

PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

June 9, 2026 – 5:30 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting

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

Beginning: 5:00 PM

Location: City Council Chambers

Members Present: Chairman Schwarz, Commissioner Harness, Commissioner Mitchell, Commissioner Yoder, Commissioner Joy, Commissioner Solla-Yates

Staff Present: Patrick Cory, Remy Trail, Dannan O'Connell, Matt Alfele, Anthony Warn, Kellie Brown

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

Beginning: 5:30 PM

Location: City Council Chambers

A. COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Commissioner Carp – No Report – Not Present

Commissioner Mitchell – No Report

Commissioner Solla-Yates – The 2nd quarter city school's capital improvement plan was on May 13th. The Walker Pre-K cost jumped from \$35 million to \$60 million. Things cost more. We are expecting a 2029 completion. The Charlottesville High School and Charlottesville Middle School solar installation will be this year. Four city elementary schools will get a lighting update (Tall Oaks, Sunrise, Trailblazer, and Summit). The sales tax power we asked for are in state budgetary discussions. There are \$475 million in funding needs projected over the next 16 years just for schools. \$240 million can come from the new sales tax if passes. The cost of a new high school if we don't expand the existing high school would be \$200 million additionally or maybe \$250 million additional. Jackson Via is projected as the highest cost elementary school of all of them because of larger needs, capacity issues, and there is land to build on. Trailblazer Elementary this summer is on track for breakout spaces. The Greenbrier bathroom is expecting a summer 2026 completion.

Commissioner Harness – On May 13th, Chairman Schwarz and I attended the development code cleanup subcommittee kickoff meeting. It is a cross-functional group of the Chair, I, and city staff to kick off the development code cleanup for the next round of changes. This serves as the next step in what was previously the tier one, tier two, and tier three items. I believe that staff want to move away from that structure. That is what this is the second piece of. The general timeline is intended to get this cleanup on a bit of a yearly cadence. Our next work session on June 23rd is the builder and developer listening session. We encourage you all to come out and let us know what is still going well with the development code and what still needs tinkered with. With July and October Planning Commission work sessions, we will be diving deeper as a group on the potential amendments. In November, there is a presentation for City Council. The end of 2026 into early 2027 is when the Planning Commission and Council will hold public hearings on these items with a goal of March 2027 as being the effective date with the new amendments. I attended the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transport statewide rail update last week. It was basically an overview of survey results from an April survey that they did. Overall, there was a strong preference for expanding rail access with most respondents supporting

service to more destinations and specifically favoring that expansion within Virginia and the DC area rather than more out of state connections. I found it interesting that many respondents were not daily or weekly riders but still showed strong demand for more rail connectivity and passenger rail capacity. The most useful data point for the city of Charlottesville and this body is that when asked about conditions at existing stations, about half of the respondents wanted dedicated public transit connections to other local destinations. When they get to where they are going, they don't want to have to rent a car or find other rideshare ways to get around. They can continue to use some form of public transportation to get around.

Commissioner Roettger – Not Present

Commissioner Yoder – We had MPO Technical Committee meeting last week. Smart scale applications from the city, county, and MPO are in the pre-application stage. They are being entered into the system. It takes a lot of supporting documentation. The deadline for submitting all of that is August 1st. OEP is the state agency that will crunch the numbers and rank the projects. The CTB (Commonwealth Transportation Board) can rearrange things. That happens in the December to January timeline. By early next year, we should find out more about how the projects did including the city's submission for the West Main, Ridge, and McIntire intersection. There have been some public meetings about that recently. That is the city's application for this upcoming round. On a similar note, the localities and VDOT are starting up the next round of STARS and Pipeline studies. Pipeline is a program that is run by OPIN. It is specifically intended to produce smart scale eligible projects. It is not necessarily its only purpose. STARS is run by VDOT. That is for projects that are on corridors of statewide significance. Both types of studies are very similar to each other. They are managed centrally at the state level with project managers from the VDOT district office within the Culpeper District. Local stakeholders will be important to these. The city gets to submit one potential study location. At that meeting, staff suggested two locations. It needs to be narrowed down to one. That is a short corridor on Ridge Street between Cherry and Elliott up to West Main Street. The other is the intersection of Preston, Ridge, and McIntire. They are both great locations for studies. They connect well with other work the city is doing, including our current smart scale application. The Policy Board will be looking at those locations at the next meeting. The county is submitting two locations on their own. The intersection of Rt. 29 and Airport Road has a lot of injury crashes. They are going to look at that. They are also suggesting looking at the I-64 exit at Rt. 29, which is the big mess to take on. They are proposing a cross-jurisdictional study location, which is Rt. 250 at the Free Bridge; looking at the intersection with High Street, River Road, and back across into the county there. They have identified activity centers on Pantops. They feel that they cannot achieve these activity centers because of mobility and access issues. This is a great opportunity for collaboration across jurisdictions. I hope there will be some creative thinking. This would be hard and expensive to widen a bridge. I don't think you could squeeze more cars into the city coming in from the county. It will be interesting to see what the stakeholders can come up with in terms of potential projects to evaluate how to move more people through the area without necessarily adding more vehicle capacity. We got an update on the Rt. 29 STAR study, which has been ongoing for some time. The high-level summary from that, extending the Hillsdale shared use path, is no longer on the table for various reasons. One reason is there is not as much of a nexus between 29 and Hillsdale anymore. They were looking at some concepts of diverting some traffic to Hillsdale. They are no longer looking at that. A lot of what they are looking at is new crosswalks on 29 (one at Greenbrier and one by The Mall). You are inconveniencing some drivers and adding some pedestrian improvements and crosswalks. Those are some exciting options that they are looking at. There is still a long way to go. On the southern part of the corridor around Hydraulic and Emmet Street, they have come up with a few concepts that are more unusual that will be interesting to track through the process.

B. UNIVERSITY REPORT

Commissioner Joy – Last week, we had the Buildings and Grounds Committee convene. I had given a preview of it at a previous meeting. I wanted to give the final action items. It is a county building. I thought it was still

helpful because it is visible from the public. There was approval to demolish the University Police building on Ivy Road. That is that white brick, single-story building at 2302 Ivy Road. It has served as the Visitor Center and the 911 dispatch call center at the same desk. With the University Police Department recent relocation to Zehmer Hall and the Virginia Guest House having a welcome center. It is not currently occupied. That will be demolished in the coming capital effort. We have schematic design approval for The School of Data Science Entrepreneurship Building. That is Phase II of Data Science at the end of the Ivy Corridor. It is immediately west of the School of Data Science where there is currently a service drive on the lawn. It is about 60,000 square feet across 5 stories. It will have classrooms, research spaces, seminar spaces, offices, and entrepreneurial engagement space. You can now see the renderings online. The design picks up on the pallet of existing School of Data Science. It has a couple references to the Guest House and the Center for the Arts. I mentioned the cold towers, which are visible at The Corner. That is going to go through a near-term fuel conversion. That plant produces 90 percent of the University's heating. It is used for sterilization, waste decontamination, research at the hospital, dining, and the domestic hot water. Currently, it is coal, gas, and some fuel oil. Part of the challenge is sourcing the coal and the operational complexity associated with operating the coal plant. The environmental compliance issue is around burning coal. The great news is that operational reliability for the hospital is going to improve. There are going to be efficiencies with staffing it and operating it. It is going to have a substantial operating savings by getting off coal. It has a significant carbon emissions reduction. It is going to improve the viewshed from The Corner that is quite visible, from 14th Street and along University Avenue. There is going to be a 3 phased sequence. The first one is to remove some existing ground-mounted equipment to make room for the new fuel oil tank. There will be the existing equipment that was associated with the coal plant to be removed. The final part will be the coal silos coming out. I don't have specific dates for those. I can report more as that project starts to move forward. There is a capital plan authorization for the athletics multi-purpose practice field. This was in the master plan. It is a site east of Copeley Road along the railway. It is going to be where the training grounds are. The modular units were for the Olympic sports locker rooms. That is going to be replaced with a grass practice field. It is conforming with the athletics master plan.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Chairman Schwarz – At the Board of Architectural Review meeting last month, we had several interesting projects. We looked at the Ridge Street Fire Station. They are doing a simple ADA upgrade to their front doors and the pathway leading up to that. They are going to be tearing up the parking spaces in front of the building. I noted that there is enough room behind those parking spaces to create a full drive aisle and still have enough room for a 7-to-10-foot-wide planting strip between that drive aisle and the street. Currently, there is a curb cut that extends the full length of that property. They could cut about 50 feet off that. That would require the city to coordinate with the fire department on this project. It did not seem like there was much appetite for that. I tried to bring it up with a couple of different people. It does not seem like it is going to go anywhere. I figure that I will mention it again. It would be a way to possibly save money while they are tearing up some asphalt. They could tear up additional asphalt and get rid of this curb cut and add some trees on a street that has no street trees. It has a lot of pedestrians and could use some additional safety improvements. We looked at a house that dated back to the 1700s on Keith Valley Road. The interesting part about that is the house is too long for our zoning code. We will likely be seeing it as a special exception. There is a garage that has been added in the middle of the last century that they are going to tear down and replace. Because they are filling in a breezeway that connects to the garage, staff have determined that the house is now the length of the house plus the garage. It is longer than our zoning code allows. We looked at 845 West Main Street, which is the LC Collective apartment building proposed adjacent to Westhaven. They have lowered it to eight stories. They are providing space for a Memory Walk that aligns with newly aligned pedestrian access that goes through Westhaven. I guess Westhaven changed their plan. LC Collective changed where they were putting the space for the Memory Walk. It now all lines up so that you could have a straight shot from West Main Street into 10th & Page as a pedestrian, which seems cool. There was still some angst from the public. Overall, the BAR was generally supportive. They

still have some work to do. They did mention that they are caught in a puzzle where they must provide something to the BAR to approve. They also want to leave time and space for the community to help design the Memory Walk. There are some spaces along West Main Street that they are providing. It will be interesting to see how that turns out. I believe that they want to come to our next BAR meeting. We will see them again. I don't know if that will be a final approval or if that will continue to be another step in the process. We also looked at an infill project on Valley Road, which is by UVA South Lawn. It is a street that is full of brick Cape Cod houses that are 1.5 stories tall. They are inserting some 3-story townhouses. That is an interesting puzzle of trying to figure out how to make those fit in. Generally, the BAR is supportive.

C. DEPARTMENT OF NDS

Matt Alfele, Development Manager – NDS is working on a missing middle working group. This will comprise of cross departmental members and some of our design professionals in that space of missing middle. We are requesting two commissioners to be in this working group. If you can give me the names of those two commissioners, I will include them in the working group.

Chairman Schwarz – It will be Commissioner Harness and Commissioner Roettger.

Mr. Alfele – We are aiming for a kickoff meeting for this in July or August. It should be this summer that will be kicking off the missing middle working group. We are moving forward with our 2026-2027 code cleanup. There will be a work session on Tuesday, the 23rd in City Space at 5 PM. This will be an opportunity for the public with a focus on our local builders and developers to work through what is currently working with the development code and what areas need to be cleaned up in this cycle. That will be followed by a July 28th work session with the Planning Commission to get into more detail. Between the listening session on June 23rd and the July 28th work session, we will be holding another subcommittee meeting to get into more of the details.

Kellie Brown, NDS Director – I will be stepping down in my role as Director of Neighborhood Development Services for personal reasons. This comes with some mixed emotions. My last day with the city will be Friday, June 6th. I wanted to say thank you for your support and for playing a critical role in supporting the needs of the community and as you do in your role as planning commissioners. Thank you for your service, your support, and your partnership over the past years. I wish you all the best. Nothing will change in terms of your staff support from NDS. Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Alfele will capably continue to support you and your needs. James Freas will be serving as acting director during this transition time.

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

No Public Comments

E. CONSENT AGENDA

- a. Minutes – January 13, 2026 – Regular Meeting
- b. Minutes – February 10, 2026 – Regular Meeting

Motion to Approve – Commissioner Solla-Yates – Second by Commissioner Yoder – Motion passes 5-0.

III. PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Beginning: 6:00 PM

Format: (i) Staff Report (ii) Public Hearing (iii) Commission Discussion & Motion

IV. PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION ITEMS

Beginning: Following any public hearings

1. Special Exception Request - 1138 Rose Hill Drive [PL-26-0063]

i. Staff Report

Dannan O’Connell, City Planner – I will be presenting this special exception request for 1138 Rose Hill Drive for expansion of mechanical equipment located in the front yard of the property.

Next Slide

This property is zoned NX-3. It is owned by the city of Charlottesville and is occupied by the Blue Ridge Health District. Most of its neighbors to north and south are zoned NX-3. Across the street, it is zoned CX-3. There is an old PUD development that is zoned R-A and Civic on the right. The area is designated in the Comp Plan as a neighborhood mixed-use node.

Next Slide

This is the description of what site element screening is supposed to accomplish per our development code. These are some excerpts from a plan that was provided to us for the property that shows a top-down view of the building. This is in the front yard. The red highlighted area on the left is the current mechanical equipment area. On the right is the newly expanded area. It is not more equipment coming in so much as the existing equipment is being replaced shifted around. The pad must slightly expand. This conflicts with our regulations that state that mechanical equipment ground mounted cannot be located within the front yard of any building.

Next Slide

I ultimately recommended approval of this special exception permit. You can go down Rose Hill Drive and see numerous examples of screened and unscreened mechanical equipment located in the front yards of neighboring properties. It is not a detriment to existing structures there. We recommend approval and we do not recommend any conditions for this special exception permit

ii. Applicant Presentation

Gerry Martin, Public Works – The only reason everything is being rearranged is the chiller is being replaced. It requires greater access to the sides than the old original chiller did. We had to move things around.

iii. Commission Discussion and Motion

Chairman Schwarz – With the existing conditions, we did not get any pictures. I used Google Street View. Am I understanding correctly there is maybe a 4-foot-tall brick wall that faces Rose Hill Drive? The rest of it is enclosed by a wooden fence.

Mr. Martin – That is correct. The brick wall will stay. We will be installing a new and improved fence.

Chairman Schwarz – It will not be natural wood.

Mr. Martin – It could be. We planned on installing Trex.

Chairman Schwarz – It said that you were proposing to use the code sections 4.7.4c.4 B, C, and E. B says that if screening is not required, if whatever is being hidden is not visible above ground. C is anything that is above

ground to be screened on 3 sides of the wall minimum 6 feet tall. D talked about access gates being provided on the 4th side, minimum 6 feet tall. E says it needs to be 90 percent opaque. Was the intention to be C, D, and E?

Mr. Martin – The fence will be 6 feet tall.

Chairman Schwarz – I am assuming that it will be opaque. It will not have a lot of holes in it.

Mr. Martin – The fence is a double-sided fence. The facades are going to 6-inch boards with a half inch between each one. On the back side, you will have a board that intercedes with that open space. There is free air flow through the fence. The chiller itself can operate properly.

Chairman Schwarz – It sounds like the memo to staff should have been C, D, and E instead of B, C, and D. From the memo from SETTY at the bottom of it. It says code section 34-4.7.4.D.4.

Mr. O'Connell – What you might have been quoting was the waste receptacles screen reading, which is 0.1. This is ground equipment screening.

Chairman Schwarz – I was confused by that too. Maybe I did read the wrong one. What do those sections say?

Mr. O'Connell – That is page 4-69. It is the last page of the section. It has A, B, C, and D. A-can't put in the front yard. B-equipment visible from a street must be fully screened by opaque wall or fence at least 6 inches higher than the topmost part of the equipment. C-screening must be 75 percent opaque.

Chairman Schwarz – We are holding it to the wall needs to be 6 inches taller than the tallest piece of equipment and it will be 75 percent opaque. That makes sense. Can we hold you to the Trex as opposed to unfinished wood?

Mr. Martin – Absolutely. That is what we planned.

Commissioner Joy – I am a neighbor to this property. I noticed that there is an ADA parking spot adjacent to where the fence is expanding. Is that being relocated?

Mr. Martin – Not to my knowledge. There are 4 or 5 parking spaces there. Every one of them is handicapped. Regardless of where you pull in there, there is going to be a handicap space. Since our fence is coming out approximately 2 feet, it will overlay that, to the lefthand side of the first handicap space, it will come out approximately 2 feet more than it is currently. It will impact that. You still have handicap access on the other side of that space. All those spaces are handicapped. We did not do anything to add any handicap spaces. I am sure that handicap space is still available. It is not quite as available as it was

Commissioner Joy – I know there are strict definitions on what the approaches are on either side. You might want to check that, so it does not become an issue.

Commissioner Harness – My comment is about the staff comment about how there are many properties that have a similar issue. I am sure that there are other properties throughout the city that have similar issues. If there is a way that through the cleanup process either this year or next year, if we can try to address this. Things that are relatively straightforward. Switching out chillers and things like that don't have to come before us.

Motion – Commissioner Harness – I move to recommend approval of this application for a Special Exception Permit in the NX-3 Node Mixed Use district at 1138 Rose Hill Drive to permit the construction of an expanded mechanical equipment area in the front yard with the following condition:

- The material will be a Trex material and not natural wood.

Second by Commissioner Solla-Yates. Motion passes 5-0.

2. Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) and HOME Investment Partnerships Program (“HOME”): Revised Citizen Participation Plan

i. Staff Report

Anthony Warn, Grants Analyst – We work with all the city departments across the city and offices on multiple grants programs. Of these two are our HUD funded programs Community Development Block Grants and HOME Investment Partnerships Programs. Part of the existing protocol is for us to bring plans that are eventually going to go to HUD for approval before the Planning Commission to get a recommendation to go on to City Council. I am here tonight to ask for your consideration and review of proposed updates to the citizen participation plan. I can go into some background on why this is coming before you right now.

Next Slide

The citizen participation plan is a component of our consolidated plan with HUD, which is a 5-year strategic plan that is updated annually. The citizen participation plan clarifies and spells out a lot of the rules that we follow to facilitate active engagement by the public to make sure that the public is aware of what is going on to provide them multiple opportunities to get involved in this work so that we can make sure that what we are doing is responsive as possible to community needs. HUD recommends that these citizen participation plans are revisited every 5 years. Our current CPP plan was last updated and approved in 2016 which suggests that it might not be current in terms of HUD guidance and regulations but also city’s practices and needs. Overall, we are now part of the Office of Budget now with budget and grants management. We are trying to bring a more consolidated approach to all the city’s many grant funded programs in part to streamline the process for staff and to reduce the amount of recurring tasks that must be done but also to clarify things for the public and to clarify things for the recipients that we work with that we provide money and support so they can go out and do their good work.

Currently, CDBG and HOME are outliers in that process. The public review and recommendations and coming before the Planning Commission and City Council occurs much later than all the other programs. We are trying to bring those in much more of a close alignment. Part of that is to revisit all the different processes involved. In full transparency, this is to be put before you as part of the consideration to remove that hearing before the Planning Commission before we go to City Council. CDBG and HOME are the only two programs that I believe we do that for. There is no specific HUD regulation requiring that. There is no specific requirement for that in the code of federal regulations. Doing so will help shorten the amount of time it takes to put forth all the different pieces involved and allow us to present City Council with much more coherent consideration of the full grant funding portfolio. There was a lot of interest in making sure that before any changes were made, that you were involved in the process. This has been part of the practice for a long time. We don’t want to do anything without your approval.

As we revisited the citizen participation plan, we started with all the different HUD requirements. We started to work on the things that are much more of a local purview.

Next Slide

Highlights of what we have proposed are to update all the references to HUD guidance and implementing regulations. There have been several changes. We have added new language to clarify the partnership that the city has between TJPDC who coordinate the HOME Program for us. It is a regional approach. There was not a lot of reference to TJPDC in the previous document. We have tried to streamline the public hearing process to

maintain Planning Commission representation on the CDBG HOME Task Force, but to streamline the amount of time it takes to go through the application process, the review process, the formulation of funding recommendations, the 30-day public comment period, and to get these before City Council closer to when all the other funding recommendations are presented to them. We preserve the number of seats available to all members. We want to keep it at nine. We have revisited the representation as those are aligned. The original citywide members were divided between seats that were tied to specific neighborhoods. There was one at-large city resident seat. There was a permanent seat for a member of the Planning Commission, permanent seat for a member of the school boards, and one member who represents the public service organizations, nonprofits that typically do the work or work with the populations we are trying to benefit. We have revisited that. Our neighborhoods tend to be less economically segregated than they were before, largely because of mixed-use developments. A lot of progress has happened over time. Having representation tied to specific neighborhoods is a little problematic. Sometimes you have two people from one neighborhood, who would be great and active members of the Task Force. If that one at-large seat is filled, there is no place for them to go if they don't work for a nonprofit public service, they are not on the School Board or Planning Commission. We have revisited that. There are five seats for people across the city at large with a preference that City Council consider for people who are tied to particular populations that are at the heart of the work we do or particular areas. There will be consideration for that. It just will not be tied geographically to a particular neighborhood, especially as the neighborhood might have changed considerably over the last ten years.

We took that as an opportunity to expand the number of seats available to representatives of the public service organizations who do the kind of work that we are trying to support. In the past, we have had people who are interested in participating. They did not live in any one of the priority neighborhoods and they did not belong to a public service group; maintain the Planning Commission representation, School Board representation, expand representation by representatives of public service groups, and have five at-large members. We have also updated the municipal code that is the implementing guidance for this to reflect these kinds of changes. That is Article 13 under Section 2-Administration that was revisited in 2016. It has specific references to things that are no longer part of what the city is doing or focusing on.

Next Slide

There currently is an engaged 30-day public hearing. We are open to hearing public comments before and after that. It starts on June 15th and will run through July 15th. The dates changed a little bit. They were going to be taking this before Council. It was moved from June 15th, the first public hearing. The first reading was scheduled for June 15th. It has now been pushed back to the July 20th Council meeting. That is going to be reflected in the public notice and on the city website. The second reading would be on August 3rd. Those two dates have been updated on the city CDBG and HOME website. People can go to the CDBG & HOME Public Notices page to get copies of the proposed documents. There is additional information provided there as well.

Next Slide

If the public wants to provide public comments, we are open to that. There are opportunities to provide it in writing, by mailing it to us, providing written comments by email, or showing up at any of the public hearings that have been scheduled. Members of the public can contact any of the people here.

Commissioner Mitchell – This basically removes this body from the review process. We have one planning commissioner on the board. We don't get to see it.

Mr. Warn – That is up for discussion and consideration. If you would like us to keep us bringing the plans before you as policy, more public hearings are a great approach. We were trying to get civic engagement and public awareness of what we are trying to do. This process does streamline it and bring it into alignment with what we do for all the other programs. We have our public comment period and take them before City Council.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Broadly, I am looking at the community engagement chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. We want people involved. We want transparent effective processes. We want the people who are affected by these things to be involved in these things. I understand that we have some Virginia law barring some best practices that otherwise we would do. How are you thinking about that conflict with our goals in the Comprehensive Plan and what we can do? To what extent, are we in harmony with what you are sharing with us?

Mr. Warn – We share those beliefs, values, and priorities for civic engagement. We are open to any considerations that you might have. If you feel strongly to keep this, that you feel like it adds value, that is a consideration. We have always struggled to get awareness out there about these two programs. They have been involved in the city for a long time. One of the approaches that we have been trying to have is to maybe get somebody more involved in the meetings of the neighborhood associations and get out there more and have discussions, especially focusing on the neighborhoods that we have traditionally operated in. We are open to any suggestions.

Commissioner Yoder – There is the engagement plan. The CPP must be updated every year. What is the process? I thought you said that you must have one every five years.

Mr. Warn – The code of federal regulations requires that we have one and that we follow it. It is publicly approved by the locally elected body (City Council) and it is approved by HUD. That was done in 2016. There is no specific language about how often it needs to be renewed. HUD recommends every five years. We are revisiting the current action plans that we have. We operate under the consolidated plan, which is a 5-year plan. This is the last year of that 5-year plan. In 2027/2028, we will be revisiting the whole process again; the consolidated plan, which is a lot of public hearings, a lot of discussions, a lot of community outreach. It is a complicated process.

Commissioner Yoder – Are the consolidated plan/the CPP done every five years?

Mr. Warn – In the federal regulation, the consolidated plan is required to be updated every five years. The CPP is a supporting document to that. It is HUD's attempt to ensure that localities are involving the community. It spells out how we are going to make things publicly aware, available to the public, how we are going to operate our public hearings. A lot of the language is what is already reflected in Virginia State Law or traditional practice.

Commissioner Yoder – The current public hearing or notice that is happening for public hearing, that is to eventually get Council to approve the CPP? Is that the consolidated plan that they are considering?

Mr. Warn – Before you right now is the Citizen Participation Plan. In a year, we will be revisiting that 5-year plan as well.

Commissioner Yoder – I have not been that involved with the HOME and CDBG Programs. I don't have a fundamental problem with removing a step in the process, especially since it must be done every year. We don't have the final say anyway. We are making recommendations. I never know what our recommendations do sometimes. If we have a commissioner who is involved in the process, I don't have an issue with giving up a little bit having one less step on the way to final approval. I am open to other opinions.

Commissioner Harness – Did these set of updates go in front of the Task Force?

Mr. Warn – The update to the Citizen Participation Plan did not necessarily go before them. It grows out of a long-standing concern that they have about the timing that is involved. The way things are right now, they are

doing their reviews. We have an open application window. It is open to all the community groups from January to the middle of February. That leaves the Task Force members starting their analysis, evaluation, discussions, and considerations into late February. The goal is that we have this done 45 days prior to the start of the July 1st start of the new program year that we have before HUD. Having all these steps constrains things. It leaves people sometimes feeling like there is not a lot of opportunity to revisit things because they are not going before the public boards with enough time to revisit things. The next hearing is contingent upon approval from this body to go before Council. Part of this concern grows out of a long-standing concern among the Task Force members to try to streamline things. Why are we doing this if nobody is requiring us? There are other opportunities to get it before the public as well.

Commissioner Harness – That is related to the potential of removing this commission from the process. What about redesignating the different seats out of the neighborhoods into an at-large position?

Mr. Warn – That distinctly grew from the members of the Task Force. Having people tied to those neighborhoods has left other people from being involved. In the last round, we had a very active member of the community who was appointed to a seat within a particular neighborhood. During the term of their service, they were forced to move. They stayed within the city. They never left the city. They moved out of the neighborhood to which they were appointed and into another neighborhood. They were prevented from being an active member of the Task Force that whole time. As soon as they moved out of their appointed seat, their membership was null. That seat closed. We did not have time to bring anybody in from that neighborhood even though there were people who had been interested. That person showed up at every meeting and was involved in every discussion and provided valuable input. They were not allowed to be an active member simply because they were forced to move from one neighborhood to another. That is why that rose up as a particular issue. The members of the Task Force felt strongly that was not fair to that person.

Commissioner Harness – The two big pieces of these updates other than bringing it to current HUD guidelines from 2016 are those two pieces, removing this commission and changing the designations of the chairs. It sounds like both of those came from comments and concerns from the Task Force.

Mr. Warn – That is correct.

Commissioner Harness – Was there consideration about codifying what to do with excess funds or coming up with a solution about how to do that? That was a big part of this commission's discussion. If you are removing us, that discussion goes to Council. How do you think about dealing with those overallocations?

Mr. Warn – That has long been a challenge for the Task Force and in ways to handle. They expressed interest in coming back together after things have settled down to try to formulate a priority. We base our initial funding recommendations on the amount of money we got last year. We wait for final notice from HUD of what the new number is going to be. If that was to happen, that opens a lot of discussion often at the last minute. Those happen in March, April, or May. Sometimes, the HUD notice comes in very late. There has been discussion about how do we codify something like that? The City Council has expressed an interest in having a say as well, which is wonderful. How do we do that when there are two public hearings and two readings? One of the discussions was to make an informal presentation, maybe through some informal process or during a work meeting ahead of time of what the recommendations are so that they have that in their minds. That is part of the interest in streamlining the process too. We have always started the application process in January. We want to push that back to November. I can confirm the dates for you later. I think we are looking at November 7th into December, which would then allow the Task Force members to review before that and come back together in January. We can have a public hearing and maybe space out the public hearings before the first reading and the second reading before Council. There are a lot of discussions. Nobody has figured out how to formulate a policy per se.

Commissioner Harness – Between now and the Council public hearing, can you provide us a red line of the changes between the documents? I know you provided the current and the proposed of both the CPP and the ordinance. Is there a way you can provide us with a red line so we can clearly see what language was changed?

Mr. Warn – That question has come up before. I will get you whatever I can. The original document was so out of date that we started with a new document instead. We can try to highlight places where there were changes. I can show you things. It was not simply an update. It was a ground level rewrite. Most of the things that are included in both plans are similar. When I joined, the Citizen Participation Plan was supposed to be a document that enables the public to become actively engaged. From early on, the first time I read it, it seemed like a technical document. One of the pieces of feedback that I have gotten from people is that when things are presented to them, it is technical. Could we provide a translation? As we were working through all the discussion about these kinds of changes, the document before you is still technical. Hopefully it reads more as a lay person friendly document than the original, more about the kind of values that drive you. That is what I noticed when I looked at other localities and how they approach their CPPs. Some of them are technical. Basically, what they have done is they have taken the HUD guidance and the requirements in the code of federal regulations and put them in an outline and put that out there. What we tried to do this time was to make it a more friendly public facing accessible document. It still has all the technical requirements and laying things out. I would be more than happy to get you what I can to show you those. It was not just a simple rewrite of the original.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Is it too late to make changes?

Mr. Warn – Yes.

Commissioner Solla-Yates – Just a broad editorial recommendation would be pictures. Pictures are engaging. They make a document livelier and more interesting to read. They provide a break for the reader and can give ideas that are relevant to the content.

Mr. Warn – I did not think about that. That is a wonderful recommendation. I find that including pictures and some of the other things I have done help show off the work that we have done. We have created a web page under budget and grants management for celebrating our community partnerships and putting pictures on there so people can see. That is the thing that has gotten me more people in the community saying ‘Oh, I saw that.’ We can do that.

Chairman Schwarz – I am in favor of removing the Planning Commission from the process if it streamlines it. I am assuming that it might give you a better chance. When the funding comes in late, you have more opportunity to make modifications rather than dealing with us as a step in the process. I always feel funny about it because it is the CDBG Task Force who does all the work. It feels weird to come in and second guess them, especially when Council is going to do that anyways.

Mr. Warn – One of the things that we did discuss among the Task Force was the idea that in lieu of a formal presentation before the Planning Commission, as soon as the initial funding recommendations are made, maybe that can be an opportunity for whoever has that seat from the Planning Commission to make a more formal presentation with what you guys do with your updates. That would give some time for you to discuss and consider and then to provide and consider and provide feedback to the member on the seat and utilize that person. We wanted to keep that representation there. That is a possibility.

ii. Commission Discussion and Motion

Motion – Commissioner Solla-Yates – I move that the Planning Commission recommend approval to City Council of the proposed amendments to the CDGB/HOME Citizen Participation Plan, and associated amendments to Chapter 2, Article XIII of the Charlottesville City Code with the recommendation that a more effective community engagement plan for the people most affected by CDBG and HOME spending replaces the Planning Commission public hearing. Second by Commissioner Mitchell. Motion passes 5-0.

V. ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting was adjourned at 6:41 PM.