

Agenda

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET  
TUESDAY, July 11, 2017 – 5:30 P.M.  
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**I. Commission Work Session (Agenda discussion(s))**

*Beginning:* 4:30 p.m.

*Location:* City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference

1. Comprehensive Plan Process Preparation

**II. Commission Regular Meeting**

*Beginning:* 5:30 p.m.

*Location:* City Hall, 2nd Floor, Council Chambers

- A. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**
- B. UNIVERSITY REPORT**
- C. CHAIR'S REPORT**
- D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS**
- E. MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA**
- F. CONSENT AGENDA**

(Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

1. Minutes - June 13, 2017 – Pre meeting and Regular meeting
2. Minutes - April 25, 2017 – Work Session

**III COMMISSION'S Work Session**

*Beginning:* upon conclusion of items above

*Location:* City Hall, 2nd Floor, NDS Conference

1. City Attorney Review of Zoning Ordinance - <http://www.charlottesville.org/departments-and-services/departments-h-z/neighborhood-development-services/zoning/legal-review-2017>

**IV. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE/ADJOURN**

| Tuesday, July 25, 2017 – 5:00 PM  | Work Session    | City Attorney Review of Zoning Ordinance/ Community Engagement Chapter  |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Tuesday, August 8, 2017 – 4:30 PM | Pre- Meeting    |   |
| Tuesday, August 8, 2017 – 5:30 PM | Regular Meeting | <u>Rezoning</u> - MACAA Intergenerational Education Campus PUD (TM 47; P 7.1, 8 & 11)<br>Comprehensive Plan Compliance - Belmont Bridge Concepts Public Hearing |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | Entrance Corridor Review Board –<br>Review of Solar Systems Ordinances<br>Minutes - May 23, 2017 – Work<br>Session |
|--|--|--|

**Anticipated Items on Future Agendas**

Critical Slope Waiver – Seminole Square and Pepsi Bottling  
Special Use Permit – 201 West Water Street, 0 Carlton Road  
Rezoning – 501 Cherry Avenue

**Persons with Disabilities may request reasonable accommodations by contacting  
[ada@charlottesville.org](mailto:ada@charlottesville.org) or (434)970-3182**

**PLEASE NOTE: THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE PRIOR TO THE MEETING.**

**PLEASE NOTE: We are including suggested time frames on Agenda items. These times are subject to change at any time during the meeting.**

**LIST OF SITE PLANS AND SUBDIVISIONS APPROVED ADMINISTRATIVELY  
6/1/2017 TO 6/30/2017**

- 1. Preliminary Site Plans**
- 2. Final Site Plans**
  - a. Charlottesville High School Track Expansion (TM 43A P1) – June 2, 2017
  - b. Demolition for south end of Brandon Ave – June 29, 2017
- 3. Site Plan Amendments**
- 4. Minor Subdivision**
  - a. 207 & 209 Douglas Avenue BLA (TMP 58-339 & 58-340) - June 6, 2017

Minutes  
**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR DOCKET**  
**TUESDAY, June 13, 2017 – 5:30 P.M.**  
**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**II. Commission Regular Meeting**

*Beginning:* 5:30 p.m.

*Location:* City Hall, 2nd Floor, Council Chambers

Members Present: Vice-Chair; Lisa Green, Commissioners Genevieve Keller, Jody Lahendro, John Santoski, and Corey Clayborne;

Members Absent: Taneaia Dowell, Kurt Keesecker

Staff: Missy Creasy, Carolyn McCray

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Lisa Green at 5:30 pm

**A. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS**

Commissioner Lahendro: attended the Tree Commission meeting on June 6<sup>th</sup>. Brian Daly, Director of Parks and Recreation made a presentation on the organization, responsibilities, staffing, and the budget of his department. There was a sensitive discussion of the condition of the trees on the mall. Significant funds and planning is needed now for remedial treatment and eventual replacement of the stressed trees. We are not getting significant response from those who probably should be concerned. Also the Redevelopment Housing Board is supportive of planting new trees at Westhaven which the Tree Commission is seeking to do. At the authority's recommendation the Tree Commission is now meeting with PHAR to engage the residents support for that plan. The data committee is collecting information on new tree planting efforts. They will be working on how best to analyze this information in a meaningful way for the city's use.

Commissioner Keller: attended the PLACE Task Force meeting and they have invited our Chair, Mr. Keesecker to attend the July meeting to have a more in-depth discussion about the Comprehensive Plan process. They were quite interested in our community meetings. A couple of people were able to attend, but some hadn't so we talked about doing that exercise at our meeting next month. To have that planning and design, arts group respond might be a good kind of check of what we have done, how does a group of professionals react to that. She also attended the TJPDC which is kicking off its regional affordable housing efforts for next year which we probably want to interface with. She asked about the opportunity later for us to talk about having perhaps either an end of the year or beginning of the next calendar year planning session so we can identify key dates that are coming up for the Planning Commission. She was disappointed that we did not have an opportunity early enough to consider whether we should holding public hearing and our meeting tonight. Someone suggested to me that some groups have an organizing meeting so why shouldn't the Planning Commission be able to look at the year ahead. Given it will be 2018, we can put things on the calendar and then institutionalize it when 2019 comes around (whomever sitting here) would have those dates to become a customary practice so that commissioners don't have to think three months ahead and say oh there is going to be an election.

Commissioner Santoski: reported he did not attend the MPO Tech or Parks and Rec meeting this month. He did report the Belmont Bridge Steering Committee meets tomorrow 6.14.2017. They are supposed to hear back from the designers the results of the open house that was held on June 1<sup>st</sup>, and hopefully the steering committee is getting to a point to make a recommendation that would come to the Planning Commission in August. He hopes everyone took the online surveys.. He attended the Rose Hill Neighborhood Association meeting; Heather Newmyer and Brennen Duncan, were there concerning on a project on Amherst and Rose Hill Drive. Keith Woodard was out there to talk to the neighborhood association, about 40 people in the audience. Staff did a really

nice job of representing the city and making sure the meeting stayed on task. Neighborhoods are not always happy with what they hear, especially with by-right developments and there is a number of people when projects are approved they kind of fall off the radar especially if years and years have gone by. He is thinking is there any way for us to periodically be able to let residents know what projects that have previously approved for the neighborhoods that are still on the books that they should be aware of because they could come back at some point and time. For instance the PUD on 5<sup>th</sup> Street there behind Johnson Village that had been approved 10 years ago but just recently began construction. Sometimes people are shocked oh my Gosh, we thought this project fell off the radar and so neighbors tend to think there is nothing going to happen with it because of the timelines for how projects can stay in the queue. A lot of times things are happening behind the scenes that they are not aware of and that might be something that might be useful in some neighborhoods especially since we're are going through the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Creasy said we keep a resource on that and it just may be how that is distributed.

Commissioner Clayborne: reported he attended the BAR meeting on May 16th and one thing that he thought was a highlight was review and approval of a nomination for West Main Street Historic District. That will be moving forward for submission in hopes to be named to the National Landmark Register and the Register of Historic Places. There are a lot of activities on West Main Street, an important piece of historic fabric in our city and so that will be a pretty cool recognition to get that.

Commissioner Lahendro said he is on the State Review Board and they will be reviewing the nominations on this Thursday. The nomination form is really well done. It is very interesting how West Main has developed as the transportation corridor, from railroad stations to hotels, the Black communities around there, the three churches that have formed on West Main, it is a fascinating story.

Commission Keller said there is a nice little presentation, the required one, and DHR has to come and do their dog and pony show. There only three people that happened to attend but it was quite interesting. If there are opportunities to present that to a larger audience in the city later during the year after it is listed that could increase public understanding.

Commissioner Santoski said this is a question for Commissioner Lahendro, you mention something about them trying to attract new planting.

Commissioner Lahendro said they have come up with a method of when the tree is planted and what kind of tree it is and then tracking it over time to see how it does and also what kind of watering it is getting and use that information to report on how many new trees are planted every year in the city so that we can give more definitive information of what we are planting and what we are leaving behind what we are losing.

Commissioner Santoski said he was assuming that is all the planting that the city does and would not be a private planting or private removal of trees and yet that has a real impact on the canopy.

Commission Lahendro: said the Tree Planting Committee is looking into tree planting at places like Westhaven or FHA property and we are trying to figure out places like Belmont that has a dense population where there are fewer trees because the houses are so close to together there are fewer trees there than most places in the city. We have already started doing something like this for 10<sup>th</sup> and Page neighborhood. We hope to reach out to the public and providing information on the types of trees that would be appropriate, what kind of care they would need, were they should be located and utility information.

**A. UNIVERSITY REPORT** – Brian Hogg: said the UVA Board of Visitors met at the end of last week and took a number of actions: The Memorial to Enslaved Laborers was approved both its design and its location.

We are moving forward with fundraising to enable the construction of that project. We presented the beginnings of an athletics precinct plan that included plant scheme for pedestrians and bicyclist through the athletic complex to north grounds to try to re-enforce the connections between grounds and central grounds and continue to study the larger plans for that area. He said with our Emmet Ivy project called Ivy Corridor, we are working with the city staff on coordinating the smart scale project for Emmet Street with the Emmet Ivy construction so the infrastructure for that is promising. Ivy Mountain what you all may know as KCRC, the Kluge Children's Rehabilitation Center, we have an approved master plan for that and an architect was selected on Friday for a new health system structure as CGF from Washington. On Brandon Avenue the schematic design was approved for a new student residence at the south end of the building. People of his generation will remember 600 Brandon Avenue as a sprawling apartment building and that is being replaced with a new larger building and that design is in PE right now. Construction for the street improvement is well into planning if not in execution.

**B.**

Commissioner Santoski: asked if the Cavalier Inn will shut down in June of 2018.

Mr. Hogg: answered yes.

Commissioner Santoski: asked will demolition happen soon thereafter.

Mr. Hogg: said yes and the same is true with the Villa, it will be closing also. The goal is to get the infrastructure for the large plan that is the basis for Ivy/Emmet through the Ivy Corridor in place and we will be working from the east to the west and that would be among the first part of that project.

Commissioner Keller: asked how does the loss of the motel building affect your plans in that area?

Mr. Hogg: said there is a discussion about whether hospitality would be retained on the site but no plans are certain for that.

Commissioner Keller: asked do you have interpretive plans for the 1960 civil rights events associated with that site?

Mr. Hogg: said the Cavalier Inn?

Commissioner Keller: said yes.. She said when those demolitions happened nobody was really thinking about it in a way that the city is now. Mr. Hogg said there are no plans now but he wouldn't say it won't be in the future. It is certainly possible. Of course we do not own the most important of the sites there, the hotel site, is still a private property.

Commissioner Keller: said with current discussions it would be good as plans develop to keep that in mind and maybe coordinate with the African American Heritage Center.

Mr. Hogg: said of course the Memorial to Enslaved Laborers is not meant to be a unique site. There are plans for it to be in a much larger group of sites and structures to discuss the African American presence at UVA. It is not a one and done thing. It is intended to be a multi-location type of memorial.

Commissioner Keller: said it just seems timely as the city struggles with response to the current events to look back into our recent past and say we have had difficult moments that perhaps would have lessons for today or that should at least be remembered in some evocative way if not tangible.

**CHAIR'S REPORT** – Vice-Chair; Lisa Green: said she did not have any meetings this month. The Citizens Transportation Advisory Commission will be meeting on July 19<sup>th</sup> at the Water Street Center at 7:00 p.m. Yesterday she attended a legislative agenda meeting in Richmond about some of the recent legislation that has passed from this session. It will take affect July 1<sup>st</sup>. Some of the things they anticipate to come up this upcoming session will be solar farms which is timely with our discussion this evening.

**DEPARTMENT OF NDS** - Missy Creasy reported they have two kick off meetings occurring next week which are the last two in that series. The first kick off meeting is on Wednesday June 21<sup>st</sup> at CHS in the evening, and the other one is on Saturday, June 24<sup>th</sup> at the Central Library from 10:00 to 12:00. We encourage anyone who is interested to attend those sessions and provide us some feedback on the Comprehensive Plan. We are starting to have conversations about what phase 2 is going to be looking like

from an outreach standpoint and will be moving forward with some of the logistic plans very soon. Tuesday, June 27, 2017 – 5:00, Work Session with the City Attorney Review of Zoning Ordinance

## **MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC NOT ON THE FORMAL AGENDA**

Travis Pietila from the Southern Environment Law Center: Thank you for the chance to speak. My comments tonight will focus on the ZTA for solar energy systems that the commission will consider later this evening. As we mentioned at the public hearing on this item last month, SELC supports this effort to make clear that the City’s zoning ordinance allows solar energy systems as an accessory use. Providing this certainty can go a long way toward promoting these renewable energy sources as homeowners and businesses plan for the future of their properties. In our comments last month, we did flag a couple of areas in which we felt the proposed revisions could be clearer. On that note, we’d like to thank Susan Elliott and Tish Tablan for following up with us and trading ideas back-and-forth on ways to clarify the requirements for yards and setbacks. We believe the revised ordinance before you tonight provides greater clarity on this subject and includes some reasonable protections for neighboring properties, while still facilitating solar energy. One other area we think could still use some clarity and further discussion is the question of when certificates of appropriateness would be required. Particularly in the case of installations that would be highly visible in design control districts and entrance corridors, it’s important to make sure everyone is as clear as possible about which types of solar facilities would require a COA, and which would not. Although many of the photos in the attachments staff provided show facilities with little visual impact that may not need to undergo review, some of the examples could undermine the purposes of those overlay districts without a COA and the review that goes along with it. With a clear understanding of when that review would be required, the Commission, City Council, and the BAR can better determine whether those lines are set in the right place for solar facilities, or may need to be adjusted one way or the other. If there is a desire to adjust those lines, staff had suggested to us the possibility of moving these initial changes forward now, but adding an enactment clause that would make clear they wouldn’t go into effect until the overlay district ordinances are updated to reflect any changes needed for solar facilities. We have no objection to that approach, so long as the enactment clause isn’t tied to a certain future date, but is instead tied to changes to the overlay district having actually been adopted or voted on.

But in closing, we want to once again offer our support and our thanks for all of the work that has gone into crafting these important changes to the zoning ordinance to promote solar energy in the City.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

(Items removed from the consent agenda will be considered at the end of the regular agenda)

1. Minutes - April 11, 2017 – Pre meeting and Regular meeting
2. Minutes - May 9, 2017 – Pre meeting and Regular meeting

Motion by Commissioner Santoski, Seconded by Commissioner Lahendro to approve the Consent Agenda, motion passes 6-0.

## **No members of Charlottesville City Council attended the joint public hearing.**

### **III. JOINT MEETING OF COMMISSION/ COUNCIL**

*Beginning:* 6:00 p.m.

*Continuing:* until all public hearings are completed

*Format:* (i) Staff Report, (ii) Applicant, (iii) Hearing

1. **ZM16-00003 910, 912, 914, and 916 King Street** –Atlas Projects LLC, owner of 910, 912, and 914 King Street and the contract purchaser for 916 King Street (owned by Jeffery Marshall) has submitted an

application to rezone land at 910, 912, 914, and 916 King Street (“Subject Properties”) from low-density (R-1S) Residential to Cherry Avenue Mixed Use Corridor (CH) with proffers. The Subject Properties are identified on City Real Property Tax Map 30 as Parcels 124, 125, 126, and 127 with frontage on King Street. The Subject Properties contain approximately 24,393 square feet of land or 0.56 acres. The residential uses allowed by-right in the current R-1S classification are limited to single-family detached dwellings (SFD), which may contain interior or exterior accessory dwelling units), limited to 1 SFD per 6,000 square foot lot (effective density of 7 DUA). The proposed CH Mixed Use Corridor would allow the same SFDs, at a density of 7 DUA, but would also allow two family dwellings, and single-family attached/ townhouse and multifamily dwellings (at a density of up to 21 DUA by-right, or 43 DUA by special use permit) , and mixed-use development containing any residential uses, up to 43 DUA by right. The applicant proposes to build a mixed use building with residential and commercial components, supportive parking, and other amenities on the Subject Properties. The rezoning is proposed subject to proffered development conditions including: dedication of right of way to accommodate a 5’ sidewalk; additional step back requirements abutting to low density residential; and restricting hotel use to no more than 30 rooms. The Land Use Map designation within the City’s Comprehensive Plan identifies this property as being planned for Low Density Residential, but the Comprehensive Plan does not specify a density range. A copy of the proposed zoning map amendment, and related materials, is available for inspection at the Charlottesville Department of Neighborhood Development Services, 610 East Market Street. Persons interested in this rezoning petition my contact Matt Alfele by email (alfelem@charlottesville.org) or by telephone (434-970-3636).

Oliver Platt Mills said this location in the city is where one can imagine the increase in density, the increase in growth that is so clearly asked for in the comprehensive plan, and said it feels difficult today to stand in that site and imagine single-family houses going back up where they’ve been taken down.

#### Open the Public Hearing

Ms. Joyce Hillstrom, King Street said she is in full support of the project.

The last thing I know that anyone wants to see is three huge homes going up there. We want something mixed-use. We want something that local people can take part in and are proud of and can be neighbors with. We want to have more neighbors there whether they’re long-term or short-term.

Mr. Gary Funston, Grove Street, said we are very concerned about traffic and I’m not sure if a two-way street is a good idea or at least would be helpful at that point. I’d like to see the project proceed with just as much attention to that as possible, especially access to Roosevelt Brown from both King and Grove.

#### Closed the Public Hearing

Commissioner Keller stated she is concerned about the possibility of a hotel on the lot after a zoning change. Although one of the proffers provided by Atlas ensures a hotel built can have no more than 30 rooms. She is wary, citing previous instances wherein approved zoning changes resulted in unwanted development.

Vice-Chair Green said all of the uses in the use matrix apply every other use is still for by-right or an SUP.

Commissioner Keller stated we’re dealing with zoning category, R-1S [residential], which is one of the few things that are keeping a number of our neighborhoods owner-occupied and somewhat affordable. I’m not sure if at this point in time I’m comfortable with moving ahead with no more assurance than we have, that this project will go the way we saw it envisioned.



Mr. Platt-Mills assured those at the meeting that Atlas Projects was not interested in building a commercial hotel and inserted the proffer dictating a room number limitation to ensure no hotel would be built. Not wanting to eliminate future opportunities for a combination short-term and long-term rental building, technically classified as a hotel, the proffer did not preclude all hotel uses.

Mr. Platt-Mills said with the proffer statement that we made, the most important one is we gave with a site plan for a big building, at that moment when traffic is increased by this project we will deed one foot to the city or enough to reach the Streets That Work guidelines which would allow us to do a two way street from the top of our property down. It would also help with what is happening on the other side since there is a parking lot there for UVA. If you go there today, it is largely treated as a two way street at the low end. It is quite wide and would allow it to efficiently be a 5 foot sidewalk, and enough road-way to go two ways with one side of on street parking.

Commissioner Keller: asked if he could talk with us a little more on the hotel.

Mr. Platt-Mills said in speaking to the neighborhood we tried quite hard to get folks to tell us things they did not want. Most people were really interested in what they do want: grocery store, ATM. The one thing nobody wants is a hotel. What we got is a stand-alone hotel we feel a chance in the future of this property ability to rent a piece of this property a match with other stories building different ways to rent property and doesn't want a stand-alone hotel.

Mr. Platt-Mills said we don't want to build a stand-alone hotel and we don't want to sell it to anyone that does a stand-alone hotel. Mr. Platt-Mills said the proffer we believe, would make it completely unattractive for any hotel to come in and purchase the property.

Matt Alfele said if this goes forward the traffic engineer be more involved assuring careful attention to the street in the site plan phase.

Commissioner Santoski: said if we approve the re-zoning and the project goes through does that give the traffic engineer time to look at the whole traffic flow for that area. I know because I come through there almost every day and the traffic backs up extremely far on Cherry Avenue as folks are trying to get to the University and try to make a right, on King Street and Grove Street in the morning or evening, restrict any of the turns. Will the traffic engineer look at that.

Mr. Platt-Mills said King Street is currently one-way, raising the issue of car backups if more occupants take up residency in the proposed mixed-used building. He said he spoke with the city traffic engineer about converting it to a two-way street but is unsure that the solution will be that simple.

Commissioner Clayborne asked is there anything we can do if the land changes ownership in light of what Commissioner Keller was talking about where someone had potentially said we will do a mixed use and then the plans change. Is there anything we can do to protect ourselves?

Lisa Robertson said the landowners are giving you an idea and their concept of where they hope to go. This is not a proposed rezoning for a specific use or development. They are still in the planning phases. This is just a general rezoning. Once it is rezoned to the Cherry Avenue district other than the hotel use that is proffered out and the other proffers that we have, it will just be Cherry Avenue. Our protection is through the regulations in the zoning district. Once that happens as you go through the zoning ordinance update you get to the point later on down the road where you are looking at your Comprehensive Plan and your land use and you think about updating your zoning ordinance in the Cherry Avenue small area plan. Those are the places to think about what you want the Cherry Avenue regulations to look like. This is just a straight up re-zoning

to the Cherry Avenue district so this property can be used for any of the uses that are allowed in that district and the building envelope standing district would apply to that use they choose.

Mr. Hogg said there are not any plans for that property and we have no position as an institution on this application as it relates to re-zoning.

Commissioner Lahendro said he has complete respect for the applicants. He commend them for how closely they have worked with the neighborhood and they have done everything they can to think ahead and think of a development to tie in with the neighborhood and the University but it scares the hell out of him that something could happen and they would be selling it to another developer. It gives him pause.

Vice-Chair Green said she has those same concerns.

Commissioner Keller said we have not had much of an opportunity to have much discussion of this. She said she can't think of another place that is more suitable for housing more particular for housing related to the largest employer in our region so she is all on board for housing on this site. She said there is a reason to have some mixed use, some very minor food service, convenience kind of retail. We have had a lot of push back because of hotels and impacts of neighborhoods and she would like an opportunity to explore that a little bit more and do the dance that one does with applicants that are considering a re-zoning and going to engage in the proffer process to some extent and I don't feel like we have had the opportunity to explore that enough yet and she doesn't think we have had enough opportunity to explore all of those other potential uses in the Cherry Avenue corridor and beyond that one of the most important things John said was at this point and time. We are dealing with a zoning category R1-S which is one of the few things that is keeping a number of our neighborhoods owner occupied, lower scaled, somewhat affordable and she is a little bit concern about creep into R1-S neighborhoods. You are saying King Street at this point and time and we don't really know what that means if this project were to go 100% commercial. Does that mean the more intensive residential use would go up other places in King Street and does that make other edge areas of the city that are adjacent to R1-S more vulnerable. That is one of the things we have been talking about in the Comp Plan - what we are doing for protection of the edge areas that are between very different intensity uses. This is a real poster child for that and it could a really good example.

Commissioner Santoski said we can only go by what we have in front of us and I think sometimes we spend too much time trying to negotiate something with folks when if they wanted to they could change something if they felt they needed too. We've had many developers stand up in front of us and over the years at times we've encouraged them to do certain things even if they really didn't want too. What we see is what we have.

Commissioner Santoski moved to recommend approval of this application to rezone subject properties from R-1S with proffers to Cherry Avenue corridor zoning on the on the basis that the proposal would service the interests of the general public and good zoning practice, seconded by Commissioner Clayborne, (Commissioner Keller voted no) motion passes 4-1.

**Break 7:17- 7:25**

#### **IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS**

Beginning: upon conclusion of all joint public hearings

Continuing: until all action items are concluded

Lin

##### **1. Report: Long Range Transportation Plan – Will Cockrell, MPO Coordinator**

- a. Purpose: The Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO (CA-MPO) recently initiated an update of the region's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), for its 5-year update. MPO staff is presenting to the Planning Commission as a primer for upcoming involvement with the LRTP update.
- b. Background: The CA-MPO is the official forum for cooperative transportation decision-making for the metropolitan area. It is federally designated to consider long-range regional projects that receive federal funds. One of the core responsibilities of the MPO is developing and maintaining the LRTP. This plan guides the region in creating a more efficient, responsive and environmentally-sensitive transportation system over the next 20+ years. The plan examines transportation trends/issues and offers a list of specific projects for addressing the region's mobility needs.
- c. The MPO Policy Board, which includes representatives for the Charlottesville City Council and Albemarle Board of Supervisors, approved the most recent plan in May 2014. During the update of that plan, the MPO had greater coordination with the local planning commissions. In that process, local commissions requested that they be included earlier in the process and more often. In response to that request, staff is initiating its first contact with the City and County commissions, two years prior to adoption.
- d. Summary: MPO staff officially kicked-off the LRTP update this past March, establishing a detailed scope of work and beginning initial steps. Just over two months later, staff completed a draft of the plan goals and objectives. Through an online survey, staff will collect early public input on transportation needs in the metro area. The MPO is also planning to collect public feedback by engaging with established groups, such as neighborhood associations and other community groups.
- e. Action Items: This discussion is a primer for future coordination in this planning process. Later this summer, MPO staff will return to the commissions with presentations of early data analysis and finalized goals. If there are any questions or comments, please contact Will Cockrell at wcockrell@tjpd.org or (434)422-4823.

Commissioner Lahendro asked if there were any coordination among metropolitan areas to metropolitan areas for the future with rail, high-speed rail, and how our current transportation plans need to dovetail with aspirational transit in the future.

Will Cockrell said we have been talking with Lynchburg about the new Amtrak service that comes through the region that has been budgeted and planned for. The Department of Rail and Transportation are also updating their rail plan and we have been participating in the process and going to those meetings. We fight for our region and put in recommendations that would help strengthen the Amtrak Station here in Charlottesville and try to bring new rail services urban areas like Northern Virginia. We are trying to push for additional service between Richmond and Charlottesville so you won't have to go to D.C. and come back or use bus service. We have given a lot of recommendations to them and as far as he knows a lot of those recommendations are going into the plan.

Commissioner Santoski: How does it tie into Louisa, Fluvanna, Orange, Green and over the other side the mountain and what is going to happen in 2045?

Mr. Hudson: said they have a federal funded project to look at the I-64 (Rt. 250) corridor the freight and Amtrak running between us and Staunton. We have to look at that and figure out how to coordinate things like developing inter-regional transit and service or facilitating the movement of freight and goods to our region and throughout the region. The efforts of inter-regional transit service to our region additionally end up feeding up into the state.

Commissioner Keller said her question is for Ms. Creasy. How does this coordinate with the Comp Plan and our calendar?

Ms. Creasy said we were talking about that as well. We are on a similar path at least in the beginning phases. Much more of our focus is not as in-depth on the transportation this time because we had a very detailed review of that portion in 2013. We have elements that we need to work on from a transportation standpoint and we have staff that is working on the transportation end here that are working with these guys on transportation plans. We don't typically have any conflict because most of the things that come big project wise are in the County but what we do is make sure that that things that would be promoted from the city prospective would be compatible.

Commissioner Keller said the one thing she thinks is really positive is you scheduled to come and we are engaged in the Long Range Transportation planning at this point in the process instead of it just being informational when it is too late to even comment on it. Thanks to the three of you. She appreciates the Planning Commission being involved.

## **2. Solar Energy System – Proposed Zoning Text Amendments**

Susan Elliott presented updated information noting that: Solar energy systems may encroach into required front, side and rear yards, subject to the provisions of sec. 34-1108 (limitations on placement in front of buildings). No solar energy system shall be placed closer than five (5) feet to any lot line and unenclosed structures (such as decks, porches, stoops, etc.) attached to a building, and which have a maximum floor height of three (3) feet above the finished grade, may encroach into any required yard, but not closer than five (5) feet to any lot line and no more than ten (10) feet into a required front yard; however, no such structure or improvement appurtenance, shall occupy more than thirty (30) percent of a rear yard.

(8) For any single- or two-family dwelling, an unenclosed structure attached to the façade of the dwelling, and having a height greater than three (3) feet above finished grade, may encroach into a required front yard by up to ten (10) feet, but no closer than five (5) feet to a front lot line.; Any such structure shall comply be in with the applicable side yard setback(s).

A solar energy system may be attached and incorporated as part of any building façade (for example: roof tiles, window shutters, canopies, etc.).(4) Placement in front of buildings: (i) Within required front yards-- Within a required front yard, a solar energy system may be incorporated as part of any structure allowed by Sec. 34-1101(b)(7) and Sec. 34-1101(b)(8). Otherwise, no solar energy system shall be located within a required front yard.

(ii) Within other areas forward of the front building façade—Within a low-density residential zoning district, except as provided in subparagraph (i), above, no solar energy system may be located forward of an imaginary line extending along the exterior façade of a residential building, parallel to the front lot line and extending between the side lot lines.

Vice Chair Green spoke on the allowed structure stating if she had a carport then solar would be allowed.

Ms. Creasy said you would not find that in the front yard. It would be a stoop or covered front porch.

Commissioner Green said she is talking about a carport.

Ms. Creasy said you would not put a carport in the front yard, it would be on the sides or in the rear.

Commissioner Lahendro said even non-conforming?

Ms. Creasy said it could be an existing situation now and you could place solar on it now anyway but a new carport is not allowed in the front yard. The allowance for this in the front yard is to allow someone to have a stoop or a small unenclosed porch on their front because that is a very common architecture in the city.

Commissioner Keller said that would be perfectly reasonable because it would be a roofing surface.

Commissioner Santoski asked can you have an unattached enclosed structure in the front yard like a garage.

Ms. Creasy stated no.

Commissioner Santoski said suppose you have parking area and you want to put a roof over it because of snow, you can't do that.

Ms. Creasy said she didn't have a 100 % answer for that.

Ms. Lisa Robertson, City Attorney, stated there are some circumstances in which parking space is allowed to be in a required yard but most of your building setbacks and most of the language in the ordinance do not allow buildings or structures in the front yard and according to the building official if you put four posts in the ground and you cement them in that makes footers and you put a roof on it that is a structure.

Ms. Creasy said there are some minimal allowances about what you can pave in the front yard too.

Vice Chair Green stated if she had a building and she puts windows in it, a concrete slab, put a roof over it and got four posts, you are telling me that now that is considered a structure.

Ms. Robertson answered saying if you have walls and columns that support a roof and closed in, that is a building.

Commissioner Lahendro said on this diagram of all the zoning districts front yard, is this only referring to the front yard or does this diagram implying that solar structures aren't allowed in any yards except for the non-required front yard.

Ms. Elliott said these two diagrams are looking just at the front yards. The next page speaks to the back yards and side yards.

Commissioner Lahendro said this is confusing and he is an architect.

Ms. Creasy said when you look at the side yard drawing you see those panels. This is what is currently in our code. This is not what the zoning staff hopes will be in there later when we move forward with changes. If it were to move forward at this point it would have to be interpreted based on what is currently in the code and if that changes then these diagrams would have to be altered to address that change. This is reflective of what the current code would allow.

Ms. Robertson said if they are okay with the parameters you are recommending and their main concern is whether they need to recommend a tweak to the language of the overlay district then she thinks it can go back to Council; and Council can initiate whatever changes to the overlay district are necessary before the rest of it goes forward. If the BAR doesn't like the recommendations that you've made about what should be in the ordinance whether it's the height or the placement that can be communicated prior to the second reading.

Commissioner Keller said would we need to do that as an ECR as well or are we going to skip that.

Ms. Robertson said yes you can do that as the ECR as well. You can do that at a separate meeting while the BAR is reviewing it. She said decide on the basic ordinance and we can help everybody understand the design issues that they should look at when it gets referred.

Commissioner Keller added it might be useful to have the BAR do it first because they do more design review than we do as the ECR and we can follow their lead.

Ms. Elliott recognized Ms. Tish Tablan who is the Sol Smart Program Consultant. She has helped with diagrams, pictures, and has been a sounding board and put in a lot of background work for this presentation.

### Public Comment

Public demand for solar energy systems has been increasing. Staff has received comments observing that its allowance is not clear in the zoning ordinance. Local solar PV industry practitioners who have aligned themselves as members of the recently-launched Charlottesville Renewable Energy Alliance (Cville-REA) reviewed the originally proposed zoning text amendment and supported the draft without concern. Staff has also incorporated comments from the public and the Planning Commissioners provided at the May 9, 2017 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Santoski moved to recommend that City Council should amend the text of Sections 34-1101, 34-1146, 34-1147, and 34-1200 of the zoning ordinance and add Section 34-1108 to the zoning ordinance, to clarify allowances and specifications for solar energy systems, because the proposed changes, with the following adjustments, are required by the public necessity, convenience, general welfare or good zoning practice, the recommended adjustments being as follows; 1) In Sec. 34-1200 (zoning definitions) heating, electrical and

mechanical equipment, utility service lines and meters, solar energy systems and related equipment should be referenced as being equipment or fixtures used accessory to the building structure or use being served. 2) Prior to taking action on the proposed amendments, City Council should have the BAR and ECRB review the ordinance and advise them whether any additional zoning text changes would be necessary in order to assure that those bodies will have the ability to review solar energy facilities that might have impacts on historic or entrance corridor districts. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lahendro, 5-0 motion passes.

### **3. Comprehensive Plan – Community Engagement Element**

Ms. Creasy said there was some informal dialogue that occur concerning having a Community Engagement Chapter within the Comprehensive Plan. It went back and forth and no set decisions were made. The Commission was interested in have a definitive answer. If you all are to say yes then we would schedule a work session in the near future to discuss more details about what would be included in such an element. You all do not have to do much more this evening other than say yes or no.

Commissioner Keller moved that we include a Community Engagement Chapter in the 2018 Comprehensive Plan, Seconded by Commissioner Lahendro 5-0, passes unanimous.

### **Review of Recommendations Set forth within the Zoning Ordinance Legal Review**

Ms. Robertson provided the Commission with a chart, identifying several categories of issues that have been noted within the Legal Review document. Ms. Robertson suggested that the PC commence with review of the City Attorney’s Office’s proposed changes to current zoning text provisions that allow administrative officials (such as the NDS Director, the Zoning Administrator, or the PC in its role as site plan reviewer) to (i) create new requirements or standards which aren’t found within the zoning ordinance text, (ii) which modify provisions or standards expressly set forth within the ordinance, (iii) that give administrative officials overly broad decision-making standards normally associated with legislative decisions (e.g., decisions based on assessments of the “public welfare”; “best interests of the public”; “demonstrated hardship”; “consistent with purpose or intent”; etc.

Ms. Robertson led the Commission through a discussion of each of these items listed on the Chart, and explained the basis or rationale for the proposed changes. The Commission considered each item and at the end of its consideration of each item the Commission indicated by consensus whether or not each item could proceed for further consideration for short-term adoption during a public hearing process. A copy of the chart used as the basis of the Commission’s discussions is included as **Attachment 1** to these minutes. There was consensus for most items to proceed for further consideration. Items on which there was consensus to either consider at a later date, or not to consider at all, were as follows:

- a. Current provisions of 34-108 allow the zoning administrator to grant a variance to building setbacks of less than one (1) foot. Ms. Robertson explained that Va. Code 15.2-2286(A)(4) authorizes zoning administrators to grant “modifications” from provisions specifying the location of a building, subject to specific procedural requirements, including advance notice to adjacent property owners. Ms. Robertson noted that the proposed change, as drafted, would allow the zoning administrator to begin making all decisions regarding building setback variances, without being limited to only a 1-foot variance. The Commission discussed the potential impacts of this change, including what may be an unintended result of requiring adjacent property owners to have to pay to appeal a decision, instead of having an opportunity to appear at a BZA hearing and comment. After completing their discussion, the Commission authorized Ms. Robertson to proceed with a change that would change the current wording of 34-108 to reference a “modification” instead of a “variance” (consistent with state law) and to include provisions requiring

compliance with the notice to property owners and other procedures specified within Va. Code 15.2-2286(A)(4). However, the Commission determined by consensus that the proposal to expand the zoning administrator's authority beyond the existing 1-foot allowance should not proceed for further consideration.

- b. In sections where the existing Code refers to "landscaping plan" the Commission by consensus directed Ms. Robertson to substitute the term "landscape plan".
- c. Current provisions of 34-874(a) require each off-street parking space to be provided with a 6-inch high concrete chock, "if deemed necessary by the planning commission" The commission agreed by consensus that, instead of modifying the existing provision as proposed within the Legal Review, Ms. Robertson should change the recommendation to a removal of sec. 34-874(a) entirely from the zoning ordinance.
- d. Current provisions of section 34-974(a) and (b) state that, "with the approval of the NDS director" required off-street parking may be provided cooperatively, and further, that the NDS Director may partially reduce the normally-required number of parking spaces for any use if uses won't conflict in time of operation and all uses' needs will be adequately met through the parking arrangements. Ms. Robertson noted first that there is really no need to reference the requirement for some special "approval" of the NDS Director for cooperative parking arrangements. The proposal is for cooperative parking to be allowed when appropriate. The Commission agreed by consensus that this change may proceed. Ms. Robertson also explained that there is insufficient guidance within the language of this section to indicate when the NDS Director might, or might not, allow a reduction if the criteria are satisfied, or to indicate whether or not there's a maximum reduction. The Commission, by consensus, agreed that no changes to the existing language regarding reductions should proceed for short-term modifications, but that this is an issue that should be considered later as part of a more comprehensive consideration of generally-applicable parking standards.

#### V. FUTURE MEETING SCHEDULE/ADJOURN 10:00 p.m.

Commissioner Lahendro motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Santoski until the second Tuesday in July 11, 2017.

## **Planning Commission Work Session**

**April 25, 2017 5:00 - 7:00**

**NDS Conference Room**

**Members Present:** Chairman Kurt Keesecker, Vice-Chair Lisa Green, Jody Lahendro, Gennie Keller, John Santoski, Brian Hogg, Corey Clayborne, Taneaia Dowell

**Staff Present:** Missy Creasy, Alex Ikefuna

Call to Order: by Chair Keesecker 5:05

Chair Keesecker introduced Richard Dickerson, a native of Charlottesville currently living in Birmingham, Ala. who has done consulting work all around the world; Mr. Neil Williamson from the Free Enterprise Forum, Sean Tubbs from Charlottesville Tomorrow, Allison Linney from Allison Partners, and Steve Blaine and Rick Jones representing CADRe.

Ms. Creasy: said many things are going on for the kickoff such as distributing flyers. Copies are available if you want one. She said staff met today with the Chapter Champions on all of the chapters, talking through the kickoff event and giving them an orientation to what we are doing. We are working through dates and times for the process for getting some of the written materials on line for comment at the same time we are processing the kickoff with the land use aspects.

Commissioner Keller: said she has heard some spin around town as to why there aren't any weekend meetings or is there a possibility of having a meeting on Saturday? It seemed like an interesting thing to consider.

Chair Keesecker: said it does make sense.

Ms. Creasy: said there is a 5<sup>th</sup> date on the calendar, set up by Councilor Bellamy and she is not sure what the expectation is for that yet, the date is May 18<sup>th</sup> at Tonsler Park.

Commissioner Keller: said she saw somewhere that Belmont is having a Comp Plan meeting at the SoJourners United Church of Christ this Saturday or next Saturday.

Commissioner Lahendro: said it is a neighborhood association group meeting.

Ms. Linney: said it would be good to touch base and remember what our overall flow of the session is.

Commissioners agreed they should have a name tag and greet everyone as they come in.



Commissioner Taneaia Dowell and Commissioner Jody Lahendro are in charge of the presentation for the kick off events and preparing to provide a run through.

Commissioner Lahendro: said after some milling around and introductions at the events, will there be an introduction of Taneaia and I.

Ms. Linney: said as each commissioner introduces themselves, Commissioner Lahendro and Commissioner Dowell will be the last to introduce yourselves and you can go right into the presentation.

### **Commissioner Dowell's Presentation**

What is the Comprehensive Plan – it is the city's guide for making community development decisions.

- a. Used as a tool for future growth
- b. Identifies where development should or should not occur and the public and private services needed to support development.
- c. Legal basis for zoning and subdivision regulations
- d. Helps to direct the city's capital improvement projects

The City of Charlottesville is required by law to review the Comp Plan every 5 years

- a. Our community engagement kickoffs are in preparation for the 2018 Comp Plan update.
- b. Chapters of the Comp Plan include Land Use, Community Facilities, Economic Sustainability, Environment, Housing, and Transportation
- c. The Comp Plan is used as an assessment of the community's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats
- d. Our Comp Plan establishes a community vision, coordinates growth and development, ensures economic stability, protects valuable natural resources, promotes regional cooperation and guides private sector development
- e. The comp plan typically includes text, maps, and pictures
  1. The format may be subject to change with the upcoming 2018 review
  2. Comp Plan shows relationships between significant factors in our city such as:
    - i. Population:
      - a. The Weldon Cooper Center at the University of Virginia estimates the current population of the city to be 49,071 residents
      - b. AN INCREASE OF OVER 5,000 RESIDENTS in the last 6 yrs.
      - c. Population increase over last 6 years places Charlottesville as one of the 10 fastest growing localities in Virginia

- d. Weldon Cooper Center projects that the city will continue to grow over the next 20 years,
      - 1. exceeding a population of 55,000 by the year 2040.
      - 2. 2012 study by city staff estimated under our current zoning regulations the city could accommodate over 70,000 residents in by-right developments--footer relationships of the Comprehensive Plan include
        - ii. Natural Resources
        - iii. Buildings
        - iv. Economic Base and our
        - v. Transportation Networks
- f. Uses of the Plan: The Comprehensive Plan is used to:
  - 1. Establish a community vision
  - 2. Coordinate growth and development and
  - 3. Ensure economic stability
  - 4. In doing the exercises after the presentation, Think of how the Comp Plan is relevant to and directly affects you
  - 5. Also envision where you see Charlottesville in 5, 10, 20 years?
- g. Guiding Principles
  - 1. This process will facilitate a community wide conversation on how the community will change based on choices made for the future
  - 2. Assuming recent trends continue, the City will change and grow. The community must have the opportunity to be heard as to how that growth would occur and can be managed
  - 3. The places where we live, work and play are important in defining our community and they will be central to the discussion- Comp Plan updates, including implementation strategies and measures, must be designed to promote and/or preserve the places important to the community. ("place-making")
  - 4. The values of the City, as expressed in the City Council Vision, Strategic Plan and the Comprehensive Plan will be considered in relation to specific places in the community.
  - 5. Information and data should be gathered, analyzed and shared in a manner that is understandable to residents.
  - 6. The best ideas for our City's future will be identified by listening
- h. 201 Avon Street
  - 1. We also want you to consider what by-right development could look like with the city's current zoning and land use regulations.
  - 2. As an example, pictured is 201 Avon Street, taken from standing on the Belmont Bridge...

3. With by right development it could potentially be pictured as such
- i. The Land Use, City Facilities, and Affordable Housing chapters will be the primary focus of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan review
  1. Land Use - growth and density increase
    - i. Planning Commission is leading this chapter review
  2. City Facilities
    - i. Police and fire
    - ii. Both have had major staff changes thus prompting new objectives and other changes/updates
  3. Affordable Housing
    - i. The city is currently facing an affordable housing crisis
    - ii. Planning Commission recognizes this section of the Com Plan needs to be changed and updated to help facilitate the change of the crisis
  4. City Staff that work most closely in these areas are involved in doing draft updates
  5. Upcoming drafts of these chapters will be placed on the City's website for review this summer.

### **Commissioner Lahendro's Presentation**

In the breakout groups, Taneaia and I, and our Planning Commission colleagues, want you to dream; to imagine the Charlottesville you want to see in the future. To be helpful, though, your vision needs to start with the Charlottesville that is here today and consider the real pressures all city residents are facing—pressures of a growing population within a limited land area.

Four months ago, in January, the Planning Commission began special work sessions to plan how we were going to find out what residents of Charlottesville want for the future of our city. ALL of the residents. To get the conversation started, we rejected past methods of using typical characteristics of development. Such measures as the types of land uses, building densities, or road setbacks were just too abstract and disconnected from our daily experiences in the city. Instead, we hit on what is most immediately familiar between the city and the people who live here—places. The places where we live, work and play define our most immediate relationship with the city. They are unique to Charlottesville; they connect us to our friends, our neighbors, and the people we work with. Many of our memories are linked to places in Charlottesville, both surviving and gone. Places and our connections to them are what make us Charlottesvilleans.

Places in Charlottesville that are important to each of us aren't necessarily pretty, or historic, or popular with others. They are the notable physical locations in the city that are important to you and your family. Most often, they are not single buildings but urban settings --streets, trails, landscapes, a group of buildings, or whatever that's together as a site is a place that is important to you.

Planning Commissioners played a game picking out their own special places, but the map has been wiped clean because what we really need to know are the special places that frame the daily lives of your families. Let us know which ones are important to you and why. The "Why?" is critical to know. Is it for living, shopping, working, learning, entertainment, or beauty? Or some combination of these?

Knowing the areas in the city that are special for you provides us with opportunities and responsibilities. Depending on what makes them special, they might offer opportunities for growth with sensitive well-designed new development. Or they might require protection and preservation for the enjoyment of generations to come. The places that are important to you need to be respected first and then understood for what they may offer the future of Charlottesville.

Not only are places important to us, personally, but also to us as a community through our shared values. You're no doubt wondering what those shared community values are. Well, past Comprehensive Plans spent a great deal of time finding out from city residents what is important to them. The 2013 Comprehensive Plan identified nine community values including economic opportunities, quality housing for all, respect and care for natural resources, health, multi-modal connections, and a community of mutual respect. City Council's 2014 Strategic Plan has a similar list of shared goals and objectives to guide future community development. For your reference, copies of both of these lists are at each breakout table and on posters in the common area.

The places that you cherish or frequent are often connected to one or more of our community values. A favorite park promotes health and natural resources. Shopping and professional services create economic opportunities. Notable residential developments provide housing. Even "mutual respect for all" has implications for affordable housing and jobs for all.

Please share with us and each other the places in Charlottesville that are important to you, then dream a little and imagine how those places might serve Charlottesville in the future as it grows and develops. Planning Commissioners are eager to listen to you, and, we hope, you will learn more about our city by listening to each other.

- This Kick-off Workshop is the first of four to be held this summer. (kick off workshops image)

- Each workshop will have the same format but will be held in different locations and times
- Workshops are only the first step in a four step process PC designed for CP public engagement (image 2)
- Second step is small meeting series which consists of talking with individual residents, neighborhood representatives, social justice advocates, developers, professional design community, anyone and any group (image 3)
- Third step is the presentation of proposed scenarios at public meetings (image 4)
- Finally the PC's recommended CP goes to CC for approval (image 5)
- General time line for all four steps (image 6)
- For the remainder of today's kick off workshop we'll break up into smaller groups to facilitate open discussion
- Each group to have Planning Commissioner and NDS staff person
- To start the discussion, a list of questions has been developed
- At end of group discussion, NDS staff will do a wrap up

Chairman Keesecker: said what we generally found when we were coming up with these principles is if we were comfortable with the statement “if trends continue”. He said looking at the last 10 years, if it keeps on that track or even something close to it, we don’t want to be caught by surprise. There is a lot of concern about how growth has been implemented in the last eight or ten years which maybe does not re-enforce some of what is best for our community. This is more about how to direct that to a more advantageous outcome, whether it is physical, social, economic, or whatever it is.

Ms. Linney: asked is there a way to state that this new process is in response to community feedback.

Commissioner Keller: said she is a little nervous about that because there has been public criticism about the engagement process and we know that we were planning this to kick-off the engagement so we did some pre-engagement because there was pressure about doing that engagement. This is the official kick-off so she thinks if 100 people show up and we have already talked to some small groups, if I am one of those 100 people and no one has asked me to come and talk, I am going to feel a little excluded.

Chairman Keesecker: said we should focus on the purpose of what we are trying to do with these meetings and he doesn't know where that is in this conversation, but what we are doing with these kick-offs is trying to describe a process that we don't have a pre-determined end result for and we don't exactly know, especially in the middle section, how we are going to get from the kick-off to where we start to propose scenarios. We hope we can break down into some useful cross pollinating working groups with different parts of the city and with people who have different expertise and this first kick-off is just an effort to frame some of the questions that need to be addressed as we get into the bulk of the discussion after we have presented an idea as for how we are going to move forward.

Commissioner Keller: asked is it okay to be specific, to say organized groups have requested meetings prior to the kick-off such as neighborhood associations.

Chairman Keesecker: said he thinks we could recognize certain groups in our community that have been underrepresented historically in these planning processes and whether by location or inconveniences, and there are prejudices that we are not going to repeat, we are making an effort to take these meetings to the community.

Mr. Hogg: said you might not want to get into those weeds at all. You started by saying this is the beginning of the process and our goal here is to hear from as many people in Charlottesville as possible and we want to hear from you today. He said don't do the back story that has been going on before this meeting. He doesn't think that serves the purpose of the process.

Ms. Linney: said then we should assure the people have a sense of the timeline so they will understand what is and what isn't possible in this kick-off process. She said if she was sitting through what you all just did, she would have no idea how long it would take and how many points of community engagement there are likely to be or is this my one and only chance to talk. She said we might want to add that in to set expectations for getting started and here is the overview and say we are doing this 4 times and it is the exact same presentation each and every time so that every citizen has an opportunity and jumps off at the same starting point.

Commissioner Santoski: said he remembers the conversation about growth and change. The city is changing and people can define that however they want - good, bad, or whatever - but know that change is inevitable even if we don't grow the city is still going to change. He said growth is such a loaded word in terms of what growth means. How you view affordable housing affects how you view economic development. It is based on the trends, and he doesn't say those things because that's where the growth will come from based on what we have seen up to this point.

Chair Keesecker: said if more people live here, and more people have jobs here, where are the appropriate places to have those new people and new jobs be located without adversely affecting all of the things we mostly enjoy about Charlottesville. In fact use that influx of new people and jobs to address some of the things that have not been done well in the past.

Commissioner Santoski: said it is how it is defined and talked about.

Ms. Linney: said “trend” is a much better word.

Commissioner Keller: said that having sat through as many meetings as she has lately and being a preservationist, she might have been thinking what is in this for me, what is happening, this is a little scary.

Commissioner Santoski: said he has heard from a number of people. It amazes him how things just walk through the atmosphere and people are saying why is there a need to meet with these people or why aren't we meeting with these other people ahead of time. Why are you not listening to these folks and why are you talking to the PHAR people and it doesn't matter if they're under representative, they are dealing with emotion and they think about it in a very factual comprehensive way and what we are doing with the Comprehensive Plan; it's going to be on an emotional base instead of a factual base. He said we haven't even started this process yet and he is trying to answer these questions for people.

Chair Keesecker: stated the only thought he had on the presentation is when you guys get up to talk, he noted to Commissioner Dowell regarding the definitions, that she should try to explain what they are and what these pieces are when she is talking. He said it would be good to say, “I am going to speak to these definitions and do some explaining”, then Commissioner Lahendro will speak more aspirational. He said as Commissioner Dowell was speaking, he was thinking more about things in the future, a little more explanation on the process that is already entrenched that we can't change on day one, but this is why we are doing it. He told Commissioner Dowell to speak the definition in an ad-lib form.

Commissioner Lahendro: said after he finishes, he will give an overview of this whole process. The public engagement of the Comprehensive Plan, we are meeting 5 times; we have 3 different phases and then go into what happens next in the break-out sessions. We then go from here and number off to the different break-out areas depending upon the numbers and that is going to be the opportunity to have direct conversation with the Planning Commission and staff at the break-out session. There will be specific questions that we want you to respond to but not limit you to those. He is saying someone should do this part.

Ms. Linney: said do you want me to do that part?

Commissioner Lahendro: said he is saying someone should do it.

Ms. Linney: said she wants someone to say there are 5 of these in 5 weeks, the timeline. When do you turn something in?

Chair Keesecker: said in December, we have to figure out the summer and the fall because at some point we are trying to bring different groups together to work toward certain scenario planning.

Commissioner Lahendro: said we will have an image up as this person explains it to show the first phase and the different locations and times. It will then show phase two, phase three and what they are and the person making the presentation will go through those.

Chair Keesecker: said obviously, we are going to have some prompting questions and will act as a survey that will give us some information but he likes your idea of having a collection of questions that would be informative. Maybe in the break-out session, we could ask each group a series of questions that they would like to have addressed during the process because then we can see some things that are related to questions and they can be very pointed and direct.

Commissioner Santoski: said not something that has to be addressed before the kick-off night, but somewhere during that phase two or three. We want those questions because they might be able to be addressed as we go through and will put those phases together.

Commissioner Keller: said the kind of attitude that we want to have in this plan is we aren't the people who have all the answers, as a community we are asking questions together.

Mr. Hogg: said is it expected that people will choose the table that they want to go to at the break-out.

Ms. Linney: said instead of putting something on name tags, it publicly says I am separating you. For everybody who is sitting with their pals, they will get a different number. Once we see how many we have, planning members and staff members, she will do a speedy 1234567 and then everybody is still pretty good about not going with their whole neighborhood when there was public accountability.

Commissioner Keller: stated as well-intentioned as that is, sometimes certain areas or groups have more people there. Could we have something for the person who feels



uncomfortable at their table, they can't get a word in edge wise, or they might feel uncomfortable, that they could hand in some written thing.

Mr. Haluska: said just put some index cards on the table.

Ms. Linney: said one recommendation to you all as facilitators at your tables: at some point you should stop and go around the table to see if anybody has anything to add or a question they have not come up with yet; so that you can then employ, use round robin, to say do you have anything.

Commissioner Santoski: said the idea that everybody's ideas or everybody's thoughts are worthwhile, at this point we are not favoring one idea or another because sometimes I am the only person left at this table so my stuff is going to be taken less seriously than the three people over here that are saying the same thing.

Ms. Linney: said she will cover all of that. At some times the facilitators will pause and say let's go around the table and see who hasn't had a chance.

Commissioner Santoski: said it's just the whole idea of respect that people don't get into it that you are a developer and you just stopped to make money and you are a neighborhood person, and you just don't want anything in your backyard.

Ms. Linney: said once she does enough on the ground rules, she will roam the whole time so she just stands there, and usually that reminds everybody, not in a condescending way but usually it works.

Commissioner Keesecker: said a handful of people would feel more comfortable if they could meet in a smaller group at a table after the reports are done, before the doors are closed and it could be a listening table. He said he would man it, take notes and listen to anyone who wanted a one-on-one at the very end.

Ms. Creasy: said that particularly happens organically.

Commissioner Lahendro: said we announce officially this is the end and commissioners will hang around for a bit and please grab one and talk to that person.

Commissioner Santoski: said you can do both things, if you want to talk and share an idea with a commissioner, but you don't necessarily need it formalized but if you do go over and bother Kurt.

Ms. Linney: said this is a good idea and what we could say is four of us will be circulating and two will be at the table.

Commissioner Lahendro: asked if he covered the definition of places adequately?

Chair Keesecker: said he described it very well and he thinks it resonated with him but thought he was falling into an architectural trap. He said he caught a lot of what he was saying and he got very excited, but it was somewhat abstract.

Commissioner Santoski: said he thought it was good and if he was listening to that and not knowing anything about what placemaking was; you made it real clear that we were talking about those places that are important to us for a lot of different reasons and you gave good examples both visually and what you were saying. The visuals are going to catch people.

Commissioner Keller: said you both were excellent. Commissioner Dowell when you said something about development decisions made me wonder, maybe something about protection at the same time because that is what a lot of people are coming about and there is a lot of kick-back about the name of this department. She would say making development decisions to somehow soften that because if we say we are growing, we won't be growing everything everyway. She said where it says we do the Comp Plan every five years it should say we are required to review by law the Comp Plan every five years. There were no images for buildings and she is cautious to choose buildings that are not charged.

Commissioner Dowell: said let's understand the slide about population and buildings and natural resources is to show significant relationships.

Commissioner Keller: asked about the slide on the economic base, using the chart from Mt. Zion, she was very taken with that, but she is not sure that is economic base because economic base means to her "industrial, professional, and retail."

Commissioner Santoski: said it has to do with how much money people are making, or housing they would be able to afford.

Commissioner Keller: said she is a little concerned about saying this establishes a vision because Council has a vision.

Ms. Creasy: said this is Council's vision.

Commissioner Keller: said somewhere in the Comp Plan establishes a vision for the future; she doesn't want to step on Council's toes because it is their prerogative to have a vision. She also recommended that we define density because nobody knows what it means. Why is the SIA singled out?

Commissioner Dowell: said it is singled out but it does not necessarily have to be the SIA. We are trying to show what the current Charlottesville looks like. The comparison would be what by-right develop could look like, meaning this is if no one makes any

changes or has any input. If a developer comes in this is what your area could look like. We just use the SIA plan as an example.

Chair Keesecker: said he didn't think we should use the SIA or form based code

Commissioner Dowell: said in the pre-meeting, Mr. Haluska said that is how they get their citizens engaged is to put lighter fluid on them, she will take that out but her goal is to show one or two examples of what could happen to you if you don't engage as a community.

Chair Keesecker: said instead of using the SIA being the singular topic, just show SIA or this or that.

Commissioner Keller: said to Commissioner Lahendro the place we cherish photo was not that strong.

Chair Keesecker asked is there anything the commission could do to help make you more comfortable.

Commissioner Lahendro: said let's do it again.

Commissioner Lahendro and Commissioner Dowell will continue to work together.

Ms. Creasy: Good Job guys, it was very down to earth.

Commissioner Santoski: said it was heart-felt.

Chair Keesecker: said discuss the survey questions, introduce the idea of a community engagement chapter as part of the conversation moving forward and introducing that to the community as a whole.

Ms. Creasy: noted with the community engagement chapter, it would be good for the commission to outline what you envision for that so we can share that with Council because there are a number of initiatives with community engagement going on. She said we just want to make sure we fit in and she is not really sure right now what that looks like and maybe if we came forward with something they may say that's it, but she does not want the commission to go in the wrong direction.

Commissioner Santoski: said we could talk about it very generally and everybody's heard about it. Might be more of a need for community engagement, whatever that is, in whatever shape or form it takes, or if we run it by Council and say do you want it to be this descriptive or we just tell the people in the beginning we think that this is important, community engagement, so does Council and it takes two minutes and we are done. It depends how deep you or Council want to get into talking about community

engagement because he doesn't think there is unity on Council about what community engagement is either.

Ms. Linney: said it is a big discussion right now and the use of facilitators. She could make a reasonable argument now that you should just show community engagement and not talk about it too much in the beginning.

Ms. Creasy: said we should all take a look at the Portland, Oregon example to see how that resonates but tread cautiously on that because she doesn't want us to get heated right now.

Commissioner Keller: said this is a pretty vanilla chapter and it is in the Comp Plan although it is Portland and there are no graphics, it is just narrative. It has some decent stuff in it. It is pretty much relating to what you would deal with in a Comp Plan, not the whole big issue of community engagement.

Ms. Linney: are we proposing going into the break-off sessions with these multiple choice questions.

Mr. Haluska: said the idea was we had something to spare, some sort of discussion, and so part of this was tying into the comments in the initial presentation about here is where the trend lines are for growth and we can put the projections from Weldon Cooper in there so, those will be in the initial presentation, the idea was if you get to the table and nobody is talking then we need to tie into this.

Ms. Linney: asked what do you want to have happen, what do you want to know from them?

Commissioner Lahendro: we want to hit them over the head with the information that the city is growing and where are we going to put the density and the growth for residential, commercial and office.

Commissioner Santoski: asked what do we give up in order to do that? The implication is if you are going to put them all some place then something has to be given up in order to fit them in. Some people will say no we don't want to do that at all.

Mr. Haluska: said we have acknowledged that as well. The concern that we had was you go into this meeting and you have a map on the table or whatever other visuals, you say you are interested in what people have to say, what are some of the places you like because this is a kick-off session and if a predominate theme comes out of that, says leave low density and residential areas alone, let's limit growth on corridors, then next step is into the summer and over the fall, you start saying this is what we heard from the community, let's talk about the drawbacks of that.

Ms. Linney: said if you want to have this big of a question it has to be printed out so people can be able to read it so you have to give some quiet time for them to read it. Do not put them all on one page. She said there are four, so she would add five and six. Give everyone a chance to read this.

Commissioner Lahendro: said he can't help but wonder that the first thing we should talk about in the group is what places are important to you and that might be a segue way to now that we have talked about residential and commercial areas, now that the city is going to grow residentially, where do you think that should happen?

Commissioner Dowell: said doing the mapping makes the most sense to her because this is what we (Planning Commission) have already done. We could start with a mini version and identify places from that and have the conversation go to the question where are we going to put more growth and development.

Mr. Ikefuna: said that is a good idea because there is a planning process going on right now: the intersection of 29 and Hydraulic. The MPO has come to setup the Planning Advisory Group had a charrette, and then a neighborhood meeting. A couple of weeks later, one of the residents came up with we are consistent with the things discussed at the charrette, so they're in consistency, so it is kind of a very good indicator that it seemed like the Planning Advisory Group and the residents they are thinking alike.

Commissioner Dowell: said also data, so when we come back for the second portion and where we go after these kick-offs, between our maps and places, and their maps and places, the data should help us to map and place it out.

Commissioner Santoski: said he did not think most people are going to be concerned about cottage apartments or bungalows. They are going to say do I own my house, a duplex, and apartment building and that is about all I need to know. And can they build it next door to me.

Chair Keesecker: said if we have the map and people can mark answers to these questions on the map as replication of the map they just had or the answer for where do these single detached family units go. It is in one of these different categories either within the neighborhoods as on our little sample map or the walking nodes or the driving ones, corridors or downtown. We should ask the people where they think housing is more appropriate. He would vote for tall stuff at the edge of commercial areas and would like smaller stuff closer to the neighborhood centers.

Commissioner Santoski: said a lot of people are going to say schools are going to be important places in their neighborhoods and what kind of housing do you want families and other people to have around there to pick any school in the city and think about

what surrounds that school. We are going to hear parks for recreation and jobs in relationship to those kinds of things.

Commissioner Dowell: said you are going to have all types and all walks of life at the table and that is our goal. If you want people to actually engage, you will have to give them an ice-breaker, then do the little activity and then you talk about it. Also, because most of you have the architectural background, we need to make sure we don't get caught up especially at the small tables, about what we think, but we should listen.

Ms. Linney: said run this table discussion as she does, without a point of view.

Commissioner Dowell: are these people taking these forms home.

Ms. Linney: said sure, we probably have enough for folks to take them home.

Commissioner Keller: asked does this count or is it just an exercise. If people are stating preferences, are we going to take that into account or are we just doing this as the ice-breaker to make people comfortable with the material.

Commissioner Lahendro: said the map is the ice-breaker and we are making lists of peoples' ideas and priorities. He said those lists would be a part of the report out.

Chair Keesecker: said we had the kick-off, the break-out sessions, and everybody wants to talk about x, y, and z.

Mr. Hogg: said we are here for a certain reason because of a certain type of expertise. We may not completely see that opportunity and the decision needs to show respect of the communities input and considerate but not to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Chair Keesecker: said we should make it very clear what we are going to do with this information.

Mr. Hogg: said use it to inform our future conversations and it will help to direct our conversations as we move forward to the second phase and we will be moving out to the groups as the second phase progresses.

Commissioner Dowell: said just give everybody at the table only 2-3 pieces to put on the map because anything more makes it too eventful.

Commissioner Keller: you have to be simplistic and start people out with what kind of place are you living, and what kind of place would you like to live, and what kind of place do you think the new people should live?

Commissioner Dowell: said although we are laughing, this is a reality that most people that built this city have. At the rate we are developing and the AMI, they are going to have to move to Waynesboro and that is not okay.

### **Public Comment**

Mr. Richard Dickerson: He has sat here for two hours and no one has mentioned demographics. No one said anything about race. The average price of a home is \$319,000, the city is 19% Black and you talk about community engagement, you got to talk about accountability, endorsement, enforcement and ownership. He said Gennie, he worked for the city of Portland and it is one of the best cities in the country, they are forward-thinking, open-minded, there's transparency and they get it. They say it is their responsibility to make sure that the under-served and the under-represented are a part of the process. He doesn't know what the end goal is here, but what is the end goal for this and how do you know it's successful and in reality of it is. He has been back in the city for 5 weeks. He grew up here; he's been around and talked to a few people, a lot of people, White and Black, who are totally disengaged with city hall. They don't think that city hall is different, disrespectful and there is a lack of customer service. He talked to Black and Whites, ministers and others. So, if you sit here planning this, there needs to be a real degree of honesty with this process and you need to check and make sure that you are not talking to yourselves, to hear yourselves talk, so at the end of the day it is a broad outreach where there is a large number of people, particularly those who are not those who are usually represented as part of an ongoing honest transparent discussion.

Mr. Bill Emory: In Portland the African American population is 6.3%. He said we are doing something that Portland is not.

Mr. Richard Jones: said he comes from a different part of the community and he thought this meeting was meant to decide how to engage the community. It sounds to him like it is the same old stuff where you feel very good about the fact that you had five meetings and whoever shows up, stacks the decks, and you're counting the cards. Ultimately, it sounds like you all are going to make decisions, and he doesn't think that is what the community wants. They want to be the ones that help write the words and map it out; and not always see what you wrote because that is what city hall does and what staff does. It is in the back room after you feel good about letting everybody say their thing. That is what was so good about 2002 because you got people from everywhere, a diverse part of the community and you invited them in and they helped write the document, picked the maps, and picked the zones and where this was going go; and where was this going to go? He said this sounds like the same old stuff. Thank you for the opportunity to say it.

Chair Keesecker: said we have been asked by Council to follow this timeline. We are constructing this thing as we go.

Commissioner Keller: said one of the things from public comment was the thing about this is business as usual and things are done in back rooms. She said at this kick-off there should be a very clear statement that nothing happens in back rooms. All of these meetings are noticed, advertised and are public because as she keeps going places people say where does this take place, and it is all happening in daylight.

Mr. Ikefuna: there is no back room; there is a state law that prohibits.

Richard Jones: said he read in the legal audit of the zoning code, and that was written in somebody's room and by one person.

Mr. Ikefuna: He explained that the city has a legal department, and they look at legal documents and how they relate to state law, so what you saw is some kind of qualification to make sure it is consistent with the state law.

Mr. Richard Jones: said it is so beyond that.

Mr. Ikefuna: said they put it out there and that is just the Legal Review. That document has not been discussed yet.

Mr. Richard Jones: said even if you have 10 public meetings, and the public generates 100 ideas and at the end of the day, the 12 ideas you started out with are the ideas that will carry the day. The public will still have the feeling that it didn't work so, that is part of the challenge of this and you have a have meeting where you are going to engage the public. At the end of the day, the public has to see that they have some traction in the process or else they feel that it's a waste of time and you did it for the sake of doing it when you already had what you were going to do. So whether or not you are experts in your chosen field or not, the public feels that you all work for us, city employees work for us, and when we come to these meetings by God, we know what is best for our neighborhood and want to make sure it's included.

Commissioner Santoski: said we are only the Planning Commission, all of this goes to City Council, and City Council has to be the one who finally signs off on this so he doesn't know where Council is in their whole process of saying yes we are going to treat this as a serious process. We are going to take all of this information at the end of the day and we are not just going to ignore it, which if they do then it goes back to them because all we can say is we are the messengers and we are trying to represent the whole community and we are going to pass this whole thing over to Council as the legal responsibility for adopting it and they could change it all at the last minute.



Commissioner Dowell: said she feels optimistic and not to discredit anything our citizens have said for instance is the information going to be used. She said if we are having these kick-offs and I am missing time from work, and we are not using this public input, she is not wasting her time. She has a good feeling about it especially being a young citizen of Charlottesville and she has lived here all of her life. If our citizens are feeling like this is the same mess, if nothing else, tell everybody else about it so help us spread the word to have everybody at the table. She said she does not want it to be the same old same old, not to sound negative but that comment about moving to Waynesboro if we don't have this community engagement, that's where most people who look like her will have no choice but to be. So to prevent that, help us to do something different.

Meeting adjourned 7:00 pm