

MINUTES FOR THE WEEKLY MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE ON THURSDAY, MAY 14th, 2009 AT 3 PM IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, BUILDING F.

PARTICIPANTS:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mary Jones
Jack Fraley
Bill Porter
Julie Leverenz
Chris Henderson
Vaughn Poller
Tom Tingle
Rich Krapf

NOT PRESENT:

George Billups
Mark Wenger
Ruth Larson

STAFF PRESENT:

Jason Purse, Senior Planner
Luke Vinciguerra, Senior Planner
Scott Whyte, Landscape Planner
Leanne Reidenbach, Senior Planner
Ellen Cook, Acting Principal Planner
Allen Murphy, Planning Director
Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner
Brian Elmore, Dev. Mgt. Asst.
Scott Thomas, Environmental Director
Leo Rogers, County Attorney

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Jack Fraley called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Fraley opened the public comment session.

Mr. John Laben, 200 Nina Lane, stated that citizens will start using bike and footpaths when they are connected. He said that paths are easier to maintain than roads. Bike lanes give cyclists additional safety and cars are less hostile when riders have their own designated areas. Bike lanes are most cost-effective when done during development, rather than as retrofits.

Mr. Steven Romine, 5388 Discovery Park Boulevard, stated that his client, Verizon, finds the new tower guidelines in the Community Character section acceptable. He says the firm understands the guidelines will lay the foundation for future ordinances. A United States Second Circuit Court case from March 26th ruled a New York town cannot mandate preferred cellular technologies. Verizon requests the language preferring a DAS system be eliminated from the Community Character Goals, Strategies, and Actions (GSA's).

Mr. Fraley stated there were wireless connections besides cellular services, including emergency connections and Wi-Fi service. He said the Wireless Communications Master Plan should incorporate all these types of systems. DAS is only a distribution system.

Mr. Robert Richardson, 2786 Lake Powell, commended the proposal for tree preservation proposed on the blog. He said he supports phased clearing and tree removal only in cases where the building plan will move forward. A concern he voiced at the May 11th Steering Committee meeting had already been resolved: Parks and Recreation had updated its website to show access to the Jamestown Beach Park. Boat access to the Little Creek Dam Reservoir should be improved to account for low water levels.

III. MINUTES

There were no minutes to consider.

IV. COMMUNITY CHARACTER

Mr. Leo Rogers stated he agreed with Mr. Romine's statement to the Steering Committee that the Comprehensive Plan is a guideline, not a law or regulations. He said the Federal Communications Commission regulates wireless technologies. If County established a law or regulation promoting one technology over another, then it would probably be overturned. However, the Telecommunications Act preserves local zoning authority over telecommunication facilities. Currently, County ordinances and policies which encourage smaller towers and co-locations are consistent with the Act. Although the Comprehensive Plan is just a policy, he stated that he would be concerned if the Comp Plan encouraged the use of specific technologies. He said he neither agrees nor disagrees with Mr. Romine's proposed Comprehensive Plan changes.

Mr. Scott Whyte presented the Community Character GSA revisions. He said the most sweeping change was to the format, revising the order and outline.

Ms. Julie Leverenz stated that the Suburban and Urban Community Character section should change "wooded buffer" to "natural screen" to allow for more options. She said some redundant words in the next sentence should be deleted.

Mr. Fraley stated that Mr. Tom Tingle had an issue with Action 1.3.3 and the word "appropriate" rezoning. He said that Action 1.3.2 may be related as well.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated the Planning Director has the ability currently to determine which projects were significant enough to trigger various submittal requirements, including illustrative drawings.

Mr. Chris Henderson stated Mr. Tingle had questioned the rezoning submittal requirements in cases where a regulatory burden would be placed on a small business owner. He asked staff to have discretion not to require illustrative drawings where the project is not of a significant enough nature.

Mr. Allen Murphy stated that there were no plans to amend the ordinance which currently provides the Planning Director discretion, gives flexibility, and allow the Planning Director to solicit input from the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors as to which cases are significant.

The consensus of the Steering Committee was in support of the discretion.

Mr. Henderson stated revised Action 1.3.10, regarding retaining the rural dark sky, would be appropriate where projects abut rural lands, but not inside more intense developments.

Ms. Leverenz stated light pollution affects areas for miles around, and applying dark sky guidelines countywide is appropriate.

Ms. Rosario stated upon request by the Steering Committee and subsequent staff research, staff found that there would be room to explore dark sky regulations during the Zoning Ordinance amendment phase.

Mr. Whyte stated dark sky guidelines are currently applied to signage and parking lot lighting. He said he felt the language could be expanded to other areas, without any additional cost to the development.

Mr. Vaughn Poller stated that up-lighting was a new development trend. He said the Committee should establish a guideline on this practice as a quality of life issue.

Mr. Henderson stated the current language does not specify which types of development would have to abide by the rules.

Mr. Fraley stated the dark sky language reads “encourage” not “require” and recommends guideline adoption. He said the Committee is not tasked with establishing specifics.

Mr. Henderson expressed concern that the dark sky regulations would be imposed across all developments.

Ms. Leverenz stated she desired for the dark sky restrictions to apply across all parcels.

Mr. Murphy stated guidelines would be decided at a later date. He said the guidelines could be as broad or narrow as the Board wished.

Mr. Henderson stated revised Action 1.4.1 should add the phrase “discourage development outside of the Primary Service Area (PSA).”

Mr. Fraley stated the Committee already recommended policies for discouraging growth outside the PSA, including lowering densities.

Mr. Murphy stated his first impression is that statements related to development occurring in the PSA are already included in other areas of the Comprehensive Plan. He said there probably isn't enough detail in the Community Character section to provide much value and it may be redundant with what is already in other sections.

Mr. Fraley stated that mention of the PSA should be removed from the Community Character section. He said statements discussing a vision for development inside and outside the PSA are included elsewhere.

Ms. Leverenz stated the PSA language should stay. She said PSA-related development and non-PSA development is a defining factor in the community's character.

Mr. Henderson stated the PSA language should remain as a value statement of the community's vision with regard to its character.

Mr. Fraley stated the Committee has expressed its strong desire for PSA language to remain.

Mr. Murphy stated staff could consider additional wording relating the broader issue of PSA and non-PSA development to community character. He stated that a value statement about the PSA would be removed as an action item and addressed in the text of the technical report.

Mr. Henderson stated that Action 1.6.1 provides staff discretion on when archaeological surveys will be required. He said on smaller parcels, the cost of compliance will exceed the cost of development.

If there is a public benefit from the extraction of artifacts, then the public should pay for the archaeology. The language in 1.6.1 does not address that issue.

Mr. Murphy stated that the wording reflects current practice with regard to implementation of the Archaeological Policy and that staff currently has the discretion to require archeological studies as an SUP condition or to suggest them as a proffer. The Board has final discretion as to how archeological surveys relate value to developers and the community. The word “require” is derivative of the Committee’s desire to be more action oriented.

Ms. Rosario clarified that staff changed the word “require” to “request” for this Comprehensive Plan. The Committee asked staff to change the language back to “require” as it is in the 2003 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Poller stated that the County could provide incentives to smaller parcel owners in the future to perform archaeological work.

Mr. Whyte read proposed language for a new action under Strategy 1.5: “Review and amend applicable County policies to require a more detailed phase clearing plan that minimizes the removal of existing trees and ensures proper tree preservation measures are implemented during site plan review and pre-construction phase of development.” Staff supports the language.

Mr. Henderson stated the language should differentiate between healthy and diseased tree stands. He said there should be a caliper requirement as well.

Mr. Fraley stated the landscaping ordinance already includes caliper requirements.

Mr. Rich Krapf stated that he supports something like this. There were several cases before the Commission where the developer agreed to a phased clearing. He said the language was a welcome addition to the ordinances.

Ms. Mary Jones stated she supported the tree preservation language’s inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan, and that more specific related ordinance amendments would be forthcoming. She said she would rather have additional enforcement of existing ordinances than new layers of regulation.

Mr. Fraley stated the proposed revisions stem from citizen comments over the past several years. He said he is comfortable with the staff response to his recommendations.

Ms. Leverenz stated she would have no objections differentiating between healthy and diseased trees in the language. She said the word “ensure” should be changed to “require.”

Mr. Bill Porter stated there were several legislative cases where developers removed trees intended for preservation. He questioned the public value of phased clear-cutting where the trees would ultimately be removed anyway.

Mr. Fraley stated the areas to be cut would be reviewed prior to removal under a new policy.

Ms. Jones stated there should be enough of a deterrent to keep developers from prematurely or incorrectly removing trees and just paying a fine.

Mr. Fraley stated that new plantings for developments would still be accepted. The trees to be saved would be clearly listed at pre-development meetings. He said the tree preservation reviews should fall under the purview of the Development Review Committee (DRC).

Mr. Henderson asked about possible conflicts between the tree preservation ordinance and forestry best management practices (BMPs).

Mr. Fraley stated the policy must be flexible enough for staff to administer.

Mr. Murphy stated the Board of Supervisors would decide on any tree removal specifics. He said forestry BMP's could be addressed during the pre-construction meeting.

Ms. Jones stated the tree removal ordinance was intended to minimize the removal of existing trees with new development.

Mr. Scott Thomas stated that when a land-disturbing permit is issued after plan review, an on-site pre-construction meeting occurs between Environmental staff, other staff, and the developer. A checklist including tree removal, soil erosion, storm water run-off, BMP inspection, etc. is reviewed.

Mr. Porter shared a concern with Mr. Poller that trees to be saved need to be identified from the beginning, during the site plan stage rather than later on in the pre-construction phase.

Mr. Poller stated that specimen trees should be decided during the site plan phase. He said having applicants preserve trees during the initial phase only to remove them later is too costly. A phased clearing is a totally different goal than preserving trees.

Mr. Murphy stated the proposed language allows for a more focused phased clearing plan, which focuses on appropriate tree preservation during both site plan and pre-construction phases.

Mr. Krapf stated if an ordinance change occurs, developers will have to take new rules into account. He said the new ordinance would extend preservation through the entire planning process.

Mr. Whyte stated it would be crucial for staff to plan tree preservation before the pre-construction meeting.

Ms. Leverenz stated the language should reflect preservation during the entire planning process, not just site plan and pre-construction. She said the preservation language in the GSAs should be limited to "require tree preservation measures be implemented."

Mr. Murphy stated the language "require tree preservation measure be implemented" could be interpreted to apply only to the phased clearing plan. He said the preservation guidelines will be reviewed with the upcoming ordinance amendments.

Mr. Fraley stated the only change to the wording would be to remove the word "proper."

Mr. Fraley stated that Action 1.7.2 should read, "Develop a wireless communications master plan." He said the wording was not precise enough.

Mr. Poller stated that the County should have a data infrastructure master plan, including wireless communications and broadband infrastructure.

Ms. Leverenz stated including data infrastructure in Community Character ensures these plans meet the County's aesthetics, as well as keeping it attached to the Public Facilities section. She said underground broadband poses no community character issues, and suggested adding a reference back to the Public Facilities section.

Mr. Fraley stated the broadband plans in Community Character and Public Facilities would be complimentary. He said a separate wireless plan would still be needed.

Mr. Poller stated the data infrastructure plan must ensure that future data needs can be built where needed. He said wireless hubs should be based off of existing and planned broadband infrastructure.

Mr. Murphy stated that while staff could consider any new types of technology, it should be the Board's discretion to invest in a wireless master plan. He said the County should have a clear understanding of what it would gain from that type of master plan.

Mr. Fraley stated the language should be changed to "Consider the development of a wireless communications master plan."

Ms. Leverenz stated a reference to the Public Facilities section should be included.

Mr. Fraley stated the DAS reference on page 25 of the Community Character Technical Report has been removed. He said references to specific systems should be changed.

Ms. Leverenz stated the technical report's language should be changed to allow for various technologies to be included.

Ms. Rosario stated staff will amend all language changes discussed thus far.

Mr. Henderson asked if placing the responsibility for Community Character Corridor compliance on property owners was the most effective strategy for maintaining the buffers.

Ms. Rosario stated there were no planned additions for a more public role in maintaining Community Character Corridors other than enforcement. She said the Committee could direct staff to develop more on this issue if it felt it was needed.

Mr. Porter stated there was no support for public ownership.

Mr. Murphy stated staff did not recommend public ownership of Community Character Corridors.

Ms. Leverenz stated there was new language in the GSA's allowing the County better enforcement of Community Character Corridors.

Ms. Jones stated she was hesitant to increase Community Character Corridor buffer enforcement.

Mr. Fraley moved for approval of the amended Community Character Technical Report and amended GSAs, with a second from Ms. Jones.

In a voice vote, the Committee approved the amended technical report and GSAs (7-0; Yes: Porter, Leverenz, Poller, Fraley, Jones, Henderson, Krapf; Abstain: Tingle; Absent: Larson, Wenger, Billups).

V. TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Luke Vinciguerra presented the Transportation Technical Report, highlighting the current state of transportation planning in the state and changes to the report since 2003. He said there are almost no state funds for road projects. In addition, the Virginia Department of Transportation is currently reviewing new regulations regarding access management, when to conduct traffic impact analyses, and secondary road acceptance standards. Although the County should continue to seek funds for road

projects, it should acknowledge that bike and pedestrian paths are tools in reducing congestion. The Committee has reviewed needed road improvements, but not discussed access management, connectivity, and innovative ideas to bike and pedestrian accommodation in detail.

Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic of Renaissance Planning Group stated that his firm used the staff technical report and GSA as the framework for its presentation. His comments covered emerging and current practices in transportation planning, new options for transportation planning alternatives, and common issues and concerns. He stated that communities are often designed not walkable. The traditional goal of transportation planning was to move people and goods, versus current paradigms focusing on accessibility. Increasing access increases freedom. Accessibility can be increased through speed or by bringing people and goods closer together. Smaller roads with more lanes and access points increase traffic capacity in a more distributed road system. The smaller roads are cheaper due to asphalt savings. Most highway funds go to maintenance, and increased traffic has far outweighed new roads built in recent years. Public opinion surveys list public transportation and walkable communities as preferred solutions to fight congestion.

Mr. Porter asked if the survey considered the percentage of people who would actually ride public transportation. He said most people favor other people riding public transit. He asked if small, cheaper roads were cheaper to maintain as well.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated the survey showed people want alternatives to building our out of traffic congestion issues. He said the asphalt savings on smaller roads, combined with increased curb and gutter and reduced speeds could balance itself out.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated safety is another major concern for traffic planners. He said numerous studies cite smaller roads as safer in both total accidents and fatalities. Connected streets are safer for emergency vehicles as well. For improved traffic flow, instead of mixing local and through traffic, these roads could be separated. Distributing roads help mix uses and create shorter trips. Distribution helps create walkable communities as well. Typical access management tools include signal spacing, limiting driveways between intersections, installing medians, and creating frontage and backage roads. Several access management tools were incorporated into Monticello Avenue, for example. Connectivity also factors into reduced congestion. Neighborhoods with less internal connectivity and greater external connectivity probably perform better than the reverse from a traffic standpoint because of the access to local connectors. Connectivity concerns are cost, additional pavement laid, loss of value of most expensive cul-de-sac lots, exclusivity of communities with lack of connections, through-traffic, and increased mobility that may be unwanted locally. Although cul-de-sac developments remain popular, connected communities are a growing trend. The traditional system of streets as pipelines is replaced with a network accommodating to all users. Greater accessibility and connectivity was addressed in Albemarle County's transportation plan for Crozet, with policies such as protecting the arterials and building a grid of signalized intersections as well as neighborhood grids. Much of the road network built since the Albemarle adopted the Crozet plan was done with private dollars. He concluded that the current GSA draft has many of the features of these emerging tools/approaches, but that despite the new techniques, there will still be a need in James City County for more traditional approaches, including additional road widening in key areas. Any solutions will need to consider local issues and conditions.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated there are new state laws the County must be aware of. VDOT established a system of access management standards for primary roads and arterials. The new regulations include quarter-mile intersections, signalized spacing, and limiting driveways between intersections. Secondary street acceptance standards include required connectivity, allowing narrower streets and new stormwater approaches, and more design flexibility in exchange for connectivity.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated he had not considered one-way streets for the County. Towns with limited space tend to favor one-ways. He has not witnessed other counties going to the extent of acquiring access easements through established cul-de-sacs to improve connectivity. Bike and pedestrian connections are more realistic in established communities. VDOT's intent is for the policy to apply to new developments.

Mr. Henderson stated connectivity to Williamsburg Crossing from adjacent neighborhoods could help alleviate bottlenecks along Route 199.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated the state was adopting greater responsibility for ensuring connectivity.

Mr. Fraley stated connections between Marywood and Williamsburg Crossing were considered but found to be cost-prohibitive by the developer due to RPA restrictions.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated the Crozet (Albemarle) master plan included 2000 acres, helping to take development pressure off rural areas by clearly defining a growth area. Albemarle County views the plan as a success. The plan also generated some controversy when its build-out by plan numbers exceeded its build-out by zoning numbers.

Mr. Tingle stated these transportation concepts should be sprinkled through the entire Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated the general issue of anticipating growth inside and outside the PSA helps transportation planning. He said the County having more area-specific plans relating to traffic plans would help with future planning as well. Augusta County defined growth areas, identified what infrastructure would be needed, then laid down a grid over the existing traffic arterials. Gaps in the grid were targeted for future growth.

Mr. Krapf stated that a recent conference, he heard that from an aesthetics standpoint, the roads should be the last piece of any development. Properties and viewsheds are identified before roads are designed.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated transportation planning and identifying aesthetics are harmonious. He said the Crozet plan placed roads to avoid certain stream crossings. There must be a mix of both planning concepts.

Mr. Henderson stated several commercial areas are internal to the Crozet development, as opposed to along a major road.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated existing Crozet residents were concerned about build-out. Albemarle learned to be clear about its build-out assumptions. Residents there have had positive reactions to the rate and predictability of growth in that community.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated that more connected roads would help the County's current public transit system. He said land use patterns with intense residential and job locations supports transit as well. He could not identify anywhere in the County to place a light rail yard. However, land use patterns and density will change in the next twenty years.

Ms. Rosario stated Committee members had access to the Hampton Roads Transit Vision Plan, which envisions a corridor between James City County and Newport News.

Mr. Tingle added that any local light or commuter rail would probably use existing rail lines and Amtrak equipment. Light rail in the area is relatively more difficult due to the lack of clear one-way traffic pattern such as in Northern Virginia. Rail between Washington and Richmond, and Richmond and Newport News and possibly the Southside are being considered. James City would probably not house a turning yard. Lightfoot or Norge would be a logical stop for high speed or commuter rail.

Mr. Gavrilovic stated candidates for area plans in the County include sites of future congestion and growth areas.

Mr. Porter stated a growth node could be created in the Lightfoot area with the Economic Opportunity designation.

Mr. Henderson proposed a road between Croaker Road and Longhill Road to alleviate future congestion at the Centerville Road/Richmond Road intersection.

Ms. Rosario stated that in response to Mr. Henderson's request, staff reviewed the Outer Bypass proposal from the 1991 Comprehensive Plan. The road was removed by the Board of Supervisors during deliberations for the 1997 Comprehensive Plan. The Colonial Heritage development has since been approved in that proposed route's alignment. Staff would want the Committee's consensus before beginning additional research on a new alignment.

Ms. Jones stated there are many property owners and many environmental considerations along the proposed route.

Mr. Henderson stated the County owns the majority of the land bordering Centerville and Jolly Pond, including the school site, Freedom Park, and the landfill. The proposed road will allow a direct conduit to the EO employment site at Croaker Road, although Colonial Heritage cannot now be used. He stated that the Candle Factory development is not yet approved, and right of way dedication could be proposed as part of that development. Connecting from Longhill Road through Freedom Park to Cranston Mill Pond, the road would wind northeast to Croaker Road.

Ms. Rosario stated a conclusion on the proposed road could not be arrived at quickly.

Mr. Krapf stated he would like to see an in-depth analysis, with zoning, build-out impacts, and environmental conditions before proceeding.

Mr. Poller stated there would be stream crossing and rural lands challenges to the road. He said some of the corridor was outside of the PSA, and that roads tend to encourage new development.

Mr. Tingle stated it was difficult to imagine the effect of an outer bypass road proposed in the early nineties applied to current traffic patterns. He questioned if there are other means of traffic management within developed areas.

Mr. Porter stated it was late in the Committee process to introduce a major new project. He said the proposal could be looked at in depth for a future Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Jones stated the County could start exploring where it wants new roads and connectivity for the next Comprehensive Plan and the regional plan.

Mr. Henderson stated staff had already been given development assumptions for the EO project.

Mr. Fraley stated the proposal should be flagged for further study in the next Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Leverenz stated if the Committee wants to investigate the corridor, it should include an action item to preserve a terminus for a future outer bypass at Croaker.

Mr. Krapf stated that the issue was so complex, he would not feel comfortable preserving a terminus.

Mr. Fraley stated the approval of the Candle Factory would provide the impetus for evaluating the outer loop. He said the Candle Factory is deferred until after the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Porter stated it would be difficult to restrain development all along a Route 199-sized corridor in the next few years.

Mr. Tingle stated he would need additional information from staff, VDOT, and environmentalists before attempting to a preserve corridor outside the PSA with significant environmental impacts and no knowledge of its impact on traffic.

Mr. Porter reminded the Committee that a previous Board had gone through a process to remove it from the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Rosario stated what she had heard—that there was interest in this idea, but without hard data, no interest in preserving the corridor yet. The Committee was sending a signal to staff to study the corridor concept before the next Comprehensive Plan. The signal could come in the form of recommendations from the current Committee to the future Committee preparing for the regional update.

Mr. Porter stated there were many unanticipated consequences from surrounding areas when Route 199 was built and one could not overemphasize the caution needed.

Mr. Fraley asked what “acceptable level of service” from Action 1.1.2 meant. He said the Committee had discussed criteria for what is acceptable, but he recognized it would be difficult to impose the same service level across the entire County. More poorly rated service levels would be acceptable in some parts of the County.

Mr. Krapf stated poor service levels may exist in areas such as Community Character Corridors where significant widening could not happen.

Mr. Fraley stated that although there was citizen pressure against widening Jamestown Road, the corridor’s current zoning would allow enough development to eventually require a widening.

Mr. Tingle stated a poor service rating in a rural area is unacceptable, but a poor service rating during rush hour is to be expected.

Ms. Rosario stated some localities were moving to an alternate classification system. She said Community Character Corridors roads could be re-evaluated for their transportation abilities and level of service expectations.

Mr. Tingle stated that road widening is not always the solution. He said since no one in the Committee wanted eight-lane roads, alternative solutions would have to be found.

Mr. Poller stated the community was willing to endure congestion rather than widen certain roads. He said the community needs to identify what levels of service are acceptable.

Ms. Rosario stated that since the Committee ruled out road widening in many areas, the County will have to accept a lower level of service as a starting point.

Mr. Fraley stated he was pleased with the number of action items that came out of the RPG presentation.

VI. LAND USE

Mr. Fraley stated his vision for a staff position for rural lands under Action 1.6.1.5 would oversee both preservation and economic development in rural areas. He said the Committee wanted to be more assertive on rural lands economic development language, and there was language related to that, but staff's language did not support a new staff position.

Ms. Leverenz stated that the County Administrator and staff were better judges of how to use staff hours and possible new staff positions.

Ms. Ellen Cook stated Administration did not want a rural lands advisor as a dedicated position. Staff had a wording recommendation based on the Administrator's statement.

Mr. Fraley stated he would like any rural lands initiatives to address issues beyond economic development.

Ms. Leverenz suggested the language "Dedicate resources to supporting and assisting the work of the Rural Economic Development Committee to identify, encourage, and promote rural natural resource based activities in James City County."

The committee supported that change.

Mr. Tingle stated if the Committee hopes to preserve rural lands, it must have a strong definition of rural economic activity.

Mr. Leverenz stated that a reference to the rural lands chart should be included in the Land Use Technical Report.

Mr. Tingle stated that a reference to Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) is only mentioned in 1.6.1.2.d. He said he would like language inserted to mention transferring development rights from sending areas to receiving areas, along with definitions of those terms. If new Comprehensive Plan does not address TDRs, then it will only become more difficult for future Committees to do so. Additional language addressing whether the County has sufficient receiving areas could also be added.

Ms. Leverenz stated TDRs may be beneficial, but not be feasible in the County without receiving areas.

Mr. Tingle stated it would be difficult to lower rural lands' densities without a successful TDR program.

Ms. Leverenz stated the incentives for offsetting density loss were not adequately addressed in the actions.

Mr. Tingle stated Action 1.6.1 presents the “tool kit” and Action 1.6.2 addresses the density issues and discouragement of development.

Ms. Cook stated the Committee should develop a package of options for preserving rural lands.

Mr. Murphy stated that in reading Action 1.5.2.3, the intent is to examine clear guidelines. He said the word “develop” seems appropriate given items (a) and (c) allow flexible consideration.

Mr. Fraley motioned for approval of the amended Land Use Technical Report and amended GSAs, with a second from Ms. Leverenz.

Ms. Cook stated the Economic Opportunity designation would appear in the final text.

In a unanimous voice vote, the Committee approved the amended Land Use Technical Report and GSAs (6-0; Yes: Porter, Leverenz, Poller, Tingle, Fraley, Krapf; Absent: Larson, Wenger, Jones, Henderson, Billups).

VII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Jack Fowler, 105 Wilderness Lane, stated he was distracted by staff conferring with one another at the staff table during the Committee meeting. He thanked Mr. Krapf for attending a meeting in Pineridge.

VIII. AJOURNMENT

Mr. Krapf moved for adjournment, with a second from Mr. Tingle.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:40pm.

Mr. Jack Fraley, Chair