out years is in there as placeholder. If we don't have the capacity, we can take it out of the CIP those years and push it later.

Chairman Solla-Yates – I would like to say that there has been tremendous progress. This is hard. I see a lot of thought and effort to make it add up. I am concerned with the number of excellent and important projects that city staff and external partners are calling for that I do not see in the plan. I worry that we have expensive items invading our plan. I do not see a solution this year. We will have to find those solutions. Revenue is going to be a part of that conversation.

Councilor Pinkston – What was the process for items that went from the new requests summary list to the CIP?

Ms. Hammill – It was more of a discussion. Some of the things that got into the CIP were things that presented themselves as more pressing issues. There were very few things that were added. Beyond discussion and at the discretion and judgment of the budget team.

Councilor Pinkston – Priority one, which is the library, did not make it to the list because of the judgment of the team in terms of holding the line.

Ms. Hammill – Those priorities were assigned by the departments when they submitted them. They had up to 10 priorities to submit. They were their priorities. The library submitted that request. That was their only request. It was assigned priority one.

Motion to Approve CIP Proposal as proposed by Staff – Commissioner Mitchell – Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg with the following amendments – Motion passes 6-0.

- **Invasive Species Removal funding by Commissioner Habbab for the \$75,000 request. Motion passes 6-0.**
- **Increasing money in out years 4 and 5 in the CIP for Sidewalk, Bikes and Pedestrian Infrastructure by Commissioner Schwarz. Motion passes 6-0.**

- **Work the Plan on Stribling so it is ‘shovel ready’ when money for construction is available by Commissioner Stolzenberg. Motion passes 6-0.**
- **Moving street light conversion to LED by Commissioner Stolzenberg. Motion passes 6-0.**

The meeting was recessed for five minutes.

2. Notice of Intent to Amend and Re-enact City Comprehensive Plan -

PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE: notice is hereby given by the Charlottesville City Council that, on **Tuesday, December 13, 2022, beginning at 6:00 p.m.**, the Charlottesville City Council and the Charlottesville Planning Commission will conduct a joint public hearing for consideration of a proposed action to amend and re-enact the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Charlottesville. Persons affected by the proposed action may appear virtually or in person at the meeting and present their views. On that same date, following the public hearing, it is the intention of the City that the Planning Commission will vote on the proposed action. (City Council’s vote would take place at a later City Council meeting agenda, following receipt of the Commission’s recommendation). The 2021 Comprehensive Plan, as amended, that is proposed to be amended and re-enacted is currently available for viewing on the City’s website:

<https://www.charlottesville.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7073/Comprehensive-Plan-Document---2021-1115-Final?bidId=> and the previous (2013) Comprehensive Plan, as amended, is also available:

<https://www.charlottesville.gov/DocumentCenter/View/477/2013-Comprehensive-Plan-PDF?bidId=>

Proposed Action: the proposed action is as follows: amendment and re-enactment of the 2021 Comprehensive Plan (previously approved 11-15-2021 by City Council Resolution # R-21-162 and amended by Resolution #R-22-018)), including, without limitation, the enactment, or re-enactment, of the following provisions modifying the organization, content, goals and strategies of the prior Comprehensive Plan (2013), as amended:

2013 Comprehensive Plan

2021 Comprehensive Plan (11-15-2021), as proposed to be amended and re-enacted

8 Land Use Categories: low-density residential, high density residential, mixed use, neighborhood commercial, business & technology, public or semi-public, parks & open space, University of Virginia. A map (Future Land Use Map) was provided to allow citizens to see which categories apply within their neighborhoods.

10 Land Use Categories (defined on pp. 29-30): general residential (GR); GR (Sensitive Community Areas); Medium-Intensity Residential; Higher-Intensity Residential; Neighborhood Mixed-Use Corridor; Neighborhood Mixed-Use Node; Business and Technology Mixed Use; Urban Mixed Use Corridor; Urban Mixed Use Node; Downtown Core. A map (Future Land Use Map) is provided to allow citizens to see which categories apply within their neighborhoods.

“Low-density residential” defined as an area for single- and two-family units; developed at 12 or less dwelling units per acre (DUA); building height not addressed. No density ranges specified.

Low-density residential land use category eliminated. New “General residential” (GR) category allows 3- and 4-unit dwellings and townhome developments, at building heights of up to 2.5 stories. Additional units and building height are allowable under an affordability bonus program. For certain sensitive areas planned for GR only one unit per lot would be allowed 3- and 4-unit dwellings would be allowed if affordable units are provided.

N/A

New “Medium Intensity residential” category contemplates buildings up to 4 stories, including 12-unit multifamily buildings as well as townhouse developments.

“High-density residential” defined as an area for multifamily units, to be developed at more than 12 dwelling units per acre. No density ranges specified.

High-density residential land use category eliminated. New “Higher-Intensity Residential” contemplates multifamily-focused development (up to 5 stories and 13+ units per lot), incentivized to meet affordable housing goals. Ground floor commercial uses will be encouraged.

N/A

Urban Rivanna River Corridor Plan (amendment approved by City Council Feb. 7, 2022)

N/A

Amendment to Ch. 4 (Land Use, Urban Form, and Historic & Cultural Preservation) and 5 (Housing), to add provisions promoting manufactured housing as a source of affordable housing.

https://www.charlottesville.gov/DocumentCenter/View/8764/202212_PC-Report-Manufactured-Housing-Comp-Plan-Update?bidId=

Climate Protection Chapter included a “Report on the Local Climate Action Planning Process” with a framework and action strategies.

Amendment to Ch. 7 (Environment, Climate and Food Equity), to add the City’s final Climate Action Plan as a component of the Comprehensive Plan, expanding the city’s action strategies related to climate change mitigation, and providing guides for action that address equity, focus on co-benefits, and plan for community engagement and capacity building.

<https://charlottesville.gov/DocumentCenter/View/8776/Charlottesville-Climate-Action-Plan-PDF>

i. Staff Report

Ms. Creasy, Deputy Director – This is an opportunity to hold an additional public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan. We have a couple of proposed amendments. This is an opportunity to amend/reenact the Comprehensive Plan. City Council approved the amended Comprehensive Plan in November 2021. The plan is adopted, reorganized, reformatted, and updated. It had been overdue for the 5-year review. We were full in the review. Many of us have been involved in that for several years. Following the public hearing, we moved forward with that. We held a hearing prior to the approval for Council at the Planning Commission meeting. In addition, City Council held an additional public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan prior to their vote. There were several public opportunities in addition to the public engagement sessions that we had. In December 2021, after the approval, litigation was made to the city asking the Court to declare the plan as adopted to be void. That was an opportunity that came forward challenging the plan on several different grounds. The plaintiffs presented arguments as to why they were concerned. Some of those included some of the items that we are going to be able to complete this evening; one being concern that the plan did not include provisions that promoted manufactured housing as a source of affordable housing per a code section that went into effect July 2021 and the contents of the public hearing notice did not have enough detail to provide the notification that was necessary. Those were the claims that were made. Most of the claims in that case have been thrown out. The only issue that is left is the newspaper notice. At this point, there is no date for the hearing on that. We are providing an opportunity with a more robust legal ad. We are not terribly concerned about the first one and the second one. The timing is such that because we have 2 opportunities that we want to amend to Comprehensive Plan. One being manufactured housing. We have the Climate Action Plan that we would like to propose as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Charlottesville Comprehensive Plan is an important component of the City’s overall policy framework, serving to express a vision and set goals for the future development of the City. On November 15, 2021, City Council unanimously approved an update to the Comprehensive Plan created through the Cville Plans Together process.

The approved plan was informed by a wide range of community engagement opportunities, as well as the experience and expertise of the Cville Plans Together team including the consultants at Rhodeside & Harwell (RHI) and City staff.

In 2021, the Commonwealth of Virginia adopted § 15.2-2223.5 directing localities to incorporate into its comprehensive plan strategies to promote manufactured housing as a source of affordable housing, noting strategies may include the preservation of existing manufactured housing communities or the creation of new manufactured home communities.

Both city and state codes define a manufactured home as a structure constructed for use as a dwelling, meeting the requirements of the Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Law and built on a permanent chassis, transportable in one or more sections, with or without a permanent foundation, and connected to the required utilities.

Structures commonly referred to as “modular homes” are industrialized buildings per Virginia code. Like traditionally built homes, industrialized buildings may be classified as single- or two-family homes in compliance with the applicable International Residential Code.

To align the City’s Comprehensive Plan with the state code, staff is proposing several additions to the approved comprehensive plan. The additions do not alter the goals and strategies created through the Cville Plans Together robust engagement process but expand the toolkit of sub-strategies established to achieve those community determined goals.

The proposed changes are provided in your packet starting on page 37 of your packet. The changes are proposed for Chapter 4 (Land Use, Urban Form, and Historic & Cultural Preservation) and Chapter 5 (Housing).

The proposed amendments comply with the City’s Comprehensive Plan’s Guiding Principles of Equity & Opportunity and Community Culture & Unity, as well as areas of Chapter 11 (Implementation).

The Equity & Opportunity guiding principle states that all people will be able to thrive in Charlottesville. The City will support development and initiatives that take into consideration the full range of needs of Charlottesville’s diverse community, including residents, visitors, people who work in Charlottesville, business owners, and property owners.

All Charlottesville residents, regardless of race, ethnicity, age, income, neighborhood, religious affiliation, gender expression, sexual orientation, country of origin, immigration status, and other personal characteristics, will have equitable and expanded access to safe and affordable housing options, desirable jobs and wealth building opportunities, healthy and local foods, robust parks and natural resources, high-quality education and training, and other infrastructure and services that support a high quality of life.

The Community Culture & Unity guiding principle states Charlottesville’s rich and diverse culture, history, and form will be celebrated, and the entire community will feel welcomed, valued, and respected. The City will protect, celebrate, and enhance the people and places that have added to the uniqueness and cultural diversity of the community.

The proposed changes also align with priority areas of Chapter 11 (Implementation), including:

Priority Area: Support the development of more housing throughout the city, with a focus on creation of more housing that is affordable to more people, especially those with the greatest need.

Priority Area: Make sure all people have access to job opportunities, shelter, healthy food, and other resources they need to thrive and have a high quality of life.

Susan Elliott, Program Manager – We are here tonight as part of Charlottesville’s climate action plan to become an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Next Slide

We have tried to include a lot of detail in the staff report that is part of tonight’s agenda. We are hoping to keep our presentation tonight succinct. We are aiming to highlight some key aspects of the climate action plan and discuss the changes to the plan that were made since our October and November presentations to City Council and to the Planning Commission.

Next Slide

Charlottesville’s climate action plan development follows Charlottesville’s long history of taking action and making commitments related to environmental stewardship and climate change extending back into the late 1990s. The development of this plan was directed by City Council. The plan was developed by staff with significant community input and was informed by a variety of sources, which we have spoken to in past presentations and are summarized tonight in the staff report. This plan is scoped to meet the city’s adopted 2030 and 2050 greenhouse gas emission reduction goals. It is built around where the city’s greenhouse gas emissions come from. That means we are looking at what the sources of those are within our Charlottesville community. We are looking at what the different sectors are for it, the fuel and material types are for those, and what the carbon intensity are for each of these pieces. As we are looking at the different strategies to reduce our emissions, we are focused first on reducing the volume and amount of carbon intensity. We are looking towards how we draw down and remove emissions that we are putting into the atmosphere and how we take those down. The climate action plan is consistent with many parts of the Comprehensive Plan. A more detailed review of this is in your staff report. The climate action plan is referenced as a forthcoming connected functional plan to the city’s Comprehensive Plan. It is directed by the Comprehensive Plan to be finalized, adopted, and implemented.

Next Slide

In terms of the timeline for development of the climate action plan, it was developed between 2020 and 2022. Preliminary plan content was presented to City Council in April 2022. The full plan was released in September. During October and November, we invited further input on the plan through presentations to City Council, different city boards and commissions, and community members and organizations. Comments we heard informed some modifications to the planned document and offered many ideas that will be useful as we move forward into implementation.

Emily Irvine, Program Manager –

Next Slide

The climate action plan is intended to be a strategic roadmap that helps Charlottesville meet its climate goals of a 45 percent reduction of emissions by 2030 and carbon neutrality by 2050. It is a dynamic document that will be regularly updated as the sub-goals are met, and new key actions become clear. The plan includes a set of guiding principles that we took into consideration throughout the entire development of the plan. They apply to all the strategies and key actions within the plan. The first one of these is encompassed in that green arrow. Climate action must be effective, affordable, equitable, and inclusive. The entire list of our guiding principles is in the staff memo. Beyond the broad emissions reduction goals of the plan are the strategies and actions that will get us to the goals. The strategies are enduring. The key actions are dynamic. We can think of them as ‘to do’ items that are meant to be accomplished in the next 1 to 3 years and crossed with new ones added as we move forward in time.

Next Slide

When we are thinking about how to reduce emissions from any source, there are 3 broad ways to do that. The first one is to reduce the emissions intensity of whatever activity you are doing. This looks like energy efficiency for buildings or walking instead of driving. The next one is fuel switching where you change the source of energy to a lower or carbon free source of energy. That looks like switching from an oil fire boiler to a heat pump, getting an electric car, or adding solar panels. The third way is to draw down emissions out of the atmosphere. That looks like increasing trees and vegetation. Essentially, that might look like carbon capture and sequestration. All the strategies and key actions that are in the plan are built around these methods. There are the tools that support those strategies like funding and financing that are also discussed in the plan.

Next Slide

We will continue with our regular climate program activities. We have started some high-level implementation planning. Once this is formally adopted, that work can get moving in earnest. A lot of input that we received in our comment period will be helpful as we are developing implementation plans. There are several informational studies that are underway that will also inform implementation work. We are looking forward to working with our partners within the city and the broader community on implementation.

Ms. Riddervold –

Next Slide

We want to acknowledge and express appreciation for the feedback we have received over the course of the plan development. We have had feedback from individual community members, city boards, commissions, & committees, and several community organizations. We have summarized a lot of the feedback in the staff memo. The staff memo has a link to the comments, letters, and summary documents. That is there for public record. The feedback themes, in general, range from the positive that it is thoughtful, researched, and a comprehensive plan. While it has been under development since 2020, the heavy lift has happened since April. We also received some concerns about some of the broad or vague phrasing in there. There were concerns about city organizational capacity and commitment to deliver on what is in the plan, the need for accountability, prioritization, a reminder to focus on equity. There is an invaluable body of information we received that will help with implementation ideas and brought up challenges.

Next Slide

In addition to the opportunities to receive feedback, we tried to engage with several of the people and groups that we had received feedback from. It gave us an opportunity to clarify what the concerns were that were being brought up. In several cases, it gave us an opportunity to help show or guide where those specific items or intents were captured or could be captured into the document. We made a couple of adjustments to the sections that you see here. We tried to put together a comprehensive staff report. We recognize that there are performance metrics needed. That is part of the accountability, part of the routine updates. It is going to be the time when we tell you things are not getting done. Hopefully that will inform decision making.

Next Slide

As the climate team before you tonight, we are proud of this plan. What we have put in front of you should make the city proud.

Commissioner Mitchell – I see a lot of strategy. I don't see a lot of tactics. I am guessing that the consultant report we are going to get in June will help us to begin wrapping the tactical events around the actions. That is the piece that I am looking forward to. I will reiterate the need to begin thinking about no longer subsidizing gas hookups and bringing gas up to new construction. This is good work.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would like to ask you to keep up that 3-year update cycle you were talking about. It is too important to let languish.

Commissioner Palmer – At UVA, that is how we did it. You have this strategic plan. We are in that phase of figuring out how to implement our goals and the best way to do that. It is not easy, and it is constantly changing as the cost of the various fuel choices change. It seems like a similar strategy.

Chairman Solla-Yates – This is an unreasonable amount of progress. I felt bad asking for more. You did it anyway. It is impressive.

Councilor Payne – This almost seems anti-climactic. I remember this being discussed in 2016. This being incorporated into our Comprehensive Plan is a huge moment for the city in terms of people wanting it to be incorporated into everything we do.

Councilor Pinkston – It is a statement of our values as a city. We are making this part of everything that we do with the Comprehensive Plan. I am grateful that we are at this moment. I am looking forward to the good work ahead.

Mayor Snook – I would like to echo what other people have said. Has there been discussion of how frequently we are updating the inventory of greenhouse gases?

Ms. Elliott – We are required to report that every 2 years. We have been updating the data annually since 2018. That is available on our website. That is where the data is located. That will be continually updated going forward. We do not include that as an action in the plan, which is focused on how to reduce those emissions.

Mayor Snook – As we make it part of the Comprehensive Plan, many people think of the Comprehensive Plan only in terms of the zoning issues. Nobody has tried hard to link the zoning with the climate action plan. We have been talking about everything but the climate action plan. It is one Comprehensive Plan. If it is comprehensive, it deals with everything. That means the zoning piece must respond to every other aspect of the Comprehensive Plan.

ii. Public Hearing

Sunshine Mathon – Charlottesville’s zoning story fundamentally originated from exclusionary first principles that segregated people by race and class. A century of marginalization built on zoning derived land use and decision-making power has isolated us from each other and codified racially desperate wealth, health, educational, and economic mobility outcomes. Like other communities and after long years of fragmented processes, Charlottesville City Council and Planning Commission thoughtfully settled on a reasoned sequence of planning efforts to confront our history and establish a new framework for the future by the formation of a vision, the Charlottesville Affordable Housing Plan, the establishment of land use principles aligned with that vision that organized the spatial future of our city (Comprehensive Plan), and the detailed building blocks shaped by the land use principles that will enable us to achieve the vision (future zoning code). Although no framework will be perfect, the only ethically defensible path forward must privilege the voices and aspirations of those who have borne the generational weight of zoning derived exclusion. Although no framework will be perfect or predictive, the good work completed today must be celebrated and fortified. Thank you for your past work and stand strong and raise your voice to re-support the Comprehensive Plan today and the updated zoning proposal in the coming months that will require steadfastness and courage as we wrestle with our history and strive for a changed future.

Ellen Morava – In the city codes chapter on the purposes of zoning, purpose #7 is to protect and enhance the character and stability of neighborhoods. The zoning proposed by the Future Land Use Map for the Jefferson Park Neighborhood neither protects it or enhances its character and stability. The map proposes to rezone the

area between Jefferson Park Avenue and Stadium Road from R-2u to higher intensity residential. No other R-2 neighborhood in the city is threatened with such drastic upzoning. This conflicts not only with the city code zoning requirements, but also with the stated guiding principles of the Future Land Use Map. The map emphasizes compatibility of new building with existing forms. The R-2u area of the JPA neighborhood is characterized by 1- and 2-story houses. Rezoning to higher intensity would allow up to 5 stories and 13+ units per lot. Even though the map pays lip service to compatibility with existing context, nothing approaching that height and density exists in the R-2u area currently. The draft diagnostic approach states that the zoning rewrite aims incremental evolution rather than the flawed approach of large change or no change. It refers to maintaining human scale. Rezoning a district to R-2u to higher intensity residential would encourage developers to buy out the remaining single-family homes, demolish them, and replace them with high-rises aimed at student renters. It is in the city's interest to retain long-term residents, who advocate for compliance with city laws, noise, safety, trash, etc. and provide a sense of continuity and community. The proposed rezoning will turn the JPA neighborhood into a neighborhood of high-rises for transient student renters.

Genevieve Keller (Preservation Piedmont) – We support these Comprehensive Plan additions and appreciate city staff work and research on the CIP and our inclusion in the process. Ms. Elliott and Ms. Irvine met with us to consider carbon sequestration in our existing buildings. We recommended addressing our concern that significant carbon emissions occur with demolition and landfilling material from existing buildings. Larger replacement buildings often use materials and techniques that are major emitters of increased carbon and production and transport despite the new system efficiencies. We provided articles on carbon sequestration for building preservation, rehabilitation, reuse, and adaptation instead of demolition. Staff responded and incorporated some of these points. We support the Tree Commission recommendations on tree canopy protection, maintenance of existing trees, and increased tree planting for our increasingly endangered residential environments. Please revisit the Future Land Use Map narrative to address overwhelming concentrations of medium density uses appearing often as strip development on our city's historic streets. Our planning guidance should be to manage these areas rather than targeting them for intensity development. Current conflicts between underlying zoning and overlay districts can be resolved by emphasizing intent to rehabilitate and reuse and not destroy them. Creating internal and external ADUs and new infill and harmony with and not conflicting with historic spatial organization should be called out in the plan definition for these areas so they are not targeted for major redevelopment, encapsulation, or dwarfed by new construction. These areas should be differentiated from other medium intensity areas on the map and narrative as most appropriate for adaptation and rehabilitations that accommodate densification in ways that are not irrevocable and that allow them to continue to meet changing housing needs now and in the future.

Mike Cusano (Johnson Neighborhood Association) – I have been tasked to convey many of our neighbors' discontent with the proposed density change along Trail Ridge. Nobody wants 4-story buildings. We are concerned about increased traffic, lack of parking on the street, the decrease in the tree canopy in the city. Johnson Village has a lot of trees. We will lose a lot of those trees when we start tearing down single-family homes and replacing them with 4-story structures. We are concerned about Johnson Elementary School. With all these new homes, are we going to be able to support student needs in the neighborhood? We are going to need that 4-way stop sign if we have all this new traffic. There is only one way into Johnson Village.

Diane Dale – I am glad to see the climate action plan is underway. I concur with the comments that it really is climate action 1.0. There is a great deal of identification of leadership, responsibility, resources needed, and most importantly a timeline so that this becomes a plan of actions. I wanted to focus on page 46 of the plan. It says, 'integrate recommended list of related design standards into the zoning code and zoning incentives and in the Standards & Design Manual.' The zoning code is being updated now. How will that happen? You mentioned the work that must be done. Is that critical act of integrating the climate action plan legitimately into the Comprehensive Plan update? Is the zoning code going to happen in this timeframe? Has there been a timeframe allocated for this work when we see the releases of the code as it comes out through the spring? Will

it be evident that it is incentivizing environmental and climate mitigation strategies as it has come around in the last review? I would love to see that the city is taking the environment and climate impacts as seriously as the commitment it has made to affordable housing.

Bob Roach (Johnson Village) – I would like to add what Mr. Cusano said. I live across the street from the back of Johnson Elementary School. All the houses along that side of the road and up Shamrock Road could be demolished and 4 stories can be put on those based on what is in the Comprehensive Plan. We are talking about supply and demand, increasing the number of units so there is enough supply to fill the demand, with the idea that the cost of those units is going to drop. For our neighborhood and the JPA neighborhood, the proximity to UVA, the people living in those units are more than likely going to be students. It is not going to be affordable housing. When you add all the traffic that is going to be coming into this neighborhood, you are talking about a neighborhood of walkers, young families, and kids playing. That goes away. It is not going to be safe with that amount of traffic coming into our neighborhood. We like living there. We have wonderful neighbors which is why we have stayed there so long. Our side of the street is susceptible to being torn down and rebuilt. It is different across the street with the zoning. You are changing the whole dynamic of this neighborhood. The idea of everybody being integrated so that there are different kinds of people living in every neighborhood. We have that. We are not a wealthy neighborhood. I don't think the amount of supply that is going to result from this is going to give you what you want. It is a noble idea.

Susan Kruse – I want to thank city staff, Planning Commission, and Council for all their hard work on climate over the past few years and on the Comprehensive Plan. Community Climate Collaborative has supported the Comprehensive Plan in the past and continues to do so. We are asking you to include the city's climate action plan as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and call for a formalized periodic review of the climate action plan contents and its implementation. The city staff, who presented tonight, have created an impressive plan that includes input from C3 and partners. We are eager to see it adopted. We are excited particularly about some of the newest additions to the climate action plan included an increased emphasis on community engagement, climate smart zoning, advocating for commercial building energy benchmarking, establishing specific targets for increased travel mode of walking, biking, and transit ridership and other changes that the city staff have made in response to our feedback. The climate action plan, as it exists today, represents a positive step forward. The Planning Commission and City Council should adopt it. This plan could be stronger. We hope you will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement on climate, to deliver periodic updates on the climate action plan progress, and to seek feedback on the implementation strategies. We know the Charlottesville community cares about climate action. More than 300 residents and 50 organizations signed on to C3s recommendations for the climate action plan. Adopting this plan will recognize those voices.

Benjamin Heller – The syllogism that underlies the housing chapter is as follows. We have residents facing affordability challenges. The problem results from a function in the housing market, which manifests in low housing production and lower elasticity of housing supply. These in turn are the result of overly restrictive zoning. Removing it will lead to the right kind of supply to improve affordability. Other than the first link in this chain, none of this is true in Charlottesville. We are not an expensive or fast inflating housing market outright or relative to wages. In the last decade, we are at the 41st percentile in terms of housing price increase but over the 90th in wage and median income increase. We are at the 60th percentile for housing prices and 73rd percentile for wages. For households in the 50 to 75,000 income range, the percentage with 40 percent plus of income rent burdens is in single digits. With housing production, we have generated units in the last decade at a higher rate than our population growth, higher rate than Virginia, and a higher rate than Charlottesville has seen at any time since 1980. According to the anti-zoning group, Up For Growth, our market is unusual in having no production gap. The claims of 72 percent of residential land being R-1 are wrong. It is more like 53 percent when properly calculated, which is comparatively low. On the Wharton residential land use restrictiveness index, we came out at 1 standard deviation below the mean on restrictiveness. In terms of de facto zoning, we are relatively liberal with SUPs and rezonings. I find an approval rate of over 70 percent since 2008. You do a

good job of turning around applications. The median is about 150 days. You have built a plan based on some mistaken premises. It is not going to lead to meaningful new housing production, except in one category: student housing. Student housing pricing is not related to labor market. It is driven by what wealthy families can pay for their kids to rent. It is an economic steamroller. Rich kids are going to get luxury apartments, UVA gets to increase its enrollment, and Charlottesville gets the short end of the stick. It is a bad deal.

Syleethia Carr – As the Comp Plan stands right now, I am for it. What I hear a lot about is the Johnson area not wanting to see these big buildings. We still live at a time that we are seeing a lot of people displaced. I don't care what the numbers say. I am working with people in the community every day. They don't have anywhere to go. Seeing that big and tall building over there is going to help a lot of these families. I have known a lot of these families since they were young. There are older people and younger people. They don't have anywhere to go. We are sticking them in. That is unfair.

John Hossack – The public notification refers to medium intensity residential as up to 12 units per lot. The update report and the zoning plan now appears to allow up to 16 units. The plan was passed November 21st with some concerns about impact, especially in relation to MIR. The term house size was in the plan for that time for GR and MIR. House size is missing in MIR. The change in density specifications and the dropping of house size is an example of bait and switch. The fact that the public notice refers to one density was submitted for this meeting. It is merely an example of the rushed approach that is a signature of this planning process. There was no lucid reason why some streets are MIR. Why do Park Street and Locust Avenue transition from MIR to GR going out? It is GR all the way to 250. On the other side of 250, it is MIR. What is that about? It looks like the Planning Commission told the consultants the color in boxes adjacent to the schools is MIR. This is noted in the Johnson Village cases you have heard about. What sense is that? The point seems to be that you can push MIR through the city. You chose to make about 15 to 20 percent of us angry. I contend that the plan is the most extreme in the country by a town this size. This has not been disputed in any meaningful way. We want to live in a safe and quiet place. We never imagined that the city would ignore our interests and hand off by right development for up to 16 units per lot and 4 stories.

Donna Shaunese (Birdwood Road) – We are so pleased to finally see this plan come to fruition. The framework is solid. The overarching goals are what we hoped it would be. We are grateful to all the climate staff and other city staff for shepherding this final push and their openness to suggestions from the public. Among the new additions we are especially pleased with are encouraging trees while allowing for future solar access, new requirements for public participation, and some information about climate smart zoning. We would like to make sure that this document does not just sit on a shelf. We request status reports to Council on a quarterly basis with the possibility of updates as new information becomes available. We are thinking first and foremost about the results of the 2 RFPs that are out now and how that addresses decarbonization of the gas utility and the study of the electrification of the city's vehicles. Another important goal of the plan is revised to incorporate measurable objectives. If things are not checked, they just do not seem to create priorities. None of these suggestions are meant to do anything more than to provide guidance for the future. Please incorporate this plan into the Comprehensive Plan.

Gareth Gaston (Rugby Road) – I grew up in Charlottesville. I am fortunate to live in a nice house partly because my parents purchased it decades ago. Times have changed and prices have gone up and wages have not. People who work for the University must live 20 to 30 minutes outside of town to afford a home. It is easy for someone who lives in a convenient neighborhood like this to pull up the latter and keep everyone out and not make a change. I know many of my neighbors feel this way. It is selfish. It is bad for Charlottesville and the planet. We need more development within the city, which will translate into more tax revenue, better services, more public transportation, fewer cars, and we need to move beyond the idea that Charlottesville is so perfect that everything needs to be preserved. We know Charlottesville was built on horrible racial and economic

inequality. We need to decide to fix these things. I applaud the addition of the climate plan and the great work you are doing.

Charlotte Meadows – I respect the efforts and energy that has been put into this by the Planning Commission and City Council. The prior speaker who mentioned bait and switch is accurate. I seriously doubt the Planning Commission and City Council meant for all this to be changed so drastically from gentle density to increasing the total of intensity with no setbacks and capitulating to developers with minimum affordable housing and no house zone house size change. The engagement process has been grossly inadequate. Citizens are unhappy. There have been a lot of plans and analysis done by local citizens that have not received any credit effect as far as acceptance of real logical data. It is critically important that I request the Planning Commission and City Council reconsider the citizen input and request for moderation and back to the same concept that was originally put out for gentle density. There is a big concern about UVA housing with students having luxury apartments and not having affordable housing. That needs to be addressed.

Nina Barnes – In October 2021 in front of the Planning Commission and City Council, you voted to approve the Comprehensive Plan and Future Land Use Map. The JPA neighborhood wrote to the Planning Commission requesting that you postpone your vote on the Future Land Use Map. We pointed out that the distractions and pandemic and turmoil in city leadership during that period had made it challenging to focus appropriate attention on the proposed plan. We argued that neighborhoods like the JPA neighborhood, which are impacted more than others by the increase in density, that the plan should be presented to our neighborhood association. We should be given the chance to give feedback. Our request was ignored. As you consider the Future Land Use Map, we ask you to respect the quality of life of our neighborhood and community. A large part of the JPA neighborhood is characterized by older houses built in the early to mid-1900s. These structures create a harmonious, historical noll. Once gone, it is gone forever. Because we are near the University, the houses are medium intensity and general residential.

Ellen Tully – As previous speakers have mentioned, when you increase the density in a residential neighborhood, you deprive the residents of amenities that they value, they considered when they moved to the neighborhood; amenities that likely increased the cost of their property, amenities such as quiet streets, minimal traffic, ease and safety of walking, tree canopy, mature trees on green space. This can be seen as a regulatory taking. What is necessary for a taking to occur is not always a formal transfer of interest in the property. What is required is a drastic interference with the use and enjoyment of that property. It is important that when you are planning for this increased density, you zone in such a way that these amenities are preserved, with severe penalties for such things as cutting mature trees with incentives for innovative architecture and disincentives for unimaginative building. You don't take away the property rights of neighbors and give them to developers, whose concern for neighborhoods is different.

Anne Benham (Observatory Avenue) – I am concerned about the city's proposed upzoning of the JPA neighborhood and what it will mean in terms of adverse heat island effects in this area. I would like to mention 2 local news articles. They both touch on heat issues in the JPA area. A January 2021 Charlottesville article on the Tree Commission report included a graphic that listed the JPA neighborhood as having a tree canopy cover of 36.6 percent, which is less than 40 percent deemed healthy according to the graphic. A second article from Charlottesville Tomorrow in August 2021 reported that JPA was one of the three hottest neighborhoods along 10th & Page and Ridge Street. The city's climate manager was quoted in the article "it is not surprising that areas with fewer trees and higher concentrations of concrete are hotter." If the JPA neighborhood experiences the kind of development that it is slated for with the rezoning, it will lose a lot of mature trees and gain an increase in concrete. Does the city have a plan to deal with the likelihood of intensified heat island effects in this upzoned neighborhood? What happens to residents of high-rises who can't afford air conditioning costs in sustained periods of high heat?

Michelle Heimgartner – With what the mayor mentioned about having the climate linked to zoning, it is important. In talking about the heat maps that the previous person mentioned, the 2021 heat maps showed areas that are hotter and cooler. When you upzone areas, you are only encouraging tree removal. There needs to be some synergy with the climate plan and the zoning plan. Right now, they are completely conflicting. I live in Johnson Village. There is one way in and one way out. If you put in a whole bunch of other higher density areas, you are just increasing the traffic that is already a problem and you are making the streets more dangerous. 85 percent of the homes on the block of Shamrock that is slated for upzoning are ranch homes. If you put in a 3-story building, you are going to completely change the feel of the neighborhood, which is part of the reason why people have moved there to begin with. I have undergraduates, who live next to me. They are renting their home out by room. To think that if you increase the density, it is going to go to affordable housing is a joke. You get a lot more money when you rent out by the bedroom or by the apartment to UVA students that have unlimited resources. I have no problem with it if it is going to affordable housing. I have a problem if it goes to UVA housing.

Emily Dreyfus – I wanted to make a comment on behalf of the Charlottesville Low-Income Housing Coalition to say that the lack of affordable housing in our community is an urgent and widespread problem. The adopted Comprehensive Plan takes important steps to address the needs to increase deeply affordable housing and to slow the tide of displacement in majority black neighborhoods. I appreciated prior comments in support of the already adopted plans. I did want to emphasize that these changes are long overdue. We hope that you will move quickly to approve zoning updates. We need your prompt action to open up improved opportunities and create a more racially equitable community.

Vern Buchanan – I am not sure that increased density will create affordable housing. Looking through what has already happened with new apartments and new buildings, it seems that bait and switch is a big thing. I am not real crazy about that either. The infrastructure that we have in town is not set up to deal with this large influx of new housing and new people. It bothers me that this is not well thought out as I think it should be. I would like to see people use some common sense with this instead of just putting their desires in front of everybody else. I would like to see the city sit down and think about this logically instead of coming up with magic plans to increase density and have things stay the same. It won't work.

Marcia Gayer – My interest in life is preventing climate change. I am happy that the Comp Plan will now include the CAP (Climate Action Plan). It sounds like it is going that way. I hope that is going to result in funding and staff to get this worked out. With housing density, the census in this area keeps going up. More people keep moving here. It is not all UVA. There must be some way to accommodate the increase in the number of people who want to live here and in the Albemarle ring. Affordability is mostly a matter of supply and demand. We have a tight supply. Landlords have the ability to keep raising rents.

Mark Whittle – I followed the long journey of this Comprehensive Plan and the associated rezoning. I am more convinced than ever that it is deeply misguided and will not only result in little if any affordable housing. It will result in a catastrophic transformation of the city into a congested, overpriced ecologically barren city. The proposed rezoning is so dramatic that it must qualify as the most extreme of its kind in the United States by a factor of about 5. If fully built out, according to the new zoning recommendations, the population of Charlottesville will quadruple, growing from 50,000 to 200,000. I have heard councilors say not to worry. The plan will unfold incrementally. This is an empty statement. This Comprehensive Plan is a gift to developers, who have little incentive to provide affordable units. All the experts, including those hired by the city, say the plan will result in few truly affordable units. With the incremental claim, changes are already occurring. Over the past year, there have been a growing number of land and property purchases by developers, who are explicitly citing the new rezoning as justification for their projects. This will only accelerate as the full rezoning is passed. The Comprehensive Plan failed to consider any of the key infrastructure issues that are essential for such unprecedented growth. To claim that these will be addressed in the future is the height of irresponsible

planning. What if it turns out the necessary infrastructural changes aren't achievable? What if it becomes clear this has been a horrible experiment? It is too late. Downzoning at that point invites every developer to sue the city because you cannot downzone once the investments have been made. It is a 1-way process. Slow down. Generates proper comprehensive plan that is developed in concert with the necessary infrastructural analysis. Find direct ways to address affordable housing. There are several excellent options. Approach the upzoning more gradually, incrementally to see how it goes. Listen to the hundreds of people who perhaps see more clearly than you think they do the failings of the current comprehensive plan. Don't push it through simply because you have invested effort in it. That would be the worst of all choices.

Brandon Collins – These conversations about the Comprehensive Plan get me riled up. I need to remind myself that you already passed the Comprehensive Plan; at least the principles behind it. I want to say that I am still in support of the Comprehensive Plan and the Affordable Housing Strategy. I support the addition of the Climate Action Plan to the Comprehensive Plan. Charlottesville is going to grow. If we are going to be smart about it and people's worst fears about developers aren't realized, we must plan for it. This plan is the best that we can do. For the first time in Charlottesville's history, it addresses comprehensively desegregation while also addressing gentrification. There is no perfect plan. There is no perfect incentive for market driven affordable housing, which is why we have a housing strategy. We are going to continually ask for public funding of affordable housing. That is how we are going to get it built. We need the density. Overall, density is good for our environment. It keeps people traveling less. We can build buildings that are safe for the planet. I appreciate trying to integrate some of that into the zoning. I hope that we can move quickly on the zoning, particularly the strategy of having a consistent affordable housing/zoning provisions and inclusionary zoning. I am worried that we are fighting the same battles, and we are going to be fighting those battles block by block when we look at the zoning.

James Aller – I have lived in Charlottesville for 36 years. I had a business here before retirement. My wife and I raised 3 children here, who all attended city schools. I support the Climate Action Plan as presented. I would encourage City Council to use this opportunity as a revote to start over instead of reauthorizing the Comp Plan and FLUM with the few legal changes that are required. It has been poorly conceived overall. It has not had adequate citizen input. As the Comp Plan and FLUM have evolved, it has become clear that they will not accomplish the original objectives as outlined and will have consequences that were not intended. Since this was voted on last year, the Planning Commission is proposing the possibility of no minimum lot size and no parking requirement. This is wrong for our city. Everyone supports affordable housing. Affordable housing has been a major point in the discussions.

Martha Smythe – I have spoken before about the Comp Plan. I am happy to see that the Climate Action Plan is being integrated into it. It is a good first step for improving several exposures that our city has. I share the concerns of many people, who have commented about the further loss of tree canopy. I am concerned that we don't even have an ordinance to prevent people from chopping down 30-inch diameter trees in their yards. The concerns that I have had have been expressed by Mr. Whittle, Mr. Buchanan, Ms. Gayer, and the last gentleman. While this is an aspirational and admirable plan, it does not have any tangible results that can be predicted in a reliable way. It is a scattershot without any pre-planning for the infrastructure. The idea of cutting lots to ever smaller dimensions will result in affordable housing does not make sense. The housing needs assessment document pointed out the rising construction costs. Every one of those subdivided lots is going to require building on it.

iii. Commission Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Mitchell – I appreciate the expressed concerns. I still believe that the strategy that we and our consultants have developed is the right way to go.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – I echo Commissioner Mitchell’s general sentiments.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I want to make one comment on the manufactured housing amendment, which we are doing as a formality. I hope that we also take it seriously and incorporate it into the zoning rewrite. State Line Institute did a study on housing costs of potential new housing under Portland’s similar zoning. Manufactured housing was able to be built or put in place at the lowest cost. It makes a lot of sense in a lot of places across the city and potential new sublots. As for the Comp Plan as a whole, we have talked a lot about it. Everything we have discussed the last 5 years remains true. Growth is coming to our area. County residents have a carbon footprint 65 percent higher than city residents. As a Climate Action Plan, simply moving people from the county into the city is one of the most effective things we can do.

Commissioner Palmer – I am impressed by our community and the comments. I want to make clear that UVA does not base its enrollment projections in any way on available housing in the community. I heard that alluded to by some of the comments. It is not how we operate.

Chairman Solla-Yates – It has been a long journey. I am very pleased with all the work that has gone into it. The Climate Action Plan has had a long journey. I am impressed with the progress there. It is just the beginning, but it is an exciting and important beginning.

Councilor Payne – I echo what Commissioner Stolzenberg said about the manufactured homes component. It has been lost in the discussion. Our mobile home communities are some of the most overlooked. They are at extreme risk of displacement. Manufactured homes are very stigmatized. I hope that we do not take it as a formality. Allow their construction and work to preserve those communities. It is very important for housing. We are going on 7 years with working and updating this Comprehensive Plan.

Mayor Snook – If I wanted to make any change at all, I would simply note that when this issue came before Council, I suggested that we not designate where we were going to put medium intensity residential for some of the reasons that we have heard in comments. People are concerned that when Council and the Planning Commission eventually get around to the lot-by-lot analysis, we will probably conclude that some of the places that people have been expressing concerns about are not going to be subject to that kind of development. My suggestion back then was not to make those designations so as not to cause a lot of people to get worked up about things they may not have to get worked up about. Unless someone wanted to revisit that issue, I do not have any problems with the rest of the Comp Plan. I applaud the additions that have been made/recommended tonight.

Motion – Commissioner Stolzenberg – I move to adopt the resolution of the Charlottesville Planning Commission recommending amendment and reenactment of the November 15, 2021 Comprehensive Plan as amended WHEREAS on October 12, 2021 the City Council and the Planning Commission held a joint public hearing on proposed amendments (“updates”) of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan, after public notice as set forth within Virginia Code Sec. 15.2-2204, and following the public hearing, the Planning Commission, by resolution, recommended the amended plan to City Council for adoption; and WHEREAS on November 15, 2021 the City Council conducted an additional public hearing on the amended plan recommended by the Planning Commission and, following this additional public hearing, the City Council approved and adopted the amended comprehensive plan; and WHEREAS on February 7, 2022 City Council amended the November 15, 2021 Comprehensive Plan, to include the Urban Rivanna River Corridor Plan as a component (hereafter, the “November 15, 2021 Plan, as amended”); and WHEREAS the future land use map (FLUM) included within the November 15, 2021 Plan, as amended, has been, and remains, a topic of public interest which has been challenged within litigation currently pending within the Charlottesville Circuit Court, and the City desires to offer an additional public

hearing opportunity to members of the public who feel that they did not previously receive adequate notice of the public hearing(s) conducted regarding the residential density provisions of the FLUM, or other matters included within the updated November 15, 2021 Comprehensive Plan; and WHEREAS the Planning Commission desires to consider further amending the November 15, 2021 Plan, as amended, to include provisions to promote manufactured housing as a source of affordable housing; and WHEREAS the Planning Commission desires to consider further amending the November 15, 2021 Plan, as amended, to include the City's Climate Action Plan as a component; and, WHEREAS on December 13, 2022, the City Council and Planning Commission held a joint public hearing on the November 15, 2021 Plan, as amended, including proposed new amendments regarding manufactured housing and a climate action plan, and the Planning Commission has considered all of the staff analysis and public comments received thereon; now, therefore, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Commission for the City of Charlottesville, Virginia that it recommends the November 15, 2021 Plan, as amended, should be further amended to include (i) provisions to promote manufactured housing as a source of affordable housing and (ii) to add the proposed climate action plan as a new component, and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Planning Commission recommends that the November 15, 2021 Plan, as amended (including the new amendments recommended by the Commission on this date) should be adopted and re-enacted as the current adopted comprehensive plan for the City of Charlottesville. A copy of the amended plan recommended by the Planning Commission for adoption and re-enactment is attached to this Resolution and is hereby certified to City Council for its consideration in accordance with City Code Section 34-27(b). Second by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion passes 6-0.

III. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS

Continuing: until all action items are concluded

1. Critical Slopes Waiver – Azalea Springs

i. Staff Report

Missy Creasy, Deputy Director – Tonight, you will be making a recommendation to City Council on a critical slope waiver request for a proposed development referred to as Azalea Springs. The tax map parcels are outlined in the staff report. The properties are located between Azalea Drive and Monte Vista Avenue. Access from a stub out section is on a right-of-way is off Azalea Drive. The properties are currently owned by Stanley Martin Company LLC. They are proposing to develop 45 single-family detached dwellings on the site with 0.6 acres of community open space, along with the supporting infrastructure and preservation of approximately 77 trees. As the Planning Commission deliberates on the recommendation, there are few key points to keep in mind as this development significantly differs from other critical slope requests this body has entertained in the past. The development site already has been platted. The lots are non-conforming legal lots of record from around the 1920s. Per section 34-1145a, the lots may be developed as platted per all permitted uses found in section 34-420. Tax map parcels are not platted lots. This comes up frequently. If properties were under single ownership, some of the policies of the past and the assessor's office were to combine them under single tax map parcel. This is something that we face regularly. A lot of lots were platted and several people would buy several of them. At this point, we must work with them to get tax-map parcel numbers. We have fewer tax map parcels. We have lots that are legal lots of record. Per section 34-1120b7b, lots that contain critical slopes are exempt from the following critical slope regulations. This would account for approximately 22 out of the 88+ lots. In the current configuration of the site, there are 22 lots currently that are affected by critical slopes. Because they are lots of record, and if they are moving forward with single-family, they would be exempt from the critical slopes ordinance. Because the applicant is choosing to alter the boundaries of the lots, which they have the

ability to do through the code, they lose that exemption from the critical slopes regulations. If the lots change, they are subject to the critical slopes waiver. It should be noted that standards for the city streets changed to allow for narrow roads. The western portion of the lots gain access, a critical waiver may not even be needed for the lots as platted. Although this is being presented as a single development, the critical slope waiver is only needed for approximately 22 lots. Most of the site could be developed by right with ministerial review from a land use and zoning standpoint. There are many considerations that would come into play, including all the physical aspects of the site concerning utilities, engineering, and those kinds of things. Mr. Alfele outlines some more information in the staff report concerning that. As stated from the land use and zoning perspective, most of the site could be developed by right. This includes removal of most of the trees on site since they are not in the critical slopes. If the approximate 22 lots that contain critical slopes are protected, meaning the critical slope waiver is denied, that would result in preservation of approximately 40 trees, which would be a decrease in tree preservation to the proposal that the applicant is bringing forward to us. As you deliberate this evening, be mindful that this isn't a typical request because these are currently lots. They are currently platted lots. Throughout your conversation, you may want to continue to come back to this. It would be easy to look at this as one large property. It is currently 88 individual, small lots. There are varying ways. It is not the most ideal situation in our current world for development. They have vestings and right-of-ways. They are asking for something different. There are pros and cons that come with that.

Commissioner Mitchell – This is probably the most complicated critical slope waiver I have ever looked at. There is a spring that is adjacent to the slopes. This stream is going to be buried based on what I have read. What are the consequences of burying that stream, consequences to the wetlands that we maintain and to Moores Creek?

Ms. Creasy – There are requirements for when waterways and those kinds of things are addressed through construction that they meet certain requirements. Those requirements would come into play if there was a development to occur.

Commissioner Mitchell – I am not certain that I get it. Let's say we don't do the waiver and they built anyway. They would still need to bury the stream.

Ms. Creasy – If they chose to do a by right development with the current platted situation, they would have to adhere to all the site plan, VSMP, Erosion & Sediment Control requirements. They could take out the entire site and do their development. This scenario is a possibility, whether they move forward with the proposal that they are working on now or move forward with something in the current configuration.

Commissioner Mitchell – The staff report seemed quiet on the impacts to Moore's Creek and the spring. I believe the recommendation from staff is because we want to protect as many trees as we can. If they do the waiver, we grant the waiver, we are going to maintain 70 trees. If they do by right, there will be around 40 trees left.

Ms. Creasy – That is the general scenario. There is a condition that has been proposed that would require significant work with the arborist to come up with a plan that preserves the number of trees.

Commissioner Mitchell – The reason that only 40 trees will be left if the waiver is not granted, and they just build is because of the engineering calisthenics necessary to provide the infrastructure. The waiver allows them to do some things on the slopes that they would not.

Ms. Creasy – The request that they have put forward includes preservation of an area that includes 77 trees. If they go with by right, the areas of that open space that they are proposing to conserve would be open to being demolished. With a by right situation, we have no means of preserving.

Commissioner Mitchell – The sewage and water infrastructure that they build, if they did go by right, it would consume more trees and the critical slope waiver would.

Ms. Creasy – Not with the analysis that Mr. Alfele put together. It is very generalized. We are working with the proposal that we have in front of us and the platted lots. Those are the 2 things we are weighing against one another. There are other factors that come into play that we are not speculating on. That is not the proposal we have been provided.

Commissioner Mitchell – If they do the by right development, the way they will have to do sewage and water, it is costly. I am wondering if a by right development is economically feasible.

Ms. Creasy – We had similar questions that were posed. We have the current scenario, the proposal that they have provided, and they might have looked at other scenarios. Maybe that information will be helpful in the deliberation.

Chairman Solla-Yates – Historically, it was platted for relatively affordable row houses.

Ms. Creasy – I don't know the history of that per se. It reminds me of a lot of our plotting of subdivisions during that time where there were some nice drawings done on paper. The comparison to what is going on in the ground was maybe not thought of as deeply. We find that any lot that exists now that is open has either been owned by someone who has no interest in development, or it is hard to try to do something. This falls into that second category. This is not an area that one would have seen as your first choice to go to. We have a lot more limited land than we used to. Areas that are complicated have been coming forward. You have been working with quite a few complicated sites.

ii. Applicant Presentation

Scott Collins, Collins Engineering – We have been looking at this project for almost 3 to 4 years. There was a lot of thought put into this on how best to develop it. We did talk to the neighbors. We talked with a lot of people. We got a lot of feedback over time about how best to come forward with a project knowing that it was going to have some aspect/impacts with the critical slopes and with the trees on the property. What we did is come forward with the best possible development that we think fits in well with the neighborhood. What you have in front of us is part of my overall application plan. This shows what staff talked about: these 88 platted lots that exist on the property. What is unique about this site is that it sits low. It sits between Azalea Drive and Monte Vista Lane. It sits down in this valley. This area takes about 22 acres of drainage from the backs of those lots. It also comes down Huntsman Road. Off that existing city right-of-way there is a drainage inlet pipe that pipes drainage to a swale that goes into this area. We have a lot of drainage that is coming into this one spot. We had to figure out how to accommodate that.

Next Slide

What we are proposing is utilizing the existing city right-of-way that is a 20-foot right-of-way from property line to property line. What we have done is extend it out to be 40 feet wide to make the street meet current city requirements for Streets That Work with sidewalks and planting strips. We have widened that existing city right-of-way to create the access front for all these lots. We have also looked at taking a product that fits in well with all the surrounding neighborhoods. The size of the lots and the size of the houses are comparable to the existing neighbors and surrounding streets. We wanted to come up with a product that fits into the neighborhood and did not overwhelm the neighborhood. We heard talk about a couple of things with this site. One is the value of creating a space where the public can still utilize the property or some part of it that still incorporates some of the natural beauty of the site. We have created this public amenity park space that would

be accessible to not only the residents of this development, but from the outside neighborhoods that can access it through the sidewalks and streets and keep that area natural. No grading would take place in that area. We would preserve the trees, work with the arborist, and create this small public park. On the other col de sac, we created an area that absorbs all those 22 acres of drainage and treats it. With 95 percent of the projects in the city, they must treat stormwater management with underground retention and buy nutrient credits. It is not a lot of space, especially when you are coming in and doing an infill. We were able to work out a scenario, especially with the property downstream of us to create a stormwater management feature that would treat and provide water quality and quantity for, not only our site, but also some of this other drainage that is coming through the site that is untreated. We are capturing all the drainage from there. Some of that is from that spring that you are talking about right there. A lot of it is also from water from existing city right-of-ways and backyards. We are picking all that up from the different spots in our development and taking it to that facility. We will treat it and outfall back into the stream at the reduced rates at better quality than what we are capturing.

Next Slide

This shows how the development is interacting with the critical slopes. Where the right-of-way is, you can see what was exempt with the development. This shows a good example of how we are bringing the sewer up from Monte Vista. We will be lowering the sewer in Monte Vista for 2 or 3 segments in that road. We will go into that street, lower the sanitary sewer as much as we can from that downstream intersection and take it up to our property. By the time it hits our property at that corner, it is almost right at grade at the site. At that point, it is much higher. It is probably 8 feet higher than that stream. That is why at that point, we take it down to the city right-of-way. That is what is required. If you can run sewer in the right-of-way, that is where the city utilities want you to put it. We will get it down to the city right-of-way and run it up the site, up the existing right-of-way where we are building our road. That basically creates the fill of that lower portion of the site. That is where the dirt will be coming in. That is where majority of the critical slopes are at that point.

Next Slide

We will take that existing stream on our property and divert it into our stormwater management facility. We will build that first. During the filling process, all that drainage will be diverted to that E&S facility. We will not have any downstream impacts from the filling process. It is all being diverted to our basins.

Next Slide

This shows the overall development. Once you come back with the trees as far as along the streetscape and along the buffering and keeping some existing trees that we can along the ends. We are preserving the city right-of-way. We are not impacting any of that existing alley right-of-way. We are planting, not only along the streets, but in the rear of the lots. That is in addition to saving that 0.6-acre public park area.

Commissioner Mitchell – If you are not granted the waiver, what would you do with the property?

Mr. Collins – If we are not granted the waiver, we will still develop it. We would take the sewer up the city right of way, which would impact the stream, which would impact those slopes around it. We would develop the upper half from Huntsman Road all the way up. We would probably develop on the lower side of that road that does not have the critical slopes. It would leave that pocket of lots 1 through 12 on the upper part. At some point, the fact that the stream is gone, those slopes up there would probably be exempt.

Commissioner Mitchell – Do the numbers work economically and financially?

Mr. Collins – I do not think we have gotten that far. We did not see this as the best scenario for this development. When you are building a road with units only on one side, it is not the right move.

Commissioner Habbab – Did you consider working with the natural elements in the forest and the spring that is already there instead of bulldozing everything that is there?

Mr. Collins – Absolutely. This one is unique in that you have platted lots and a platted city right-of-way. If you take away that city right-of-way by taking the road a different configuration, you are creating lots that don't have frontage. The reason why we can even do this size of a lot, what is allowed by R-1s, this design is still nonconforming. It is less nonconforming than what that current pot of 88 lots are. That is why it has taken us this long to get here. We looked at shifting the road and seeing if we had to go back to the city to vacate that right-of-way. You are taking a complex narrative and making it more complex by deleting access points.

Commissioner Habbab – It would make more sense to have smaller and denser buildings.

Mr. Collins – This is about the right size. It fits with the neighborhood. This size of house is comparable to all the other houses in different areas. I am not sure if the dynamics would work if it were much smaller than that.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – If you did not have to work within the constraints of R-1s zoning and the city would vacate right-of-way as needed, is this the project you would build?

Mr. Collins – On this piece of property, yes. This is the best product that fits in with the existing neighborhood. To come in with something smaller and denser has the feeling that it does not quite fit in with the character of this neighborhood and how it interacts with the lots planned up and planned down all along this whole area. This product in this size is a good fit. It is a good compromise. It completes this part of the area/neighborhood.

Chairman Solla-Yates – The connection to steep slopes is a bit tenuous. We had some public comment concerned about traffic being routed through existing neighborhoods. I see that there is an existing city right-of-way that directly connects to JPA. I wonder if you had considered that issue.

Mr. Collins – We tried to get an emergency access or have access through there. Those 2 properties that are adjacent to that existing city right-of-way have elements of their lots that have gone over into that area. One of the first comments that we received when we had a road and a pedestrian pathway and the different concepts through there, we had to get permission from those lot owners to use that existing city right-of-way for our development. We could not relocate or remove those features without their permission.

Ms. Creasy – There are individuals on other lots who have placed things in the right-of-way. That gets tricky. They did that at their own risk because they do not own the land. If people put things in public right-of-way, it is an at-risk situation. If there is something that needs to occur within that right-of-way, the locality has the right to do that within the parameters of that area. They are not required to put back the item. That is not the first reaction that Charlottesville has. It is typically working with an individual in situations like that. We do not want to perpetuate new opportunities like that. If someone has a situation where they need to put something within a right-of-way, we make them go through the Council process of getting the permissions to do so. If it is within a platted right-of-way, the opportunity to remove those items is there.

iii. Commissioner Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Mitchell – When we are dealing with critical slopes, my first concern is the management of the water. I am getting comfortable with the way they are going to be managing run up and things like that. I was a little worried about the spring and the burying of the spring. Water management is not as problematic as I thought it might be. It breaks my heart to see all those trees taken down. This site is going to get developed one way or the other.

Commissioner d’Oronzio – My thoughts tend to parallel Commissioner Mitchell’s comments in most respects. This allows for a requirement for replenishment appropriately. I was concerned about the water management.

Commissioner Habbab – I agree. We just talked about the Climate Action Plan and the importance of tree preservation. This is leaving us with 14 percent of the trees that are there. I feel that we are being bullied into a bad scenario to avoid a horrible scenario. There is no care at all given to the existing asset. It was just treated like empty land with nothing there. We have a great asset there. It is the lesser of 2 evils.

Commissioner Schwarz – I hate to think of this as the lesser of 2 evils. Staff has provided 10 conditions to make sure that this is done properly. The end result does seem to be better. At some point, the land will be developed. We have that density problem. Even if it is too difficult today, it is going to be built on. Let’s use this opportunity to make sure what goes there is done properly.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would not be as convinced that this will be viable with a quarter of the units removed. I don’t know that is necessarily something that I should be judging this project on. What gets me about this project is that it is painful to see this plan. This is the kind of site that is ‘crying out’ for a PUD. All the stuff about neighborhood character does not resonate with me. You are downslope lower than the houses on either side. You could make a townhouse development that builds into the hill and is not as tall visually. You can get more units out of it and make more money. Dumping in 20 feet of fill to accomplish this result is difficult. We are supposed to be judging this based on impacts on water features. I appreciate the 116 percent of on-site water treatment increasing the water quality to Moores Creek. I am not as heartbroken about the trees. I will support this with Finding 1.

Chairman Solla-Yates – This is a difficult mathematical and geometrical problem. I am pleased with the sewer solution. I see a real value in that to the community. From a design perspective, I see that there are similarities to the existing. We want to see the gentle changes. I don’t see those here.

Motion – Commissioner Mitchell – move to recommend approval of the critical slope waiver for Tax Map and Parcels 200142000, 200126000, 200147000, 200131200, 200125000, 200146000, 200130001, 200122000, 200145000, 200129000, 200121000, 200144000, 200127001, 200148000, and 200143000 as requested, with conditions, based on a finding that the public benefits of allowing the disturbance outweigh the benefits afforded by the existing undisturbed critical slope, per Section 34-1120(b)(6)(d)(i)

Conditions

1. The applicant shall work with the City’s Urban Forester during site plan review to create a tree protection/preservation plan for approximately seventy-seven (77) trees as presented in the application materials. The applicant shall perform all protection/preservation measures as identified in this plan. The tree preservation/protection plan will include a monitoring program to ensure compliance throughout the construction period. The plan shall also include provisions, such as easements, deed restrictions, or other legally binding measures to ensure preservation of trees in perpetuity.
2. The applicant shall, through easement, deed restriction, or other legally binding document, ensure no development or tree removal within the 0.6 acres “Public Amenity Area” as presented in the application materials. This documentation shall be enacted prior to approval of a Final Site Plan.
3. The applicant shall memorialize the “landscape screening” as presented in the application materials prior to approval of a final site plan. Planting within the screening area shall be a mixture of deciduous and evergreen trees, and the remaining trees will be large and medium deciduous trees as stated in the application materials.
4. In addition to providing the minimum tree cover requirements as required by code, the applicant shall preserve approximately seventy-seven (77) trees as shown in the application materials. The preserved trees shall not count towards the minimum tree cover requirement.

5. **Site Plans (VESCP Plans) should include, at a minimum, 4 stages/phases of ESC controls. The first phase shall include “Initial/Preliminary Controls”. Outfalls from any proposed traps shall be established with rigorous independent ESC controls, early in the sequence, prior to the establishment of a sediment trap and associated conveyances.**
6. **Any channels/diversions that convey ‘clear’ water shall be stabilized with sod on the ‘clear water’ side immediately after installation.**
7. **“Super Silt Fence” (chain linked backing) shall be installed where perimeter silt fence is specified.**
8. **Any disturbance occurring outside of conveyances to the trap, in either sequence or space, planned or unforeseen, shall be immediately stabilized with sod (for pervious areas, utilities should have other “same day stabilization”).**
9. **At no time shall concentrated water be directed toward the critical slopes without adequate conveyance down and beyond the slopes to an acceptable outfall.**
10. **The Final Plan should include a Virginia Stormwater Management Plan that includes a design for onsite water quality provided by a facility, or facilities, designed in accordance with the BMP Clearinghouse “2013 Draft Design Specifications for Practices 1-15”, or a proprietary Manufactured Treatment Device acceptable to DEQ at the time the Final Plan is submitted. The facility or facilities should provide 110 percent of the onsite Phosphorus removal required as determined with an accurately completed VRRM spreadsheet for the project. Second by Commissioner Schwarz. Motion passes 6-0.**

2. Presentation – Entrance Corridor Design Review Overview – To Be postponed to a later date and time.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:24 PM.