

**Albemarle County Planning Commission
February 24, 2015**

The Albemarle County Planning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, February 24, 2015, at 6:00 p.m., at the County Office Building, Auditorium, Second Floor, 401 McIntire Road, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Members attending were Cal Morris, Chair; Richard Randolph, Bruce Dotson, Tim Keller, and Karen Firehock. Absent was Thomas Loach and Mac Lafferty, Vice Chair. Julia Monteith, AICP, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was absent.

Other officials present were Mark Graham, Director of Community Development; Elaine Echols, Principal Planner; Wayne Cilimberg, Director of Planning; Gerald Gatobu, Transportation Planner; Sharon Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris, Chair, called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

CPA-2013-00001 Development Area Infill & Redevelopment

Review of Development Areas Chapter Updates for Promoting Livability in Existing Residential Neighborhoods. *This topic is a continuation of the work session of the Planning Commission held on January 27, 2015. (Elaine Echols)*

Staff Presentation:

Elaine Echols presented a PowerPoint presentation on CPA-2013-00001 Comprehensive Plan for Development Area Infill and Redevelopment.

The Planning Commission received in the staff report several things that are red line version of the Development Area chapter and a clean version. At the end of January staff was reporting on the Board of Supervisors meeting from November where they had made some requests for changes to the chapter.

BOS Meeting November 11, 2014

- ✓ **New Neighborhoods**
- **Concerns with**
 - **Infill**
 - **Redevelopment**
 - **Neighborhood preservation and improvement**

New Objective: Promote Livability in Existing Neighborhoods

One of the big ones was in the change of tone for how this would be written and especially as it related to existing neighborhoods. The Board said the new neighborhoods are really looking good and are functioning as they want them to. However, with existing neighborhoods they are having issues with infill, redevelopment and any existing neighborhood preservation and improvement.

Staff brought the Commission just a little piece of the Development Areas chapter and it really did not make a lot of sense out of context. Therefore, staff provided the context for the changes that the Board asked for. Staff will talk a little about that objective, but also about some of the other changes. One of the most important pieces obviously was to promote livability in the existing neighborhoods. If the Development Areas are going to be the places where they want people to be and where people want to be they need to in some ways be improved to reflect our goals for our Development Areas. Therefore, four strategies were added to Objective 3 about promoting livability in existing neighborhoods.

New Objective: Promote Livability in Existing Neighborhoods

- **3a: Use Community Advisory Councils (CAC's) to identify needs**
- **3b: Invest in improvements that are necessary, such as sidewalks, drainage improvements, road improvements, interconnections, and those kind of things**
- **3c: Establish expectations for property maintenance**

They had a discussion on the issue of property maintenance. At the last meeting staff told the Commission that the Board really was trying to introduce the concept and not solve the issues, but introduce the concept for future work. That really started with establishing what the expectations are for property maintenance. It was not to figure out how to improve properties, but start at the beginning on that. Staff gave some text with that

- **3d: Identify needed connections**

These were not necessarily interconnections for neighborhoods from one to the next, like opening up a cul-de-sac. Although that could come out as something that is needed, but mainly to help people get from their existing homes to places of employment or shopping using better methods of transportation and also road improvements to make those road connections work. Objective 3 is really what they want to be focusing on tonight.

Objective 5: promote density to create new compact places

- **Distinctions between "infill" and "greenfield"**
- **High end of density for greenfield**
- **Within density range for infill – depends on context – don't assume high end is most appropriate**

The other changes that they made to this chapter to try to respond to the Board of Supervisors request were to provide some greater distinctions between "infill" and "Greenfield" development. There have been some rezoning that have taken place over the last several years where a lot of density was proposed near existing neighborhoods when the Comp Plan says the density should be at the highest level. It also says that there should be care taken when you are in an infill situation. The Board wanted more language about compatibility. Staff split those concepts up into the "infill" and "Greenfield" matters. Infill and Greenfield are really kind of soft fluffy terms and are not closely defined. Some of it is a matter of the eye of the beholder. However, what they are trying to get at is if there are people who are very close in an existing neighborhood that might be affected by new development they need to be part of the process. The highest end of density may or may not be the most appropriate there. So it really depends on the context.

The other issue had to do with infill and compatibility, Objective 6: promote infill that is compatible with surroundings

- The importance of the Neighborhood Model principles needing to be applied reasonably. That is something that already exists in the plan, but it apparently was not obvious enough to the Board about what and when to apply it. Staff gave some more text and explanation to that.
- Encourage developers to meet with neighbors sort of reflecting the new process. Staff also made a note that they have a requirement for a neighborhood meeting for rezonings, special use permits and 2232 compliance with the Comp Plan. However, they can also encourage developers in by-right situations to have neighborhood meetings.
- Use designs to help new development blend (in infill situation use to blend). When somebody is designing a development in an infill situation use the existing design and architectural characteristics of that neighborhood to help it blend better so that something is not so starkly different.

Other Changes:

- **Review new water resources requirements – do intermittent streams need to be buffered?**
- **Differences between density calculations in ZO and Comp. Plan – review to see if ZO needs to be changed**

- **Continue joint work with City, UVA, and Scottsville**

Concerns came from the Village of Rivanna Advisory Council about whether or not stream buffers should be put on intermittent streams. They don't know the answer to that question because they are still looking at the new state and federal regulations. However, that is something the Board said let's look into that and see if they need to have stream buffer requirements on intermittent streams and if those should be taken out of the area that would then be available for development. The Board really likes the cooperative work that has been done to date with the County/City Planning Commissions and they want to see it continued. So they bolstered that recommendation as well as with University of Virginia (UVA). In addition, they wanted to make sure they did not leave out Scottsville in conversations about things. So that is now in what the Commission reviewed.

The bulk of the conversation tonight staff is hoping will be on Objective 3, which is what the Board asked the Commission to provide feedback on. The feedback, suggested changes or recommendation then would go to the Board of Supervisors. If the Commission has other comments on other sections, please feel free to provide those. Staff can make changes to basic editing or clarity before putting it in the final form. Staff wants to get it to the Board of Supervisors in the best form for them to see. But, if there is something substantive that really is going to be a separate matter that the Commission would need to suggest to the Board separately. Staff's request would be there are no substantive changes. First, the Board wanted to get the Commission focused on just Objective 3. They are so far in the process now that staff is hoping to get things tidied up. The Board has said they want to have the comp plan adopted by June. Therefore, they don't have a lot more time. She asked for the Commission's recommendation after they take public comment.

Mr. Morris invited questions for staff. He encouraged the Commission focus on Objective 3.

Ms. Firehock said she had some questions and comments, but will stick to Objective 3 as requested. One of the questions she had is under Objective 3, Strategy 3c establish expectations for maintenance of properties within neighborhoods. She is looking at 8.28 on the track changes.

Ms. Echols said it was easier to look at the clean version.

Ms. Firehock said she remembers the conversation so understands how this got to be the way it is. The first paragraph at the end of that paragraph is says, "For a few of the County's older apartment complexes and mobile home parks, maintenance is needed to ensure that broken elements such as windows and stairs, are fixed or replaced, and trash is picked up." She is concerned about whether they are setting up a higher expectation than what the county has the ability to meet. The note she wrote to herself was whose job is that. Sometimes when neighborhood associations or advisory committees get together and there is power in numbers and then they can go talk to landlords who are not being good actors or not as aware of the maintenance needs of their facilities. That can be a very useful tool, which she certainly has found that in her experience. The way that it was worded she wondered what is the Count actually saying about whose job that would be.

Ms. Echols replied the answer is they don't know yet and that is sort of for the establishment. She was trying to give an example of what she saw while out looking in the neighborhoods that represented some of the issues that one might be dealing with regarding property maintenance. In terms of who should do what she thinks that is part of the activity that would take place after establishing what is the expectation and at what level they want property maintenance to be taking place if they want to be involved in it at all. Her understanding to date of how change has taken place has been with different staff members sort of informally. In the last staff report she pointed out that sometimes the police have gotten involved because of situations that have taken place mostly in apartment complexes where there was crime occurring. They contacted the property owner and said some of this might be eliminated if they did X Y and Z just in terms of their property maintenance. Some of it has come from Social Services and the Housing Office. It is just different people who are not formally saying you have to do this but making suggestions because it affected groups of people that they were dealing with. The discussion about how or if there should be some requirements developed has to start somewhere. That is where they are starting. If she thinks maybe those are not great examples staff can certainly reword things.

Ms. Firehock apologized that she did not come tonight with specific language. However, she was feeling like there needs to be some reworking of that text to be clear. Obviously, the county does not have a blight ordinance at this time. That is something that may or may not be considered in the future. They do not have these councils in place. There are state laws for landlord tenant rights, etc. She guessed it was just a little too muddy for her comfort level. Maybe they should talk more about how they would want to see these councils or committees established to help to have a way to facilitate this conversation. She worried that the way it was worded now if she was reading it and just a citizen of Albemarle without being a planner she would be very confused as to what the county was saying about its authority, interest and level of intent to get engaged in private property issues, etc.

Ms. Echols noted just to be clear about our advisory councils. Places29 is being reconstituted. However, as soon as that gets resolved at the Board's level and they appoint the members there will be advisory councils there. As soon as the comprehensive plan is adopted with the Southern and Western Neighborhoods advisory councils will be appointed at that time. So she would expect early in the summer they are going to have all councils in place. If there is a question about community advisory councils hopefully the hyperlink will help.

Ms. Firehock said she was not questioning whether there should be advisory councils. She was just saying that it reads as if there is a lot more power on the part of the county than there actually is. That is the concern.

Mr. Randolph pointed out that within the City of Charlottesville there is an ordinance that sidewalks must be shoveled within 24 hours. He was at a meeting today and had to walk the sidewalks. He found that probably a third of the sidewalks he walked on were not shoveled. Thereby, he walked on the road. He was conscious that a car was behind that slowed down because he was walking in the road. To follow up on Ms. Firehock's point he asked can the county meet these kinds of expectations. Who is going to be available on county staff to determine that there are broken elements such as windows and stairs that need repair or replacement? Who is going to cite somebody for when trash has been littered in a yard? He wanted to keep Mr. Williamson's point in front of us here to permit us to permit you. He did not think anyone is interested in seeing 12 additional people hired who will be the neighborhood enforcement staff and will be out there writing tickets on low level kinds of infringements on ordinances in the county. He thinks what is missing in here, which is the devil in the details, is how we are going to get there. They are going to need some wording in here about a neighborhood enhancement program that is going to need some muscle in it. The muscle is going to have to be probably volunteered centered and neighborhood based. He did not see this if it going to be effective being appointed from the top. He did not see the Board of Supervisors being able to have people come to them and say they want to be a part of a CAC that is going to clean up and cite neighbors for violations because they are littering the neighborhood. It really is going to have to be people that are in the neighborhood that want to take on this role that are prepared to step up and say their property values are dependent on the protection of that neighborhood. What is missing in here as he reads 3a, 3b and 3c is some kind of a program that has to be volunteered centered neighborhood based and is not government created where they can have ownership taken by residents in the neighborhood who help county employees, the police, social worker, planning commission and planners, etc. go ahead and see these changes. He thinks it is going to be a while before this county is prepared to undertake a blight ordinance. If they are not program centric things will continue to deteriorate. He would hate to see us get involved with that at the tail end when things are worse than they are today. There are some neighborhoods and streets that it is a real problem currently and probably will not get better.

Mr. Morris invited public comment.

Morgan Butler, with the Southern Environmental Law Center (SELC), provided SELC Comments on the Development Areas Chapter - County Planning Commission Work Session 2/24/15.

"The primary focus tonight is on the new Objective 3. We've reviewed that section and agree it's an important objective and we're glad to see some additional emphasis being put on this issue. We don't have any major concerns with the language.

We also took advantage of the opportunity to review the revisions to the Development Area chapter carefully, with special attention to Objective 7 and Strategy 7a, which address the availability of industrial land – an issue we’ve been involved with throughout this process. We’re concerned that some of the recent changes to the language in Strategy 7a could give the mistaken impression that there is an insufficient amount of land designated for industrial uses in the Development Area, which could lead to the new economic development director focusing attention on expanding the Development Areas. In fact, the analyses that have been done indicated that there’s a sufficient amount of land designated for industrial use, but that there are some challenges with some of that land, as well as places where work needs to be done to get the land into the desired use.

On this important point, there’s new language in the Economic Development chapter that summarizes the situation well – Strategy 4a on p. 6.13: *“As part of the background work for this Comp Plan update, an analysis of land area available for industrial and office/R&D/flex/light industrial uses was done. The result of the analysis was that overall acreage is sufficient for future needs, but much of the available land is in small parcels and lacks the needed roads to be marketable to new and expanding target industries.”*

We request that the language on this point in Strategy 7a be made more consistent with the language in Strategy 4a, and that the focus be on steps to be taken to make the designated land in the Development Areas more available for the desired use. These steps include:

1. Rezone industrially designated land to industrial zoning.
2. Look at ways to combine smaller industrial parcels into larger ones.
3. Look at ways to provide better infrastructure and utilities to industrial parcels.

In addition, there’s another important point we request be emphasized better in the text, and that’s the 2013 zoning text amendment that made commercially zoned parcels available for more industrial uses. In the assessments of industrial land availability that have been done to date, commercially zoned parcels have not to our knowledge been taken into account. And while market forces may put some constraints on how much commercially zoned land may be used for employment and industrial uses, we can’t just ignore the commercial land issue, either. So a fourth important piece of work will be to identify vacant commercially zoned parcels that could accommodate employment uses and which possess the needed characteristics for the target industries.

In sum, there are plenty of good and necessary steps to be taken within the development areas to get the appropriate use out of industrially designated land, and we should be emphasizing those – and that overarching context – in this section of the Comprehensive Plan. Our concern is that some of the new language in Strategy 7a could make it sound like overall industrial land availability is an issue, and could thereby inadvertently suggest that it’s already time to be looking outside the Development Areas.”

Neil Williamson, with Free Enterprise Forum, recognized with regards to infill development and maintenance that there are individuals within the County who chose to live in developments specifically because they do not have homeowners associations due to restrictions under the covenants. Due to the challenges he did not believe the County should get into the “lawnmower police” that he has seen other localities actually attempt. There is an issue with the level of intensity the county placed on the citizens’ advisory councils of elected bodies of well intentioned citizens that may or may not have the wide view the Planning Commission and others may have on mixed infill development use. With regards to Mr. Butler’s comments about Strategy 7 he would raise a different concern since the way he read that it really allowed for some flexibility especially for existing businesses. They have existing businesses that literally cannot expand because of the development area boundaries. It seems reasonable and rational that those job producing businesses should be allowed if they have an opportunity to expand from the Development Area into the Rural Area. He strongly encourages the Commission to support flexibility in this comprehensive plan rather than what they see with our 16 year old growth development area boundaries. He thinks the jobs are critical to the Economic Development Plan and how you look at infill. He thinks they are going to be seeing in the future more mixed use infill and he did not know if they are really ready for it. He did not think the community advisory councils are ready to accept infill mixed use within the neighborhoods.

There being no other public comment, Mr. Morris closed the public comment period to bring the matter before the Planning Commission for discussion and recommendations.

Mr. Randolph pointed out he liked the comment in Mr. Williamson's remarks. He would cite that in the case of Carter Myers this body did agreed with a comp plan amendment and unanimously recommended it so that there would be expansion of an existing business into a residential area. Secondly, they also were unanimous as a planning commission behind the multi-use aspects of Woolen Mills and actually urging that there be more residential because it seemed appropriate to the objectives of the developer. They are very conscious of that. In both cases he was pleased to say the Commission was unanimous in its agreement that these needed to move forward. He just wants that to be on the record.

Mr. Dotson said he had a few comments with Objective 3. In going back to the discussion that the Commission had the last they looked at this he was troubled by the wording "utilize community advisory councils." It sounds almost manipulate to say utilize. What he would propose is "work with community advisory councils and/or other neighborhood groups." They had a considerable discussion about whether community advisory councils were the only groups that might get involved here. So he would not want to leave it just at community advisory councils. In the next line the word "those" needs to be moved after the word "make" so it says "make those", which is a minor typo. That being his only comment he thinks Objective 3 is good as it stands though he has heard the concerns of the other commissioners. On Objective 6 he had sent out some thoughts to Commission members a number of weeks ago. He thanked staff for giving us the whole context. He thinks Objective 6 addresses the things that he was concerned about. So he thanked staff for providing that advance look at that.

Mr. Keller said it seemed with the work staff has done on the design guidelines for existing neighborhoods and the physical changes documents. It seems that there is going to be an infill. Staff knows the numbers since they have looked at these neighborhoods. So maybe they are far fewer than he would think. However, in these older subdivisions there would be undeveloped lots or double lots with one house on them to have the development potential. So the only piece that seems to be missing in terms of strategy is a strategy that is actually addressing design and how new construction fits within the character of those existing neighborhoods. Staff has done it in terms of the public infrastructure, such as sidewalks, drainage and that sort of thing. He wondered if it needs to be called out as a separate strategy. He would cite the discussions that the city had in the Fryer Spring neighborhood a while back. There were very interesting discussions from developers who were interested in taking advantage of zoning, other folks that wanted zoning changes, and the ancillary building discussion. It was a concern of at least one Commissioner and Supervisor about how that could become problematic as opposed to the carriage house units that they are encouraging in new development that they are seeing as a positive density increase or possibly even an affordable housing component. Maybe this is something they start with the next comp plan update. However, he thinks they do need to be thinking along these lines.

Ms. Echols asked if he had looked at Strategy 6b. It is not in Objective 3b, but it is in Strategy 6b.

Mr. Keller agreed that does it, which gets him to the point of what Mr. Butler was saying about the industrial. He asked is there a way for us to kind of cite when these things need to be interconnected across these points is there a way that they can reference back so they don't have to be redundant.

Ms. Echols replied yes.

Ms. Firehock said she agreed. In 6b at the bottom it says the county may want to consider such guidelines for the development community, etc. In her notes she wrote yes! However, she also thinks they need to create some density design information geared at citizens. This talks a lot about ask your neighborhoods and people what they want. In her experience a lot of times people, for example, gave been against townhouses because they see a not well constructed, not very attractive townhouse development in Albemarle County and they think that is what all townhouse developments look like. Or they density is a dirty word and all density is ugly and terrible. When you show them pictures or new ways to do density they say oh actually I like that. When asked if they knew it was 7 units per acre, they respond that they had no idea it could be that nice and it could still have open space. She thinks they

should definitely provide some kind of guidance for the development community on what they think good infill and good density is. However, she also thinks that they should not overlook the community. If they ask the community what they want they can only comment on what they know or what they have seen. If they have not seen a good example, they are not going to come up with something new. To push it a little farther she would also like to figure out a way to do this with the community. They could have some guidance that is perhaps written for the lay person. She would be happy to work on some sort of future work group with her colleagues about establishing some of this guidance and easy to understand imagery.

Mr. Morris said that he would focus on primarily the 3 areas that staff asked the Commission to look at. He liked what was written. It sounds great. He would have to go back to Ms. Firehock's comment about how they are going to do it. Unfortunately when he sees invest in public services, improvements and sidewalks, drainage, public parks and so on very nice effluent subdivisions come to mind, which includes such as Fontana, Ashcroft, Franklin, etc. where they like it without sidewalks except there is nowhere to walk. So they are darn if they do or darn if they don't. He asked how they are going to get it done. In a lot of communities, such as my own, as Ms. Firehock brought out they have let the covenant lapse and they now call the county and complain about blight. However, there is nothing the county can do about it unless they break specific rules and regulations. But, what they have written here are strategies and as strategies they are wonderful. He just has to look at and ask how we are going to do it.

Ms. Echols replied it would be with the master plans. In our Development Areas they have in our master plans the list of improvements that are needed. If there are improvements that need to get on that list through the master planning process through the comp plan updates some of those improvements would be added to the list. She thinks there is a big distinction between public improvements and improvements on private properties. So things like drainage and sidewalk improvements some of those are already on the list for the master planned areas. Through the updates of the master plan they would expect more might go on those. So that is sort of the community advisory council role in the public improvement realm. When the Board asked that this be added to the strategies she thinks the Supervisor was trying to make a point that they have a lot of capital improvements project needs and they need to recognize them and somehow get them going. A lot of them are in our neighborhoods that maybe are not as old as Fontana. It might be a lot of the older neighborhoods where there are problems that result because of age and not because of the development style. So in terms of the advisory councils for that particular aspect she thinks that was how they intended that to play out.

Mr. Cilimberg noted the reality is that anything they do in the plan as an initiative that moves forward through an implementation is going to have a resource requirement connected with it. A lot of this would be capital improvements program, which of course has to have budgeted monies to be successful or they are accomplishing it through other means that might involve volunteerism and citizens that are not on the payroll and initiatives that are not in the capital budget. But, he thinks what he is saying is that for any of these things it might be considered whether it is some kind of a program that better addresses some maintenance needs or investment in new infrastructure that there has to be an analysis of how to bring the resources to bear to do that. That is just basically a statement they could include in here. That is a fundamental piece. They have to identify the resources that can make it happen.

Mr. Morris said he did not know what the legal process would be for a community. He asked how they reinstitute it if they let it lapse. He understands that almost 100 percent have to agree to it.

Mr. Kamptner replied that he was not well versed in that area of the law. However, he would think that any lot owner within the subdivision would have to consent in having the covenant recorded against their property.

Mr. Morris said he would love to see it because it is wonderful and a great strategy. But, how do you do it.

Mr. Keller asked to go back to the infill. Because he had looked at Strategy 6 it seems that there are two scales of infill that they are talking about. Strategy 3 is a lot within an existing neighborhood and Strategy 6 talks about that. However, Strategy 6 is really talking about a small subdivision that fits in where there

ALBEMARLE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION – FEBRUARY 24, 2015
DRAFT PARTIAL MINUTES – CPA-2013-1 Development Area Neighborhood Preservation, Infill & Redevelopment
Submit to BOS

is land that has not been developed between other subdivisions. He thinks there needs to be a distinction made between those two. The design guidelines and development process is going to be different, especially if the encouragement is to get higher density through a rezoning or special use permit for multiple units. Perhaps that is splitting hairs at this time, but in future they need to think about those types of development differently because they have different needs.

Ms. Firehock said along those lines there is a section talks about encouraging side loaded garages so that most of the experience of the unit is at the front. When she thinks about trying to encourage density and infill then that becomes challenging. She has worked with some clients in other localities where requiring side loaded garages made it very difficult to achieve density because of having to spread so much that way and the extra driveway length coming around the side. So they ended up with wider lots than what the design was trying to achieve. She was going to put her Storm water Committee hat on for a moment because they are trying to find ways to reduce excessive pavement in the county as they try to go forward with reducing storm water. There are some conflicts within this chapter in terms of the objectives that it is trying overall. That is why she feels they need to be clear on what they are talking about. They are talking about infill brand new development. Any brand new development she did not think they should be pushing so hard on that level of design.

Ms. Echols asked Ms. Firehock to show her where the side loaded garages are because rear loaded is what they have been talking about for relegated parking so they would have access from the rear. If side loaded was in the language, it was not intentional.

Mr. Randolph made a recommendation in 8.35 to change to “hoofed animals.”

Ms. Echols asked to go back to Objective 3 to bring that one to closure. She reiterated her biggest take away from this was:

- The point Mr. Dotson made in 3a working with advisory councils and/or other neighborhoods groups.
- It captures the kinds of things that Mr. Randolph was saying about needing to get volunteers and other neighborhood residents involved in whatever happens with those particular neighborhoods.
- In terms of the expectations for maintenance in 3c rewriting this so that it is clearer that this is about they are establishing expectations as well as the methods. The first step is the expectations and the next step is the methods. There is not a perception that the county is going to be doing all of these things before we know what all is involved in it.
- If there is a place for us to be a little clearer about levels of infill sort of small versus large. If there is a way to work something like that in there with the 6a and also making sure it is clear they are suppose to be hyperlinked back so it is not repeated. They can try to incorporate that. She asked if that was a fair assessment of what she was hearing so they can rewrite so that it more closely follows the things the Commission was saying.
- The other thing she would like to respond to with regards to the other Objective 7 is that they are trying if the language is in one place that it needs to be very closely if not exactly the same in another place and this may be a place where they did not get those two lined up exactly right. She appreciates the comments about that and will take those comments to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Dotson said he would agree with that summary. For his own sake he would say also the comments that Mr. Butler offered seemed very much on target and sensible.

Mr. Morris agreed that it was well done and the Planning Commission recommended approval of this chapter with changes to staff's recommended language.

Summary - CPA-2013-00001 Development Area Neighborhood Preservation, Infill & Redevelopment - Planning Commission Recommendation

The Planning Commission **AGREED BY CONSENSUS** to staff's recommended language in the **updated** Comprehensive Plan text clarifying uses allowed in the new Objective 3 for preservation of existing neighborhoods:

- Modify Strategy 3a to reflect the need to work with advisory councils and/or other neighborhoods groups.
- Revise Strategy 3c to be clear as to who should be doing the work related to property maintenance. The Commission believes that it is important that the County not expect to set up a program requiring property maintenance as the first step. There are other ways to help improve properties that should be explored as the first step, such as neighborhood enhancement programs that are volunteer-centered and neighborhood based.

The Planning Commission also provided suggestions on other changes to the Development Areas chapter for clarity:

- Be clear that Strategy 24o related to redevelopment ties to Strategy 6b regarding use of architectural techniques to create more compatible design.
- Objective 6 related to infill should also relate to redevelopment. See if you can find a way to distinguish between different levels of infill, such as small vs. large infill.
- Make sure you have good hyperlinks.
- In Strategy 6b, include laypersons with developers for groups who should be included for receiving more detailed guidelines for infill and redevelopment.
- Make the wording in Strategy 7a more consistent with the language in Strategy 4a from the Economic Development Chapter. This would focus the new Economic Development Director's attention on steps to be taken to make the designated land in the Development Areas more available for the desired use. The way it is currently written, it appears that expanding the Development Areas might be intended as the outcome for making more industrial land or land designated for employment uses the first step.
- In Strategy 8.35 consider changing "pigs and cattle" to "hoofed animals," to represent the types of animals that are not appropriate in the Development Areas for urban agriculture. Otherwise, someone might think that llamas and alpacas are ok in the Development Areas because they are not pigs or cattle.

The Planning Commission recessed at 7:27 p.m. and the meeting reconvened at 7:32 p.m.

(Recorded and transcribed by Sharon C. Taylor, Clerk to Planning Commission & Planning Boards)