



Master Planning Council (MPC)

MEETING NOTES - December 12, 2005

Office of the Architect for the University

Summary: County Comprehensive and UVA Transportation Planning

Meeting Attendees

Ed Ayers
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Ashley Cooper
Neighborhood Planner, City of Charlottesville

Elliott DeJarnette
Student, School of Law

Bill Edgerton
Albemarle County Planning Commission

L. Cameron Howell
Assistant to the President

Ed Howell
Vice President and CEO, UVA Health System

Patricia M. Lampkin
VP for Student Affairs

Cheri Lewis
Chair, City of Charlottesville Planning Commission

Craig K. Littlepage
Director of Athletic Programs

Richard Minturn
Senior Academic Facility Planner, Provost's Office

Julia Monteith, AICP
Senior Land Use Planner, Office of the Architect

David J. Neuman, FAIA
Architect for the University

Yoke San L. Reynolds
VP and Chief Financial Officer

Rick Rice
Chief Facilities Officer

Tim Rose
CEO, UVA Foundation

Mary Joy Scala
Neighborhood Planner, City of Charlottesville

Colette Sheehy
VP for Management & Budget

Karen Van Lengen
Dean, School of Architecture

Rebecca White
Director of Parking & Transportation

Casey Williams
Graduate Student, School of Architecture

Meeting Agenda

- Review of the County of Albemarle Planning Process – Presented by David Benish, Chief of Planning for Albemarle County
- UVA Transportation Planning – Presented by Carl Tewksbury and David Whyte of Kimley-Horn and Associates
- UVA Parking and Transportation – Presented by Rebecca White
- UVA Bike Planning – Presented by Julia Monteith

Review of the County of Albemarle Planning Process

David Benish, Chief of Planning for Albemarle County, presented an overview of the comprehensive plan process and its current status.

The Comprehensive Plan is the most important policy document in the County. It is the fundamental basis for zoning, school planning, resource protection, environmental guidance and other areas.

The Four sections in the Comprehensive Plan are:

1. Natural and cultural resource conservation
2. Rural Land Area Plan
 - a. Rural Area is 95% of County
3. Land Use Plan
 - a. Growth Management
 - b. Community Standards
 - c. Environmental Requirements
4. Economic Development

Virginia law mandates that the comprehensive plan be reviewed every 5 years. Due to the size of the County document, there is a rolling review process. The last full adoption of the Land Use Plan was in 1996. Since then, the major amendment has been the introduction of the Neighborhood Model in 1998, and that has since been updated.

The Land Use plan covers 11 neighborhoods: Crozet, Hollymead, Piney Mountain, Rivanna plus the 7 neighborhoods of the Urban Area, which surrounds the City of Charlottesville. Of these neighborhoods, 4 of 11 have been completed in the current cycle. Those under current review are Places 29, to be completed at the end of 2006, and Pantops to be completed by summer 2006. There has been a recently completed update to the community standards section of Land Use plan.

For the other sections of the Comprehensive Plan, the Rural Area plan was

updated in 2005, and the Transportation plan is under Board of Supervisors review in January. The Natural Resources section was last completed in 1999 and is currently undergoing an internal review. The oldest section is Economic Development, which hasn't changed since its 1996 adoption. This is currently under internal review and awaiting the Board of Supervisors guidance in regard to priorities.

Questions for David Benish:

- Q. Julia Monteith: Are updates to the comprehensive plan completed on a regular schedule?
A. David Benish: The County attempts to meet the 5 year legal requirement, but in actuality the updates usually take 7 years due to the delay in review and approval by the Board of Supervisors.
- Q. Ed Ayers: Are more developments such as Eagle's Landing and other remote, student oriented developments in the works?
A. David: One more is in the review stage now. Hopefully we have reached the market limit, but there appears to be an opinion among developers that this market is still hot.

Elliott Dejarnette: The space/price ratio, especially at Eagle's Landing is very attractive to students who don't mind the distance.

- Q. Richard Minturn: Is it the sense among city/county planners that these type of projects were approved just prior to the city's rezoning effort that allowed for higher density in some areas close to the university?
A. David: Yes, but there still are some market slots, such as secure housing. There is a plan for a gated student community.
- Q. Cheri Lewis: Is there a complete site plan for Biscuit Run?
A. David: Yes, the rezoning requires a complete master plan. It is important to remember that the County averages the approval of only about 800-1000 building permits per year, so Biscuit Run will not come online all at once or even in the next 5-10 years. Another strong desire of the County is the completion of the Sunset to Fontaine connector.

Cheri Lewis: Many residents in the JPA neighborhood have also voiced strong opinions in favor of the connector; they are very concerned about increased traffic and feel the connector would divert much of the Biscuit Run traffic away from their neighborhood.

- Q. David Neuman: Are traffic plans required from these developments?
A. David Benish: Yes.

UVA Transportation Planning

Carl Tewksbury and David Whyte of Kimley Horn (a transportation consultant for UVA) presented an overview of transportation planning on Grounds.

Kimley Horn has provided traffic and transportation consulting to the University since September 2003. To date, they have been involved in 21 projects on grounds, examples include the Emmet/Ivy, South, and Arts Grounds Garages, West Main Street, Stadium Road Extension, and the South Lawn.

Transportation challenges on grounds include topography, the natural environment, buildings, railroad corridors, public interactions, and funding.

In creating transportation plans for grounds, Kimley Horn breaks plans into three groups: Precinct Plans, Area Plan, and Corridor Plans. These plans feature an emphasis on the importance of multi-modal transportation through use of wider sidewalks, additional bicycle accommodations, improved connectivity, transit rerouting and ADA access.

Parking planning requires a balance between available supply, the limited areas available for new facilities, the high cost of structured parking, and traffic impacts. Planning for new parking facilities also needs to integrate into existing Master Plans.

Kimley Horn also spoke of their work in special event traffic management. The soon-to-be-completed John Paul Jones Arena will attract an even more diverse range of events and underscore the importance of understanding the bigger picture of special event traffic.

In regards to public confidence, Kimley Horn spoke of their continued relationship building effort and their partnerships with both the City and County.

Under the title of “moving forward”, Kimley Horn posed several questions to the group:

1. How do we better manage the transportation and parking systems we have.
2. How can we better or more appropriately accommodate the system’s users?
3. Is there a fundamental shift in how we accomplish circulation and transportation?
4. How do we encourage the use of and enhance transit?
5. How do we encourage more people to walk and bicycle?

The mechanisms for answering these questions may be management, policy, and/or physical changes. Finishing their presentation, Kimley Horn offered some possibilities for answering these questions:

1. Transportation demand management
2. Priority corridors
3. Master parking plan
4. Enhanced pedestrian and bicycle accommodations
5. Transit provisions
6. Special event traffic plans
7. Wayfinding

[Kimley-Horn next solicited thoughts from the MPC on how the University should plan for the future in terms of transportation planning on Grounds:](#)

Dick Minturn: From today’s Washington Post, the idea of paying to get someplace faster.

- Q. Ed Ayers: What is the scope of the traffic problem in Charlottesville?
- A. Kimley-Horn response: On a scale of 1-5, many people in Charlottesville might say 4.5 and it can be a matter of personal preference. But, comparatively, Charlottesville is likely a 3-4, but at times, for special events and the like, traffic can overwhelm capacity and stall the system.
- Q. Tim Rose: Do you work with any other cities about Charlottesville’s size that have successfully encouraged biking and transit as means of transportation?
- A. Kimley-Horn response: Chapel Hill, NC has been successful at meeting that goal. They have a fare-free transit system and encourage alternative modes of transit.

Rebecca White: UNC-Chapel Hill also has a 7-figure traffic management office to work these issues. A million dollars might seem like a lot until you are faced with the cost of an 800 car garage.

- Q. Ed Howell: On the same 1-5 scale, how do you rate parking in Charlottesville?
- A. Kimley-Horn response: I think the inventory is there, but this might be a better question for Rebecca.
- A. Rebecca White: Parking should be cheap, convenient, and plentiful, but we can only manage two of there. We have all of the capacity we need, but much of it is in remote areas.

Ed Howell: After traveling to other health systems and schools, I can say that our parking situation is superlative. After making that statement in public, I found that many disagreed with that view. I think the level of irritation at parking might also be lower here too.

Ashley Cooper: At a recent neighborhood meeting, close in areas such as Lewis Mountain have expressed a desire for more programs to assist Faculty and Staff in purchasing homes near the school, as a method to increase the rate of owner occupied housing.

Ed Ayers: I would like to second Ashley’s comment, the sole complaint that we get from many potential and new

hires is in regard to the price of housing in Charlottesville. The rate of owner occupied housing is thought to be 50% in the Lewis Mountain neighborhood, but drops as low as 13% in the JPA neighborhood.

UVA Parking and Transportation

Rebecca White, Director of Parking and Transportation at UVA presented a report on Parking and Transportation at UVA:

The goal of Parking and Transportation (P&T) at UVA is to increase demand for transit while lowering the parking demand. As part of this mission, P&T has developed working relationships with neighboring transportation providers. The free Charlottesville Trolley is a collaboration between P&T and the Charlottesville Transit Service (CTS). The Trolley is the most utilized bus route in the city, making up a third of total CTS ridership.

In October, P&T conducted an experiment offering free CTS rides to UVA students, staff, and faculty. This trial run was successful and the offer will be repeated in April in order to have a complete set of data.

Other P&T collaborations include RideShare, an organization that promotes carpool and vanpool programs and involves the City of Charlottesville and five neighboring counties.

After an trial period last summer, the entire 30-bus UTS fleet now runs on B20 biodiesel fuel. The blend of 80 percent diesel and 20 percent vegetable oil results in reduced emissions and less dependence on petroleum.

Questions for Rebecca White:

- Q. Ed Ayers: Are people, students in particular, moving around. What do we know about patterns in student housing?
- A. Rebecca: In the past the Geostat Center has performed a geocode of housing patterns. Another effort is in process, which will give us a means to identify some trends.
- Q. Ashley Cooper: Why does UVA provide parking spaces for all students who want one?
- A. Rebecca: First to qualify, first year students are prevented from having cars since the policy was changed three years ago. We provide spaces to students in order to prevent forcing them into neighborhoods.
- Q. Ed Howell: Several schools he has seen offer free parking in a secure but remote environment.
- A. Rebecca: UVA offers a similar service with the Ivy/Emmet garage.

David Whyte: It is also important for the City to keep up with permitting and enforcement to prevent students from parking in neighborhoods.

UVA Bike Planning

Julia Monteith, Senior Land Use Planner for the Office of the Architect at UVA, provided a report on the UVA bicycle planning efforts:

The Office of the Architect has initiated a coordinated planning effort between the City, County, MPO and the University for bicycle and pedestrian planning. This planning group includes representatives from each of the entities and will be meeting on a quarterly basis to coordinate planning efforts as well as look for opportunities for joint funding and implementation. Each of these entities have developed or are in the process of developing their own plans.

In 2003, the City adopted their new Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Master Plan, which was initiated in 2001. It is a long-range plan, but has had immediate benefits with the installation of bike lanes, trails, and other related facilities.

The County has been in the process of developing the Jefferson Area Bicycle, Pedestrian and Greenways Plan. The Plan builds on the pedestrian and bicycle planning that has occurred in the Comprehensive plan and it represents the county's priority bike/ped projects for the first quarter of this century. While in draft now, the plan is nearing adop-

tion.

In recent years the MPO has been developing a coordinated bike/ped planning effort that has been adopted by all the counties/city in the MPO.

UVA developed a comprehensive Bicycle Master Plan in 1993, and additional planning was completed for the 1997 Landscape Master Plan. The Office of the Architect will now be updating the University's Bicycle Plan, working with the Green Grounds Committee members as part of the work effort.

This coordinated effort was initiated in fall of 2005 with Elaine Uang coordinating the efforts of the Green Grounds Committee members and Julia Monteith managing the project for Office of the Architect. The primary focus for fall was research on previous planning efforts and establishing a methodology for mapping existing use on Grounds. The priorities and related schedule for the Spring semester 2006 are case studies of peer institutions in regard to bike planning; an on-Grounds bicycle usage survey, completion of the bicycle usage mapping, and updating of bicycle-friendly map for campus use.

Questions for Julia Monteith:

- Q. Yoke San Reynolds: As you look at bicycle efforts at other universities, will you examine those that utilized free bike programs?
- A. Julia: That is a good suggestion and we will investigate those case studies.
- A. Cheri Lewis: The previous free bike program in Charlottesville proved unsuccessful do to theft of bicycles by children who desired bikes, so that should be taken into consideration with planning for any similar program in the future.
- Q. Dick Minturn: On the bicycle initiative, how much success do we expect given the challenges in topography and weather that exist in Charlottesville?
- A. Julia: We need to keep that in mind. There are many case studies from California institutions that don't have our weather challenges, but there are also institutions that succeed despite challenging weather conditions, such as Universities of Oregon and Colorado.

Ed Ayers: While living in the Netherlands I observed bicycle use that continued despite the harsh conditions. Bicycle garages offered safe, dry storage and helped overcome the conditions.

David Neuman: Increasing bicycle use will require a cultural shift, but not an impossible one. By designing dorms, parking garages, and other structures with bikes in mind, we can get a substantial amount of convenient storage and help change the culture.