ALBEMARLE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION AND CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION JOINT WORK SESSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 2008 -- 6:00 P.M.
BASEMENT CONFERENCE ROOM

The Albemarle County Planning Commission and Charlottesville City Planning Commission held a joint work session on Tuesday, October 28, 2008, at 6:00 p.m., in the Basement Conference Room in City Hall (610 East Market Street).

Members attending were Bill Edgerton, Jon Cannon, Vice Chair; Eric Strucko, Linda Porterfield, Marcia Joseph, Tom Loach and Calvin Morris, Chairman.

Julia Monteith, Senior Land Use Planner for the University of Virginia was present.

Other officials present were Wayne Cilimberg, Planning Director; Ron White, Director of Housing, and Greg Kamptner, Deputy County Attorney.

City Planning Commissioners present were Bill Emory, Jason Pearson, Chairman; Dan Rosensweig, Genevieve Keller, Cheri Lewis, Mike Osteen, and David Neuman, University of Virginia Architect.

Absent was Mike Farruggio

Staff present includes Missy Creasy, Planning Manager; Richard Harris, Deputy City Attorney; Nick Rogers, Neighborhood Planner; and Melissa Celii, Grants Coordinator.

Call to Order and Establish Quorum:

Mr. Morris called the Albemarle County Planning Commission meeting order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Mr. Pearson called the Charlottesville City Planning Commission meeting order at 6:00 p.m. and established a quorum.

Members of the public were present.

Joint meeting of the Charlottesville City and Albemarle County Planning Commissions:

Ms Creasy and Ms. Celii reviewed the City Housing Initiative presentation followed by Mr. Cilimberg's presentation of the County Housing initiatives. Those presentations were followed by a report from Mr. White and Ms. Celii on the Joint Housing Task Force report highlights.

It was asked what happens to the recommendations once the report is complete.

Mr. White noted that it will likely go to each of the governing bodies. At this point the report is being reviewed by each localities housing committee.

It was asked if the priorities were linked and noted that the dedicated funding source would be crucial to moving forward on the other items.

Mr. Rosensweig noted that the city is already looking at the priorities and how they may link into regulatory items.

Mr. Strucko wondered about what the immediate needs are. Should we be asking for units or for cash? Data is needed to make the best decisions.

Mr. Morris asked if the data on the population within each income level was available. It was noted that it

would only be at one point in time.

Ms. Joseph felt that longevity of affordability for units was more important and timeframes are increasing.

There was a brief discussion on deed restrictions. There was concern about who would be enforcing restrictions since the localities do not have this ability.

Mr. Loach asked how this report relates to the neighborhood model and master planning. He was concerned but his feeling was that it likely worked better with large developments to tier the housing types.

Mr. Cilimberg noted that the Board of Supervisors asks the Housing office to determine if cash or units make the most sense at the time of development. Changes in the market have delayed the units coming on line so priorities could change between approval and implementation.

Mr. Strucko was interested in having additional data. It was determined that the data was hard to obtain.

Mr. Neuman noted that CRHA was looking at some of these topics and has some data available.

Ms. Lewis was interested in knowing the number of units available and Mr. White noted that data is present from the larger housing complexes but there is no way to know how many individual units are present.

There was a brief discussion on the sliding scale proffer proposal the county has made and no developers have considered. It was noted that the proposal is not seen as enough of an incentive at this time.

Mr. Edgerton noted there is a housing need and that it would be difficult to even come close to what is needed.

Mr. Pearson asked if there was any way to get ahead of the problem.

Mr. Neuman noted that transportation costs, transit availability, wages and accessibility are key to the affordability issue. Social aspects will need to be taken into account.

Mr. Loach noted that housing for the life cycle is important so individuals do not have to move from their communities as they need to change housing.

Mr. Edgerton noted that there is no incentive to build affordable at this time.

Mr. Pearson commented on the number of multigenerational households present and wondered if housing is being explored for different socio status groups. Mr. White noted that there had been some discussion of accessory apartments.

Ms Monteith noted that it is the chicken before the egg. It is very difficult to respond to the unknown.

Mr. Pearson asked where the opportunities and challenges would be for the three parties to work together.

Mr. Neuman noted the limitations of the University in participation in the proposal. It was noted that would be highlighted in the final report.

The meeting adjourned until respective Planning Commission meetings on November 11, 2008 at 7:35 p.m.

_____

V. Wayne Cilimberg, Secretary