

Minutes

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
December 14, 2021 – 5:30 P.M.
Virtual Meeting

I. COMMISSION PRE-MEETING (Agenda discussion(s))

Beginning: 5:00 PM

Location: Virtual/Electronic

Members Present: Commissioner Russell, Commissioner Lahendro, Chairman Solla-Yates, Commissioner Habbab, Commissioner Stolzenberg, Commissioner Dowell

Members Absent: Commissioner Mitchell

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Missy Creasy, James Freas, Joe Rice, Jack Dawson, Dannan O'Connell, Krisy Hammill, Lisa Robertson, Robert Watkins, Jeff Werner, Vic Garber, Alex Ikfunu, Hezedeane Smith

Chair Solla-Yates called the meeting to order at 5:00pm and he asked if there any questions concerning the consent agenda. Commissioner Russell asked about the critical slopes process. Ms. Creasy and Mr. Haluska provided background. Commissioner Habbab asked if the critical slopes waiver would be required if there was not a SUP. Mr. Haluska noted that it is required if any part of the slopes are to be disturbed.

Chair Solla-Yates asked if there were questions on the CIP item. He noted that the question answer narrative in the packet was very helpful. Ms. Hammill noted two updates to the packet. Commissioner Stolzenberg asked about the economic initiatives funds. What are those dollars used for? Ms. Hammill noted that Mr. Engel can go into more detail later but that these funds help to leverage/match other activity to react to opportunities that arise. They are typically used for large projects. Commissioner Stolzenberg asked what the last project was and how much it was funded for? Mr. Engle will need to answer during the meeting.

Commissioner Russell asked about CIP project intent and how funds rollover to address the needs. What is the total cost of a project and do we ever catch up with the amount of funds that we need? Is funding just put aside and at some point we say go. Ms. Hammill noted that in the CIP there are some projects with specific costs, there are some that are annual funding accounts and some things are cyclical. The strategic funds are for the city to use to react to opportunities.

Commissioner Russell asked about lump sum annual items. Some of those sound like operational and maintenance. Why are those in the CIP? Ms. Hammill noted that it has to do with the usable life of the project and the ability to bond. Having those items in the CIP also stabilizes the operations accounts.

Chair Solla-Yates asked if bike improvements are bondable. Ms. Hammill noted yes and it is dependent on the project.

Commissioner Russell asked about Stribling. It is shown on the non-funded list. Would it be cost neutral if including the developer contribution? Ms. Hammill noted it could be neutral but there are priority decisions because it would ultimately need to be funded.

Commissioner Habbab asked if the development didn't happen, then the general funds would not be spent and it was confirmed that was accurate. He then asked about bonding capacity. Ms. Hammill explained that it is looked at through in the perspective of the full program. There is about 185M for bonding for the full program and anything that has not been allocated to date can be allocated in the next five years. There is the concern of affordability into the future.

Chair Solla-Yates asked if there were questions pertaining to the Park Street project.

Commissioner Stolzenberg asked Ms. Robertson about his question pertaining to uses that are noted in the matrix as not allowable when the state requires. Ms. Robertson noted it would be ideal for it to be noted in the matrix but ultimately the state requirements will prevail.

Chair Solla-Yates asked if there were questions pertaining to the MACAA project. Commissioner Russell asked about the potential to place a sidewalk on the other side of Park Street. Mr. Dawson thought it was on the priority listing but not a high priority. She noted that she will ask her additional question in the regular meeting.

II. COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING – Meeting called to order at 5:30 PM by the Chairman

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: Virtual/Electronic

A. COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Commissioner Habbab – The Rivanna Bicycle Pedestrian Committee met to discuss potential locations for a connector bridge. We have our next meeting tomorrow to continue that conversation.

Commissioner Dowell – No Report

Commissioner Lahendro – I have attended a couple of meetings. The Board of Architectural Review met on November 16th. We had 7 Certificate of Appropriateness applications approved. One application was denied and one application was deferred. We also had a discussion of the latest design for 612 West Main Street, which is the apartment mixed use development going on the site of University Tire on Main Street. We elected new officers. Breck Gastinger replaces Carl Schwarz as the Chair of the BAR and Cheri Lewis will step in as the new Vice-Chair. The Tree Commission met on December 7th. As I reported last month, Mike Roman, the urban forester is leaving the city. The new position for urban forester has been posted. The application deadline is December 20th. RFQ submissions for planting this year's allocation of about 160 trees was due last Friday. I have not heard the results of that. We discussed the preliminary results of the current tree canopy study that is being done. Because of COVID, the flyover for this tree canopy study was done in 2018. It is now dated. The news is not great. For context, let's go back to 2004. At that time, we had a 50 percent tree canopy coverage for the city. In 2009, it went down to 47 percent. In 2014, it went down to 45 percent. In 2018, it is down to 40 percent. In the ten year between 2004 and 2014, we lost tree canopy at the rate of about 0.5 percent per year. In the last four years, we're losing tree canopy at 1.2 percent per year. The most important impact is happening at the neighborhood level. Of the 19 identified designated neighborhoods in Charlottesville, 9 of them are below 40 percent canopy coverage. That is the point where health and economic detrimental effects are being

experienced. Two of our districts, Starr Hill and Tenth & Page, are below 20 percent. Those are where the most significant detrimental effects are happening. We reviewed the CIP where the request by the Tree Commission for \$100,000 for tree planting has been reduced to \$75,000. The \$105,000 we asked for Emerald Ashe Bore removal has been reduced to \$50,000. You can see why those two things are really causing us tremendous concern. The city is only able to fund Emerald Ashe Bore treatment for about 30 ash trees. It is estimated that the city is going to lose 360 ash trees over the next 5 years. As a member of the BAR, I want to bring attention to something that passed on Consent Agenda. We approved the initiation of a process for creating the CH Brown Historic Conservation District. This is a tremendous story. This designation would honor and recognize the importance of Reverend Charles H. Brown. From his experience in the building trades in the early 1930s and 1940s, Reverend Brown personally managed, financed, and participated in the construction of about seventy houses and churches from the 1940s to the 1980s. These were primarily in African American neighborhoods that were purposely built to be inexpensive and affordable. He often cosigned promissory notes and provided financing to get people into these houses. Right now, it is proposed that this conservation district is just for his church, The Holy Temple Church of God in Christ, and 5 surrounding houses. This is just the ‘tip of the iceberg’ for what this gentleman accomplished and his importance in Charlottesville.

Commissioner Russell – No Report

Commissioner Stolzenberg – We had the final meeting of the year with the TJPDC. We got some legislative updates that were interesting for the General Assembly next year. They announced the hiring of a new planner at the TJPDC. We had a meeting of the MPO Tech. The big news was very technical and difficult to follow the presentation of the new scoring procedures for the next round of smart-scale. They are not amazing for us. It seems that it will deprioritize funding for cities. In discussing it, it became apparent that it was less that they are trying to mess with us and more of that in the previous round, we hogged all of the money and almost none of it went to more of the rural areas, which is probably why we got all of our projects funded last time. We might do less off next time. The Transit Vision Plan is ongoing. They’re doing a survey. They had a public meeting last month to get feedback from the community on what the transit system should look like in the future. If you want to participate in that, please give your feedback. There is a text survey describing what you want to see in the city transit system, area transit system, and a map survey where you can put dots on places where you want to go.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Palmer – Our affordable housing initiative has taken the next step to identify 3 sites that we’re considering.

C. CHAIR’S REPORT

Chairman Solla-Yates – No Report

D. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

James Freas, NDS Director – We don’t have anything particular to report. I do want to note that we’re working with our consultant team to prepare for the zoning rewrite project. We’re anticipating initiation

of that project in January, 2022. I am sure we will have a more detailed update for you at your January meeting.

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

No Public Comments from the Public

F. CONSENT AGENDA

1. Critical Slope Waiver Request – 1223 Harris Street
2. Zoning Text and Map Amendment Initiation – CH Brown Historic Conservation District

Commissioner Russell moved to approve the Consent Agenda (Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg) – Motion passes 6-0.

The meeting was recessed until 6:00 PM for the start of the public hearings.

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

Councilor Hill called Council to order for these public hearings.

1. **Charlottesville Capital Improvement Program FY2023-2027** - Consideration of the proposed 5-year Capital Improvement Program in the areas of Affordable Housing, Education, Economic Development, Public Safety & Justice, Facilities Management, Transportation & Access, Parks & Recreation, and Technology Infrastructure. A copy of the proposed CIP is available for review at: <https://www.charlottesville.gov/171/Budget-Work-Sessions> Report prepared by Krisy Hammill, Office of Budget and Performance Management.

i. Staff Report

Krisy Hammill, Budget Analyst –

Next Slide – What is the Capital Improvement Program?

It is a 5 year financing plan. The projects in that plan usually cost more than \$50,000. They are generally non-recurring and non-operational expenses. The projects have a useful life of 5 years or more.

Next Slide –FY 2023-2027 CIP Budget Focus

When we were looking at this year's Capital Plan, we basically made very little changes to the plan that was presented last year. With that in mind, as we were constructing this CIP, there were several things that led to that decision, largely because of the school reconfiguration placeholder. Things that changed with that is that we increased that placeholder from \$50 million to \$75 million. The funding for that placeholder was also moved from FY25 to FY24. We know that in order to even accomplish that we will need significant revenue enhancements to be able to afford that. In addition, we know that our debt capacity will soon be exhausted with this plan. There were some large projects that were previously

authorized to use bonds for that we unfunded essentially to be able to move them to get us to a place where we could increase the \$25 million for the school project. That was the West Main Street project, which was originally in the CIP plan at \$18.25 million and the 7th Street Parking Garage, which we unfunded about \$5 million of that project. We did look at existing project balances in determining what would get new funding this year. If there were large balances, we did look to spend down some of those before adding new funds. The net effect of all of these considerations when developing this draft is that any additions to the CIP (across the entire 5 years), require some type of offsetting reduction.

Next Slide – FY 2023 to 2027 CIP Budget Draft

Here is a breakdown by category. As demoted by the green lines, we feel that this plan continues to illustrate and put funding in a place where Council has stated are their priorities. In looking at the 5 year totals, education would be #1, affordable housing would be #2, and transportation & access would be #3. In each year, you will see that the revenues have to match the expenses. As we talk about adding things, we have to make sure that we take things away to keep that balance. You will also notice that we fund the CIP largely with two sources. One is cash from the General Fund and the other is with bond issues. The other category are small dollar amounts that relate to agreements that we have with the county and some money the schools contribute and any other one-off types of grants that we have. The other thing to note is that I have highlighted in 2027 the bond issue in yellow. That number is zero. That is largely because, as we move through or if we were to move forward with this plan as proposed, we would not have bond capacity to sell additional bonds in 2027 or based on the projects that are laid out in this plan. That would probably be the case likely for 2 to 3 years. By this time next year, we will see another column with a yellow highlight there. What we would be left with would be the ability to only add projects to the CIP that we can afford to pay cash for. The amount of cash here is based on a city policy where we contribute 3 percent of the General Fund budget to go to the Capital Projects fund. That is the \$6.4 million. I have looked at the priorities and funded our agreements with the CAHF and the supplemental rental assistance, the Friendship Court project, and allocated the rest of the money to the annual recurring capital expenditures. That would all be subject to Council's discretion to move that around; 2027 is to illustrate that point.

Next Slide – Capital Improvement Program

When we talk about the Capital Projects Fund, often we talk about it in a vacuum. We talk about Capital Projects, we have the public hearing, we move on, and we start the whole conversation about the General Fund. It is important to note that they do work hand-in-hand. The money that is allocated to the Capital Projects or to debt all come from tax revenues from the General Fund. The point of this slide is to show you a pie graph of all of the General Fund expenditures that are all paid using tax revenue. You will see that debt service is a smaller portion of that pie, as well as the transfer of cash that we put in the Capital Projects fund. As we put more stress on the cash or debt service on the Capital Projects side, we also are decreasing the other pots/pieces of pie for other expenses that come out of the General Fund.

Next Slide – The AAA/Aaa Bond Rating

One important factor and one thing is that the city is very lucky. We are one of very few communities to actually be AAA bond rated. The AAA bond rating is the highest standard to indicate that we have structurally sound finances in terms of our results and in terms of our policies. It is an independent determination of our municipality and our ability and willingness to pay our debt. We have maintained this bond rating since 1964 from Standard & Poors and since 1973 from Moodys. Essentially the AAA bond rating gives the city the opportunity to borrow money at the lowest cost available. That means more

money is going towards the project and less money is going towards interest. The rating agency focuses on four key factors: **Economy** – What do our demographics look like? What is our employment base? Property values? What is our tax payer composition? **Management** – What are our policies? What are our procedures? Do we do strategic planning? More importantly, do we have the ability to achieve all of those things and to maintain them as well as meet budgetary targets and adhere to financial policies? As we talk about keeping to our policy, it is important. **Finances** – What are our budgetary practices? What do our investments look like? What do our year end results look like? **Debt** – How much do we have outstanding? What are our future needs? What are our current obligations? All of these factors weigh into the bond rating. Even when we talk about all of these issues, it is an exciting time because we have so much to do. It is important to keep in mind that we are financially sound. We're not struggling because we have financial issues. We're struggling because we're excited to do a lot of great things. It becomes more of a conversation about priorities than the ability to do something.

Next Slide – FY2023 Draft vs FY2023 as Planned

We started this CIP draft by looking at the 2022 plan and making very minor changes. When we did make those changes, they were made with offsetting reductions. If you look at this chart, this attempts to show you what categories changed from what we planned to spend in 23 when we presented this to you last year versus what we are now planning to spend in 23 for this year. If you look at the totals, you will see that last year, we were planning a CIP for \$26.3 million. What we have actually proposed in this draft is about \$22.7 million. It is an overall reduction just in 2023 for \$3.6 million. That is a bit of misnomer because we know that we added \$25 million for the school project. If you looked at the other years and compared them, for example 2024, what we planned in the plan last year versus this this year, there is an increase there. To highlight what the changes were, there was a change in Public Safety from 2023 last year to this year. That is largely related to \$1.2 million that was added for construction cost increases for a bypass fire station. There was a roughly \$111,000 reduction for savings accounts that we were building up to replace radio and EBT replacements, which are an expensive endeavor. In Transportation and Access that decrease of \$5.4 million was largely because we reduced what was originally budgeted for this 7th Street parking deck by \$5.6 million. Five million went for the increase in the school reconfiguration project and \$638,000 has been allocated for some structural repairs that are necessary for the Market Street Garage. Additionally, we reduced some paving. We added \$50,000 for the historic district and entrance corridor design guidelines. With Parks and Recreation, there was an increase there. There were also reductions. We reduced their lump sum by \$500,000. We added \$150,000 for a comprehensive master plan. This is not for individual parks but to look at the Parks and Recreation Program and Department as a whole to get an idea for what the mission is. What do we want to do? How do we want to move forward? We also added \$45,000 to address some drainage issues with the Oakwood Cemetery. We added \$55,000 for the ash tree removal. We added \$92,000 for the city/county park project, which is a joint project at Ivy Creek and Darden Towe. \$350,000 was also added for McIntire Park drainage corrections. Those are some DEQ identified issues. We also added \$42,000, which is the first funding pot for a slate roof replacement that needs to happen at Key Recreation. There is also the larger construction money planned for 2024. Besides those changes, you will see that the affordable housing money planned for the CAHF/supplemental rental assistance did not change from what we had planned last year. In addition, Friendship Court/CRHA funding remained the same. The other categories remained the same as well.

Next Slide – Key Messages

We feel this draft focuses on Council's key priorities. We know that this plan is not affordable without significant revenue enhancements. We have talked about tax increases, sales tax increases. We need to explore all of those. Just because the numbers are here in the plan, we still have to make sure we have the numbers and the corresponding debt service. We can also look at reallocations. We know that in years past, we have committed funds in previous plans where those projects may have changed, our priorities have changed, and they haven't yet happened like we did with West Main and the 7th Street parking garage. Perhaps, there are other opportunities to reprogram that money. We also know that future needs for the new CIP funding will not be available for quite some time if we proceed with this plan. We talked about cash being the only option. FY23 would be the first of approximately three years in which we would not be able to sell bonds. We also know that under this plan, we have also talked about the fact that even if we raised tax revenues, we will have depleted all of our reserves. Even with a 10 cent tax increase that we talked about, those costs are going to be offset with spending down debt service reserves that we previously had in place. By the time we finish, we will really be at 'ground zero' to start building everything back up.

Next Slide – The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

We have gotten more information since we last met. We know that there are specified targeted areas of funding. They have been identified as repair, rebuild for roads, bridges, and rails. There is a goal to improve healthy and sustainable transportation, to build a network of EV chargers, access to high speed internet. There is going to be funding available to prepare infrastructure for the impacts of climate change, cyberattacks, extreme weather events, funding for access to clean drinking water, and funding for airport improvements. Many of us in finance have been waiting to find out what would be available. It is actually not 'one size fits all.' It also doesn't deliver on a lot of what we already have in our CIP. It's not going to help us address our financing problems. We have found out that matching funds are likely to be part of the equation to leverage any of these dollars. As we talk about reaching capacity and needing to raise revenue to pay for debt service, we won't have capacity to probably make a match to leverage these dollars. One such example that has potentially been discussed is a potential for CAT to receive up to \$37 million. In order to leverage those funds, it will require a \$2 million match approximately. That is not in our current CIP. It also doesn't leave us a lot of room to be able to address these. As we think about the CIP, it is another thing to think about in terms of making decisions.

Next Slide – Planning Commission Discussion Items

When we met on the 23rd of November, these are the things that staff heard the Planning Commission throw out as ideas for potential reallocation or changes to the CIP.

Commissioner Dowell – The one question I had she answered. That was about the reduction in funds for the parking structure. It is important but not probably a high priority at this point.

Ms. Hammill – The message and the decision have been clear that there is probably not a parking structure in the future, which is why the funding was reduced. Final decisions in terms of what will be needed or required to deliver on our obligations to the County have also not been decided. The money that is being left in that account will give us the flexibility to let that agreement and those conversations happen. Should all of that money not be needed, they would go back to Council for Council to redistribute that money in the CIP.

Commissioner Habbab – On the slide where we looked at the expenses, in 2027, it had about \$4 million. I am looking at the projected numbers. It has \$2 million. I was wondering where that other \$2 million was coming from for 2027.

Ms. Hammill – What we have in there for 2027 for affordable housing is \$925,000 for CAHF, \$900,000 for supplemental rental assistance. Those two are funded level for 2023 through 2027. There is \$2.25 million for Phase IV Friendship Court. That gives us the total of \$4 million, 75 thousand.

Commissioner Habbab – With the pie chart, where would the CIP budget be in that?

Ms. Hammill – The CIP is budgeted from debt bonds. That comes out of the General Fund in the form of debt service payments. That's the piece of the pie sticking out. The other money comes from cash from the General Fund in the way of a transfer. That shows up in the infrastructure in transportation in the non-departmental piece of the pie. The total CIP budget doesn't show up here. The debt service is spread over 20 years. For 2027, we have \$19 million of bonds. We are just showing the annual debt service for that out of the General Fund. That is spread over the life of the project.

Commissioner Habbab – I was wondering about the debt capacity. There is the proposed sales tax increase. How would that impact the real estate tax increase that is also proposed? If the sales tax happens, does that mean the real estate tax doesn't happen? Is that still needed?

Ms. Hammill – That would be for Council to decide. What we do know is that the sales tax proposal, if that was to pass, it first has to pass the General Assembly. It would have to go to a referendum for city voters to approve. If both of those things happen, that is roughly a \$12 million revenue stream that would come in. It has to be used on school projects. We could use all of that money to pay for the school reconfiguration project; pay for it using that money over a short period of time or certainly to pay all of the debt service. We would probably not have to do a tax increase to pay that.

Commissioner Habbab – We find out in a month or so if it passes the General Assembly?

Ms. Hammill – I believe the General Assembly meets in January. We should get an indication at that point. If it passes there, it would go on a November ballot in the city.

Commissioner Habbab – I have a question about the school project. I am wondering if there were options to see what we could value engineer the numbers for that project.

Mike Goddard, Project Manager – There was always the opportunity to value engineer the project. We started out with a budget of around \$50 million. It was determined from the community design group that was probably not going to give us the project that would best meet the demands of the city. We did get approval from City Council to raise that budget to design towards that \$75 million budget. If there was a change in direction that could always happen if so directed by Council. We are in schematic design right now with a targeted budget of \$75 million.

Commissioner Habbab – With the parking structure, what is the leftover money in that account? I heard \$4.2 million including the 2023 allocation.

Ms. Hammill – \$1.3 million is currently in the proposed budget. That is pretty close to the amount of money that would be there for that. There have been no decisions because those conversations are still happening with the County. Is it too much or too little? It is hard to say right now. We're trying to leave ourselves some flexibility because we do have those contractual obligations.

Commissioner Russell – I was struck by a note in one of the slides that said reallocation is possible. That could mean revising the FY22 budget, which is a fascinating thought. Though we are looking at the FY23 budget, what we plan to spend in the future, we have also been looking at what the balances are on our FY22 budget. In a lot of those categories, there is a lot of money that has accrued over prior years. We have been trying to talk about it holistically, what is realistic, and what we could actually accomplish with those total funds available. Is that an exercise that has been done before, adjusting the prior year budgets or existing year budgets midyear?

Ms. Hammill – We wouldn't tackle it by budget year by year by year. What we do every year, right before a bond issue, is we send out an itemized project list to all of the project managers. They get a list of accounting all of their projects. What is the budget? What has been spent? We ask them to provide a status update in a couple of ways. What do you plan to spend between that time period and the end of the calendar year? We're asking that because we sell bonds based on cash needs. We're not going to sell the bonds until you have spent the money and we're reimbursing ourselves. We know you're going to spend it in a very short period of time. We ask for that information. We also ask them for a status update on the project. That information is used to size the bond. It is also shared with management and our budget team. Last year, went through an exercise where we provided the authorized but not issued bond list, which is how we came to a conclusion; that's how West Main got tabled. In addition through conversations and passing the proposed budget last year, that's how the parking garage funding became a discussion. Any of the funding for any of the projects that has been reallocated or is not moving or has stalled is something that we look at. It is not typically something we have done publicly. It is part of our process when planning the CIP and presenting a proposal for new funding.

Commissioner Russell – This question is around affordable housing and how much of our budget, which includes capital and operating, would we put under the category of our affordable housing (meeting the goals of our affordable housing plan). It states a funding level of \$10 million annually. We know that in the capital budget we are not hitting that mark. I am wondering if there is an operating side that we're not seeing. How do we get at that whole picture?

Ms. Hammill – An analysis has been done. I know that a list has been created. We are doing other affordable housing things. Things are on that list such as tax relief, the CHAP Program. There are items that are not only capital projects fund and general fund but in other funds as well that do hit that affordable housing mark. We do have reports on that.

Alex Ikefuna, Director of Community Solutions – In terms of the categories, the consultants are trying to compile a comprehensive inventory of the city's investment in the past 8 years. Hopefully by the time they are finished, we will take a look at what they have, review it, and eventually the Planning Commission and City Council will get the final report. Some of the programs such as tax abatement, human services, affordable housing program, or rental assistance are not included in the CIP.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I notice there is an unfunded item for revenue sharing grant matching funds that would have to be applied for in FY24. They would come through in FY29. I know in last year's responses there was some talk about a revenue sharing grant that was awarded that would be giving FY25. Are there opportunities to expand the amount of funds available for various projects on top of the amount that we have in the CIP now? I see there is a revenue item for revenue sharing for East High utilization. That ends in the current fiscal year. There is no other revenue sharing revenue items. Is that not reflected in the CIP?

Ms. Hammill – With revenue sharing, it is typically a 50-50 match. For every dollar that we are rewarded from VDOT, the city has to match that dollar for dollar. It comes down to priorities. Can we apply for those? Sure. If we are allocating dollars for that match, we're taking those dollars from something else. At this point, we do have on the books from previous CIPs other projects that are in the mix where there is revenue sharing. We have allocated dollars. There just aren't any new dollars reflected here for revenue sharing.

Jack Dawson, City Engineer – We asked for the revenue share in the General Fund to match future grants. When you look at them, some of them are like East High. Some of these are pretty old projects. We have changed how we do it over the years. That is a single source to match for that project. The general revenue share request was to be there so we could put matches up for multimodal improvements or fits the bill. With sidewalks, we had approximately \$650,000 at the time and we used \$500,000 of that as a match for revenue share. If we had a dedicated fund, we can use the sidewalk fund to do the sidewalks and fill in gaps from the priority list without tying it up with the state funding. We're happy to leverage what we have with state funding. It would be nice to have both of those options.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is the advantage of that is that it is quicker? We don't have to wait for the state funding to come in.

Mr. Dawson – For our multimodal grant that we got for sidewalks, we can't use that until FY23/24. We can't add any new sidewalks until that money comes in. We have to have a consultant design these things. When the money starts to come in, we start designing and prioritizing it. Our current revenue share grant is for a list of multimodal projects. The first thing we have to do is go through those, get updated estimates as we go from a concept in the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan to a real project. All of those estimates are going to change. We submitted around \$1.4 million worth of projects. That is probably like \$2.1 million worth of projects when we start going through that and developing that. There is a time impact. It essentially doubles our money. You never know how this is going to work out. VDOT did end up both delaying it and reducing their match. It essentially went from 500/500 to 395/605.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – When we put money into the regular sidewalk account for future fiscal years/next fiscal year, would we expect to tie those up in revenue sharing projects as well to get that extra grant?

Mr. Dawson – There is a lot of hypotheticals on this timescale. If we get funding for revenue share, it makes sense to me. This has been our very general policy that city leadership has supported to apply for revenue sharing and match those funds. That will probably be our intent without the dedicated revenue share; use the sidewalk funds to match those projects.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is it fair to say that because of that timeline of revenue sharing, we would expect to have that decent size balance sitting in there because those funds are committed? We won't get the match until later. If we don't continue to backfilling funds each year behind those, then we can't get our revenue sharing for the year after that? When we have these multiyear gaps in new sidewalk funding, we're looking at a pause in new sidewalks; falling behind on what our schedule would have been for sidewalk construction?

Mr. Dawson – Very generally, that's correct. This year's cycle is smart scale, which is 100 percent funding. That application process starts now. We're thinking about what projects we want to go for. Next year, we will not have any funds to match revenue share at this rate. We will have \$100,000, which is not going to get us very far.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Going back to the conversation of rearranging funds, if we're taking a bondable project, like sidewalks, would it make sense to do it instead of \$100,000 a year of each fiscal year, to frontload that so that we could do a revenue sharing request now. We're probably not issuing those bonds until later. At least we have them, 'in the bank' as authorized but not issued so we can apply for those matching funds?

Ms. Hammill – To simply answer your question, 'yes.' What we are faced with though is priorities. Keep in mind that there is not just a single sidewalk account. We also have other funds that are addressing other sidewalk issues such as ADA ramps, curb cuts, and those kinds of things. Simply, 'yes.' Ideally, we're not always in an ideal situation. We have to figure out how to best fund the immediate need.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – With the paving item, I recall from the responses, we target a paving condition index of 65. We're at 69. We're doing a little better than the target. Prior to COVID, we were at a million a year in projected funding for future years for paving. We now have \$1.5 million for this fiscal year, \$1.25 million in the draft, and \$1.5 million after that. I get that constructions costs have increased. What would be the impact of reducing that to \$1.4 million a year in the out years, which is a relatively minor reduction for that (6.5 percent)? It would be doubling the sidewalk budget if we reallocated it that way. Would that see us falling behind?

Ms. Hammill – Speaking specifically of what the impact would be, I can't answer that. Pre-COVID, in prior years, we were paving close to \$2 million a year. That has slowly been reduced for several reasons. One was primarily that there was a pause at one point to go back and look at sidewalks and curb cuts and to be more deliberate about getting those on the same schedule. If we were moving along, we were able to address the sidewalks and curb cuts before the paving or vice versa. There is also lots of coordination that happens with utilities. As they're doing work and paving is about to happen, we're not going back in and cutting new pavement. Could we cut it? Perhaps. What is the impact? I don't know.

Mr. Dawson – There is no Public Works Director right now. The paving was reduced. It is an operational thing as opposed to a project thing. There almost certainly would be impacts. I can't tell you what you could turn that dial down to that there wouldn't be impacts.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In terms of priority setting, I think there is a question of where we turn that dial and whether we're aiming to be slowly increasing our paving condition index, whether we're trying to stay even, or whether we're allowing ourselves a slight decline as long as we're above our target. To

me, it makes sense to prioritize that last one; to set that as our priority and roughly stay ‘treading water.’ Maybe allow ourselves a slight drop, given how large that budget item is and how much impact shifting would have percentage wise on increasing it on other items.

For affordable housing, I am looking at the Affordable Housing Plan, (pg. 49) which talks about the division of that \$10 million funding per year. It calls for \$2 million in tax relief, \$7 million in direct subsidy, and \$1 million in administrative funds. For tax and rent relief this year, we’re looking at \$1.82 million. In the draft fiscal year, there is \$7.3 million in the CIP, which puts us at \$9.1 million plus administrative. It seems to me that we’re at about the right target for this year. We stay at that through FY26. That’s where it drops, when we hit our bonding capacity. We can’t give any money to CRHA. Are we hoping that they will be done with redevelopment? Is that the plan? The question becomes: How do we keep capacity available given that is supposed to be \$10 million per year for 10 years? Given what is now in there, it is just Friendship Court and CRHA Redevelopment and no other projects beyond \$900,000 a year given to the CAHF, which is going to be split up? Does it make sense to be trying to pare back other programs enough that we can keep some amount of capacity going through FY27 or later? Maybe dialing back spending on everything in previous years rather than that hard cliff? Are we thinking that we would have cash funding potentially available in FY27 and later?

Ms. Hammill – Should we think about moving things around? That is more of a policy discussion for both the Commission and Council to mull over. Will we have cash? Bluntly, as currently proposed, when we’re talking about multiple cents of tax increase for one project (the school reconfiguration), you’re using up your ability largely to raise the revenue, which is for the tax increase. It doesn’t leave you a lot of room in future years. That would be one nice thing if we could offset with the sales tax. That would alleviate that problem. What we are currently looking at, that is the reality for both affordable housing and any other project. We’re putting all of our eggs in one basket that is before you.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Was there a concern from staff that having to use up our capacity could put us in a risky situation in case we needed to do some large project? Are there general reasons to keep that room available beyond just trying to keep things funded steadily in later years? Do we have a little room in this scenario?

Ms. Hammill – Currently, there is no room. What we’re showing you and what the projections show is that there is no room. We’re using the capacity. We’re buying down all of our debt service reserves. We’re talking about a tax increase. Our flexibility will be extremely limited. Is there a policy about how much you should keep back? I don’t know if that exists specifically. For anybody who follows government finance, from budget to budget, year to year, when we come to you with a CIP plan, the last two years have been extremely rare. The plan that was put before you the first year looks very similar to the plan being presented to you again. Typically, there are pretty big changes because big, new, exciting things come along. We try to address those in the current year. If you don’t have the flexibility to address those types of things, it is concerning. If that is our priority or Council’s priority, arguably we’re meeting the mark. It really is a value judgement.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – In this draft, we hit zero in the final year. It is years beyond that it is going to stay at zero? When do we see ourselves getting off of zero? When we do, is it going to be all at once that we get back to the amount per year we’re bonding now or are we still looking at reduced amounts for years after that?

Ms. Hammill – The numbers we presented are projections. Things change a lot. With some of the projections, there are a lot of variables in there; interest rates, assessments. There are a lot of assumptions that have been built in to the 10 cents we talked about, the bond capacity. As one of those numbers change, it all shifts. There is not a hard answer that I can give you. What I can say is that current projections are such that, in roughly 3 years, we would be exceeding 10 percent policy in one scenario. In one scenario, we were exceeding our target of 9. We will be burning up all of our reserves for debt service. What happens now is the way that we're able to manage the CIP, is we manage our projects and our bond issues to a level that we can afford. If we were not at our maximum capacity and a sidewalk project for \$2 million came up, we would evaluate that project and say that we can get it in the CIP this year because we can afford it under our current debt service. If you notice from our budgeting for debt service, a lot of times what is coming out of the General Fund is more of a level annual contribution. We're able to do that because we have debt service fund balance that can buy down some of those increases. Under the current scenario, using up all of that debt service reserves, we're also having to increase the General Fund transfer to be able to pay the new debt. We're adding on \$75 million all at once. It doesn't give us a lot of flexibility.

Commissioner Palmer – Can you recollect a time where we have had that zero debt capacity occurrence happen?

Ms. Hammill – Never in my time. I am working on my 22nd year. When we talk about debt capacity, there is a state allowed level, which is you can issue up to 10 percent of your assessed value, which is millions of dollars. There is our policy, which says that we're not going to issue more debt that would exceed a target of 9 or 10 percent debt service limit from our General Fund. We have never been at that capacity. Typically, our General Fund debt has ranged in the \$40 to \$50 million area. We knew that the CIP was ramping up. We're now closer to the \$80 million. Our oldest debt goes back to 2012. Our total outstanding debt is roughly \$80 million. When you look at that over a long period of time, you talk about one debt issuance of \$75 million, you doubled it in one swoop. That's why we're bumping up to this capacity issue.

Chairman Solla-Yates – We really don't talk about reserve in the Capital Improvement Plan. It does seem important. Could that be a possible thing that we could talk about in this conversation?

Ms. Hammill – Reserve typically means that we're setting aside money so we can draw down from that in an emergency situation. We do have a 'contingency account.' That is typically funded by policy. What happens is that every year at the end of the year, the Finance Director comes to Council, presents the year-end results, and anything that is 'surplus' goes to the CIP contingency. We do have dollars there that can be drawn down for these types of things. It is not a lot at this point. One thing that has happened and will be happening is that in 2021, due to COVID, we didn't fund any cash in the CIP. We deferred everything. We held that in the General Fund as a COVID reserve. We didn't need it. That will be coming to Council at the next Council meeting to vote. By policy, those dollars will be going to the CIP.

Councilor Snook – I am trying to understand as I look at the document on pages 70 to 74 in the packet. It is going account by account/expenditure summary. It is listed that there is a balance for the lump sum. For the lump sum to schools, there's a balance of \$3 million. We have been giving them \$1.2 million in this

lump sum to schools. I have never understood why we end up running a positive balance in some of those accounts, when I know that there are needs in those areas. Why are those amounts not being spent?

Ms. Hammill – The balance that is included there is truly a snapshot as of that moment. It does not take into account any projects that are perhaps planned or in the works or have been allocated and not have formally gone through a bid process to generate a PO or an expense. The projects that are being contemplated are large projects, which takes more than a year/two of funding to get to that total to pay those out. It does look like there are balances but they do have pretty detailed plans for how they are envisioned to be spent.

Councilor Snook – One example would be that we're suggesting another \$200,000 for this coming year and the 3 years beyond that for the SIA implementation. The balance in that account is over \$1 million. It has been over \$1 million for quite some time. Is there some issue there? Is there a reason we're not spending the \$1 million that we previously allocated?

Mr. Ikefuna – I think we have been spending some of that money for the Form Based Code that came from that. We have Pollacks Branch Pedestrian Bridge that is currently being finalized for construction. There are several projects within the SIA that consume that balance. There is an Elliott streetscape project, which is currently under design and about 95 percent complete. We have the Belmont Bridge, which is fully funded. There is always the tendency for some cost run-over or some kind of spillover financially. That could be a source of funding for that. There also is the PHA. Part of the Friendship Court project includes infrastructure improvement because they have to break up that neighborhood and integrate that into the city grid. CRHA does have massive development projects, which includes infrastructure. There are several ongoing projects right now that will consume that balance.

Councilor Snook – When I look at this. I literally see at least \$10/15 million worth of funds/fund balances for various projects to which we are allocating more of our money. We're allocating more money this year. With the SIA, we're allocating \$200,000 when there is already \$1.2 million in that account. Unfortunately, we don't know when there is a fund balance there that isn't likely to be spent. We don't know what the plan is. With small area plans, we're putting in another \$100,000. The balance for the project is \$496,000. Other than Cherry Avenue, I don't know what is coming next for that money. I wonder if we're scrounging around looking for money here or there to put towards a new sidewalk. We're putting another \$100,000 into Small Area Plans when we haven't been spending money out of that account already. We have 5 times that amount already in the account. I asked these same questions last year. I didn't feel I completely understood the reasoning as to why we end up putting more money into accounts and building up money in accounts like that. I keep looking at these things and seeing places where we're putting money apparently into accounts to not be spent until the next time around. As a general proposition, I look at sidewalks. It is the same issue. The balance for sidewalks is already \$500,000. That might be last year's allocation or this fiscal year's allocation. We also see other funds available for another \$1.4 million. I find myself looking at these accounts that we have been putting the money in on a regular basis and building up these balances. When we're scrounging to figure out we might put in another \$100,000 into building new sidewalks for this year, I find myself wondering why we keep putting money into accounts that aren't getting depleted.

Ms. Hammill – Those are good, legitimate questions. In 2021 and 2020, the direction was please pause the CIP expenses. We didn't know what the impacts were going to be. We need to maintain what we need

for operations, etc. Many projects were put on hold. In ramping those back up, it takes time once that pause was released. That is some of the balance issue. Are there areas where we could ask those questions and do that research and get that information for someone to decide that you maybe don't want to put more money in? Absolutely. That's part of that whole reallocation conversation; either from monies that was previously budgeted or monies that are currently budgeted and to look at those and ask those questions.

Councilor Snook – I have specific questions about specific funds like that. Maybe I can talk with you and have you explain to me why we're doing it. With The Small School Capital Improvements there is another \$200,000 going into it. The balance is \$3 million. That doesn't make much sense.

Mr. Goddard – I manage the Small School and Large School Capital Programs. There are some elements of what Ms. Hammill said that certainly play into it. Other things that effect our ability to spend down on those funds are large projects that come through. We often have large things that come through that are prioritized at the moment. The same people who are trying to spend those small capital dollars are the ones who manage the projects. We would not be happy to see those funds go away. Those expenditures are needed. All of those funds are programmed and planned 5 years into the future. We're happy to share those plans at any time. At the same time every year, our division asks for more FTEs to help with that workload. If we're never going to get those people and the large projects are going to keep coming, your question is a very legitimate one.

Councilor Snook – If we were giving \$200,000 a year to small capital improvements and there is \$3 million in the account, I have a hard time understanding why there is \$3 million worth of small capital improvements that haven't yet been done.

Last year, I noted that in the authorized but not issued account, there was \$1.7 million for school small capital projects from 2017 that had been authorized but not yet spent. I don't understand the scheme.

Councilor Payne – With what we're discussing tonight, is it accurate that it doesn't contemplate at all the costs that will be coming from permanent fire department staff members that were paid for by one time stimulus money from the federal government? Two recurring school expenditures were made with one time funding from the federal government? Our wage and compensation study, which would likely require wage increases across the entire city for employees? Any recurring expenditures the city itself made with one time stimulus money? Any deferred departmental requests, including things like full time staff members?

Ms. Hammill – Yes to all of those questions. This does not contemplate any of those things. All of the things that you mentioned are operating budget things. If you recall the piece of the pie and how it was divided, all of those things are competing with the debt service piece of the pie and the cash contribution that goes to capital projects fund. All of those things are competing factors because our sources of money are one pot. With how we choose to divide those up, the needs and the wants are plentiful. If we decide to direct more/tax increase to debt service, those dollars related to the tax increase aren't available to help offset other things in the operating budget.

Councilor Payne – Given that, do we have a sense of the total dollar amount of what those bills will be and when those bills will be coming due and what we will need to do in terms of our fiscal planning and priorities to make it so we can pay those bills?

Ms. Hammill – We know a couple of those things. With the FY22 budget, we do know that the schools funded \$4.5 million of their operating increase with one time federal money. The addition of the additional firefighters with the Safer Grant is either \$1.8/1.9 million that will be coming online in March, 2023. There will be three months of impact on that in the FY23 budget. The fourth rate will be coming online in FY24. In terms of the federal dollars that the city has allocated for ongoing expenses, the Finance Director is managing that. For the most part in allocating those dollars, we have been conscious about trying not to allocate those to necessarily ongoing expenses but to address immediate COVID needs than one time things. I am not going to say that there is an operational impact. It is largely small in comparison to the dollars we have spent.

Councilor Payne – When you factor in the schools, fire department, wage & compensation study, and deferred departmental requests, we're looking at a \$10+ million bill?

Ms. Hammill – We are early in the stages of the General Fund. We have received the budget. I don't have the tally for you on what the new departmental requests are. I do know for the comp study, from a prior year in, we allocated \$1.25 million that is in the CIP to help pay for the comp study and there were additional dollars to help address other related needs. To fund any kind of pay scale change, there are no dollars contemplated or included in that.

Councilor Payne – I definitely want to highlight how important some of those departmental requests are. We have deferred them for several years. They are intimately and directly connected toward the ability to execute our Climate Action Plan process, the Affordable Housing Plan, manage sidewalk and bike & pedestrian infrastructure projects.

ii. Public Hearing

Peter Krebs – I am speaking on behalf of the Piedmont Environmental Council. I have the honor of being part of the steering committee for the recently passed Comprehensive Plan. The Comp Plan is appealing because it balances density and improvements to make this livable and sustainable. That includes safe places to walk and bike. The Comp Plan mentions bike and walking over 150 times. There are more than 50 references to parks. The word 'tree' appears 130 times. The city will place an emphasis on enhancing networks from safe streets for walking, riding bicycles, and public transportation. The Plan cannot succeed without robust funding. The current CIP dramatically reduces funding for new sidewalks, bike lanes, and other infrastructure that makes this place livable. This was part of downward trend that began a few years ago. It got worse during the pandemic. At this point, the proposed funding is described as minimal. You need to allocate the full \$600,000 for sidewalks. Increase the Parks lump sum and direct to trails and canopy restoration. Have a pool of funding to match federal monies. A recent experience with the Stripling sidewalks showed that infrastructure is necessary and expensive. In 2022, I would like for you to work with the new Public Works Director. Hopefully, a new transportation planner will get underway a significant section of the priority list. The city's budget is the first real opportunity to decide whether we're serious about the Comprehensive Plan.

Matthew Gillikin – I am speaking on behalf of Livable Cville. The approval of the Comprehensive Plan was a historic moment for our city. It provides excellent guidance for prioritizing capital projects. The city's current proposed Capital Improvement Program is an improvement compared to previous years. We believe several changes will bring our budget in line with the priorities that the new Comprehensive Plan lays out. The first strategy of the Comprehensive Plan to address affordable housing is to dedicate \$10 million in average annual spending to fund affordable housing and programs. With transportation, the community statement of the Comprehensive Plan states that the city will expand transportation options for walking, biking, and transit. We are asking for several changes to the Capital Improvement Program. We strongly recommend funding the affordable housing fund with \$3 million a year. Increased funding will help local families maintain and secure affordable housing. Remove funding from the Courts parking agreement. It is economic and environmental malfeasance to spend \$4.3 million on additional parking. Increase the funding for new sidewalks, sidewalk repairs, safe routes to school, and citywide ADA improvements. Accessible and complete sidewalks are essential to making Charlottesville a safe and walkable city. Increase funding for bicycle infrastructure. The Comp Plan states the need to improve the bikeability of Charlottesville. Fully fund the Tree Commission request for self-improvement and tree planting. Recommend a new line item for improvements to bus stops.

Vikki Bravo – I am with IMPACT. In our community prior to the pandemic, 3780 families in our city were one paycheck away from homelessness because they pay more than half their income for housing. That is enough families to fill the Ridge Street and Belmont neighborhoods. Hard working people should be able to afford housing and have money for groceries and other necessities. We already have a proven solution: The Charlottesville Affordable Housing Fund. How do we know it works? Over 1100 affordable homes have been built, rehabbed, or preserved since 2007. Places like Carlton Views, The Crossings, and numerous Habitat for Humanity homes would not be here if not for the CAHF. There are upcoming affordable home projects at MACAA and Park Street Christian Church that will be counting on the city's support to make them possible. We call on City Council and Planning Commission to allocate \$3 million annually to the CAHF for the next 5 years. We call on City Council to find dedicated income streams to make that goal possible. The new land use map and affordable housing plan don't mean a thing if we can't fund our goals.

Josh Carp – We now have a Comp Plan. It is really good. We are now supposed to build a connected network of sidewalks, bike facilities, and trails to support increased walking, biking, and transit use. We are supposed to create safe walking and biking routes to every public school. We are supposed to consistently apply universal design features, including ADA standards citywide. I am having a hard time reading this budget and comparing it to the Comp Plan that you passed. The Plan calls for more sidewalks. We have gone from \$2 million for new sidewalks to \$300,000. That's a huge cut. Sidewalks have not gotten better in the last 2 or 3 years. There is a smaller and galling cut to bike infrastructure. The Plan requires safe routes to school. We're denying a pretty well-matched funding request to the Safe Routes Program. The Plan calls for increased ADA access. We're denying a request for that as well. There are a lot of cuts. There is still money for downtown parking, which we don't seem to need. There's increased funding for paving and milling. I did not see paving and milling in the Comp Plan. There is funding for the SIA implementation. I have no idea what that money is for. I don't think this budget fits with the Comp Plan you have worked on. If we're serious about the Plan, we will need to cut funding on car infrastructure and reallocate funds to walking, cycling, and transit. We should allocate funds that are in line with the Comp Plan.

Brad Slocum – I would like to speak about the current fiscal year allocation of approximately \$1.3 million for the contractual obligations to Albemarle County related to parking. I encourage the Commission to examine any and all ways to refine and reduce the budgeted amount and reallocate to unfunded items like the green infrastructure opportunities. Given the urgency of climate change, the Planning Commission and Albemarle County must work together to prioritize CIP allocations that reduce dependency on single driver and parking dependent modes of transportation. Funding for similar initiatives like Park and Ride, greener infrastructure, and more walkability would be visible improvements that residents and commuters could see improve their daily lives. I would like to congratulate CAT on their receipt of significant grant funding for zero fare service.

Chris Meyer – I want to thank councilors, commissioners, and city staff for the efforts that they have been making in regards to developing the CIP and improving this community. Going back a couple of years ago, school infrastructure funding was not prioritized, which left the city schools with a huge deficit in building modernization. While school modernization was not being prioritized, one local private school (STAB), between 2006 and 2019, raised \$90 million. When I compared the city's 2007 to 2020 CIP budgets for school related allocations, it was only able to allocate \$34.8 million to school investments. Ninety million raised by a private school versus thirty-five in the same time period by the city. There is plenty of money in this community to supporting education; just not always the public system. While I am happy to hear that we could have a sales tax increase to support school funding, it is still regressive when compared to our local property tax, which utilizes the Charlottesville Affordability Program to make it more progressive. Charlottesville's current tax rate is well below the 2019 state median for cities at \$1.09 per \$100 of value. Taxes do impact low income households. What happens if we don't raise taxes? The alternative is that low income people don't get the same opportunities as middle/high income people because the city can't provide basic services. Low income people only have the public school system as the option to where they send their children to schools. High income people can send their children to private schools. Opportunity is now equal. We need to carefully think about taxing, raising revenue. I encourage the Planning Commission and Council to strongly think about raising as much revenue as possible to fully fund all of the infrastructure.

Josh Krahn – I co-signed the letter from Livable Cville. I agree with what Josh Carp and Peter Krebbs said about walkable, bikeable, transit. There was a slide that had funding coming from the infrastructure (federal funding). There was a list item on there that said "improve healthy, sustainable transportation." That means sidewalks, protected bike lanes, and improved buses for Charlottesville. What kind of funding are we going to expect? What can we dream up to do with it? Staff mentioned that in past years, we have been spending around \$2 million a year on paving. Why aren't we also spending \$2 million on sidewalks? Why are pedestrians' 2nd class people? Why are bicyclists 2nd class? We're certainly spending more on car infrastructure. The city has made significant goals to reduce climate emissions in the near future. We can't do this without improving walkability. That starts with connected sidewalks on every street within the city limits. The Comprehensive Plan that was passed was a 'banger.' We now need to act on it.

Crystal Passmore – I concur with everything the previous commenter just said. I would like to advocate for money to be put towards biking and pedestrian infrastructure and to actually spend that money. I know that the money for sidewalks is woefully inadequate. I know that the city does not prioritize fixing our sidewalks. This is reflected currently in the CIP and the spending for sidewalks in previous years. I would like it if it was easier for myself and others to bike, instead of driving in the city. We need to put more money into getting people out of cars as opposed to spending money to keep people driving. We need to

make biking in this town easier and safer. We need to allocate money towards protected bike lanes and actually spend that money. We have a large line item for transportation. When we allocate that money, we don't need to give all of it to paving roads. We need to split that money across biking and sidewalks. These are modes of transportation, not just for recreation. Please find the money accumulated and allocate more money away from roads and towards other modes of transportation.

Katherine Slaughter – I know that you have many large projects and limited funds. I ask that you consider a small allocation to refurbish the Drewary J. Brown Memorial Bridge, which memorializes 37 local citizens who crossed racial and economic bridges to make Charlottesville a more equitable community. A city monument to local people, the bridge needs a few simple improvements to make it more visible and to properly commemorate its honorees. Five years ago, the Blue Ribbon Commission on race, memorials, and public spaces unanimously recommended that the city enhance its visibility and appearance of the bridge. My comments have also been endorsed by former colleagues on City Council. We request appropriate and visible signs announcing the bridge on its east and west ends. This signage should draw the attention of drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists. The city, through its consultants, has developed design plans to replace broken and missing plaques. These plans should move forward. Banners on the bridge light posts could feature images of the bridge builders, which would make this memorial more visible and get people to know something about these individuals. We ask that you ask staff to price out these items and put it in your CIP. At the time of refurbishment, a citizen's advisory group be established so we can celebrate these local people.

Gregory Weaver – I want to urge you to commit to reallocate the money for the parking garage towards projects to get cars off the road. Not only will doing so strengthen the strides we are making in the Comprehensive Plan, if done the right way, this reallocation can have a significant effect on our climate impact. Remember that Council committed to reducing our emissions by 45 percent by 2030 and becoming carbon neutral by 2050. These are fine goals. We should be thinking far more radically. 2050 should be the absolute latest we become carbon neutral. The projection that we won't have new bond funding a few years starting 2027 is alarming. We are on the planet's time. Climate change is not waiting for us. We need to have a long-term vision for the city that cuts our dependence on cars that we are willing to start acting on right now. We need to pour as much money that will mitigate our contribution to global warming. That means focusing on mass transit as well as pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. We need to transform the way we get around in the city. Let's reallocate this parking garage funds and think about reallocating other funds to projects that will get people on the bus, bikes, and new sidewalks. I would love for bus stops to be transformed to improve safety. Doing so is one of the fastest ways to make the largest potential impact on ridership. I am concerned that if we don't soon act on this, the Youngkin administration is going to cut more from mass transit initiatives.

Claire Denton-Spalding – My priority for speaking is to target the city's climate goals and to use the work that you are doing to target those goals, especially the emission goals for 2030. Given that we have one shot at funding some of these activities in the near term due to the decrease of funding in the bond issue. I encourage you to reevaluate some of these priorities. There are quite a few unfunded investments and infrastructure like biking and walking. There are opportunities to make positive change while we still have the money and flexibility. I would like to advocate for a few things that you mentioned. I wanted to support allocating funds towards CAT to get that match that you are mentioning. I would like to second the funding for the Park and Ride. This is an unfunded section with the \$3.6 million from the state and federal. I would like to support the idea of bicycle infrastructure. I can't be alone in finding the biking in

Charlottesville to be a terrifying experience. I would love to continue to support improving bike transportation. It would improve the experience of living in Charlottesville for many of its residents.

Peggy Van Yahres – I am speaking tonight as a representative from a new project that the Tree Commission just started. We call it RELEAF Cville. We are here tonight to support the Tree Commission CIP request. We support the \$100,000 for new tree planting, particularly how rapidly our tree canopy is declining. Since the rate of decline has doubled in the last 4 years, as compared to the prior 10 years, we can project that our tree canopy now in 2021 is under 40 percent. That is a bare minimum for a healthy city. We also support the \$105,000 for removal of ash trees. We know that one of the best ways to combat climate change is to protect our existing, large shade trees. If you don't fund this request, our tree preservation budget could be actually be cut in half. We believe that trees save lives. RELEAF's mission is to protect our low canopy neighborhoods health and wellbeing from the rising heat of climate change. We're going to plant trees, preserve trees, and educate kids and families about the importance of trees in nature. We're focusing on the Tenth and Page neighborhood, which has the lowest tree canopy in the city at about 18 percent. This is a dire situation. That is resulting in more heat and polluted related illnesses and higher energy costs. We know that the families in Tenth and Page pay more than 10 percent for their energy costs. The average across the city is 2 percent. We just gave a presentation to all of the 3rd and 4th graders at Venable talking about how important trees are. We want you to be our partners. We will plant and preserve trees on private property. If you fund the Tree Commission request, we will match that number on private property.

Brian Menard – I am the chair of the Tree Commission. I endorse what the previous speaker just said. I do want to stress four points. I like to think of these as loss in terms of tree canopy, the need to invest in green infrastructure, think of trees as important infrastructure, and also hazard liability. On loss, the accelerated decline is about 650 to 700 acres of canopy that have been lost in that period of time between 2018 and 2020. That is out 7,700 acres within the city boundary. It is an accelerating and unsustainable loss. One of the reasons for this is investment. We need to invest in planting trees. We have a goal to plant 200 trees a year. We have not been doing that. We have been losing ground because we have to replace trees during the year. In the last fiscal year, we planted 23 trees total. The \$75,000 we have currently will allow us to plant about 160 trees. Although, we won't know that until we get the final quotes in because of the inflationary costs of trees and contracting services. If we stay at \$75,000 for the next fiscal year in the CIP, we're looking at planting significantly less. We need to invest in green infrastructure. It is important to public health, sustainability for stormwater management, as well as for environmental justice and equity.

Robin Hanes – I am with the Charlottesville Area Tree Stewards. I want to echo the previous commenters. We're so concerned that the city hasn't been able to give what is needed for the planting of city trees. There is so much construction/density you are planning on. The trees are needed for stormwater issues, clean air, and many reasons. It keeps being cut and cut. The quality of life in the city is going to tumble. I really ask you to hear us.

iii. Commission Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Dowell – One of the questions that I heard from my fellow commissioners and city residents is about the unused funds for the parking deck. I would be curious to see the commissioner thoughts on moving funds from that line item and allocating it somewhere else. We already have plenty of

parking downtown that is not being used to its fullest capacity. We definitely need to update our sidewalks and infrastructure. One of the projects that I am thinking about is the one that we just passed. It is great for affordable housing. All of the key components are in the project. We can't get the project done without doing sidewalk construction.

Commissioner Habbab – I fully agree. There is \$4 million, \$1.3 million that we're allocating in 2023. The rest is in a bucket of money to be used for this. That money could fully fund the trees request and bike/pedestrian unfunded request and the sidewalk request. We would have money left in the bucket to fund our affordable housing gap that we have. I completely agree with doing that. Things come up with the CIP all the time. Projects come up that we fund as the need arises. Why are we saving all of this money when it could go to good use now and provide housing and trees? If we need to spend \$100,000/\$200,000 to satisfy the county agreement, we can do that when it happens.

Commissioner Russell – I generally agree. It might be prudent to leave some amount dedicated towards that out of good will towards the county. Where we're going is how much we can squeeze out of that parking structure and try to distribute it among other projects.

Commissioner Dowell – We have a commitment with the county. I definitely want to make sure that we're upholding our commitment. I'm just not sure that we need that much money allocated to do so.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I definitely agree. My understanding is that since we opted to not build the garage, the county gets to choose whether they want the 63 space surface parking lot next to the S&P Building or spaces in the Market Street Garage. If I am understanding staff correctly, they want to keep the money in there and add this extra money to fulfill the cost associated with those. With the surface option, we repave the lot and add gates that is probably the more expensive option. If it's the garage, we add a bunch of signs that say Courts Parking Only and need a validation system for people going to the courts. It seems to me that either of these cases cost a lot less than \$4.3 million based on what little I know about what gates cost. I don't know how much that is. I am hearing that the county is going to make a decision soon. We will know which option it is going to be. It will be easy to price out. From our perspective, it makes sense to minimize the amount that we spend on that to the amount needed to meet the obligation to the county, maybe without putting a number on it since we don't know. We know that frees up a few million for all of these other priorities.

Commissioner Dowell – That makes sense.

For Ms. Hammill, what was the option that we could possibly fully fund the school reconstruction without having to raise property taxes?

Ms. Hammill – That was the sales tax option. It has to first be approved by the General Assembly. It then has to go on the ballot as a referendum to be approved by the voters in the city.

Commissioner Dowell – If we can possibly find a way to not cost burden our citizens in this budget so much on the school reconfiguration that will also be part of my preference. Staff has clarified that we will have to wait on that.

Commissioner Habbab – I completely agree with everything that Commissioner Dowell said. I want to bring up Stribling. We tied the development to a sidewalk that we now need to get funded. It cannot happen without the sidewalk. If we look at the Comp Plan we just passed, we call for pedestrian access even though the sidewalk is not at the top of the priorities. Essentially, we're getting it for free. It is about a half mile of sidewalk. I don't see why we can't request that to be funded, to move up the spreadsheet without any significant implications.

Commissioner Dowell – I didn't name the project. That was the project I was referring to. That project hits so many of the Comprehensive Plan goals: affordable housing, access/walkability. It is not safe. I would hate to have to encroach new people in that area without already protecting the residents that already live there. If we could figure out a way to move that up on our priorities. That would be essential.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Since it doesn't impact our fund capacity and the revenue is not going to be there if we don't build the project. It is a win-win total improvement with essentially no direct cost to us, which is a no-brainer. The thing that I would add is that not only does it pay for the sidewalk, in the draft agreement, Economic Development is anticipating (depending on the development schedule) that the sidewalk would be paid off in about 6/7 years. After that, we're getting that \$600,000+ a year in revenue without any strings attached. Very conveniently, seven or so years from now is exactly when we very badly need cash because we have no bonding capacity left. To me, the fiscal implications are pretty clear.

Commissioner Habbab – I have a concern about hitting our bond capacity. Looking at 2027, it goes completely against our Comprehensive Plan. Having \$0 for sidewalks, trees, and almost anything, less than half the housing promise of \$10 million. It almost seems like we can't afford it. I want to raise that. I am not sure what the motion would be. It seems concerning. If that does pass, we have to go back and look at our CIP budget. We would have to determine what things are CIP and what things are not CIP. We will be running on that 3 percent going in to fund projects. We don't want it to get diluted with other projects that aren't CIP specific.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Schools are a tough one. The amount of that project (school reconfiguration) is the entirety of the five year 2017 budget. It is this 'elephant in the room.' It does seem like Council and the School Board have approved the project without consulting us. It is a little out of our wheelhouse. It certainly constrains us a lot. I don't know that I am comfortable expressing an opinion either way. I really hope that if we go through with it that the sales tax comes through and frees us from this burden.

Commissioner Lahendro – I agree. I don't feel qualified to even have the discussion because I don't know the issues involved with the educational reorganization. I just look at the broad picture and see the imbalance between all of the funds going in one place and disregarding the rest of the city's needs at the same time. I am just trusting that someone has a game plan and has figured this out in the back. We will all find out about it and we will all be OK. I was interested in Ms. Hammill's presentation. The first of the four keys to an excellent bond rating is the economy and the demographics. That means keeping the people wanting to live in this city. When you start sacrificing infrastructure, trees, utilities, sidewalks, and parks, you start sacrificing that for one overwhelming need, it seems to me that it becomes a less desirable place to live. You start jeopardizing that first key point.

Commissioner Habbab – I am not against the project. I am not comfortable with the bond capacity situation. Hopefully, there is a better solution.

Commissioner Lahendro – My main focus is restoring the delta between what the Tree Commission requested and what is in the current CIP; about \$80,000. I feel like there is room in any number of places for providing that small bit of change compared to the other larger expenditures that the city is committing itself to; even if it is to get rid of the small area plan budget for one year. We have more important needs. We have greater needs.

Commissioner Russell – I want to bring something new up. Ms. Hammill, you alluded to this exercise in which you can go back and really push on project managers to give a project update on their projects and the status of what is left to spend. Councilor Snook brought this up as well. Are we overfunded in these categories? That exercise would be useful. I don't know, from a motion standpoint, if it is something that we have to have a motion to do and go back and be really judicious about FY22 and what is still in the balance. I wanted to bring up the topic of the small amount to remain in the West Main Streetscape around the Drewary Brown Bridge, the bridge builders, and Kay Slaughter's plea to keep some money for that initiative. I don't know if we have a number in mind or if that number could be available. That would be a worthy initiative.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – On the bridge builders' bridge, would that potentially be an operating item that wouldn't go in the CIP? I know that Parks and Recreation puts up all of those banners on the Mall five times a year. I wonder if there is another route that we could explore with that. It does seem like a worthy thing in itself. In terms of things I would like to explore but not necessarily act on, there was talk of Park and Ride. I got the sense that it is still in the early stage of planning on that. I wonder if that is more the county's 'wheelhouse' than ours, given that a Park and Ride in the county for commuters to the city would be serving county residents. With bus stop funding, I would like to understand whether it makes sense that we should be funding that ourselves or whether that is the sort of thing where you would be getting grant funding from the federal or state government to do that. It certainly seems like a worthwhile thing to do that. I don't that we do that much right now.

I have some suggestions. I think everyone's suggestions to fund have been good. I also have some suggestions for things to defund. The parking structure is authorized but not issued; minimize that amount. We had a discussion earlier about milling and paving. I would specifically say that we want to target or collaborate our spending on that in a way we're not going under our long term target of 65 per our index and we're not defunding it so much that we're increasing that amount. Whether that means a small reduction of something like a \$100,000 a year on that \$1.5 million or alternating years going down \$1.25 million like we're doing this fiscal year. I don't have an exact suggestion. I would like that general sentiment to be something that we say if others are agreeable to that. With things with big balances, it seems that there are few different buckets those fall into. We have a pretty compelling argument for sidewalks to have that big balance. It lets us get those state matching funds that multiply our money but require tying it up for a couple of years. If our revenue sharing kicks in next year or year after that, we're going to spend all of that. We're going to have nothing in the pot. We're not going to have any revenue sharing applications that we applied for from several years ago that would trigger in the following two years. We very much need to refund sidewalks at the amount that we saw before COVID, the FY21 budget (\$300,000), or ideally at the full \$600,000; potentially frontload that money. Instead of using up a little bit, we're to get it done all at once, get those applications in the pipeline for matching funds. Other

things with big balances that don't make as much sense to continue building up include the Economic Development Initiatives Fund. It has over \$1.5 million in it. There has been very little spent out of it in a given year. I am not clear on what has been spent out of it before. They seem disjointed, not necessarily economic development. It seems like a pot of money to draw from. I don't know if that is a great way of planning. I am not suggesting that we withdraw the \$1.5 million that is in it now. Maybe we should stop funding it at \$150,000 per year until it starts to draw down. To the point about this 'giant elephant' taking up all of our capacity, we need to be treating the next few years/four years in a little bit of similar austerity mode as we treated the last fiscal year where we put a big stop to things that weren't absolutely critical or super important. That is what removing funds from items like that come into play. I would add to that the small area plan fund. It has about \$500,000 in it. I believe small area plans cost about \$500,000, judging what the Cherry Avenue one cost. Let's maybe put a pause on that; at least until we do one of those. I would imagine we would be doing one of those at a time. I also feel that we have done a couple small area plans. Several of them are 'sitting on a shelf' not doing much, like the Hydraulic Small Area Plan. Others like the SIA Plan, we are devoting a lot of resources into implementing them; millions of dollars through the strategic core directly, which is the centerpiece of the plan in reintegrating that into the street grid, the parks. Separately, we have this SIA implementation fund, which has a lot of money in it. There are certainly some good projects like Pollocks Branch, Elliott Streetscape. It is similar to the Economic Development pot. It is a 'grab bag.' It seems to me that the Pollocks Branch Bridge or Elliott Streetscape should be line items in themselves. Continuing to fill up this bucket to draw from makes less sense than that. I would say to take a look at what we have planned for that. If that is the \$2 million in there, maybe put a pause on that. Use the recommendations in the Small Area Plan to help guide our decisions in using other pots of funds. If we have a really big item come up, put that in as a top level CIP item.

To recap, I would pull from the parking structure. With milling and paving, recalibrate and turn down the dial a little bit. Put a stop/pause until we have bonding capacity for Economic Development Strategic Initiatives. Stop small area plans for several years until the next one is finished and a pause on SIA implementation.

Commissioner Palmer – I can't say that I have too much advice to give. What the commissioners have outlined seems to make a lot of sense, especially with the school projects gobbling up a lot of debt capacity in the future years.

Chairman Solla-Yates – Every year, I keep saying that this is the hardest CIP I have ever done. We do a harder one. Thank you to the staff and other commissioners who have done so much hard work in grasping this and figuring out where we go with it.

Councilor Hill – Given where we are, it is important to see where some of the small wins are. I encouraged to hear so much consistency around some of the bike/pedestrian infrastructure and tree infrastructure. With small area plans and given what was just raised, the Grady, Preston, and Tenth intersection area (related to one of the VDOT projects for smart-scale funding) was identified at that time as something we would want to have more planning around. There was a lot of resistance that there wasn't a lot of community engagement when that proposed plan was coming to fruition. When I hear the phrase small area plans, that's one of the priorities that comes to my mind. I feel like there was some kind of commitment to the community that we would follow through on before that intersection was done. With the schools, I hear where people are coming from. This is certainly a huge commitment. At the same time and having sat through so many meetings, I understand how long putting in the real investment for

our school system has been in the making. Investing in our school infrastructure doesn't solve all of the issues. When we think how long it has been since we made this type of investment in our school infrastructure, it has been a tremendously long time. I encourage all of us to push forward. I believe that this sales tax allowance is really our only path forward. To forgo so many of these other things is going to be a challenging uphill for many years to come. I am committed to continuing that work. I am optimistic that we will get there. I am just concerned that we may not get there this next year. I am not ruling it out. I do think that is going to have to be part of this equation as we move forward. I appreciate the consideration of the small wins that we can have and the recognition that we do have the commitment with the county that does keep some of this money in limbo. If that money frees up, identifying where some realistic things that we can do. I am surprised that some of those projects haven't specifically been raised. They do come with money associated with them for those LI HTC applications.

Councilor Snook – Ms. Hammill, could you explain what the practical effect is of money being on the authorized but not issued list? If we were to say 'let's go ahead and do it,' what effect does that have on any of the other equations that we have to balance in our finances?

Ms. Hammill – The money on the authorized but not issued list is just a number. It does not represent actual dollars until we sell the bonds. In calculating what our total capacity is, it was roughly \$185 million. The authorized but not issued becomes a subtraction out of that as those were prior commitments that we made. Those were dollars that had been appropriated to projects. There is a budget sitting on the books for someone to spend. As they spend those, we need to sell the bonds to recoup those dollars. If they are not spent, we can remove those from the authorized but not issued list, remove the budget for the project, and that becomes additional capacity you could allocate somewhere else.

Councilor Snook – If we have \$2.9 million roughly on the authorized but not issued list, for the parking garage. If we assume that we're not, in fact, building the parking garage, I am curious what the effect of having that \$2.9 million out there really is. If we say that we're not going to spend it, it doesn't sound as though it frees up \$2.9 million for us.

Ms. Hammill – It frees up \$2.9 million of capacity. It depends on what you replace it with. If we wanted to put that into a housing project that did not qualify for bonds, you're right. It doesn't help you. Freeing those dollars up frees up bond capacity. That means the expenses on the other side have to be bondable.

Councilor Snook – I am just trying to understand all of the different limits that we have. The ABNI list is one of those things that I have never quite figured out what we're supposed to do with that information.

Ms. Hammill – We have often talked about bond capacity as our 'limit on the credit card.' The way you could equate the bonds authorized but not issued list is that 'they're in the pin' category. You have actually spent those dollars and it is not going to come as a bill to you yet. They're waiting out there for the project to actually happen and for that switch to turn on in which you're going to owe that bill. When we are setting a budget in the CIP, we say "how are we going to pay for it?" As you see from the CIP, we have revenues that match expenditures. What that means is that once the budget is approved, that expenditure budget hits our books and is available to be allocated. We follow up on the backend to either make sure we are fine with the cash or the bonds. The budget is sitting there. The bonds are authorized but not issued are sitting there. If we're not going to spend the money, these bonds are freed up to allocate somewhere else. It is essentially just a reallocation of your credit spending limit.

Councilor Snook – Nothing on the ABNI list is in this CIP

Ms. Hammill – It is not in this CIP because what you're looking at is going forward. The authorized but not issued represents projects that you have approved in prior years for projects that are on the books either in the works or haven't started. If you looked at the authorized but not issued list, almost every project that was approved in FY22 is going to be at the bottom of that list. The reason for that is because we're about a year behind. By the time the CIP is approved, the project has to come to fruition, we have to start spending money, and then we're going to sell the bonds. There is a time delay. Looking at that, it is a big deal to try to find money that you can take off that list. They are associated with real projects. Rather than trying to look at the list in isolation, it really does come back to a conversation about individual projects and which projects we want to move forward.

Councilor Snook – To use the \$2.9 million on the ABNI list (the parking garage), if we take that off the ABNI list, we completely defund that. It doesn't change anything on this spreadsheet.

Ms. Hammill – The only thing it could change is that the \$2.9 million could go into the revenue side. It would give you the opportunity to add \$2.9 million on the expenditure side. What that does is that it doesn't leave you any ability to address our contractual obligations. \$2.8 million is what we have on the books right now for the parking obligation with the county.

Councilor Payne – I think Commissioner Lahendro said that he hoped there was someone somewhere who had a plan and had it all figured out how to reckon with the fact that, as presented, the CIP (even with a 10 cent tax increase) will both max out our current capacity and, in a few years, cause our funding for affordable housing, sidewalks, climate planning, etc. to fall off a cliff. I just want to be clear that no such plan or solution does exist. I would just want to underline that is one of the central challenges facing us over the next few years, to figure out how we're going to prioritize given the realities of where our budget is. I would echo what Councilor Hill said. One of the solutions is definitely the sales tax increase and what we can do to try to encourage that to happen in the General Assembly and those coalition partners to make that happen.

Commissioner Russell – There was something about affordable housing that I wanted to bring up. What we're talking about doing is (if that reallocation works) to reduce the parking deck budget to the maximum amount possible and to reallocate to several buckets. I heard trees, sidewalks, bike infrastructure, and affordable housing. It doesn't cover all of it; to the maximum degree possible. If we were able to bump up the affordable housing number, would some of these gap fundings that are unfunded be able to apply for some of those funds if there was a bigger bucket of money in the affordable housing pool? On the unfunded list, the PHA gap funding for two projects that we're reviewing tonight and we have proposed to not add those back in. If we increased our affordable housing commitments/dollars next year and in future years, could that be the route by which projects like that go?

Ms. Hammill – In theory, you're thinking in the right direction. The problem with the affordable housing piece is that not all of those expenses are bondable for technical IRS reasons. The funding that was contemplated for the parking garage because it was to build a parking deck, it was 100 percent bond financing. Something like the PHA project, CAHF, Supplemental Rental Assistance do not qualify for bond funding. It is not a one for one tradeoff in that instance.

Commissioner Russell – Maybe there is a way to look through and do that accounting. If we reduce what is bondable and reduce from what is not bondable, where does it shake out?

Ms. Hammill – I am thankful that the conversation has gotten to this level. One thing that might make it easier for you is to simply evaluate the projects on the merit of the projects or the funding on the basis of where you might want that to go and pass that along as your recommendation. We can work through those other details. Limiting you to think about what is bondable, what is cash gets away from the point of the importance of the project, how it applies to the Comp Plan. The funding limitations are a secondary piece. I would just offer to not let that limit you. Make your suggestions based on the project.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Many people have asked us to add \$2/3 million more to the CAHF. I am looking at the Affordable Housing Plan. Its recommendations are pretty clear: \$10 million a year, \$2 million in tax relief \$1 million in administration. It is really \$7 million in direct subsidy. With the \$7 million, you take out the \$3 million for CRHA, that's \$4 million. You take off \$900,000 for the voucher program. We're down to a little over \$3 million. We try to put almost a million into the CAHF. When you look at the \$2/3 million remaining funds after those things, it gets to the fact that we already committed those funds with Friendship Court (between \$2.5 million and \$3.5 million) every single fiscal year through the end of this CIP. That essentially leaves no room to add anything to the CAHF unless we go above that \$10 million a year commitment beyond what the Affordable Housing Plan recommended. There is a question of: Was the \$10 million a year that we committed to not enough? In which case, where is that extra few million coming from? If we are meeting it, we seem to be meeting it for every year at least through FY26 in this plan; whether we're doing as much as we possibly can with the money. The Affordable Housing Plan makes some recommendations of essentially forming a new committee to competitively analyze and score requests in order to get the absolute most housing for our dollar. It seems to me that (at least for the next 4 to 5 years), unless we were to move money around, they're just playing with that \$900,000 in the CAHF and not the bulk of the funds, which was at least \$7 million a year in direct subsidy. Does that undermine the Affordable Housing Plan that we adopted? On the flipside, we have made the commitment to redevelop Friendship Court. We have a 4th Phase plan that was created by a resident led planning team. I am certainly not saying that we should just abandon that. When it is running at the cost of \$400,000 a unit or more, there is always infrastructure costs. We also have this other SIA pot of infrastructure costs that we might be using for overruns on top of that amount. It puts in a really tricky position where things like the 2 projects we will be reviewing later tonight are completely 'crowded out of the room.' I don't have an easy answer to what to do about that. It is worth pointing out that Phase 4 of Friendship Court is much hazier and doesn't have a concrete plan. That is after all, how existing residents have been rehoused. Maybe that is the point where we start shifting funds into the CAHF so that things from there are funded competitively. Even that keeps us locked into the situation through FY25. I know that staff has mentioned HR&A is working on that report of how we have spent our CAHF funds so far. I am eagerly looking forward to it. It's going to tell us a lot. The question becomes: How will we act on whatever it says if we have already locked ourselves into a path anyway? I don't have any easy answers. Throwing millions of dollars at the problem each year would make it easier. It is not clear to me that is in the cards. Those millions of dollars don't exist. I don't know where that puts us.

Motion – Commissioner Russell – Revise the Parking Structure budget for prior years and both FY22 and FY23 to the minimum amount necessary to meet our current contract obligations with Albemarle County. Second by Commissioner Dowell. Motion passes 6-0.

Motion – Commissioner Russell – Fully fund the requests for hazardous tree removal, tree planting, new sidewalks, and bicycle infrastructure. Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg. Motion passes 6-0.

Motion – Commissioner Russell – Reduce future projected budgets including FY23 in Economic Development Strategic Initiatives, Small Area Plans, and SIA Implementation. Second by Commissioner Stolzenberg. Motion passes 5-1.

Motion – Commissioner Russell – Fully fund the Stribling Avenue sidewalk project for all phases at the full amount requested. Second by Commissioner Habbab. Motion passes 6-0.

Motion – Commissioner Lahendro – Recommend that the city provide funds needed for appropriate commemoration of the Drewary B. Brown Bridge. Motion passes 5-1.

Motion – Commissioner Dowell – Reallocate any surplus funding to any unfunded affordable housing projects. Second by Commissioner Lahendro. Motion passes 5-1.

Motion – Commissioner Stolzenberg – Minimize Milling and Paving line item money to a level that keeps us moving towards our target of a pavement condition index of 65. Second by Commissioner Habbab. Motion passes 6-0.

Motion – Commissioner Dowell – Approve the CIP as proposed with the amendments that we have already moved and seconded. Second by Commissioner Russell. Motion passes 6-0.

Meeting was recessed for five minutes.

2. ZM21-00004 – Park Street Christian Church PUD - Piedmont Housing Alliance, in partnership with landowner Park Street Christian Church, have submitted an application seeking a rezoning of approximately seven (7) acres of land, including one lot identified within City tax records as 1200 Park Street, Tax Map and Parcel 470002120 (the “Subject Property”). The Subject Property has frontage on Park Street and Cutler Lane and is accessible by driveway off Cutler Lane. The application proposes to change the zoning district classification of the Subject Property from R-1 (Low Density Residential) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) subject to certain proffered development conditions (“Proffers”) and an approved PUD Development Plan. The Proffers include: (1) All residential units constructed on the site shall be Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs) accessible to residents with not more than 80% of the area median income with affordability provisions guaranteed through 30+ year deed restrictions; (2) the applicant shall remove vegetation to improve sight distances onto Cutler Lane; (3) the applicant shall dedicate pedestrian easements upon request of the City to provide access from the Subject Property to Park Street and the Rivanna Trail; and (4) the owner shall provide an ADA compliant pedestrian crossing at the corner of Park Street and Cutler Lane. The rezoning would create a PUD referred to as “Park Street Christian Church PUD” containing up to fifty (50) apartment units within two multifamily buildings at an approximate density of 7 dwelling units per acre (DUA), to be located northwest of the existing church and preschool buildings on the Subject Property. The new Comprehensive Land Use Map for this area calls for Higher-Intensity Residential (13+ units per lot) in this area. The PUD Development Plan proposes a development with the following unique

characteristics and amenities: preservation of the existing church and childcare uses, limitation of residential uses to affordable housing for the elderly, pedestrian and trail connections to existing infrastructure, and a private access driveway with off-street parking. The Subject Property's current R-1 zoning does not allow multifamily developments. The PUD Development Plan calls for disturbance of land within Critical Slopes area; this application also presents a request for a Critical Slopes Waiver per City Code Sec. 34-516(c). Information pertaining to this application may be viewed online at <https://www.charlottesville.gov/1077/Agendas-Minutes> Persons interested in this Rezoning may contact NDS Planner Dannan O'Connell by e-mail (oconnelld@charlottesville.gov) or by telephone (434-970-3991).

i. Staff Report

Dannan O'Connell, City Planner – This is a rezoning request and critical slope waiver request. Piedmont Housing Alliance, in partnership with Park Street Christian Church, has submitted an application pursuant to City Code 34-490 seeking a zoning map amendment to change the zoning district classifications of the above parcel of land. The application proposes to change the zoning classification of the Subject Property from "R-1" (Single Family Residential) to "PUD" (Planned Unit Development) subject to a development plan and proffered development conditions. The property is currently developed with a religious use, which is Park Street Christian Church and an associated preschool permitted by a Special Use Permit. The proposed PUD development plan calls for 50 multifamily units and 54 parking spaces to be constructed to the rear of the existing church site, access to be a new private driveway off of Cutler Lane. The rezoning proposal contains the following proffered conditions:

- All residential units constructed on the site shall be Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs) accessible to residents with not more than 80% of the area median income with affordability provisions guaranteed through 30+ year deed restrictions.
- The applicant shall remove vegetation to improve sight distances onto Cutler Lane for vehicles to turn onto Cutler Lane and install a Right Only direction curb island to permit right only out of the subject property.
- The applicant shall dedicate pedestrian easements upon request of the City to provide access from the Subject Property to Park Street and the Rivanna Trail.
- The owner shall provide an ADA compliant pedestrian crossing at the corner of Park Street and Cutler Lane.

The proposed use matrix for the proposed rezoning adds multifamily units, surface parking lots, daycare facilities, and outdoor parks, playgrounds, ball fields, and swimming pools on private property as by right or ancillary uses to those currently allowed under R-1 zoning. Accessory apartments, radio antennas, homestays, family day homes, private clubs, educational facilities, and city owned clubs or parks would be disallowed as per the use matrix as by right uses for this property. The recently adopted 2021 Future Land Use Map designates this property as higher intensity residential, which is described as multifamily unit housing, with 13 or more units per lot, along with limited ground floor commercial uses with building form and height determined by historic and neighborhood context. Affordability and increased density in this district are emphasized in need of affordable housing plan goals. The existing church contains no residential dwelling units. If the rezoning is approved, the overall density for the site would be around 7 dwelling units per acre. The proposed buildings vary in height but do not exceed the 5 story limit of higher intensity residential specified in the Land Use Map. The rezoning application for the subject property was accompanied by a sidewalk waiver for the property's frontage on Park Street. The sidewalk on Park Street currently extends for about 180 feet past the intersection of Cutler Lane. The remaining

eastern shoulder of Park Street down to the intersection with Melbourne Road lacks curb and sidewalk, although no sidewalk is present on the western shoulder of the road. Upon discussion with city staff, the applicant elected to postpone consideration of this sidewalk waiver until after the rezoning is approved. Although the proposed development plan does not currently show a sidewalk, a sidewalk would be required as part of the site plan review process unless this waiver is granted by City Council at a later date. City staff strongly feel a sidewalk would be desired for this property, as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies Park Street as an important local corridor. An additional sidewalk along Park Street would complement future improvements and improved connectivity between the church and the nearest bus stop, which is CAT Route 11 located around 400 feet north of the intersection of Park Street and Cutler Lane. Staff finds the proposed development as presented in the application materials to contribute to many of the goals in the Comprehensive Plan. The uses in the proposed development are consistent with the Future Land Use Map. As presented in the applications, staff finds the PUD to be desirable. As to preserving tree cover and increasing housing diversity and affordability, staff does have concerns about sidewalk construction and the granting of a sidewalk waiver for this site but otherwise recommends approval of this rezoning with the included proffers. The proposed improvements associated with the rezoning will impact critical slopes on site as defined by Section 34-1120b2. That is our critical slope ordinance. Per that, a request for a critical slope waiver must be heard simultaneously with the PUD rezoning request by the Planning Commission. Improvements specific to areas or critical slopes that would be impacted include portions of the north-most multifamily building, graded areas surrounding the northern portion of the building, electrical telecommunications, and storm sewer placement. Existing critical slopes located on this property include about 2.8 acres or around 38 percent of the site. The applicant proposes to disturb 0.1 acres. The applicant indicates that impacts to storm water runoff and erosion would be mitigated by underground storage facilities, level spreaders, and other measures to be determined during site plan design. However, alternative site layouts could reduce impact to critical slope areas by reducing the number of residential buildings. Based on the submitted materials, the city engineering staff could not recommend approval under either finding 1 or finding 2 as described in the critical slopes ordinance. The plan, as presented, was not developed enough to provide specific conditions about providing erosion and sediment control methods and sequencing. However, several recommended conditions are included if the Planning Commission decides to approve the project, which have been selected for this applicability, absent a more developed erosion and sediment control and grading plan.

Commissioner Habbab – Regarding this project and the following MACAA project, I am employed by BRW Architects. As a result of the annual salary that I receive from BRW Architects, I am required to disqualify myself from participating in the transactions under consideration by the Planning Commission. If anybody would like to review the detailed disclosure statement of the reasons for my disqualification, I have filed the statement with the Secretary of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Habbab left the meeting after reading the above statement.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – With The Right Turn Only out, is that warranted/needed for traffic impact reasons? Or is that just a preference? If so, why?

Mr. O’Connell – I am not sure if it was specifically needed for traffic concerns. I know the initial presentation of this did not include that. I believe it was included after their public meeting based on the comments from the neighborhood.

ii. Applicant Presentation

Kurt Keesecker, Applicant – Our partner in this endeavor is Park Street Christian Church. This project started with their broad view of our greater community in Charlottesville. That view was created by a small neighborhood church on a very large parcel. The church recognized that they had an opportunity to serve a need that was presented in the community with their land. We, PHA, and Timmons have been engaged and enjoyed working through the different aspects of this design with them, the neighbors, and you guys.

Next Slide

The location is north of Downtown and 250 and interestingly adjacent to the Rivanna Trail Foundation and Meadowcreek on the north that puts this site in a unique position to take advantage of some of the natural areas close to this unique in-town location.

Next Slide

On the edge of the Locust Grove neighborhood, this church has been an intimate neighbor to Locust Grove and involved with the neighbors. Their fellowship hall/worship space has been available for meetings. We have heard stories from the neighbors about how the property has been enjoyed for dog walking, walks through the trail. They are happy to be a part of the Locust Grove neighborhood.

Next Slide

There are some characteristics that will jump out at you. The first is that it is defined by some very steep slopes. The second characteristic is that it has a large tree canopy. The third characteristic is that it has some open spaces that are enjoyed facing Cutler Lane that is currently the front yard of the church. All of those things weighed in our decision making as we were trying to suggest design ideas.

Next Slide

An urban planner/designer begins to think this site sits on an edge of fabric: The neighborhood fabric and the wooded areas. It is a unique position where it transitions over from the built to the relatively unbuilt, sparser in terms of its characteristics. It also sits on the edge of buildable areas and places that are too steep and too stream-like to build. It takes advantage of that. The footprints of the buildings on the Park Street site really change from smaller neighborhood footprints to the larger footprints of the multifamily buildings to the west and north.

Next Slide

In the site, there are some characteristics that are worth noting. The church occupies a relatively small portion of the site. You can see their existing footprint in pink. The #1 is their parking area for the preschool and the worship space/fellowship hall. Secondly, there are some areas that are generally a mix of wild and landscaped areas. They have gardens on their property and a playground for the children. Down on the slopes, there is a trail and wooded canopy that people can enjoy. Those are characteristics that we recognized as well.

Next Slide

Our proposal takes advantage of those site characteristics that are larger observations to provide 50 senior affordable homes with parking that is relegated from the neighborhood convenient for the seniors. It is

nestled on the edge of the hill with disturbed slopes. It is a minimal slope disturbance. It is mostly from the outfall of being able to work in that area. The placement of the building helps create a campus that is buffered from Park Street and the areas to the west by that surrounding wooded area.

Next Slide

These are some images from our earlier design work. That work continues today. The building massing is going to be broken down into various pieces. Each of the residents can have an identity and numerous front doors from the parking area. We imagine the parking area that is better than asphalt. We imagine it as a landscaped parking area. That shows up in some of our images with those green swaths.

Next Slide

This image starts to show conceptually how that buffered slope with the tree canopy surrounds the building. We are nestled into that with parking between us and the church at the top. The senior housing building will have solar panels. It will be 100 percent affordable senior housing. The church will have imagined this partnership as a way to create a campus and let the church expand slightly to create a synergy between the two uses on this location.

Next Slide

With any community design effort, they started with some sketching, over the table with our team partners. We immediately started to meet with the neighborhood in late July. We learned each time we spoke with the neighborhood and Planning Commission and we have continued to learn and adapt our ideas and details as we have worked with staff over the past months since our submission. This chart outlines how the community meetings were held and when they were held through the series of submission dates. We were working with the staff the last couple of months.

Next Slide

When the meetings were held, what we heard when we had the meetings. We just wanted to recap some of the issues that came up and explain how we have adjusted our plans accordingly. We did want to engage and understand. We think that it makes the design better. The broad view of the topics that we heard were concerns about the scale of the project, the impacts on the stream and stormwater management for the location, neighborhood traffic concerns, the pedestrian connections within the site and out of the site into the neighborhood, and generally tree preservation and what we could do to minimize impacts there

Next Slide

The first topic on that list is the massing and scale of the project. We decided and recommended taking advantage of the slope of the property to put our larger footprint building downslope from the smaller church footprint buildings. That will help us mitigate the height of the new building. The church buildings are really just a story with their sloping roofs. They're not very tall. The preschool has a basement. Placing our building down the hill, we believe those impacts will be mitigated from the church.

Next Slide

This concept really is a reflection of work that was done at McGuffey Hill Condos in North Downtown, just off Market Street. From the image on the left, you can see the intersection of High and Market Street. That wooded stand of trees behind contains multi-story condo buildings that most visitors to

Charlottesville do not realize that those building are there. You can have density in the trees and make it a pleasurable experience for both residents and visitors.

Next Slide

This shows the view from the top of Cutler Lane looking toward the church and preschool and gives you a sense of that grey box and how tall our building will be.

Next Slide

This is a view looking from the sidewalk up Cutler. The church is on the left. This is the open lawn that is shared with the neighborhood. The building placement is over to the left. You can get a sense of its massing both in terms of its relationship to the church building and the buildings across Cutler Lane. We believe that we have placed our building in a position that won't negatively impact them in terms of view.

Jonathan Showalter, Applicant Engineer –

Next Slide

We know that this site sits uphill from Meadow Creek. A big focus for us during the site plan is always to protect the stream, the creeks, and the downstream waterways. Knowing the critical slopes on this site, we want to make sure we're in a good position to protect those. We have been coordinating with city staff through this process. We're still in the PUD process. This is all very conceptual at this point. We wanted to do that early coordination knowing that those details will be worked out when we get to the site plan. At that point, we will do a full storm water management plan, a full erosion sediment control plan, and really work out those details, and have them reviewed and approved by city staff. We will meet the state and local storm water regulations. This is just a conceptual plan showing an option to be developed in coordination with city staff to make sure we have a stabilized storm water outfall that has minimum impact. With the slopes and the trees, it is basically a riprap channel on grade, going down the slopes to an existing defined channel. This is not a final plan. I want to make sure we have enough coordination at this phase to ensure we can work all of those details out with city staff at site plan.

Next Slide

This is about the traffic study. This has not changed since the work session or the public hearings. In summary, we scoped a traffic study with the city engineer early in the process. We investigated the intersections at Cutler Lane/Park Street and North Avenue/Park Street. There were no existing safety issues identified or operational issues identified by that study. In those subsequent public hearings, we had a lot of good input from neighbors who are at those intersections every day. We did some follow up visits, spent some time in off peak hours in the community watching those. We identified a couple of improvements that we're making that weren't identified in the traffic study but we feel are great improvements for the existing neighborhood and these future residents.

Next Slide (Back to a Previous Slide)

To summarize those, there is a right turnout only. That is to address the concern of Wilder Drive being very narrow and wanting to make sure we direct as much traffic from our development directly to Park Street and not adding extra traffic to Wilder Drive. We're also looking at an intersection sight distance improvement. Currently, there are concerns about Cutler Lane turning onto Park Street and looking right. It is hard to see. There will be some trimming of vegetation there to make sure there is adequate sight distance for safety.

Next Slide

This shows a bit more pedestrian connectivity. Currently on Cutler Lane, our entrance ties into the sidewalks on both sides. There is the sidewalk on Park Street that is on the other side of the road. You can see that there is an existing sidewalk (yellow line). There is a bus stop to the north. I believe there is another bus stop to the south. That sidewalk leads into town. Currently, Cutler is cut off sidewalk connectivity-wise from the major sidewalk network. What we're proposing, as part of this development, is to add a new crosswalk at Cutler and Park Street to tie it into the rest of the pedestrian network. We also have a new sidewalk on our site; formalizing those trail easements to allow a permanent home for that trail.

Mr. Keesecker –**Next Slide**

There was a choice that had to be made. Do we build in the open space? Do we build on the edges of the tree canopy? We thought the amenity of the open lawn and the character of the site is experienced by the majority of the people who drive by the property on Park Street and look up at that intersection with Cutler and the neighborhood people who enjoy that open lawn. We would try to do our best to have a less impactful plan. A building of this size is going to take down some trees with the placement of the building, as shown here. The result is that we preserve the vast majority of the tree canopy. The experience from Park Street and the neighborhood will be less impacted by our placement here. We also hope that our tree canopy (over time) will grow back and be supplemented by the trees that we're going to add as part of our landscaping plan. One of the concerns we heard from the neighbors was that there were a couple of specimen trees in the open lawn area that people enjoy. We rerouted the driveway to access the parking so we can avoid those root balls and to hopefully preserve those trees.

Next Slide

Our proposal, in looking at the big picture and on the surface, is affordable housing in an underserved neighborhood for affordable housing. Affordable housing is a need for our community. Our process, to this point, has been a welcoming and shared future focused endeavor. We hope that it will be experienced in the neighborhood and broader community for young and old. The preschool and the senior housing concept was one that led the church's vision making as we got started. This is the kind of work generated by a community member. The church generated this idea. They looked at a need. It is an endeavor that was initiated and sustained by the long term vision articulated in the Comp Plan.

Commissioner Dowell – I would like to know why staff felt that it was an issue for disturbing the critical slopes based on findings 1 and 2.

Mr. Dawson – This is very early on in this process. When I make the recommendations, I look at the code that outlines what we're supposed to be looking at for the critical slopes waiver. The way I read finding #1, it talks more about natural features than low income housing. I am not a policy maker/decision maker. When I provide those, it is from reading an applicant's justification for finding #1 or finding #2. Finding #2 is typically the one that convinces me to provide some recommendations that it be approved. There are lots of sites that are ringed by critical slopes. This application essentially said that it will conform, it is affordable housing, it is finding #1. They will minimize the impacts to the slope. At this stage, looking at a two dimensional plan, it is too early to say that is going to work. It is early on in the

process to say, as presented, it will meet all of these requirements. With a 3D print, you can't put a 3 foot wide swale on a hillside. You have to get down there with machines. You have to do all of those things. They are obviously not putting the buildings on the slope. There is some disturbance there. That's why I did not recommend it be approved under those findings. It is based on the applicant's justifications.

Commissioner Lahendro – With the stormwater outfall that is being proposed, is that following a natural channel that is already there? Or is this a completely new outfall?

Mr. Showalter – Currently, the water on this hill flows down the hill in natural flow (sheet flow) over the ground. Whenever you develop, you basically create more concentrated flow. Initially, we were looking at doing a level spreader towards the edge of our development further up the hill to return that flow back to sheet flow. Based on our coordination with city staff, it didn't seem that was going to be a practical option. We did a site visit and walked it with Mr. Dawson. We saw that it would likely re-concentrate, given how steep that slope is. It became obvious that we couldn't just have natural, sheet flow down the slope. We were looking at other options to have a stabilized outfall to convey that water down to an existing channel. There is an existing channel down at the bottom of the hill at the Melbourne/Park Street intersection. We're basically trying to get the water to that as effectively as we can and have a stabilized channel that won't erode and protect all of the slopes and trees. The goal of that channel is to keep it on grade. We want to avoid something like a piped system or a larger channel that could cause a 20 to 50 swath of tree disturbance. The goal is to have a minimal amount of disturbance, place that channel on grade. Per conversation with staff, there will be a lot of engineering details that need to go into that at the site plan phase; potentially some structural detailing to make sure that the slopes are acceptable and a lot of hydraulic modeling for that. We are in the PUD phase. There are a lot of those details that will be worked out in the site plan.

Commissioner Lahendro – Does most of the stormwater from the crest of the hill at the church to the backside go down this channel or is there any retention happening on site?

Mr. Showalter – We also plan to have onsite detention. Per state requirements, when you develop an area like this, we have to reduce the flow in the post-condition back to the precondition. We can't allow any more flow off of it than in the current condition. We actually have to reduce it even more than that. There is an improvement factor on that. We will have underground detention pipes. What we're currently planning in the parking lot, trying to minimize the footprint of this development, those will hold onto those bigger storms and let that flow go at or below the pre-developed rate.

Commissioner Lahendro – Is that pervious or impervious paving in the parking area?

Mr. Showalter – That's still a detail to work out at the site plan. We're sizing the stormwater for impervious parking just to be safe. That's one of those details we will get to at site plan.

Commissioner Lahendro – The Rivanna Trail going across this drainage well will have some sort of bridge or something across it.

Mr. Showalter – Based on our conceptual look, we will probably have a pipe that extends around 30 feet from the building. The trail could go over the top of that before it turns into a channel.

Commissioner Russell – When driving, does it cut into the hill? Is it going to have to cut into that hill or follow the grade?

Mr. Showalter – It is a little bit of both. We're basically cutting that down probably 2 or 3 feet. We're trying to keep the slope of this driveway at a 5 percent maximum to be ADA accessible. We're cutting that down. We're also trying to minimize how much that is cut down. We don't want to create a break in that yard. It will probably be cutting down about 3 or 4 feet at the most through that yard area.

Commissioner Russell – Someone walking from the apartment building to that sidewalk is going to be able to navigate that at an ADA accessible grade?

Mr. Showalter – That is the goal. We're still early in the design in our conceptual look at grading. We believe that we can grade that to be 5 percent or less.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What does a high visibility crosswalk mean in this context?

Mr. Showalter – Basically, there are different kinds of crosswalks. The lowest level is where you have two striped lines. The city minimum is high visibility. That is those 2 foot rectangular reflective panels across the road. That way is highly visible to cars. The current plan is to just have signage; reflective signage as well. We have gone through a VDOT analysis process to determine what VDOT requires for this. We are coordinating with Amanda Poncy. Based on that, it shows that it warrants a high visibility crosswalk and considering advanced signage. That's what we're looking to do for this one.

Commissioner Palmer – When I look at Cutler Lane, I am curious how the decisions were made to set everything so far back; not necessarily have some enlivening of the street at Cutler Lane. I understand that the church uses that field.

Mr. Keesecker – We did discuss the placement of the building. The advantages of sliding the building down around the hill both in terms of massing and taking advantage of the landscape and the view into the woods and proximity to the church building seemed to outweigh being closer to Cutler. The type of building we were going to provide was going to be different from the ones across Cutler Lane in terms of its massing and scale. It wouldn't necessarily be a 'like for like' street profile. We heard 'loud and clear' that the neighborhood treats the open lawn in front of the church along Cutler Lane as a community amenity that is in the foreground and an entranceway to the trail through the woods that exist today that we're preserving and slightly locating, as we go around the one corner of the new building. We felt like, as we're trying to create a campus, it was better to place the building where we're suggesting it so the amenities that were enjoyed and activated by the neighborhood could continue unabated. That's how we came to that idea.

iii. Public Hearing

Colleen Swingle-Titus – I have served as the pastor at Park Street Christian Church for nearly 6 years. The ministry that we're most proud of is the preschool, which has offered families affordable, quality, full-day education and care for nearly 25 years. Our preschool and sanctuary are on the corner of our 7 acre lot. What many do not know about Park Street is that the original intent of the founding Fore Fathers back in the 1960s was to build several generationally focused buildings on this property to not only serve

the members of the church but the local community. In my seminary training, we called this type of vision ‘kingdom building’ vs ‘fortress building.’ The latter being those churches more interested in securing and fortifying their churches for members only. Park Street is not a wealthy church. However, we do sit on a valuable asset, our land. We could have sold this land to the highest bidder to secure our congregational future. That would be ‘fortress building.’ That is not who we are. We hope to fulfill the legacy of our founders by releasing a portion of our land to care for our community from senior housing to formal development of a trail system to access the Rivanna Trail. We ask you, our local leadership, to support us in these efforts.

John Hossack – I would like to note that the Park Street numbers are between 50 and 100 percent. The traffic analysis was performed in late June, 2021; in the middle of the summer, in the middle of COVID. These numbers are relevant to future peak hour needs. The county numbers are 32,000 cars a day. The majority are using Park Street. The actual volumes are 16,000 to 20,000 cars per day. The junctions are not likely to work. This is a uniquely hilly part of Park Street. I don’t see any allowance that traffic habitually speeds up, especially in times of less visibility. Please do not overlook the longer term problems of Park Street. The problems with Park Street are largely the result of an irresponsible county planning decision.

Vikki Bravo – I am here to talk on behalf of IMPACT, our group of 27 faith congregation communities that works to solve community problems. I am also speaking as a neighbor. I know that you all are very sensitive to the crisis in affordable housing. I want to point out that there’s a growing crisis for seniors in affordable housing. There are more seniors showing up at PACEM to be housed in the winter. There are more seniors showing up at AIM (Alliance of Interfaith Ministries), not just for rental help but to find a place to live. We have seniors in our congregation. We have a person who spends 85 percent of their income on housing. We have a person who uses sticks to hold up their roof and their floor is falling in. We have people who have to walk up stairs and down stairs when they’re not really able to do that. We have an opportunity for seniors to be able to have safety and security and have a place to live with enough money to buy food, medicine, and other necessities. It is not just good for those seniors, it is good for all of us. It gives seniors an opportunity to stay involved and continue contributing to our community.

iv. Commission Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Lahendro – I love the project. It is well designed, well-conceived. I love the mission that it is serving. I love the partnership. I am very much in favor of this project.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I would like to commend the church and the community on doing a really good thing here. The intentions are really admirable. With the design, some of the choices that were made seem disappointing compromises. I think affordable housing for seniors is something that we can be proud of and not something that needs to be hidden and shorter than one story buildings at any cost. The right turn only goes against the Comprehensive Plan goals on grid connectivity. It is clearly a choice made to satisfy some squeaky wheel neighbors rather than an engineering decision. I understand that the church wants to be a good neighbor. Ultimately, none of those things are bad. The design is perfectly serviceable. I will vote to make it legal. It is a shame that the funding model doesn’t work out.

Chairman Solla-Yates – It is a very exciting project. It is a pretty remarkable effort from the community.

Councilor Payne – I want to echo what others have said. It is an exciting project. It is exciting to see the community taking this kind of effort to try to meet a real critical need in the community.

Commissioner Dowell – This is a good project. I was concerned about the recommendation from staff regarding the critical slopes. I am glad to see that we have our community partners coming together to fill our affordable housing.

Motion (Critical Slope Waiver) – Commissioner Russell – I move to recommend approval of the critical slope waiver for Tax Map and Parcel 470002120, as requested, with the conditions recommended by City staff, based on a finding that the public benefits of allowing the disturbance outweigh the benefits afforded by the existing undisturbed critical slope, per Section 34-1120(b)(6)(d)(i). Second by Commissioner Dowell. Motion passes 5-0.

Motion (Rezoning) – Commissioner Russell – I move to recommend that City Council should approve ZM21-0003 on the basis that the streets proposed within the PUD Development are laid out in a manner substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan, and approval of the proposed PUD Development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and will serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice. Second by Commissioner Lahendro. Motion passes 5-0.

3. **ZM21-00003** – MACAA PUD - Piedmont Housing Alliance, in partnership with landowners Monticello Area Community Action Agency (MACAA) and 1023 Park Street LLC, have submitted an application seeking a rezoning of approximately nine (9) acres of land, including multiple lots identified within City tax records as Tax Map and Parcel 470007100, 470011000 and 470008000 (collectively, “Subject Property”). The Subject Property has frontage on Park Street and the Route 250 Bypass and is accessible by the private lane Macaa Drive off Park Street. The application proposes to change the zoning district classification of the Subject Property from R-1 (Low Density Residential) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) subject to certain proffered development conditions (“Proffers”) and an approved PUD Development Plan. The Proffers include: (1) 80% of the residential units constructed on the site shall be Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs) accessible to residents with not more than 80% of the area median income with affordability provisions guaranteed through 30+ year deed restrictions; (2) the applicant shall construct road improvements at the intersection of Park Street and Davis Avenue, including realigning the entrance to the Subject Property with the intersection, removal of fencing and vegetation to improve sight distances, elimination of a driveway on TMP 470008000 accessing Park Street, installation of a curb island to prevent right turns exiting the Subject Property onto Park Street, and reconstruction of a high-visibility, ADA accessible crosswalk at the intersection; and (3) the applicant shall dedicate bicycle and pedestrian easements upon request of the City to provide access from the Subject Property to the US Route 29/250 Bypass multi-modal trail. The rezoning would create a PUD referred to as “MACAA PUD” containing up to ninety-five (95) residential units divided between townhomes, two-family, single-family, and multifamily buildings at an approximate density of 10 dwelling units per acre (DUA), along with 7,500 sq. ft. of non-residential daycare space and about 4.9 acres of preserved open space. The new Comprehensive Land Use Map for this area calls for a Neighborhood Mixed-Use Node in this area. The PUD Development Plan proposes a development with the following unique characteristics and amenities: preservation of two (2) existing single-family homes off Park Street, limitation of non-residential uses to recreational and daycare facilities, preservation of existing historic gardens and open space on-site, pedestrian and trail connections to existing infrastructure, and a combination of public and private internal roadways with

on street parking. The Subject Property's current R-1 zoning does not allow townhouse or multifamily developments, while daycare facilities are only allowed with the issuance of a Special Use Permit. Information pertaining to this application may be viewed online at <https://www.charlottesville.gov/1077/Agendas-Minutes> Persons interested in this Rezoning may contact NDS Planner Dannan O'Connell by e-mail (oconnelld@charlottesville.org) or by telephone (434-970-3991).

i. Staff Report

Commissioner Dowell – I am an employee of the Monticello Area Community Action Agency (MACAA) and I am required to disqualify myself from participating in the transaction that is before the Planning Commission for action. The nature of my conflict of interest is the annual salary that I receive as a MACAA employee. If anybody would like to review my written disclosure statement of my reasons for disqualification, I have filed the statement with the Secretary of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Dowell left the meeting following the reading of the above statement.

Dannan O'Connell, City Planner – Piedmont Housing Alliance, in partnership with the Monticello Area Community Action Agency (MACAA) and 1023 Park Street LLC, has submitted an application pursuant to City Code 34-490 seeking a zoning map amendment to change the zoning district classifications of the above parcels of land. The application proposes to change the zoning classification of the Subject Property from "R-1" (Single Family Residential) to "PUD" (Planned Unit Development) subject to a development plan and proffered development conditions. 1021 and 1023 Park Street are currently developed with single family homes. 1025 Park Street is currently developed with the MACAA school site. The proposed PUD development calls for preservation of the two existing single family homes and the construction of 28 new townhome/duplex units, 65 multifamily units in two buildings, and a maximum of 7500 square feet of commercial, childcare space. The existing MACAA Drive will be upgraded to a public street along with a connected road as illustrated in the development plan. The remaining roads depicted in the plan will be private. The rezoning proposal contains the following proffered conditions:

- 80% of the residential units constructed on the site shall be Affordable Dwelling Units (ADUs) accessible to residents with not more than 80% of the area median income with affordability provisions guaranteed through 30+ year deed restrictions.
- The applicant shall construct road improvements at the intersection of Park Street and Davis Avenue, including realigning the entrance to the Subject Property with the intersection, removal of fencing and vegetation to improve sight distances, elimination of a driveway on TMP 470008000 accessing Park Street, installation of a curb island to prevent right turns exiting the Subject Property onto Park Street, and reconstruction of a high-visibility, ADA accessible crosswalk at the intersection.
- The applicant shall dedicate bicycle and pedestrian easements upon request of the City to provide access from the Subject Property to the US Route 29/250 Bypass multi-modal trail.

The proposed use matrix for the rezoning allows multifamily townhouse, two family parking garage, surface parking lot, daycare facilities, indoor health and sports clubs, outdoor parks, playgrounds, ball fields, and swimming pools and temporary sale as by right, ancillary uses in addition to those currently allowed under R-1 zoning for the subject property. The recently adopted 2021 Future Lane Use Map designates 1025 Park Street as a neighborhood mixed use node. Neighborhood mixed use nodes are

described as compact neighborhood centers containing a mix of residential and commercial uses arranged in smaller scale buildings. No density is specified. Up to 5 stories in height is permitted. Mixed use buildings are encouraged. The two single family lots included with the subject property (1021 and 1023 Park Street) are designated as medium intensity residential. Medium intensity residential allows for house sized infill of multiunit dwellings, townhomes, and accessory dwelling units within single family areas with an emphasis on providing affordable units and integrating development with the existing neighborhood character. Heights of up to 4 stories are allowed.

Should the rezoning be approved, the overall density for the site will increase to around 10 dwelling units per acre. Proposed buildings vary in height but do not exceed the 5 story limit for neighborhood mixed use nodes or the 4 story limit for medium intensity residential. The proffered intersection improvements previously mentioned would eliminate an existing skewed intersection, bringing it more in line with city standards and reduced conflict points between the MACAA PUD site and vehicles traveling along Park Street and Davis Avenue. Staff believes the new MACAA Drive would generally meet standards and design manual criteria for public streets. However, the applicant should consider extending the public street dedication to the parking and access area connecting the endpoints of MACAA Drive and Road C to ensure future connectivity and access to the site. The applicants are proposing a proffered pedestrian and bicycle access easement connecting the parking area between buildings 1 and 2 to the 250 bypass sidewalk at the base of the hill to the top of the property. This would provide bicycle and pedestrian access between the 250 bypass and Park Street by way of MACAA Drive. Public sidewalks depicted along MACAA Drive and Road C connecting the proposed parking areas to Park Street. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan identifies Park Street as an important local corridor. The establishment of a pedestrian and bicycle access easement through the subject property could compliment future improvements and improve connectivity between Park Street and the nearby Rivanna Trail. The proposed easement path does depict several sets of stairs down a steep incline, which would complicate accessibility to bicyclists. Additional trail easements to the 250 bypass sidewalk and Rivanna Trail might be possible. They are not included as proffered conditions of this rezoning plan. Staff finds the proposed rezoning to be consistent with the Future Land Use Map for density, use, and housing type. The development may contribute to other goals within the Land Use, Housing, & Transportation Chapters of the 2021 Comprehensive Plan. Staff also finds the type of use to be consistent with the existing development pattern in this area. The transition from the higher intensity multifamily apartments to the lower intensity development along MACAA Drive adequately separates the higher intensity from uses from existing single family along Park Street. However, townhomes will still abut single family residential areas, all be it with a ten foot setback and screened by vegetation. Overall, staff finds the proposed development as presented in the application materials contribute to many goals of the city's Comprehensive Plan. As presented in the application, staff finds the PUD to be desirable to preserving open space, increasing housing diversity, and improving intersection design and pedestrian connectivity along Park Street. Staff does have one concern about adequate accessibility of pedestrian infrastructure along the southern slope of the property and turn around access to the proposed public road, but otherwise recommends approval of this rezoning with the included proffers.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I have a question about the pedestrian easement to the trail. The last time, there was discussion about one trail directly to the corner of 250 and the John Warner Parkway and another trail to the southeast corner. Which trail was the one that was committed?

Mr. O'Connell – They are proposing the southeast one that goes along the existing old driveway for the home that used to exist there. They're showing proposed in some of their plans. They're not included in the proffers or the development plan at this time.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Is the sewer/stormwater connection directly beneath that trail?

Mr. O'Connell – I don't know. I believe the applicants can tell us exactly where they are.

Mr. Showalter – Currently, we are showing the stormwater running down that same alignment trying to minimize the disturbance to slopes or avoid disturbance to critical slopes. We're looking at that alignment as a potential sewer option. There are other ones we are exploring with city utilities. Those details will be worked out at the site plan. In general, we're trying to use that corridor as much as possible to avoid other disturbance.

Commissioner Palmer – What was the density on this project?

Mr. O'Connell – It would be around 10 dwelling units per acre

ii. Applicant Presentation

Mr. Keesecker, Applicant –
Next Slide

The Piedmont Housing Alliance is the nonprofit developer. BRW Architects is the architectural team. We have two new partners on this site. MACAA owns the property. It is currently used as their operation center for childcare. They have recognized that it is underutilized. Habitat for Humanity is also on the project team to provide an affordable housing component to the neighborhood proposition. This is a dream team of local nonprofits that have been serving our community for many years.

Next Slide

This project finds itself in a LI HTC funding cycle with the annual review in March. We found ourselves developing this with Park Street Christian Church. It wasn't intentional. We were able to find some accommodation and efficiency by meeting with the community at The Waldorf School for both projects and concentrating on the details of this one separately from the Park Street Christian Church. We had a community meeting in August with the work session with the Planning Commission in late August, which helped us identify some design ideas that we have reflected in the current version.

Next Slide

This site is unique and has had a number of proposals in the past. We think it takes advantage of all the qualities of the site to make it unique and perfect for this use. It is very conveniently located. It is adjacent to the John Warner Parkway and all of the trails that connect through there by bike and other means. We're excited about taking on the challenge of finding a good layout for this project.

Next Slide

Locust Grove is the neighborhood. What we find ourselves navigating is how to work on a project that straddles between single family residential neighborhood and large highways. It has some great, unique qualities that we hope our design will resonate with you.

Next Slide

Within the site, the existing MACAA building is highlighted in white on the left. It sits on the edge of the slope. Our new buildings have taken advantage of the footprint of that building. That building will be removed. The new housing will be built there. We're able to minimize our critical slope or any kind of tree canopy disturbance by building where the former building existed. It is different than Park Street in that regard. There are some wonderful garden walls and historic elements that flow through the southern portion of the site. There is greenspace that is fantastically beautiful. There is the potential trail connection over to the 250 bypass through the former driveway.

Next Slide

These are the numbers for the proposal. The proposed density would yield 96 units, 65 apartments. We might be able to get 66 apartments depending on how the final mix of support spaces falls out. Essentially, we have organized the site in a number of different ways. At the top of the site, we preserved two existing homes on Park Street. Behind those will be a series of townhomes and duplexes. All of those along MACAA Drive will be homeownership developed by Habitat. Some will be market rate. The apartment buildings that are shown with daycare in the footprint of the one on the left will be developed by the Piedmont Housing Alliance. They have been strategically placed at the edge of that existing hill for the building on the left and the slope down towards the driveway on the right to buffer the community from some of the highway noise and frame the views from the community green. What we tried to do is transition the scale of the new buildings from the neighborhood scale into our larger footprints that can address a more urban, large scale visibility from the highway.

Next Slide

This diagram shows this connection of the MACAA site. It is very steep from where building #1 will be down to Schenks Branch. There is a lot of slope that we are not disturbing. What that does is allow us to take advantage of a relatively flat portion at the top of the hill to create a community green, which we think would be a wonderful amenity for the broader neighborhood, not just these homes; framed by townhomes on the other side.

Next Slide

This is an artist rendering of the new MACAA Drive with townhomes and duplexes lining that new street. It is pedestrian focused with parking relegated to the rear. We imagine a tree lined street. We moved the multi-family building a little bit to the left in this frame so that you get a view of the mountains beyond. We're looking through the tree tops over to McIntire Park.

Next Slide

This is a view of the new community green space with townhomes on the left, building #2 behind the trees left, and the larger apartment building where the former MACAA building was located on the right, framed views down towards that garden area and 250 beyond. We wanted to create a space that the neighbors could gather but also open up a new experience for people who might be passing through the site.

Next Slide

This is a view from the 250 ramp. What you can see is the general massing of the new multifamily buildings because we have been able to preserve some of the trees along 250 as well as their general

placement on the hill that already exists. We feel that we have answered the scale and the view from this location that seems appropriate for this context.

Next Slide

On this slide, we heard concerns about traffic, intersection improvements on MACAA Drive. We heard about the preservation of the historic assets in the landscape, which begins to speak to why we removed the trail building from the lower part of the site. We heard concerns from staff concerning accessibility and connectivity through the property.

Mr. Showalter –

Next Slide

This slide is a traffic slide similar to what we had shown before. It was essentially part of the same traffic study we scoped in coordination with the city traffic engineer and used traffic inflation factors because those were summer counts. Those traffic factors were increased based on inflation because of that. We studied the intersection of Park Street, Davis Avenue, and MACAA Drive. The main impact with this is the new traffic at that intersection. There currently aren't any operational issues with that intersection. The level of service remains the same from the existing condition to the proposed condition. The intersection will continue to operate pretty similar to what it does today. The only change may be additional waiting times or backups into the site.

Next Slide

We heard from the neighbors various concerns and being out there on site. We noticed some issues in talking with the traffic engineer some issues that have come up in past PUDs. One of the big ones is that it is currently misaligned with Davis Avenue. You can see in this slide the red hatch below the grey MACAA Drive hatch. That is the current alignment. They are offset. It creates more conflict points, potential safety issues and confusion of which drivers go first. Part of this project is realigning MACAA Drive with Davis Avenue to make it a safer intersection. There is also a driveway to one of the houses. That part of the driveway will be eliminated, making this effective almost 5 way intersection a typical 4 way intersection. There are a lot of concerns about backup on MACAA Drive. If someone is trying to take a left turn, another item we're looking at is making 'No Left Turn' or a 'Right Turn Only.' That will make it more efficient.

Next Slide

There are sight distance issues. When trying to pull out, there are a number of things obscuring the view. This left view shows a lot of things that will go away. Just moving it will have the potential to recreate some of that driveway. It is going to vastly improve the sight distance. It will be safer for the drivers pulling out and drivers coming down Park Street.

Mr. Keesecker –

Next Slide

This slide speaks to the number of historic walls that surrounded the old residence that predated the MACAA buildings and still exist today. As we surveyed the land, we realized that the majority of the property is ringed by historic walls. They line the whole driveway, the former gardens. We're going to preserve the vast majority of those walls. Yellow indicates those areas that we will disturb primarily on

the top of the page. It is for grading issues. We are flattening as much as we can MACAA Drive and the sidewalks surrounding the community green to provide accessibility for the new buildings all the way over to Park Street. That demands some regrading that effects the walls to the top of the page. We're hoping to take advantage by incorporating those walls into our design of the terraces and that green playful space between the two buildings that are maybe dedicated to the children, gathering space for the community.

Next Slide

We wanted to illustrate that because we're in the middle of all of these connections, we wanted to take advantage of them.

Next Slide

We provided a diagram of existing sidewalks on Park Street on both sides. I realize only one exists now. The other one is planned in the Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan. We want to encourage connectivity into this site. Because we had to make a choice about the topography to make the top part of the site more accessible over to Park Street, we found ourselves in a situation where we had not created a steep connection down to the former driveway. We haven't given up hope that we might be able to resolve that in the future. A stairway with a bike channel will allow bikes to move over to the former driveway that turns onto 250. The issue with the accessibility down to the gardens is that their slopes are not presently accessible. The disturbance that might occur for us to try to make that happen seemed to outweigh the benefits, especially when we have the ramp on 250 that is built for accessibility down to the trails. Our thought was that we would open up at the end of that wall at the intersection or close to the intersection on John Warner on our property so that anyone could come into the gardens from the bottom and enjoy them. It is just transversing from the bottom to the top that is going to be difficult without a lot of disturbance.

Next Slide

This is our tree diagram. We have the trees that are preserved and a series of trees that are helping to frame outdoor spaces that are highlighted in a light green. Our impact on the existing tree canopy, especially where the critical slopes are, is minimal.

Next Slide

Our efforts are to transition from the scale of the neighborhood into the property to provide affordable housing units, both in terms of rentals and homeownerships. We have that kind of mix that supports a neighborhood. It is a creation of a series of inviting public spaces that the immediate neighbors to these new properties can enjoy. This project opens itself to the community and tries to allow people to come and experience the existing spaces and the new spaces that will be created.

Commissioner Lahendro – With the stone house on Park Street, is that individually protected?

Mr. Keesecker – I think it is the white house next door that is individually protected.

Commissioner Lahendro – With the gardens and the walls (the historic elements that you mentioned), any protections on those?

Mr. Keesecker – I am not aware of any protections.

Commissioner Lahendro – It is the intention of the applicant to preserve those features, except for the limited amount that was outlined? Is it possible to have those features open to the public?

Andy Miller, Applicant – It is our intent to leave those walls intact. We're in the preliminary stages of the planning for the project. We have talked about a number of different ideas in terms of engaging community partners to help us maintain some of those features. There have also been other ideas that have been proposed. We're in the early phases of those discussions. The intent is to keep those walls intact. If we can find a way to transition them into a functioning garden, that would be the idea.

Commissioner Russell – Why are the connections to this future trail 'potential'? What is preventing them from being assured?

Mr. Keesecker – Grading is the simplest answer. Our proffers try to speak to some connection.

Mr. Showalter – We're proffering an easement that would be along the stairway with a bike rail down the old driveway next to the 250 bypass trail. The issue is grading. With one of the slides, we had a section of the site that was the steepest part of the site, there was 100 feet of fall vertically. Through this section, there is at least 60 feet of fall from Park Street to the 250 bypass. We want to keep the site as accessible as possible (under 5 percent slopes). That means when we get to this limit where the stair is, we then have a lot of vertical fall that we have to make up with a stair. The existing driveway is steeper than ADA slopes. We don't want to have to regrade that.

Commissioner Russell – That is an important connection that someone would be able to get from the MACAA site to the sidewalk network that is pretty close to the Park Street overpass and not have to go up Park Street and down that narrow road?

Mr. Showalter – That's correct. Where that John Warner Parkway Trail comes up 250, it is a 10 foot wide shared use path. At that point, it narrows down to a sidewalk next to the onramp to 250. This will allow for a connection off the street through the site for pedestrians.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – How do those stairs interact with ADA accessibility? Is that allowed?

Mr. Keesecker – They wouldn't be accessible stairs. The site stairs to the inaccessible portion of the site today would remain inaccessible. The lower portion of the site is not accessible today. Our theory is that we're not making that condition any worse. We're actually improving accessibility on the site by having all of the community green and sidewalks that we're building in the neighborhood proper be accessible. It was a choice that we had to make because of the difficult topography.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – What is the height of building 2, the southeastern building?

Mr. Keesecker – It is a 3 story building with a basement. We call it a 4 story building as it faces 250. The floors are about 10 feet, 8 inches with a parapet and some amount of foundation wall for the lowest level coming out of the grades. People will have an elevated view. I believe it will be under the height that we promised in the Planning Commission package. I think it was 50 feet.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – There was a slide that said 45 feet for the apartment. It appears to be within 75 feet of the R-1. I think it is subject to the R-1 height limits.

Mr. Keesecker – That's right.

Mandy Burbage, Applicant – We did explore that from the front of the building. We're measuring where it is only 3 stories. It does not exceed 35 feet. That follows the city's definition of measuring building height. We were aware of that requirement.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – Do you know your mix of apartment types in terms of number of bedrooms will be?

Mr. Miller – That is still in flex. It is really determined primarily by the LI HTC application process. We're roughly speaking at 20 percent of units be one bedroom and 5 to 10 percent be 3 bedroom with the remaining units being 2 bedroom units. Given the structure of the LI HTC process, we're hemmed in by the unit mix that really allows us to get awarded the credits.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – The tricky part arises because the way the parking is allocated. Each townhome has two spaces on their own private lots when they only require one. With the communal spaces, there are 85. Nineteen of those are going to be on public streets. I don't think they count towards the requirements. That leaves 1-to-1 parking per apartment ratio. Those 3 bedroom units are going to require two. I think you can request a reduction.

Mr. Miller – One thing I would say is that within our communities, we do understand the parking counts relative to affordable housing. One space per unit is more than adequate for the majority of our communities. In more urban locations, we're not even hitting the one space per unit. We can speak to that anecdotally from our experience.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – I agree that you could get away with less.

Commissioner Palmer – With how you interact with Park Street, there might be an opportunity at 1023 Park Street to think about maybe adding a few more units that could help with adding more affordable units to this. I understand that there are community relation reasons to leave that as is. I didn't know if you have looked into that.

Mr. Keesecker – That particular parcel with the existing home taken some good negotiation to bring into the fold. It is not currently owned by MACAA. There is some negotiation that has taken place to allow it to be included in the PUD so other provisions of the plan can move forward.

Councilor Hill – My questions are related to getting them across the 'finish line.' What do you need in terms of plans? Is this the hurdle you need in order to complete your LI HTC process? Is there another whole phase between now and March?

Mr. Miller – In order to submit the LI HTC application, we have to be appropriately zoned. This step would actually get us to a place where we can submit that LI HTC application. There are other things. There is one thing coming in front of the Planning Commission or Council. It would be a revitalization

certificate, which helps us with the point scoring piece of it. Those are the two fundamental tasks that we need in order to submit the LI HTC application.

iii. Public Hearing

John Hossack – I believe that it is very doubtful that a safe road junction can be built at this intersection. There is a fundamental inadequate sight distance problem. I strongly discourage you from ignoring the federal guidelines. The traffic numbers are wrong between 50 and 100 percent. The county numbers for this road 32,000 cars a day, the majority using Park Street. It is not going to work. Davis Avenue has a cut through problem. Where is MACAA? We all appreciate the good work MACAA has done in the past decades.

Leslie Burns – I have a great interest in affordable housing. I have done some work with some nonprofits. I am very excited to see Charlottesville is engaging with supporting this kind of development. It is a great project. I love how this group incorporates some of the historical aspects and keeps beauty in mind in their development.

Vikki Bravo – I am speaking on behalf of the 27 congregations of IMPACT. Many of the people that we rely on can't afford to live here. During the pandemic, we have applauded them as essential workers. Shouldn't we make sure that they can live in the same community that they are so essential to?

Sarah Hanks – It is my pleasure to speak in favor of this proposal and MACAA's initiative moving forward. We feel very fortunate to partner with Piedmont Housing Alliance and Habitat to create an opportunity that is otherwise unavailable. We have an asset that we believe is able to meet a tremendous need in the community. We feel responsible to meet the highest and greatest need of those experiencing low income in our community. We do intend to partner with PHA and Habitat to provide onsite early childhood education and ensure that the needs of the families beyond housing are met in our community. We appreciate the opportunity to partner on such a valuable project. We look forward to your support now and in the future.

Patricia Johnson – We live on Davis Avenue. We participated the last time MACAA bought a site plan/proposal. We were supportive of it. I think the concerns about traffic on Park Street and Davis Avenue really need to be looked into. The traffic study that was done was very short-sighted. It didn't look any further than the entrance. One of the things that was said in the proposal was that sight line problems were going to be taken care of. I don't know what you can require the developer to do. One of the problems is that there is a hump coming up from North Avenue. That has not been addressed. That is the big issue at that intersection. The traffic study was flawed. I didn't see real projections about the future.

Constance Johnson – I also voice the traffic issues. You have that hump. Unless you get rid of that, it is dangerous. The visibility is bad. We found some discrepancies in your report about a barrier there. It wasn't clear how that effected Davis. That is a very dangerous right there. Davis Avenue dumps down to Watson. We're supportive of housing up there. We're concerned about the danger. I am confused about what is affordable up there. I want it to be a pretty place to live. The lighting with building #2 is also a concern.

iv. Commission Discussion and Motion

Commissioner Lahendro – I find the design to be very skillful in its use of the site, in the placement of the larger buildings relative to the townhomes, and how that creates a rather residential feel coming into the new development. I am delighted that the applicant is preserving the historic features that are on the site and will be making them available to the residents as well as to the public. I am satisfied with the engineering studies that have been done with regard to traffic, the recommendations that have been made, and to the staff's analysis of the situation and recommendations for traffic. The mission and what is being provided is commendable and the city is very fortunate to have this proposal in front of us.

Commissioner Russell – I want to speak to the concerns about traffic on Park Street. Those are not unheard. Park Street is identified in the 2015 Streets and Sidewalks Plan. The image that the applicant showed showed two sides of sidewalks. I would like to see us work towards meeting the goals that we set out and that we plan, budget, prioritize, staff, and support accordingly. This project overall is a huge plus and an amenity to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Stolzenberg – My thoughts are very similar to my thoughts on Park Street Christian Church. The goal is very admirable. I would love to see this project come to fruition. The design is perfectly serviceable. It is insufficiently ambitious. You could fit a lot more housing on this site. Those townhomes could be stacked townhomes. Those duplexes could be townhomes. Those are Habitat. They won't help you with your LI HTC affordability. You could be fitting in more apartments on the site. You could have tucked under parking instead of surface parking. The amount of surface parking strikes me as almost Albemarle County or R-3 style development. There could have been more housing. That could either be a lot more affordable housing. You could have added market rate units. That would have helped close that funding gap. The design is better than the by right status quo. I will vote to legalize it. I hope that you will prove me wrong on both of these projects and they somehow come to fruition.

Motion – Commissioner Lahendro – I move to recommend that City Council should approve ZM21-0003 on the basis that the streets proposed within the PUD Development are laid out in a manner substantially in accord with the Comprehensive Plan, and approval of the proposed PUD Development is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and will serve the public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice. Second by Commissioner Russell. Motion passes 4-0.

IV. COMMISSION ACTION ITEMS

Continuing: until all action items are concluded.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 PM