

FINAL ACTIONS
Planning Commission Meeting of November 27, 2012

<u>AGENDA ITEM/ACTION</u>	<u>FOLLOW-UP ACTION</u>
<p>1. Call to Order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Mr. Morris, Chair. PC members present were Mr. Morris, Mr. Lafferty, Vice-Chair; Mr. Dotson, Mr. Loach, Mr. Franco, Mr. Randolph and Mr. Smith. Ms. Monteith was present. • Staff present was Wayne Cilimberg, Ron White, Elaine Echols, Andy Sorrell, Dan Mahon, Trails Planner with Parks & Recreation Department, Matt Weaver, Sharon Taylor, and Greg Kamptner. 	
<p>2. From the Public: Matters Not Listed for Public Hearing on the Agenda.</p> <p>John Lowry, Chair of the Economic Development Authority, Chair of the Equalization Board, and Assistant Chief at the Redhill Precinct, spoke regarding the Comp Plan work.</p> <p>Charles Battig, M.D. spoke regarding concerns including sustainable population growth in the Comp Plan review.</p>	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>None</u>
<p>3. <u>Consent Agenda</u></p> <p><u>Proposed 2013 Planning Commission meeting schedule:</u></p> <p>APPROVED CONSENT AGENDA, by a vote of 7:0.</p>	<p><u>Clerk:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved proposed 2013 Planning Commission meeting schedule as proposed by staff.
<p>4. Work Sessions</p> <p><u>CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan</u> (Elaine Echols, Andy Sorrel)</p> <p>Staff presented highlights of the recommended changes to the Comp Plan sections on Housing, Other Community Facilities, and Parks & Public Greenways, Recreation, and</p>	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to comments and suggestions noted in Attachment 1 in further work on the Comp Plan Update. (Minutes will reflect Individual Comments and Suggestions)

<p>Greenway Systems. The Commission received public comment, asked questions and provided comments. A summary of public comments and Commission directions is noted in Attachment 1. Staff was asked to take the comments into consideration in the Comp Plan Update. No formal action taken.</p>	
<p>The Planning Commission took a break at 7:57 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 8:02 p.m. after the Parks & Public Greenways, Recreation, and Green Systems Session.</p>	
<p>7. Old Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>8. New Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEXT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BE ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2012 JOINT CITY/COUNTY WORKSESSION AT CITY HALL at 5:30 p.m. 	<p><u>Staff:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
<p>9. • Adjourn to December 4, 2012, 5:30 p.m., at City Space, 100 Fifth Street NE, Charlottesville, Virginia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The meeting was adjourned at 9:28 p.m. 	

Attachment 1 – Housing; Parks & Public Greenways, Recreation, and Green Systems; and Other Community Facilities - Planning Commission Comments

ATTACHMENT 1

Housing, Parks, and Community Facilities Worksession -- Planning Commission Comments

Housing Discussion

The Commission received staff's presentation and public comment. Elaine Echols reviewed the Existing Conditions and Recommended Goals, Objectives, Strategies and Performance Measures. Discussion took place on the topic of "Medi-Pods" and reporting on progress with affordable units. Ms. Echols said that the strategy related to accessory units should be moved out of the "affordable housing" section because it relates to a number of other goals for housing. Ron White was available to answer questions related to the affordable housing policy.

Planning Commission Comments:

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- On page 9, provide greater clarification concerning the County's existing inventory of housing and land and projected needs.
- Change the word, "builders" to "developers" in Strategy 4c, in terms of who to encourage to provide affordable housing using density bonuses.
- Change Strategy 4e to say, "Amend the zoning ordinance to provide for greater opportunities to construct accessory units to diversify housing supply," and move this section out of the affordable housing section. Talk about the benefits of accessory units, what it can accomplish as well as mentioning granny pods as a form of housing for care givers.
- Incorporate transportation into the discussion, specifically transportation in the definition of affordability and public transportation related to affordable housing. Transportation for affordable housing should be public transportation needs greater prominence in the Master Planning efforts.
- Look at the City's housing program and opportunities for the two localities to work together, as is done in the Parks section. Defer this discussion to get more information from subcommittee report at next week's joint meeting. Put the County in a more regional context – What is the City and UVA's commitment to affordable housing? Consider putting a broad goal earlier in the plan about regional relationships that would set the stage for this part.
- Provide an explanation on where the range of density came from on page 9.
- Be more specific about the relationship of the growth management policy and housing location/types.
- Reference the "State of Housing Report" completed in 2007 for the region.
- Consider recommending changes to the zoning regulations for affordable housing to encourage and allow such things as density bonuses or having no

parking requirement on-site for developments that are on a bus-line or allowing multi-family structures in single-family districts if the structure looks like other houses in the neighborhood. These changes would not just be in architectural design, but really in code changes that would help achieve density and affordability.

- Mr. Loach disagreed with doing away with the parking requirements since it was problematic.
- Identify thresholds for when additional public transit is needed based on stress on existing roads.
- Be consistent with the timing of performance measurements – 2015 or 2018?
- New possible performance measures would be to monitor land supply, track the number of housing units approved by legislative action, track the number of units that have been proffered and how many have been built. A strategy could be to review the results of the above tracking on a regular basis considering adjustments based on such review.
- Work on ways to ensure that affordable units continue to stay affordable.
- Look into how whether or how providing affordable housing has suffered from reductions in staff.
- Clarify the affordable housing policy as it relates to cash proffers and conditions under which cash in lieu of units should be accepted.
- Provide data on participants who have been part of the Homebuyer's Club who have successfully been able to purchase a home.
- Emphasize the need for the Homebuyer's Club to be reinstated and the importance of having adequate staffing.
- Make distinctions between strategies and performance measures. Having at least 15% affordable units in all new housing developments is a performance measure. Amending the zoning ordinance for more opportunities for accessory units is a strategy.

The following comments came from the public:

Charles Battig, M.D. – commented that so much hangs on these meetings. Tonight he represents the public. He was a biased person in that view and was trying to represent some thoughts of the public. He thinks this is a problem in moving forward with these types of meetings. He had not heard a definition of what affordability is. What makes housing affordable and what is driving this. He asked what the Neighborhood Model has achieved, specifically clustering and what not. All regulations make housing more expensive. The more layers of regulations make property more expensive. He was

glad the county was considering senior citizens. The public can make their own value choice. However, he questioned where the public was making their choice. They were designing a system for them, which may appeal to some but not others.

The Planning Commission moved to the next topic.

Parks and Recreation, Greenways and Green Systems Discussion

The Commission received staff's presentation and public comment. Elaine Echols reviewed the Existing Conditions and Recommended Goals, Objectives, Strategies and Performance Measures. Dan Mahon was available to answer questions.

Planning Commission Comments:

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- Identify the joint work of the City and County for the Rivanna River corridor as a high priority.
- Look at parks in the southern and western part of the county – more are needed there. Those will be discussed with upcoming meeting on Neighborhoods 4, 5, 6, and 7.
- UVA grounds should be identified on the parks and greenways plan.
- Rivanna River crossings are needed for cyclists and walkers, especially if they want to commute.
- There needs to be connectivity between the southern and western parts of the County.
- A better definition is needed for greenways, greenway trails, and paths in the beginning of the chapter.
- Develop criteria for land offers in conjunction with the City. The City may have funds where the County does not and joint land acquisition may be possible.
- Can we use the provisions of the TMDL process as leverage for acquiring easements? Check with Greg Harper.
- Should parks and amenities be classified by the age group or the users? Or by special interest, like dog parks?
- Providing bike racks and benches at parks should be in the recommendations; donated benches, bike racks, or trash receptacles can mitigate the cost for the County. Also, there should be trails within those parks.
- Note that there is a need for walkable parks in the Development Areas.

- Should the amenities provided by private entities (such as homeowners associations) be discussed?
- Provide additional references to the different needs of specialized population, such as the elderly and young. Also, needs for dog parks and equestrian facilities.
- Recommend that more work is needed with the public, including homeowners who might be living near a future greenway trails, about the value of greenways.
- Continue to create plans for County parks even if the County does not have the funding to develop the parks in the near future.
- Consider grade separated interchanges at the intersections of Rt 29 & Hydraulic Road and Route 29 & Rio Road. to help provide a pedestrian network to connect greenway trails.
- Coordinate better with City to provide better bike/pedestrian access to the Ragged Mountain Natural Area.
- Broaden the language for the Trail Advisory Committees to include City representatives and associated club representatives.

The following comments came from the public:

Ken Crawford - present on behalf of one of the mountain bike clubs mentioned by Mr. Lafferty, CAMBC (Charlottesville Area Mountain Bike Club). They are a non-profit organization whose mission is to advocate for mountain biking in the area. They provide support through their 300 plus members by volunteering with the Albemarle County Parks and Recreation on the trails. He was happy with the plan, but was present to discuss resolution and clarification for the recreation, the planning, and the access of this plan. They support all seven of the objectives and glad to hear about the bridge crossing for the Rivanna River. They support that access as well as a crossing on Route 29 for the retail corridor on Hydraulic Road and Route 29. They support bike access as well as access for the trail walkers, joggers, and runners. They also would like to have an access way to new trails or an easement granted for bikers for the Ragged Mountain area. They objected to the words "natural area" in the documentation and would like to see large parks, rural parks or wooded parks. Natural area has a negative connotation where it sounds like it is only going to be open to pedestrians and not bikers.

Will Sanford - with the Charlottesville Area Mountain Bike Club, asked to add to Mr. Crawford's comments. On strategy 1d there is an opportunity to mention working with the city on Sugar Hollow. It would be a nice connection through the national park to Byron Park. He suggested adding CAMBC to the Greenway Trail Advisory Committee. He would like a clarification on page 33 on the class b - are these standards and greenway services specific to the greenways or all the trails in county parks considered greenways. He would like a discussion on the 4' to 5' wide width specification for a class b trail. That does not seem it provides enough variety for the different uses out

there if every trail is specified to be 4' to 5' wide. There are reasons why they might want to have a 2' wide trail or a 6' wide trail corridor. He did not think the class b definition is wide enough and he encouraged that to be developed more.

The Planning Commission took a break at 7:57 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 8:02 p.m.

Other Community Facilities Discussion

The Commission received staff's presentation and public comment. Andy Sorrell reviewed the Introduction to the Community Facility Standards section of the Plan as well as recommended standards for Police, Schools, Fire/Rescue, County Government, Solid Waste Management and Libraries.

Planning Commission Comments:

Commissioners made the following comments or asked the following questions:

- The introduction is very helpful. Bold and underline the paragraph on page 3 which speaks to the importance of efficiently using the Development Areas and the need for an increased commitment by the County for public infrastructure improvements and community facilities and services.
- Add to the general community facilities section that regular dialogue should occur among the City, County and UVA to seek ways to optimize provision of facilities and services.
- Define standards – are they really guidance?
- Provide some text describing the current fiscal realities and what that means for community facilities. Some needs are currently not being met.
- The term “bikers” should be replaced with the term, “cyclists”.
- In terms of format, consider placing the existing conditions for each community facility along with the objectives and strategies instead of in a standalone “Existing Conditions” section.
- In general, the text of this entire section is very disjointed compared to the Housing and Parks sections. It is unbalanced. In some cases there is too much detail and in other places there does not seem to be enough.
- Much of the detail is “programmatic” in nature. It is unvetted and should not be included.
- Work on the consistency regarding the level of detail provided for each County Service. Consider an Appendix for the detail.
- The entire process for review of the CIP should be redone. By the time the PC receives recommendations from staff, all the prioritization has been done and the

public has not been part of the input. Consider a change in the way the CIP is developed. More involvement by the Planning Commission and public is needed.

- Why are there detailed recommendations related to the Keene Landfill which are contrary to the comments provided by the Commission at their last meeting on the topic? There has been no public notification and this implies that the County has done a bait and switch. This section needs to be totally redone and text recommending the location and components of the public safety training facility need to be removed. Instead, the language should say,

Objective 4: Evaluate of the need for a County owned Public Safety Training Facility to provide for firearms and vehicle training to meet Department of Criminal Justice Service certifications as well as firefighting training, including burn buildings and hazardous materials training. Identify options for meeting training requirements, evaluate the benefits and liabilities of constructing a local facility and, if appropriate, consider future locations for these facilities in the County.

The next time this topic comes up, neighbors to the Keene Landfill should be notified.

- Regarding schools, in Objective 1, add a reference to the fact that schools serve as important community centers and help implement the Neighborhood Model.
- Schools - Objective 5 is bureaucratic gobbledy-gook. This objective needs to clear and usable, not just words on a page to make people feel good. Clarify what “parity” refers to. Programmatic aspects of schools should not be included in this section since it deals mostly with facilities standards.
- Schools – Objective 12 – provide individual sites for schools rather than multi-school sites – needs more review. Not all PC members support this objective.
- Schools – Objective 14 – further discussion is needed on the recommendations related to site grading. Consideration should be given to having a single school design that can be applied to any site rather than having architects draw up individual plans for specific sites.
- Something should be provided on creating safe routes to school. This includes funding and how to identify who would be responsible for getting that funding.
- Regarding Libraries, reword the text saying new technologies should be considered after the library in Crozet is built. Something about the wording is confusing.

Regarding Libraries, use of “travel time” as a level of service objective may not be appropriate. Number of miles traveled might be more appropriate. Travel

times may need to be amended if you are considering other transportation modes such as cycling.

- Regarding County Government Buildings, consider referring to the McIntire Road County Office Building as COB-North and the Fifth Street County Office Building as COB-South.
- Regarding Emergency Communications, add text pertaining to how the County, City, and UVA would respond to and support the community in a large scale emergency – hurricane, earthquake, etc.
- Regarding Solid Waste Management, make sure that the correct terminology for household hazardous materials is used.
- The section on Solid Waste Management needs more metrics or performance standards.
- Consideration should be given to adding a library to serve the Village of Rivanna.

Other comments related to Community Facilities

- Reference somewhere needs to be made to the 2011 Citizen Survey and the value placed on the County's rural areas, growth management policy, and regulations that help to keep the rural areas rural.
- Recommend making a coordinated effort between all county departments when searching for grant opportunities and writing grant applications, such as the Safe Routes to Schools grant.

There were no comments from the public.