

Minutes

**PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**  
**April 11, 2023 – 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 Schwarz, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner d’Oronzio, Commissioner Russell, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Habbab

**Staff Present:** Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Missy Creasy, James Freas, Alex Ikefuna, Matt Alfele, Anthony Warn

Chair Solla-Yates called the meeting to order at 5:00pm. He noted the hearing for the CDBG/HOME budget and action plan. Draft motions will be available to assist during the meeting. It was outlined that the transportation presentation will focus on the items included in the packet materials. If there is interest in additional information, those topics can be collected, and staff can return at another time to provide additional information. Staff noted that there is no additional information on the zoning ordinance to be provided this evening. Reminders of this week’s events were provided, and Mr. Freas did provide an overview of the table of authority which is a new element of the code coming forward.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if there was any information on the trees on West Main Street wrapped with tape. No one in the room was aware and it was noted to check in with the City Arborist.

**II. 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** – I had a meeting with the Downtown Mall Committee last Thursday. We received an interesting presentation from Beth Meyer from the Architecture School at UVA about the history of the Mall, Lawrence Halprin’s vision for the Mall, and the 2008 plan to redo The Mall. Some radical changes were proposed. We kept our brick size. There were some changes to the tree grates that were problematic and a variety of other issues about café spaces being privatized and a lack of seating and other changes from the original vision in the Mall we see today. We will be discussing more about that and how to remedy those problems over the coming months. I was supposed to be at an MPO Tech meeting, which I missed. They discussed moving towards the 2050 long-range transportation plan and are starting to talk about smart scale round 6, which will be coming up next year. We scored poorly on our 5<sup>th</sup> Street application for a low benefit score. There is discussion of whether we can rework that project to do better. The low benefit is the benefit of the project according to a scoring criterion. With smart scale, you get all these points for the various benefits, and you divide by the cost. In the end, the cost was too high, or the benefit was too low. We need to increase those benefits, or we can put in local money and reduce that cost to get the overall score higher and get higher ranked in the future.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – The Parks and Recreation Board is busy. There were a couple of things that I want to bring to your attention. There was a presentation by Y Street. That is a youth engagement group that

is based at CHS. They have other affiliates throughout the state. They did a wonderful presentation called Share the Air. The objective is to be 100 percent tobacco and vape free in all outdoor spaces, all parks, and all public spaces. There are several localities that have joined their campaign. It will be voluntary wherever they do this by any location that does this. You must mandate that all public parks be tobacco and vape free. We talked about the budget submission. Commissioner Habbab, we were unsuccessful in getting the invasive species line item added. It is not going to make it this year. We are short at least 12 FTEs. We are working to fill those. It has been quite the effort. We are getting ready to open the pools in the future. We are short on lifeguards. We have a mitigation plan. It looks like we are going to outsource or contract out the support for the Onesty pool. We will directly staff Washington Park and Smith Pool with our own people. The LUPEC group met. There were 4 different conversations. The first was managed by UVA. It was talking about transportation in and around Fontaine. The traffic in that area will continue to grow as we continue to build out that area. It will be intensified by the onboarding of the biotech building that is on the way. UVA has undertaken an analysis that assesses what a full build out would look like by 2025. It is going to be busy out there. They walked us through an in-depth analysis of their data. There was a back and forth between UVAs data and VDOTs data. We are working through that. I would ask you to look at that presentation. It is detailed, in-depth, and enlightening. Another conversation was managed by the county. This was walking us through their Comp Plan update. The tagline for their effort is called AC-44. It is a vision for 2044. The goals, themes, objectives, and public feedback will be familiar to you guys when you look at the presentation. Another presentation was about what the county is doing with their ordinance. They are modernizing their zoning ordinance. They are doing that in conjunction with AC-44. The last time it was updated was 1980. There have been 200 amendments to their ordinance since 1980. The modernization process is a full-scale rewrite. The things that they are doing will remind you of the things that Mr. Freas is attempting to do with our rewrite; to make it more readable, to make it user friendly, and to make it more streamlined. The last thing in that meeting was Mr. Freas. He did a wonderful job of updating the members of what we are doing. The people in the county have agreed to do more collaboration as we work through our Comp Plans.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I attended the BAR meeting last month. The only thing of interest was a proposed hotel at 843 West Main Street. It has a 15- to 20-foot setback to try and create a nice outdoor plaza in front. I will be interested to see how that works with our future zoning code. There is going to be a lot of discussion about how the back works. It is currently following the regulations for bulk plane. It is sitting high above West Haven. There is some community feedback about how it can be less. That will be interesting to follow. That was a preliminary discussion. At the BPAC meeting, there was a presentation from our transportation planner. I did meet with 2 representatives of Livable Cville to listen to some of their concerns.

**Commissioner d’Oronzio** – There were a few meetings at the end of March. The CAHF Committee went through several sessions in late March finishing off the HOPS (Housing Operations Funding Suggestions). It went to Council with some adjustments to be made there. We have just finished the decision on the CAHF itself. We had \$1.8 million in requests for \$835,000. The CDBG Task Force met. We worked through the numbers and allotments there. You are going to see that shortly. The HAC had its inaugural meeting. In that meeting, Joy Johnson was elected chair. She tasked a sub-committee to review Module One quickly in advance of the work session to be held on the 29<sup>th</sup>. We have not adopted new bylaws in the HAC. The sub-committees don’t have the power to say that this is the product of the HAC. Until the HAC says, ‘this is our final product,’ it is not the final product. It has been circulated and provided to staff. I am not a member of that sub-committee. I did read it. Essentially, it is privilege, affordable housing, high multiple of density for making things predominantly affordable, 3,4 times bonus, and moved height another 50 percent. There is privilege in most zones. Privilege is of affordable housing.

**Commissioner Habbab** – The Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee met March 15<sup>th</sup>. We looked at the long-range transportation plan for 2050. We got a review of it. We reviewed the website for that. Instead of climate action and equity being standalone chapters, they are interwoven into all the other sections. We received an update on the Rivanna River Pedestrian Bridge. Because of the design that was chosen, it is now in the county instead of being the county and city. The TJPDC applied for a grant to complete the engineering for the bridge, which we hope will reduce the contingency and make it more feasible for the next round of smart-scale applications. We got an update from Safe Streets For All. We were awarded about \$850,000. We will probably hear about that later in the evening. That will go to complete the comprehensive safety action plan for this region. The goal is to prevent roadway deaths and serious injury. The Tree Commission met April 4<sup>th</sup>. We looked at the Downtown Mall trees that were cut down. I believe 2 benches have been created and are being tested from the lumber of those trees. We still need to figure out what to do with the tree stumps. We also received a presentation by Mr. Freas on Module Two. The codes and practices subcommittee of the Tree Commission is going to be reviewing that and submitting its comments. We discussed best practices to measure existing trees for the tree removal permit. There might be other ways that would be better to do that that people were suggesting. We discussed fines from the tree removal permit or people violating that could pay into a tree fund. We learned Module Three is going to have some flexibility in the setbacks and language like that to save some trees that would apply to Module One. The city did its first controlled burn.

**Commissioner Russell** – I missed the April 6<sup>th</sup> TJPDC meeting. I am looking through the agenda packet. It looks like there was a report on the Charlottesville Albemarle MPO unified planning work program presentation. It is both a summary of some of the big projects that have been ongoing like smart-scale, bike-ped, regional transit planning, and a look ahead at the next fiscal year. There is information online.

## **B. UNIVERSITY REPORT**

**Commissioner Palmer** – I don't have a lot to report. We have several construction projects happening around UVA that you might have seen. The Alderman Library seems to be moving along very well. That is one we don't talk about too much because it doesn't impact traffic. It should be done towards the end of 2023. The Contemplative Commons should be done at around the same time. That is the one on Emmet Street, which includes the pedestrian bridge across the street there, which would be a nice addition to Grounds. The Data Science Building is moving along. They are putting a lot of brick on the building. That is going to be a new school for UVA. That will be a new home for that school. That should also be done towards the end of 2023/early 2024. A few projects are starting to come together.

## **C. CHAIR'S REPORT**

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – With Karen Firehock at Albemarle County, we put together a talk about climate action planning in the region as part of a larger University of Virginia event. It was recorded and I will share the recording when it comes out. It was productive. It is good for us to be talking about regional climate action planning. Hopefully, it will lead to good things in the future.

## **D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS**

**Ms. Creasy** – I read in the paper this morning about funding for the invasive species. I did clarify with the budget office that Council did put that back in the budget. We have 2 open houses coming up. We have an open house tomorrow evening at Carver from 4 to 7 PM. If you can attend, that would be wonderful. We also have an open house on Saturday in this room from 10 to 12:30. There is a lot of activity on Saturday going on downtown. We are hopeful that some of those events will also encourage people to come and visit us. We

have those opportunities. There are some other opportunities that are occurring with our consultants in town during the next couple of days that they are here. We will be focused on Module Two during that event. I anticipate that we will get comments and feedback on lots of aspects it. They are drop-in with stations or different explanations of what is involved with Module Two. Module Two is out for review. It is available on the website. The next part will be forthcoming. We have a work session scheduled for April 25<sup>th</sup>. We are planning a review of Module Two.

**James Freas, NDS Director** – I am encouraging commissioners to come to one of the open houses. We are going to be reassessing our overall schedule and try to provide that to you, the public, and Council our assessment of where we think this thing is going to land at this point given where we are now and what additional work needs to happen.

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

**Brian Emory** – Speaking about Module Two, Division 4.11 (Outdoor Lighting), is ‘outside of my lane.’ There are good model lighting ordinances available that we can adapt for our locality, lighting codes known to have worked well for decades. There are detailed lighting recommendations from The Illuminating Engineering Society to provide a further guide. There is local expertise and interests from architects, lighting designers, environmentalists, and others to write a new ordinance that serves our community well. Artificial light at night is an issue, especially for its longer-term impact on our environment and our health. It can be ameliorated by good lighting. The draft lighting ordinance in its simplicity turns back the clock to the 1970s. It is a step backwards from the existing lighting code. It is professionally and legislatively naïve. It has no basis in the national standards that VDOT follows. The basic principle is simple. Use the right amount of light only where needed and only when needed. Lighting affects health. Lighting creates serious environmental issues. LED technology has made light cheap to produce and spectrally disastrous. There are good lighting ordinances available that we can use as a guide. This section needs a thoughtful, professional redo.

**Genevieve Keller** – I am a former member of this body. I appreciate and respect the time and talent you bring to your deliberations. I hope that you will take my comment in the spirit in which it is given tonight. That is to be helpful and share my thoughts about the recent dialogue around the table. At your last joint work session, I was distracted, disgusted, and concerned that a commissioner made a comment about a hypothetical armed situation regarding the distance of a setback. The comment included a reference to a Maserati driven by a lingerie model. There was another comment that referred to a male body part as a descriptive term. This semester I am working with some extraordinary young women, who I believe must be reawakening some of my dormant 1970s brand of feminism as they critique writings by men from earlier eras. I am heartened by their concern about the way that women’s attitudes work, and roles have been underrepresented, ignored, or dismissed in environmental and planning literature. At a recent meeting, two other colleagues, both formally associated with the city, also found the commissioner comments offensive. As a person who spent the first half of my career as a community planning consultant, I was accustomed to being the only woman in the room. I have experienced much worse, both verbally and physically, than what happened in City Space two weeks ago. However, this was not acceptable. It is not acceptable among public officials in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The comment made me more aware that at that meeting, there were 9 men and 1 woman around the table. As the most important land use decision is being made here over the next months, the major advisory opinion will come from 6 men and 1 woman. It will ultimately be decided by 4 men and 1 woman. These are decisions that will affect women in many ways. They will affect the most vulnerable women of all profiles: young single parents usually women, single women living alone, and aging women on fixed incomes. Many women who own their residence, it is their only or major asset. If they are older, they were probably underemployed, underpaid, and spent some time out of the workforce. Women today spend

more time in their homes and their neighborhoods because they are nest makers, caregivers, and are still exploited, stereotyped, and demeaned.

**Ellen Contini-Morava** (225 Montebello Circle) – I would like to say something about the proposal to build an 8-story building at 1709 Jefferson Park Avenue. This is another example of how developers are scrambling to use the current Special Use Permit process to add height and density to their projects that go beyond what current zoning would allow by right without having to include any affordable units. They would have to do that if the proposals for inclusionary zoning are implemented just like the 5- to 7-story high rise at 2005 JPA you approved last year. SUPs for extra height, extra density, reduced on-site parking, reduced on-site setbacks, and no affordable units. City planners have been promoting the idea that more density will bring more affordable housing. The inclusionary zoning analysis hosted by the Cville Plans Together last summer mentions extra height, density, and reduced on-site parking as bonuses that are meant to encourage developers to include some affordable housing. Filling up the neighborhood with high-rises comes with a cost, adding to the current parking and traffic congestion, loss of tree canopy, and loss of a sense of community for residents in our neighborhood. Why award bonuses to developers without the gain of affordable units that are supposed to be the justification for them?

**Jennifer King** (221 Montebello Circle) – I would like to echo the previous comments. She eloquently presented the point. There is no need for me to re-present. I wanted to make sure that it was on the record that there was another resident in the JPA neighborhood that shared that perspective.

**F. CONSENT AGENDA**

- 1. Minutes – October 21, 2021 – Special Meeting

**Commissioner Russell – Approve the Consent Agenda – Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg – Motion passes 7-0.**

Mayor Snook called Council to Order for the one public hearing.

**III. 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. **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Funding - DRAFT FY23-24 ACTION PLAN FOR THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND THE DRAFT 2023-2027 CONSOLIDATED PLAN FOR THE THOMAS JEFFERSON PLANNING DISTRICT HOME CONSORTIUM - 5th Year Action Plan, FY23-24:** The Planning Commission and City Council will be considering projects to be undertaken as part of the federal fiscal year 2023-2024 Annual Action Plan for the city’s CDBG and HOME programs. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has informed the City that funding for these two programs is currently estimated at approximately \$410,468 for CDBG and approximately \$98,161 for HOME, although these numbers may change with the final HUD allocation. CDBG funds will be used in the City to address economic development activities, housing activities, and public service projects that benefit low- and moderate-income citizens. HOME funds will be used to support the housing needs of low- and moderate-income citizens through homeownership opportunities. Report prepared by Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst.

## i. Staff Report

**Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst** – I would like to bring your attention to the resolution in favor of the current 1-year annual action plan for the city CDBG and Home Plans. There are currently two plans under development. One plan is the 5-year consolidated plan. Tonight, we are going to be discussing the first-year action plan for that, which guides the programs that are currently being evaluated and are the subject of the funding recommendations we are eventually going to put before Council for approval. We have the 2 plans. We have worked with the staff at the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission in developing the larger 5-year consolidated plan, of which the actual annual plan is part of it. We are evaluating applications for funding for the 2 federal programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In the memo, there are the 2 estimated allocations we have received initial notification from HUD. We will be receiving \$410,468 for the Community Development Block Grant Program and a large allocation of \$785,286 for the HOME Program. The city will receive a share of approximately \$98,161 for programs of our choosing. That touches on the larger home consortium, of which TJPDC is the program coordinator. The work of the CDBG and HOME Task Force is guided by several documents the city has set out for its comprehensive planning. We can talk the specific priorities set forth by City Council last September. There are 2 set asides in the city guidance for \$89,896.51. One is for economic development, which we have included in the funding recommendations that you are going to be looking at later. Another set aside is for the public facilities improvements. The Task Force did not believe that we received applications were directly relevant to that. We have held that as a set aside for programs that are currently being researched right now. The Task Force will reconvene and discuss how we want to use that money to best maximize the impact for the residents of Charlottesville. We will be coming before you again and eventually to Council for recommendation on that.

The Task Force meets annually. It is composed of members from a variety of different stakeholder groups. Their work is to evaluate the application for funding from community based non-profit organizations that are related to the key goals of the programs. Each application is reviewed by staff for completeness, thoroughness, and appropriateness to the established goals that we have. The Task Force members read each of the applications thoroughly and score them on a scale of 1 to 4 on each of 13 evaluation criteria.

In terms of the requests for funding, they were broken down into 4 major categories, CDBG Community Services, CDBG Economic Development, and CDBG Housing Related. The 4<sup>th</sup> category was directly related to our share of the HOME allocation. We received 7 applications. Most of them were for CDBG funding. There was 1 applicant for the HOME funding, which made that deliberation process relatively easy. Two things emerged quickly in our discussions. It was agreed upon by all members of the Task Force that all the applications received speak to very important community goals. If we had the capacity and the power to do so, we would fund all of them at 100 percent. The asks in each category exceeded the amount of money available to us. We met several times. We had an in-depth discussion about each of the applications and how we could best maximize the impact of this very limited funding. This slide outlines what the applications were asking for in each of the different areas.

It was decided by the Task Force. All members agreed to fund several of these programs. We have utilized all the money available to us. With the Charlottesville Critical Rehab Program from AHIP, the members could speak to the important work that they were doing. With the Charlottesville Public Housing Association of Residents, members could speak to their work. With the Community Investment Collaborative, we are interested to look through their program. It was decided to fund them. the Literacy Volunteers of Charlottesville & Albemarle were funded. The recommendation is before you. A lot of discussion was made towards the coordinated entry into homelessness systems of care; the Haven at First and Market Streets. One of the things that was important about the work that they were doing is that they have various intake

coordinators, who bring people into their programs. They have a hotline. The hotline is currently not funded to be available 100 percent of the time. This funding would help them expand the hours that is available and the number of people that they can help bring into the coordinated system of care for people with unstable housing.

Under the HOME Funding Program, Piedmont Housing Alliance has a program for permanent and long-term home ownership opportunities. They received Charlottesville's full share as a recommendation. In almost all cases, they were less than what the ask was for. The larger HOME program involves the City of Charlottesville and 5 surrounding counties.

The reason why we are here today is because we are currently developing the 5-Year Plan and the 1-Year Action Plan. The Commission will look at it tonight and recommend changes or revisions and move this on to a final recommendation by City Council. If it is accepted and approved, it is submitted to HUD. The deadline for submission of the 5-year and 1-year plans to HUD is May 15<sup>th</sup>. If we are able to submit locally approved plans, then we continue to remain eligible for the next 5 years of our funding through these 2 programs as an entitlement community.

**Commissioner Habbab** – The only question that I had was the condition on the resolution. Why are we adding that?

**Mr. Warn** – The way HUD funding occurs is that they give an initial estimate of funding for the 2 programs. That funding can change at any point based on HUD's decision either with warning or without warning both before and after the official funding agreement is completed. Sometimes, there are several conditions. There is always a condition that if HUD does come in at some point with the final official allocation and they revise the number down, all the funding recommendations would be adjusted.

**Commissioner Russell** – **I should disclose that I am on the board of AHIP. I don't think that I have a personal interest as defined by city code.**

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I noted that Habitat wasn't funded because they would probably be applying to other programs like HOPS. Do we know if they applied to HOPS?

**Commissioner D'Oronzio** – Yes, they did. Yes, they were funded.

**Mr. Warn** – That was probably the longest discussion that the Task Force members had. If we had the capacity, we would fund everything. The decision revolved around the fact that, in terms of the numbers of people that could be impacted and that they were likely to get funding in other ways, we could allocate our resources for the maximum effect.

## **ii. Public Hearing**

No Public Comments

## **iii. Commission Discussion and Motion**

**Commissioner Mitchell** – This is very good work. I appreciate how you netted out so much information.

**Motion – Chairman Solla-Yates** – **I make a motion to recommend approval of the FY23/24 annual action plan for the City of Charlottesville as recommended by the current CDBG HOME Task Force and as outlined in the Planning Commission packet for April 11, 2023 with the following conditions:**

- **The city adjusts for actual CDBG entitlement amounts as received from HUD in which funding allocations will be increased/reduced at the same prorated percentage actual entitlement to be estimated and no agency will increase more than their initial funding request.**

**Second by Commissioner Habbab. Motion passes 7-0.**

**Discussion following Motion**

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I have some critiques on the process. One would be that it would be helpful to have the applications posted on the internet or linked to them. Another critique is that the rubric feels like it is judging the wording of the grant or of the application/grant writing rather than the end thing. Provides a clear description and clearly explains how it will address one or more Council priorities. It should be clearly addresses or strongly addresses Council priorities or adequately addresses Council priorities rather than how it explained it. I think this is the same rubric we have been using for years. With the minutes, I wasn't sure who some of the initials were.

**It was decided to have another public comment period for items not on the agenda. The public comments were added to the Matters From The Public above.**

**IV. COMMISSION'S ACTION ITEMS**

*Continuing:* until all action items are concluded

1. Preliminary Discussion – 1709 JPA

**Staff Report**

**Mat Alfele, City Planner** – You are having a preliminary discussion and receiving a presentation from Mitchell Matthews Architects (representing the owner, Neighborhood Investments, LLC) who is in the early stages of pursuing the redevelopment of 1709 Jefferson Park Avenue. The site is currently occupied by a four (4) story apartment building with a total of eight (8) units and approximately fifteen (15) surface parking spaces (eight (8) off Montebello Circle and seven (7) off JPA, and was constructed in 1972. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing building with an eight (8) story (approximately seventy (70) feet) residential building that would have twenty-seven (27) units and twenty-three (23) parking spaces (nineteen (19) structured spaces off JPA and four (4) surface spaces off Montebello Circle). To accommodate the development as proposed the applicant will need to pursue a Special Use Permit and a Critical Slope Waiver. Prior to moving forward with these applications, the developer and their team is looking for feedback from the Planning Commission on the proposed project. Within your packet, there are 4 different topics that the Planning Commission might want to consider after the presentation. We have not received any application. There is nothing that has been reviewed by staff. This is very early in the application process.

**Commissioner Russell** – Normally, your staff reports analyze the proposal to the Future Land Use Map. I didn't see that.

**Mr. Alfele** – We don't have an application to review. What they are asking is that before they even apply, they wanted to come before this body. We will review it once we have an application.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – What is this currently zoned?

**Mr. Alfele** – Currently, this is R-3. It will be CX-5 if the proposed ordinance goes through.



**Commissioner Habbab** – We still have the FAR. Do they have to provide some affordable units or cash in lieu? What would that be? If we were looking at the draft zoning, how many affordable units would they have to provide?

**Mr. Alfele** – There is not enough information to do the 1-FAR calculation at this point. It would be 10 percent over any 10 units above or under the draft inclusionary zoning.

**Councilor Payne** – Is it to the point where we haven't seen any information about whether they plan to match the draft inclusionary zoning ordinance requirements?

**Mr. Alfele** – In their presentation, they can speak to that more. They are talking about in their preliminary plan trying to hit some of that inclusionary zoning. I think they would still have to use the 1-FAR. They might be able to provide that during their presentation.

### **Applicant Presentation/Commission Questions/Commission Feedback**

**Kevin Riddle, Applicant** – I will go through the materials that we submitted to you.

#### **Next Slide**

This summarizes the request for the Special Use Permit. By right, it is an R-3 zone. It is less than a third of an acre. By right, we can have 7 dwellings on the property. Division Seven of the zoning ordinance allows for up to 87 DUA, which is what we are seeking (27 apartments). Accompanying this, you can request additional height of up to 101 feet. What we are requesting is about 70 feet above the average grade. The yard dimensions required by right would significantly limit a new building footprint to less than 40 percent of the total land area. The existing building is non-conforming. You couldn't build it now by right. We request yard reductions to support more housing and more apartments on the parcel. Because of the size and the grades on the parcel, the capacity to park cars here is limited. We are requesting a reduction of about 40 percent over where the current zoning requires. We think this is probably appropriate. This street is not so unlike West Main Street and The Corner. There are a lot of services nearby, markets, University of Virginia. There are already a lot of people walking here. Incidents of car use is relatively lower here than it is in other city neighborhoods.

#### **Next Slide**

This shows some census data. Most of the people who live in the neighborhood are very young. They are graduate and undergraduate students, renters. They are walking and biking a lot.

#### **Next Slide**

Here we are looking at the site outlined in white dashes along Jefferson Park Avenue. It is on the west side. It is about 300 yards south of The Grounds. There is a bus stop a couple of doors down. Within 500 feet of the property are several multi-family buildings that are greater than 40 feet in height. You have 106 Stadium Road, the South Range Apartments associated with the Oakhurst Inn, and The Jefferson Commons Apartment building that is almost across the street at 1620 JPA. Further down on this aerial, we have a recent project at 1725 JPA.

#### **Next Slide**

Here we see a map that is color coded with the current zoning. This property is R-3. It is intended for potential multi-family use. The existing building on site sits far away. It is over 50 feet from Jefferson Park Avenue. Like many of its neighbors to the south, the deep yard here is surrendered to surface parking with

little regard to street scape or pedestrian comfort and safety. Plantings and paths are sparse. Asphalt and severe exposure are common. Several recent buildings on the corridor suggest a potentially better alternative, one with smaller yards but with walkways, entries connected to the public way, and planting beds in place of parked cars. Among these are the apartment buildings at 1620 JPA. That has a front yard of about 25 feet. 1725 JPA has about a 20-foot front yard. Directly north of the property is 1707 JPA. It was built about 15 years ago. It also has about a 20-foot front yard. The front facades of the apartments at 1600 JPA are right on the property boundary in places. The front yard in this property is somewhat negligible ranging somewhere from 2 to 8 feet in size. At 1707 and 1725 JPA, side yards are less than what is required by right. They are under 10 feet wide. With the property built about 15 years ago and the property built several years ago, we think they provide a useful bookend to this property and this neighborhood. If you imagine their front yards extending along the other parcels, we think that makes it better sense, an improved trend here to create a better street wall and use more of this land to provide more housing. If we look at the circle, there are currently 2 3.5-story buildings on Montebello Circle. It has a few buildings with some height to them. There is one at 210 and 300 Montebello Circle.

### **Next Slide**

Here is a map color coded with the city's proposed new zoning classifications. CX-5 is what is currently intended for this property and its immediate neighbors. Note that the new zoning as currently drafted would allow an owner to build on more of their property. It would impose no limit to density and potentially no minimums to on-site parking spaces. One correction on this slide. Before Module Two of the zoning rewrite the draft was published, we just had a placeholder that included current zoning requirements for parking. We understand that potentially could be significantly reduced if not eliminated.

### **Next Slide**

This slide emphasizes some areas of denser construction or housing in the city. The ones in the dark orange were built by 2011. The ones in the darker purple were built since 2011. While we have had one recent project at JPA come along at 1725 and the one at 2005, there is so much along this current stretch that is older. It is a place that has potential promise for significantly denser housing. We think our proposal would align with that vision.

### **Next Slide**

Here is Streets That Work. The current zoning draft agrees with a lot of this, even though this is an older document. We see here that JPA is intended to be mixed-use. That is also true of West Main Street and The Corner. There is the same access to commercial services to UVA. There is a lot of walking. It is a wide, bustling avenue. It is a place where parking reductions would make sense.

### **Next Slide**

We have zoomed in on the site. This is a survey. Montebello Circle is at the top. Jefferson Park Avenue is down below. We have colored this with light pink. This matches what is on the city's GIS map indicating critical slopes on the property. The site is unusually steep. As you go from Montebello to Jefferson Park Avenue, you drop 54 feet. There are a few locations that are not coded as critical. I think those are not naturally occurring flat areas. Those were produced when this earlier apartment building was constructed. This is true of a lot of properties along this stretch of JPA. There are at least 8 or 9 south of this property. If you look at the GIS map, you will notice that they are laced with critical slopes. These would be significantly hindered if some waiver was not allowed. We are seeking a waiver in this case.

### **Next Slide**

Here are some drawings that help you see what would be allowed under different standards. We contrast first what is on the left here. We have a plan above that survey shrunk down. Below, we have a cross section cut

through the site and looking north towards UVA. The sections below go with the plans above. On the left, you see the by right use. Where you see a right rectangle, that is the area somebody could build without seeking any special uses or exceptions. On the right is a different vision for the property. This aligns with what we have in Module One of the zoning rewrite. You can see that side yards can potentially be built. There is a build-to range at front yards. This is a double frontage site. Montebello Circle and JPA are front yards. You can see that that range is rather narrow. With bonuses, you can build 100 feet tall with the zoning rewrite. We have this here to indicate the vision going forward for the city. It is not that we would be depending on what is currently in the Comp Plan and zoning drafts to have a viable project here. What is allowed with a special use permit process can also be achieved. We show that in the middle here. We are proposing a 70-foot-tall building from the average grade. We are proposing 5-foot minimums along the side. You will see in subsequent plans that most of the building would not get that close to the side yards. At JPA, we are proposing 18 feet. At Montebello, we are proposing a 25-foot front yard.

### **Next Slide**

Here are a couple of floor plans for reference to give you some impression of how the building is working with each of its streets. On the left is the entry level off Jefferson Park Avenue. You can see where most of the parking will be. It is under the building. It will be largely concealed from view. What you see in the lighter brown as opposed to the dark black is where we are considering having planting beds so we can have better street trees where there are none now. In addition to the entry into the parking area, which we would like to keep as narrow as possible, we have an entry court here and a lobby for the tenants. On the left, we are hoping that we can find space to largely conceal trash bins. The grades here might assist us so that we could submerge those and have them behind site walls or retaining walls. On the right is the floor plan about 4 levels up. You could enter the building here from Montebello up at the top of the site. We have reduced the surface parking by half of what is there now. We are keeping 4 spaces up here. To improve the streetscape, we are proposing some planting so that we have a couple of medium-sized trees and understory planting on the right side. We have a covered entry and a walk that leads from a sidewalk that we would be introducing with a small seating wall over here. Most of the building will be 12 feet from the property boundary. It is just up here close to JPA where we are proposing an entry volume that comes up 2 stories. That gets closer to the street and to the north boundary. We believe this is going to have beneficial effects on the massing of the building. We can step back the front façade and the corner facades as we go up to the full height of the building on the Avenue.

### **Next Slide**

We are cutting through about halfway through the site and the building. We are looking towards UVA. We have extended the section out to show you buildings that are on the other side of the street, to give you some impression of what kind of room there is beyond the property. With JPA, we have an unusually wide right-of-way. It is over 80 feet. The outcome here would be, with our proposed front yard, we are still over 120 feet from the façade of the 1620 JPA apartment building across the street. There is also a smaller stone house that is south of Valley Road here. That is also about 120 feet away from the proposed building. As we go to Montebello, we have a narrower street. While the street is narrow, you have different conditions on either side of it. On the project side, many buildings are within 25 feet of the right-of-way. Sidewalks are missing. Entry points are often below the street grade. On the west side, it is different. The buildings sit higher above the circle, usually at least 12 feet above the elevation of Montebello. They are also typically about 50 feet away from their property boundary. There is a nice stone wall that consistently runs with a sidewalk there that helps to further define the edge there and perch these properties. There are also a lot of plantings on that side. There are a lot of buffers in place on that side of the street.

### **Next Slides**

The following slides will give you some photographs looking at the site from different angles. Here you begin to appreciate the grades and existing conditions. You can see a tall retaining wall here on the neighboring property that extends to the southeast corner of our property and wraps around. You are left with this unyielding apron of aging concrete that is very steep with no walks. You can eventually reach a little stair that is tucked around over here. There is no legible or inviting connection from the street up to the building as it currently is. Trash cans are often out. There are 2 curb cuts even though it is a 90-foot-wide frontage.

This is another view. We are near where Valley Road intersects JPA. Behind us is the 1620 apartment building. To the right is the apartment building at 1707 JPA. You can see that the building is 4 stories tall. Because of its location on the site up from JPA, it is over 20 feet before you get to the terrace on which this building is constructed.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is a glimpse of a residential project possible with the requested special use permit. This creates street frontage that is aligned more closely with 1707 JPA and further to itself at 1725 JPA. It allows room for at least 2 large trees and understory plantings, new walks, seat walls, and a concealed trash enclosure. All this would replace the deteriorating and daunting slab of parking that currently is occupying the entire front yard.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is the same proposal with some alternative exterior materials.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is another option for exterior cladding. We are showing these alternatives, not so much to discuss them specifically here tonight or look for preferences for many of you. It is more to demonstrate that we have been trying to consider multiple options and work through this design. It is important to test a variety of materials. At this point, we want to keep a range of colors and textures in play as availability and cost of materials are bound to vary. We haven't had the chance to narrow down our choices with material samples. If the project was to move forward, during the entrance review process, we would start zeroing on these.

#### **Next Slide**

This is the site directly across the street. We currently have a building there with 8 apartments.

#### **Next Slide**

This is a masonry building to replace it with 27 apartments. Over to the right, you get a glimpse of the tree and the entry lobby. We imagine right now that it would have storefront. It would be visible to the street and from the street into the lobby. Up above, we have located a study lounge there. This would be a heavily glazed space with common use and a lot of visibility to the street.

#### **Next Slide**

Here is the elevation with ribbed and corrugated metal siding and a white gray masonry base.

#### **Next Slide**

This is the aluminum cladding that is mimicking wood. What we are showing in the balconies is to hopefully have operable mesh curtains that could be hung there to create screening and privacy and to be opened or closed depending on the time of day. We think that this is a nice way that the façade could be enlivened. Up here is a canopy at the top level where we step back. This is a semi-open canopy. We are imagining it having a fine framing and closely spaced metal pipers up there that would allow sunlight to rake through. With the

change in materials, we think that it will help that upper story along with the step-back to recede somewhat and not be as prominent.

**Next Slide**

We have swung around. We are up to the Montebello Circle. We see the existing conditions at the other front yard. It is tough over here. There is a lot of parking almost completely in the front yard, a meager bridge that comes over there. There are no sidewalks on the east side of Montebello Circle.

**Next Slide**

Here it is from another vantage point. You can see the conditions that are typical here. On the west side, you start to see a little bit of what is going on. You have this continuous sidewalk, a sidewall, and the yards that begin to slope up. The houses are about 50 feet away and are perched up. You also have parallel parking on this side.

**Next Slides**

Here is our vision for this side. Here is the wood version and the gray and silver version. Here is the last look in brick and metal. Although we retain half the existing surface parking, this combination of pavers, planting beds, and concrete scoured and textured would significantly improve the streetscape. We propose a sidewalk and a seat wall along about half the yard. An entry walk leads to a covered entry point. The planting beds would be sufficient to support at least 3 medium-sized trees and a lot of understory planting. The 4<sup>th</sup> story steps back rather significantly about 14 feet from the facades below it. There is also a change in material. At the building's corners, we have located living rooms and balconies to better orient common space and increase visibility to the public realm to give the tenants a nice view.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – With the 3 affordable units, what is your thinking about that? How are you planning to build those in?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is a question we are just beginning to think about. One of the challenges with a project like this is that it is going to be geared so much to student housing. I don't know if you have had any discussions or have any insights about the potential there might be to have an affordable provision that would be geared toward young people, who might be attending UVA that are coming from modest or low-income families. If there is a potential to have an affordability provision for a project like this one that is level to have this kind of demographic. There is going to be an obligation to affordable housing. We will be working that out if the project moves along. We know those discussions are going to involve the City Council.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – We care deeply about these students at UVA that maybe in need of some additional subsidies. We care about providing affordable housing for the permanent residents of Charlottesville. That is something that we will have to work through. With the tree canopy, it looks like we are going to lose some trees.

**Mr. Riddle** – I think that we might lose one tree of any size that is on the north of the property, close to the boundary with 1707.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – In your survey, there are 2 4-inch crepe myrtles on the south side. There is a 12-inch unknown tree. It is over the property line. Would that be affected by your grading?

**Mr. Riddle** – That one might be affected.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – There is that 30-inch deciduous. It is further away but up a little bit. Would that be affected?

**Mr. Riddle** – I am seeing the 20-inch mulberry. I don't think that 30-inch deciduous is close enough that it would be affected. The one up top at the northwest corner. That 20-inch mulberry should be fine. We are going to be potentially having to use retaining walls and grading significantly will be closer to JPA and about halfway up the site. As we get closer to Montebello, we are not proposing to change the grades there very much. All those trees should be fine. That 12-inch tree is far enough down the site that I would suspect its root system would be damaged. That one would be lost. We have the potential here for maybe 3 large new street trees on JPA and 3 medium-sized trees at Montebello. Because of those locations, their location will make them work harder to serve the public realm than some of the trees that are further up and buried within the sites.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – It would be helpful if you would present a proposal that allows us to break even or at least maybe net up a little in the canopy. With the critical slopes, pay attention to that you are walking through that and what that is going to do to the greenery. Make sure that you can 'walk' us through what you are going to do to mitigate any loss of greenery in the critical slopes. There is no waterway at the base of these slopes.

**Mr. Riddle** – There is a waterway that is close by on the other side of JPA. It is within 200 feet. That is the thing along with the excess of 25 percent that triggers the critical slope.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – It is going to be important when you present that you have a good and strong mitigation plan. Things like nutrient credits, while intriguing, don't help us locally. Any mitigation you can do on site would be of great value.

**Mr. Riddle** – When making these kinds of proposals, it sounds like you would like to see an outline or intentions even though I assume that with the site plan review, a lot more of the details are going to be 'hammered out.'

**Commissioner Mitchell** – That is certainly what Mr. Freas is trying to point us to. I would still like to be comfortable that there is a good strong mitigation plan to protect the waterways and at least net zero on the tree canopy.

**Commissioner Habbab** – Like Commissioner Mitchell, I like the trees on the street. It is better than what is currently there, more if you can fit them all around the site to break even. The current site is unfriendly with a lot of pavement. This is a good approach that nestles that grade change from JPA to Montebello. It does a better job representing itself on Montebello than the current structure. I appreciate the eyes on the street approach. My concerns are the rent and considering the existing units. They are in this building that is not very nice. It is going to be a higher end rent potentially and trying to preserve some of that affordability, whether for students or if it finds its way into our larger Charlottesville affordable housing funding. Another concern was how much space there was between this building and the building next door. There are units there with windows facing the site.

**Mr. Riddle** – That building is 10 feet off its side yard. It is a somewhat narrow space. We realize that for code purposes that when we are so close to the property boundary, there are going to be limitations on openings. They might have to be protected if we go above that. We feel that if we have at least 15 feet between this façade and the other one, it is not necessarily going to be too close for comfort. I think that right now, we would have over 20 feet based on this proposal and what is there now.

**Commissioner Habbab** – Along that same location, more plantings and/or a way for the public to navigate between the upper gathering space and the lower gathering space. Material-wise, brick on the JPA side would be my preference. I had questions about the material on the balcony.

**Mr. Riddle** – Where we have exterior drapery, that would be a metal mesh curtain. It would be durable but also potentially operable. It is a potential addition. Some of us think it could be nice because it would allow for potentially more privacy for tenants. It would create the potential for a different kind of shifting façade depending on how people are using those.

**Commissioner Russell** – I was hoping that you could help me understand how I am reading the height, the floors, and the stories, and looking at the proposed future zoning. You are proposing an 8-story building at 70 feet. In this future rezoning, that is proposed to be a CX-5, which is a maximum of 5 floors, height of 72 feet. What am I missing in that?

**Mr. Riddle** – I don't think you are getting anything wrong. That is true about CX-5. I think at a bonus level, you can have 100 feet and 7 stories. We are seeking a special use permit based on the current zoning. With the current zoning, there is not a limitation on stories. There is only a limitation on height at 101 feet. Potentially, you can consider up to 101 feet in height from the average grade. We are proposing about 70 feet from the average grade. The reading of the stories of the building can be a little tricky. It is a property that has 2 front yards. It is equally valid to say 'yes' it is an 8-story building on JPA, but on Montebello it is a 4-story building because the grade inevitably creates that change as you go from one side to the other. On that section, it is rough at this point. Normally, it is something we would have to calculate specifically to make sure we got it right. Ultimately, if this proposal was to be built, it could be the roof is 72 feet from the average grade or 68 feet. We think it is going to be about 70 feet based on what we have drawn here. At JPA, we have a couple of step-backs. They are modest but not insignificant. There is the entry volume I mentioned at the base of the building at JPA. We stepped back about 7 feet to the floors above. With the top story, we step back about another 5 feet and change materials. On the Montebello side, we go up 3 stories and step back about 14 feet and change materials. On the Montebello side, it is creating an impression not unlike a 3.5-story building if this had a pitched roof. There are already a couple of buildings with that height on Montebello. We don't think this is getting out of neighborhood scale for Montebello.

**Commissioner Russell** – We don't know if you are asking for more than what is in the bonus scenario in CX-5 world because we don't quite know where that height is going to come in. It would be more than 7 stories. I have concerns over the absence of affordability.

**Mr. Riddle** – We don't mean to suggest that we weren't planning on there being that obligation. It is just not something we have yet had a chance to really consider and include in the presentation. That is not to say it is an afterthought. We started by trying to figure out what is the potential for a building here to provide more housing in general. An affordability obligation would come along.

**Commissioner Russell** – My concern is pertinent to our public comment. It is the thing that we talked about. Density for density's sake is what we want to avoid and the impact on our community that it be linked to this thing that we all want, which is affordability.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I am going to be paying a lot of attention to how you deal with the streetscape. What you currently propose has me a little worried. It is two-thirds parking garage and trash cans and one-third lobby. I know you are on a constrained site. There is not a whole lot you can do. Whatever you can do when you develop this for an SUP would be appreciated. As far as the massing and the height, I realize you are not quite meeting what we are trying to get with the new code. It is JPA. This does show what happens

when you have a steep slope. One of the reasons I personally feel height is appropriate on JPA on this side is because the impact uphill to the neighborhood there is far less than downhill. Basically, the impact is on the students. That is where the height is going to be. I don't necessarily think that is a problem. I am supportive of the massing that you are trying to show.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Where did we land on affordable units? I thought that I remembered in the presentation or packet that you were going to do the existing 34-12 5 percent of floor area over one FAR.

**Mr. Riddle** – In the early parts of the presentation in the narrative, there was maybe some language there that we had put into the booklet. We have been reevaluating that in light of what we see as the vision based on the Comp Plan and the zoning drafts. If there is something there that looks like it is talking about affordability as it was written in the zoning, we realize there is still more discussion and debate around that.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I agree with everybody. We have had vague discussions about a student affordability program. It seems like we have mostly landed on the idea of enforcing that would be a nightmare. Something like this seems why you have an in-lieu payment. Otherwise, you have stuck people with a bunch of kids and units designed for roommates. Why are you here now?

**Mr. Riddle** – It is the owner's feeling that it still feels a little uncertain. He would like to move at some pace to get this underway. Maybe you can tell us more. We were thinking that between really 'hammering it out' and there potentially being some legal challenges, would the zoning be in place a year from now, two years from now? We are not meaning to 'jump the gun.' I understand why you are asking that. We have had the same discussion. Are these requests going to be effectively obsolete? We figured that we would go forward now because there are provisions with a special use permit that can allow this building. We think it is close to what is outlined in the new zoning draft.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – With the special use permit, you can do basically the same as the new zoning. Commissioner Schwarz made some comments on Module One about how this, with the ridge around JPA, makes sense to spread CX-8 more. This is a site that makes that clear. I do want to talk about the couple ways that it seems that you are not super-compliant with the new zoning. One is the front setback where we are going to institute this build-to line up to 10 feet. What is the logic behind setting it back more?

**Mr. Riddle** – There are a couple of things that work there. We were thinking first for the sake of planning street trees. We are not aware that the city has enough ground at the sidewalk with the parallel parking that is common there to plant trees of any significance. We thought it would make for a better entry experience, to have a little plaza out there, a place to take a load off where you are not necessarily inside the building. It felt like a more comfortable distance considering the building. It does have some height to it. It is coming closer to JPA than the existing building. It also seems to make sense for it to be somewhat close in its yard depth to what is on the neighboring property at 1707. It feels like a comfortable yard for a building that is more than 3 stories tall. That is where we landed on that.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – With the green-scape requirements, you would be required to have a planting strip. The sidewalk would zigzag around it.

**Mr. Riddle** – You have an outdoor space requirement that would have to get carved out. It could maybe happen at Montebello. It could maybe happen at a part of JPA. If you are saying that you are intrigued by the possibility of some of the building maybe getting closer to the street. I don't know if that is something we are going to be able to weigh. It would be interesting to know if that had any appeal.



**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I wouldn't want to lose all the street trees. The right-of-way is constrained there. I agree with Commissioner Schwarz's comment about the front and how it is a gaping mauve of a parking garage. I think there is an exemption in the code to the build-to requirement or the active space requirement if you need it for access. It doesn't work with the layout. If you could move the entrance to a side, that would feel good. The treatment of your second floor looks like the garage is extending upward.

**Mr. Riddle** – We did look at that. That is a very good observation. We thought the same thing. It would be better if we could have more lobby, more building that is there close to the street. Putting the drive on one side would help with that. If you look at the floor plan, it ends up taking a lot of spaces away. We already are at a small number here. I don't think the owner is going to have in his program a building with no parking. This seemed like it was a decent compromise. We could have planting on either side of the drive. We could look to a material that is better than asphalt to get there, maybe some nice paving maybe aligned with the sidewalk. Look at the property that exists to the north. It has the same kind of entry right in the middle. You can see, what those sycamore trees have helped to do, in just 15 years since it was built. It is lost in shadow for much of the day. That is something to consider.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – That helps across the street, but not if you are on the sidewalk right there.

**Mr. Riddle** – If you walk by and check it out, it doesn't 'grab' you as you walk by it. I don't believe that they have a garage door there. You can see right into the parking level. It would be nice if there was a way to make that drive less prominent there without losing 20 percent of the spaces down there. At that point, there is so much excavating that the owner is doing and a relatively small amount of parking. It might start to get a little perverse. We have talked about that entry/drive in the office. We are extending the reading of the opening up and the masonry thinking that the vertical proportions have a certain appeal. We could revisit that or reconsider it. It would maybe help to diminish that parking entry.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – You are on the right track with how to make the driveway more pleasant to pedestrians. I wonder if you could do something. In some places, you see a level sidewalk rather than a curb cut. That way you don't have this cross slope that pedestrians must walk. That would be great.

**Commissioner Palmer** – A couple of things come to mind. It seems that we have gone from questions to comments. A lot of what I had thought about has been covered with Commissioner Mitchell's comments about the critical slope. They make a lot of sense in terms of stormwater. The site is probably not holding back any stormwater at this point. It is good that we have these discussions to have a strategy in understanding how you are going to improve that. You don't have it all figured out. That is important. We talked about that with 2005 JPA. I had a misunderstanding of the height from JPA. It is a 95-foot building from the sidewalk because of the zoning code and how it is applied. When you talked about it being a 50-foot drop from top to bottom, I was thinking 70 feet. Why is it 40 feet off Montebello Circle? What Commissioner Habbab and Commissioner Schwarz said about the streetscape makes a lot of sense. When thinking about students, the safety coming out of that side of the building is very important. When cars are coming out of that garage, it is important that it be visible and easy for a pedestrian to get a warning that a car is coming. I also want to make sure there is room for the street trees. Future things that the city might want to do to bring it up to more of the type B proposed Streets That Work streetscape would be a good thing to look at. Make sure your landscape plan is matching that. On the Montebello side, that is a neighborhood. It is weird. How often do you have 2 primary frontages? Setting it back makes sense there, especially for the neighbors. It seems that would be appreciated and providing a good formal entry and streetscape there. One thing that came to mind talking about affordability. I know we all snicker a little when we think about affordability for students or think that it is misplaced in some ways. Having lived on JPA in the past as a student, the choice to live there had a lot to do with price. Here we have 8 units that will not any longer be

affordable to a student. I am assuming these would probably be a little bit more expensive. However we end up dealing with the affordability, it is good to recognize conceptually that there are affordable student units that will be going away with this and not coming back necessarily. It is well-located for students. I look forward to continuing to see the evolution of the project.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – I am excited about this site. I think that we can do better than current conditions. I am excited to see some permeability. Some trees would be a good thing. Because there are 2 front doors to this property, that creates an opportunity. You could do vehicular circulation on one side and not the other side. Have one curb cut on one side and the other side has a high-quality pedestrian frontage. Personally, I would like to see that on JPA. I understand there are major costs and amenity tradeoffs. There are benefits too. It is something to think about. In terms of design, I love verticality and design. We will have concerns from the public about height. That is verticality. Please consider that in the design. I am happy to see modern materials. I am happy to see ideas of shifting and adjusting to the needs of occupants. That seems reasonable to me. Affordability is a concern.

**Councilor Payne** – Do you have any specifics on what you are thinking in terms of affordability?

**Mr. Riddle** – Not right now.

**Councilor Payne** – To make such heavy reference to the Future Land Use Map, Comprehensive Plan, and zoning, and to not match the draft inclusionary zoning program is not appropriate or acceptable for this or any projects. I would agree with the comments of Commissioner Mitchell. It is an interesting calculus to think through with 8 affordable units being permanently destroyed for 27 new units at a luxury price point. It changes if there is an affordability requirement.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – We still have some formal questions to consider. Those being concerns related to the proposed density, concerns about height and massing, reasonable conditions to consider, and SUP and critical slope waivers. Any additional comments on those items?

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – On critical slopes, I feel this is an interesting case where we often think of critical slopes as heavily wooded slopes that are undisturbed things. What we want out of it is protection of waterways and protection of natural features. There are no natural features on this site except for the 2 crepe myrtles and the neighboring tree that might be taken out. There is a waterway nearby. It strikes me that you could pave over some flat sites near this, buy nutrient credits, and never get a waiver. It isn't accomplishing that goal of waterway protection. With the slope, you need to worry about erosion stuff. It sounds like the state requirements cover. I am assuming that you will have a good erosion plan. It would be great to have as much treatment as you can fit. I will be interested in whatever stream buffer stuff we come up with once we are done with this zoning code.

**Commissioner Russell** – I have a question about our inclusionary zoning. If we say that it is going to be hard to track student affordability, it sounds like we are requiring the inclusionary zoning no matter what. We are going to have to figure that out. Clearly, it is bringing up a thing we need to investigate.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – I am assuming there is going to be a lot of rock you are going to get rid of.

**Mr. Riddle** – We haven't done any Geotech borings yet. There could be some bad surprises. We don't know.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – That might be something you could offer as part of the SUP as conditions you put on yourselves to not blast for a whole year.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – What is this building made of? Is it stick over concrete podium?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is what we are assuming now. It might be getting tall enough that we would go to a metal framing. That is something else we will be working out, especially if there is a masonry façade going up that tall. We probably would have to go to a metal framing in this case.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Can you do 6 stories of wood?

**Mr. Riddle** – You can do 5 stories over the podium. Masonry often has some limitations as to how high you can go before you need more reinforcing than a stick frame will provide.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – There is a media post called Praise of Dumb Boxes. The concern is that if you chop up a building too many times, you lose building, you increase cost, and you lose habitable space. I see a lot of modulation and a lot of step-backs in this proposal. Can you speak to those tradeoffs?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is a good point. A building that I am fond of is the old Norcross Station building that is parallel to the tracks. The building is interesting because it doesn't do any of those things that we often talk about; a modulated façade, stepping in & out, breaking up monotony. It is a terrific building. It is not as tall as this one. It is more of a long horizontal building of several stories. It relies on a simple brick façade and some nice, old, and steel windows. It is great like that without a lot of fussing. In this case, as we were designing the building, we had a building that came up at about as tall as it is with a bit of a step back at the top but not at the base. When we started to look at introducing the entry volume that we have at the first 2 stories, that encloses the entry to the parking and the lobby. It felt at home on the project. It gave it this forebuilding that introduces the architecture to JPA. It looked proportionally better to us.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – R-3 is limited at 87 DUA, which is the 27 units. Would you be splitting this up into more units if you didn't have that density restriction in the new code?

**Mr. Riddle** – That is something we might consider. As we have it designed now, without going up another story or several stories, it would be difficult for us to have more apartments than we are currently showing. We look at this a lot of ways with independent buildings, bridging between them, and courtyard space. We ended up coming back to here. It does provide more housing. It is a site that is confined enough that you can array all the tenants with views out. It is almost like it doesn't want a courtyard building unless it was a smaller scale project. We arrived at this seeming to work well with the owner's program and to provide something dense here at an appropriate height considering the corridor.

## 2. Presentation – Transportation Update

**Ben Chambers, Transportation Planner** – I am going to try to keep us focused to about 4 topics. We will try to stick to these 4 topics.

### Next Slide

What did I find when I came back? What state was our transportation planning in?

### Next Slide

I wanted to look at it from the academic sense. In the academic world of planning, they talk about the 3 Cs of planning to make sure you know it is good planning. It must be comprehensive, continuous, and collaborative. In terms of comprehensive, we have had some issues. A lot of our planning activities are happening in silos across the city. Some of it is happening in NDS. Some of it is happening in public works. Some of it is happening in CAT. Some of it is happening at TJPDC. Our Comprehensive Plan identifies a transportation master plan. It is several different plans. It is our Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan, Streets That Work plan, a bunch of smaller area plans. They are spread all over the place. That leads us to an issue with the continuity of it. A lot of those plans are older. We have our 2015 Bike Ped Master Plan and 2016 Streets That Work Plan. We have a bunch of small area plans that were completed prior to the pandemic. We are working with old plans. We are also working with old data from those plans. We have data that we are relying on that is pre-pandemic that is informing our projects. It probably isn't as relative as it was 5 years ago. We also have a continuity issue between the plans. They don't always agree with each other. Even plans done in the same year don't agree with each other. We must figure out how to put all those back on the same page and make sure we are headed in the same direction. Collaboration has been an issue, partly because of the silos, the different plans being planned separately, we have had challenges with effective engagement prior to the pandemic and because of the pandemic. It has become even more challenging. We are now trying to get 'our feet back under us,' and remember what it was we did before the pandemic that was working right. How are we tackling these 3 big issues that we are facing?

#### **Next Slide**

We are doing a lot of different things. We are doing a lot of work with CAT, the region, the schools. We are being comprehensive in our scope, being collaborative across departments, and we are trying to make everything continuous at the same time. It is a challenge. We could talk through all of these. It would probably take us several days.

#### **Next Slide**

We are going to stick to these three. This will be the safe streets and roads for all action plan, non-motorized infrastructure prioritization process, and dockless permit regulations revisit.

#### **Next Slide – Dockless Mobility Permit Program**

The scooters first came to town in 2019 as part of a pilot program, which resulted in us adopting regulations for a dockless mobility permit program. VEO is our scooter operator in town. They have had that permit since 2020, since it first became available. There were 2 other vendors that previously held the permit along with VEO. This permit is managed by the bike-ped coordinator. It is not currently managed by the bike-ped coordinator because we don't have one. We have an offer out to a candidate right now. Hopefully, we will have a bike-ped coordinator shortly. When I was hired, VEO came to the city and said that it had been a while since they had somebody to talk to. They wanted to talk about the regulations. I told them that we have had some issues from our end that we have heard from the public. The public had not been happy with how they had been performing.

#### **Next Slide**

This tells you how they have been performing over the past year and why it was important for us to talk with VEO. These are a lot of rides. We have about a quarter million rides a year at this point. A lot of the traffic is between UVA and Downtown, along West Main Street. We also see some areas along JPA, up at Preston and Grady. Most of the traffic is between UVA and Downtown. You can see from the graph at the top that it is seasonal. People like riding scooters when it is warm outside. It is also dependent on the student population. That is where a lot of our riders are coming from. It is students who don't have vehicles. You see a lot of students riding those scooters and e-bikes during the fall months and the spring months but not so much in the winter or in the summer.

**Next Slide**

Here are the issues that we came to the table with. VEO's biggest concern was the fees. That is not surprising. They are a for-profit company. They are looking for more profit. I told them that was going to be a hard sell. We put this in place for a reason. We have these regulations and these fees for a reason. They said that the city was charging way more than anybody else. They were getting to the point where they couldn't make much of a profit. The other issue that they had fleet flexibility. Previously, the way that the dockless permit regulations were written, they are Byzantine on how many scooters they could put on the streets. It started with 350 scooters maximum. That doesn't include e-bikes. If you do e-bikes, you get 25 more scooters. It became this difficult thing for us to manage on our side to make sure that they were putting the right number of scooters out and that they were complying with the different potential elements that they could be adding to the fleet. It became annoying on their side because they wanted to put a certain mix that attracts their customers. If we are dictating those little nuances, it becomes hard for them to do business. It becomes annoying for us. Our biggest concern was parking. We had misplaced scooters throughout the city. It was causing safety concerns, ADA concerns. We were having issues with our sidewalks, bike lanes, and roads being blocked. This has been an ongoing thing that we were hearing from the public. We were also hearing from the public about safety concerns with how people were riding the scooters. We have some outreach that needs to happen to the users to make sure that they are correctly operating them. Equity is a concern. These trips are not cheap. There is a fee for unlocking the scooter and there is a permanent fee for riding the scooter. It adds up quickly. This may not be the best resource for a low-income resident as it is currently set up. We have outreach in our regulations that they are supposed to be doing to low-income residents, student populations, to promote safe usage, promote better parking, to educate users on how they are supposed to be operating these vehicles. Partly because of the way the pandemic has made things difficult with outreach, they have not been able to do it. They haven't been getting out there when they can. We are going to dive into each of these issues and how we resolve them.

**Next Slide**

This is a high-level summary of how we are resolving each of these issues. With the high fees, we said that we would take away the per vehicle fee that we charge at the beginning of the year. We usually say pay for the number of vehicles you are going to put on the street on January 1<sup>st</sup>. They must come back later in the year. Instead of having the back and forth, remove the per vehicle fee. That seemed to be the easiest piece to cut so they could bring down their cost. For the fleet flexibility, we wanted to take out the Byzantine rules. Make it a higher max cap, but also include the e-bikes. A lot of their fleet is switching over to e-bikes instead of scooters. For parking, we are looking at piloting parking hubs along West Main Street and Downtown. We will be allowing VEO to have parking fees for misplaced vehicles. With safety, we are asking them to implement an education mode for first ride or first couple rides. With equity, they will be implementing a reduced-price access program for low-income residents. With outreach, they will be conducting two outreach events per quarter, typically aimed at low-income residents or student populations.

**Next Slide**

For the reduced per-ride fee and removed per-vehicle fee, we are dropping the fees down to 4 or 5 percent of their revenues instead of 12 percent. That is more in line with what they are seeing in other markets. In other markets, they don't have a per vehicle fee. We are pulling that out. That will save us some time. We don't have to track down how many vehicles they are putting on the road all the time. It is a benefit for VEO. We are changing the higher max cap and not including any bonuses. This is to get back to the fleet flexibility issue. With the previous regulations, it was more onerous for us to keep track of. There were also some things written into it that had some loopholes that let them put as many e-bikes on our streets as they wanted to. We wanted to stave them off from doing that. They now have a cap of 700 vehicles total.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Why have a cap?

**Mr. Chambers** – They would put them everywhere.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – You would be able to find one.

**Mr. Chambers** – The public has come to us with the difficulty of finding a VEO scooter.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I think you are hearing from the public that isn't riding them. It is difficult to find them a lot of the time at least 5 blocks.

**Mr. Chambers** – The 700 will take us from 450 (now) to 700. That is a significant increase. This doesn't just apply to VEO. This applies to anybody who wants to put a scooter on our streets. If another company comes in, they can come in, apply for a permit, and compete with VEO on our streets. We would then have 1400 scooters.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – Can you talk about the revenue impact?

**Mr. Chambers** – It is minimal. Last year, the per-vehicle fee came in at about \$35,000. At the beginning of the year, there were some adjustments made after that. We don't have anything that is dedicated to it now. It is not a really big impact on us. It is more of a deterrent for them than it is a benefit for us.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Have we collected that at this point?

**Mr. Chambers** – Not for this year.

**Commissioner Mitchell** – The \$35,000 is revenue to the city?

**Mr. Chambers** – That is correct.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – How much is the per-ride total?

**Mr. Chambers** – The per-ride is currently 25 cents. The per-minute is reduced. It was about 85 last year. We don't have a dedicated use for it.

#### **Next Slide**

For parking, the first thing we are going to do is try to implement parking hubs on West Main and Downtown, usually around areas where there is going to be bike parking, so they are co-located. This is what UVA Grounds is doing. This will be an extension of that down West Main Street to Downtown. Once we have those installed, we are going to be looking at the Rugby-Grady area and JPA area as our next areas. This has been successful on UVA Grounds. There are still some complaints about mis-parked scooters on UVA Grounds. A lot of those are privately owned. We get a lot of the same complaints about scooters on the Downtown Mall. I can sympathize with that. The other thing that they will start doing that UVA doesn't have is that they are going to start charging fees for people who park incorrectly. Right now, when you end a ride on a VEO scooter, it asks you to take a picture of where you parked. That picture currently goes in the garbage. In the future, they will take complaints from residents about misplaced scooters. They will compare that to the picture that they received from the user to make sure it isn't somebody dragging the scooter to a bad place or tipped it over. If the picture matches what we found when we pick up the scooter, that user will be charged a fee. It will be a fee through their user fees built into the VEO app. It won't be a city

enforcement issue. This allows VEO to enforce some of the issues we have had issues with. It makes them responsible for it instead of us. The fees are going to be low. The first offense will be a warning. It will eventually top out to \$75 or a ban from the service.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Who keeps the fee money?

**Mr. Chambers** – They keep the fee money. They are administering the enforcement.

**Commissioner d’Oronzio** – Does that generate a moral hazard?

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – No. They should be looking for as many violations as they can.

**Mr. Chambers** – The next item is discouraging sloppy parking and if they are in education mode.

#### **Next Slide**

When you get on the scooter, it gives you some instructions the first time you get on about where you should park, how you should ride, and where you shouldn’t ride. Most people get on the scooter and hit ‘next’ multiple times so they can turn on the scooter. What this will do is take them through those screens and put the scooter into an education mode which mean you can only go 8 miles-per-hour. In other markets, what you see is that first-time users make up a vast majority of the crashes and a lot of the complaints. In other markets where they have tried this, slowing everyone down has flattened that line where the same number of crashes are happening with early users as with seasoned users. They are not being as risky. They are being forced not to be as risky. They will be implementing that. There is also a rider safety quiz. When they get through those screens, they will have to read those screens to answer the quiz. We are having them implement that with the new permit.

**Commissioner Habbab** – With the fines, we still get the 5 percent from the fines.

**Mr. Chambers** – They will be collecting the fines themselves and keeping the fines. We get revenue for each ride.

**Commissioner Habbab** – On the hubs, it says that if you don’t park at a hub, you get a fine. What if the hubs are full when you get to your destination?

**Mr. Chambers** – They are going to be a like an empty parking space or an empty area we have marked off. If it is completely full and you have parked close to it, they probably aren’t going to do anything about that. Their GPS isn’t accurate enough. If you are within 5 to 10 feet of a space where you are supposed to be, that wouldn’t be an issue.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – UVA has 2 kinds of hubs. Along McCormick, you can’t park anywhere except in a hub. In other places, there are just hubs because people gravitate to the corrals.

**Mr. Chambers** – They have them split into enforcement and encouragement.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – The hubs we are going to do across the city.

**Mr. Chambers** – The initial ones that we are looking at on West Main and Downtown will be enforcement.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Unless you have one on every corner, there are a lot of safe places you can correctly park a single scooter. You lose a lot of the point-to-point benefit of a scooter and the ability for the next user to be able to find it without walking. We need them to be correctly parked when they are outside of a corral. Forcing them into corrals if there are only 3 corrals around Downtown is harmful to users. You are discouraging use.

**Mr. Chambers** – We are looking at not just 3 spots Downtown, but for a wider distribution around the Downtown area. It is going to be more of a challenge along West Main because of where bike parking is currently located and the space constraints along the sidewalk. We might have to look at potential spots in the roadway where we can set up a corral. In that case, they might be smaller corrals that we do along the way. That is an ongoing discussion we are having with VEO on how we locate those and how they work.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – Thinking beyond the students, we have tourists and commuter workers. Are there ways we can address those needs with this service?

**Mr. Chambers** – The commuter works are going to be a more challenging one. A lot of those are people that are coming in from out of town. They are already in a car. Tourists are not the target of our outreach at this point. We can work with Economic Development Office to see how we might be able to promote this. I am sure that VEO would love to have that conversation.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – Commuters could be a target if you are in Belmont. I am told that people drive in from Belmont. If you have one around, it could be doable to get Downtown.

**Mr. Chambers** – We might be able to make that expansion to neighborhoods like Belmont with our outreach as we are growing the fleet. Since most of the fleet is concentrated on West Main and UVA, we don't have that to go to Belmont. As the fleet expands and we can have more coverage throughout the city, we may have that opportunity to do more of that.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I was thinking of coverage. That is where I am skeptical of the cap. Maybe you want to have the cap in the areas where we have too many of them so that you allow them to spread out.

**Mr. Chambers** – That is something VEO is open to; talking about how they redistribute vehicles. In other markets, they must have this percentage of the fleet must be in certain areas of town. That could be something we get into. We are initially trying to do outreach to low-income communities as part of our equity drive. That could expand in the future.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I assume when they are doing that outreach, they are going to put them in the neighborhoods even if it is not mandated.

**Mr. Chambers** – Their initial efforts have been focused on Friendship Court and West Haven. I think they will be going out to Prospect in a couple of weeks.

#### **Next Slide**

We are implemented a reduced-price access program for low-income residents. Right now, when you get on a scooter, you must pay a dollar to unlock it. You must pay per-minute. It gets expensive. With this program, users would pay \$5 a month. They would get no unlock fee. Anytime they turn on a scooter, that dollar is immediately knocked off. They get one free ride for up to 30 minutes every day. One leg of the commute would be paid for and a discounted per-minute fee for any other ride. I believe the per-minute fee is 20 cents. It would go down to 10 or 15 cents. Individuals would qualify through any state or federal assistance



program. VEO is open to a local assistance program that we want to incorporate into this. They are willing to accept that if we recognize it. It has been used in other cities to great effect. In New York City, it is about 10 or 11 percent of users are part of this program. In Seattle, it is 40 percent. They have a large scooter program in Seattle. That is a lot of low-income residents with a new mode for riding.

**Commissioner Schwarz** – When you say an assistance program, what is that?

**Mr. Chambers** – They use SNAP and have evidence that they are using SNAP. They can qualify for the program. If they live in public housing, they can qualify for the program.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – How do children fit in?

**Mr. Chambers** – They don't fit in. They are not renting scooters. You must be 18 years old. They must do 2 outreach programs per quarter. Previously, they had requirements to do outreach. Nobody has been meeting them. Our previous vendors weren't meeting them. VEO hasn't been meeting them. In this year, they have done 4 outreach events. What they call outreach events are minor. We are looking to have them participate in Bike to Work Week coming up in May. Having them partner with some of our advocacy groups that are taking the lead on that. They have been promoting scooters, bikes, e-bikes, and pedestrians get to work all in one package. Our outreach will be focused on making sure everybody knows how to park and getting some education on parking hubs, they start getting installed. Telling people about education mode and how they can ride safely, where they can ride safely, where they shouldn't be riding, and educating people about the VEO access program.

#### **Next Slide**

We have adopted these new regulations. We have informed VEO that they need to apply for a new permit under the regulations. Their current permit under the 2019 regulations is extended through its 60 days. If they can get us an updated permit application before then, we will start with the new regulations. They are incentivized to put together that application more quickly because they get the reduced fees, and they get an enhanced profit. We are working with them to identify hub locations. We are working with Public Works to figure out how we can get those on the ground. We are working with them to set up coordination for outreach on Bike to Work Week. We expect that they will apply for a full year permit in December for 2024. While we were going through these regulations, we did find one tool buried in our existing regulations that should help us with the parking. It is going to take some coordination to figure out how we are going to pull that off. If there is a complaint made about a scooter's parking, if VEO doesn't get to that scooter within an hour and I get to it first, I can charge them \$100. There are a lot of complaints we have had coming through in the past couple years. We need to figure out how we are going to race VEO to that scooter.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I am still stuck on this requirement versus encourage thing when we have both options. Why not start with the encourage thing for Downtown and West Main, see how it works, give you some chances to race, and collect the \$100 and see if encouragement is enough before we take away a major feature of the scooters if you are a good citizen about it.

**Mr. Chambers** – We are not 'married' to sticking with enforcement versus the other. We can talk to VEO about if they have any data that supports whether we should go one way or the other. Right now, we are tending to lean towards the enforcement one because we are giving them the power of enforcement. They are already doing a similar thing along McCormick Road and UVA. We are talking about extending it down a similarly, heavily traveled corridor. That is the logic behind it. Whether it holds up to the data that they have and whether we should go the other direction, that is for us to decide.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – The corridors are the same. The distribution of scooters is different. It is dense at UVA and hard to find one around here. We are also giving them the power of finding them when they are in bad places. Those 2 things combined could be enough.

**Next Slide**

This is the Safe Streets and Roads for All Action Plan. As part of the bipartisan infrastructure law, there was a \$5 billion discretionary program set aside for safe streets and roads for all. It is \$1 billion every year for the next 5 years. To get that funding, we need to have an action plan in place. We partnered with the TJPDC. They are sponsors behind the grant to get this action plan. Communities all over the country submitted for this so that they could get action plans so they can access this funding over the next 5 years. It is not a surprise that everyone is talking about doing an action plan for safe streets. Our region was awarded over \$800,000. That is the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest amount in the entire state. Why we got that amount is that we worked on it as a region. We are working with TJPDC across Region 10. That includes all the rural communities to do our action plan together. When we are done, we can coordinate what the implementation steps will need to be.

**Next Slide**

What this is going to result in is a regional plan. Each of the chapters of that plan will focus on a specific community. Our chapter, as it has been previously scoped out, is going to have additional outreach and engagement compared to the other counties. That is because we have more modes, and we have more people interacting with those modes in a tight space. We are going to have more outreach and engagement within our city that is associated with this. You might get the sense that we have our own plan. Each county has its own plan. It is part of a bigger picture that will get melded into one plan. Currently, we are enrolled in an infrastructure boot camp for the implementation grants, walking us through what is going to be required for the next steps once we have this action plan in place. The safety needs, data, and funding availability that comes with this action plan and our implementation grants that we will apply for in the future are going to inform our near-term priorities.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – When do we start seeing projects done?

**Mr. Chambers** – Right now, we are scoping it with USCOT (the consultant that has been selected). We have a scoping meeting next Thursday. We should be kicking off probably late May. I am not sure when the outreach events will be happening. We will have a lot of them over the next year.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – What are the odds we are done by next fiscal year's funding cycle?

**Mr. Chambers** – I think that it is 2 years, especially given when we are starting. It is about 1-year process.

**Next Slide**

Our Comp Plan identifies several documents in the transportation master plan. That includes the Bicycle-Pedestrian Master Plan from 2016, the 2016 Streets That Work Plan, the ADA Transition Plan (2017 or 2018), CAT Transit Development Plan (2018), and several small area plans. When you see all these plans, you will realize some of these priorities don't align with each other. We are talking about a world pre-pandemic, about a community pre-pandemic. Some of those people have left Charlottesville. New people have come in. We are also not accounting in our priorities across these plans for staffing changes that have happened in the past 6 years. Staffing levels have also changed. These plans are optimistic about what they could get done in the next 5 to 10 years. We are sitting with these plans. We realized that these were all issues that needed to be solved.

**Next Slide**

We knew that we had to bring all these priorities together and figure out what to do with them. We applied for grant assistance through OIPI (state office of intermodal planning and investment) that is under the Secretary of Transportation. They were assisting the TJPDC on setting up their prioritization process. We brought in a consultant team that would develop a process, look at quantitative metrics for key needs under that process, which has output scores that we are reviewing through a qualitative analysis. All the analysis was performed on projects identified in the Bike-Ped Master Plan and in The Streets That Work Plan. There are some old projects that we are looking at but have been vetted by the community. We are now bringing those 2 plans together. To date, our consultant is done with the quantitative part of it. We have received all their work out of it. We are now looking through all these projects internally and making sure that they still make sense.

### **Next Slide**

This is an overview of the process. The left half is the quantitative assessment. The right half is our qualitative assessment. From the left you can see the Bike-Ped Master Plan and Streets That Work projects in that green bubble feeding into the quantitative assessment, which looks at suitability (bike score, walk score, schools and transit nearby, hilly area), demand (latent demand from zone to zone, actual travel, connectivity, slopes, cost), and safety (crash density and number of cars next to these bike and ped facilities). These get added into a final score that provides us a list to look at qualitatively. Qualitatively, we are looking at how this impacts equity. Are all these projects concentrated in parts of town where they may not be used or not meeting the demand of low-income residents? Are we spreading this around equitably throughout the city? We are looking at feasibility in terms of funding, physical, and near-term versus medium-term versus long-term. Are there projects that we can get done within the next 5 years using the funding that we know is available and they are easy enough feasibility-wise so we can get them on the ground? We have hundreds of projects listed. Are there 2 good projects that would be a great project if we paired them together? That qualitative assessment is happening right now. Once we get through that and collecting stakeholder input, we will have a prioritized list. The projects will be in tiers depending on feasibility, cost, and stakeholder input. We are going to come back to you with a list that looks more like that than a prioritized 1 through 60 list of projects. You will notice a little box off to the left that says sharrows. When we were looking through the bike facilities, a lot of the stuff that came up from 2015/2016 was shared lanes or sharrows. We didn't want to list these as project priorities. They are not really projects. What we are going to do with these is hand these over to Public Service so they can incorporate them into their paving schedule. We don't need to have more discussions about whether to put the paint of a bike picture on the ground. We will have bike facilities and sidewalks out of this plan. Those 2 things will be covered by these prioritizations.

### **Next Slide**

We are focused on sidewalks and bicycle facilities. We are working through the qualitative assessment. We will have a draft list of priorities to share. We will be engaging stakeholders to give feedback on what those draft priorities are. We will revise the list and take it to Council for adoption. Once we get Council to adopt it, it is not the end of the road. This is something we will have to look at annually. We will be doing this annually to make sure that we are pursuing projects that are going to continue being feasible. We will be documenting lessons learned about our prioritization process and how that is playing out. Down the line, we will have start from scratch and figure out what the inputs are for the projects that we want to prioritize. We are working off a list from 2015 and 2016. We will have to revisit that and do a better job with the prioritization in the future.

**Commissioner Stolzenberg** – I understand that the administration has removed most of the bike/ped funding out of the CIP in the last 3 or 4 years because we don't need it because we have so much money accumulating and we can't spend it. At what point will you be ready for us to spend or fund things again?

**Mr. Chambers** – When you hear city officials complain less about staffing, you will know. That is currently the biggest holdup. It is a matter of getting the right people in the door.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – Something I have noted in recent debates over bicycle and pedestrian facilities is that at some level, there is a re-allocation of space from private motor vehicles to anything else. That rallies people with private motor vehicles to want to keep their space. The project dies. That seems like a bad formula. Is there any way, we can separate allocation for private motor vehicles from safe space for everything else?

**Mr. Chambers** – The constraint there is the right-of-way that we have available. That is a major issue in town because we have some old streets and old right-of-way property. Within a lot of those constrained areas, there is not a lot we can do to separate. There are areas in town where you have a lot of right-of-way and a large area. You could do something completely separated and protected there if you have the support from the public to do that. That is the other element of it. The public is going to weigh in on that private vehicle versus bike/ped trade-off.

**Chairman Solla-Yates** – I expect that feedback will come. We don't hear from people who need safe space because they are not yet using it. It is difficult to balance.

**Mr. Chambers** – I have had some conversations with advocacy groups in town that are keeping an eye out for that. They want to have more users on the streets of the modes that they are trying to promote. Making sure that we have good facilities for people who ride a bike or walk down a busy street, but also providing facilities for kids is a big issue in our city. Kids need bike/ped facilities to get to school because we don't have as many school buses. There is a focus on making sure that those less-confident users and less-experienced users do have safe facilities.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 PM.