

**AT A WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, HELD ON THE 28TH DAY OF JULY 2009, AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA.**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**B. ROLL CALL**

James G. Kennedy, Chairman, Stonehouse District  
Mary Jones, Vice Chair, Berkeley District  
Bruce C. Goodson, Roberts District  
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Powhatan District  
John J. McGlennon, Jamestown District

Sanford B. Wanner, County Administrator  
Leo P. Rogers, County Attorney

**C. BOARD DISCUSSION**

1. Joint Work Session with the Planning Commission – 2009 Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Krapf called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order. In attendance from the Planning Commission were: Mr. George Billups, Mr. Jack Fraley, Mr. Chris Henderson, Mr. Rich Krapf, Ms. Deborah Kratter, and Mr. Reese Peck. Mr. Joe Poole was absent.

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner, commented on the meeting's agenda and discussion points. She reviewed the milestones of the Comprehensive Plan review process for the Board and Planning Commission, including the adoption of the methodology, formation and meetings of the Community Participation Team, public input through Community Conversations and an interactive website, and the formation and meetings of the Steering Committee. She stated the Plan was adopted (with revisions) by the Steering Committee on June 25, 2009, and was distributed to the Board and Planning Commission for consideration. She stated that after adoption of the Plan by the Planning Commission, the Board would consider the matter, likely in fall 2009. Ms. Rosario reviewed key elements of the draft Comprehensive Plan and highlighted how community input was implemented throughout the process. Ms. Rosario stated the goals of the work session were to receive feedback from the Board on the draft plan, as well as feedback on specific items brought forward by Mr. Krapf, and identification of any additional items related to the Plan for future discussion.

Mr. Krapf noted that the Planning Commission was in the early stages of its review of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that there was a need for a process to address each of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that some items will require additional research by staff and that an additional work session may be needed for detailed text revisions. He stated that there were a number of items for discussion related to content and organization, which was provided to the Board. He highlighted Fairfax County's approach of providing a high-level policy plan document as a supplement to its Comprehensive Plan.

The Board and Commission discussed the differing functions of a policy plan document concept and the adaptation of this idea into an executive summary for the benefit of the public.

Discussion was held about the structure of the Comprehensive Plan and having growth management strategies substantially highlighted and creation of a model to develop and assess cumulative impact of land use projects for levels of service. There was discussion about how population numbers guide the plan and the vision of a sustainable community.

Mr. Krapf explained that a new component to the Plan was an implementation guide and noted the potential for monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Plan. There was also discussion of a potential amendment process that would allow updates of policy documents, including items such as an adopted Parks and Recreation Master Plan, special studies, and land use designation change requests, as a way to keep the document current for the public. Mr. McGlennon expressed his concern about amending the Comprehensive Plan between cycles without a compelling purpose.

Discussion was held about a potential sustainability plan action item to unite sustainability initiatives and to reference a weighted checklist for sustainable development. Sustainability was defined as production outweighing consumption of resources, such as traffic levels of service. Emphasis was placed on growth principles, sustainable development strategies, housing options, recreational and education opportunities, and economic development. Mr. Fraley reviewed applications of each of the elements and the process for using a checklist during the application process.

Mr. McGlennon discussed the general nature of the Comprehensive Plan document and the measurability of particular components of the Plan, as well as variability of circumstances in relation to application of parts of the Plan. He commented on the pace of growth in the County and how it could be reflected in the Comprehensive Plan, and noted his desire to highlight community character. He stated that the Office of Economic Development should encourage locally-based retail stores rather than national chains and that the affordable housing component should be researched and evaluated from the employment perspective to increase diversity of jobs. He stated that he wished to see an increased quality in employment opportunities. Ms. Jones echoed concerns about the pace of growth in the County. The direction and vision of the plan and its influence on the County were discussed, including economic development strategies and maintaining the quality of life in the community.

Discussion was held about prioritization of the action items or creating an implementation schedule. Mr. Krapf stated that this was a discussion item that would be addressed before the Plan came before the Board. Mr. Peck suggested that the Board give guidance on a "Top 10" for the priorities to be addressed, which would be matched to the action items that were provided. He stated that often, public awareness of issues was not widespread, so though the County was working to address matters such as growth management, the efforts were not made clear to the public.

Mr. Fraley stated that he went forward with the Steering Committee in making the Comprehensive Plan more actionable and measurable. He did not wish to use vague "weasel wording" that would diminish accountability for the proposed action items. He noted that he was supportive of most points in the County Administrator's recent memo on the Comp Plan.

Ms. Kratter commented that a report card or evaluation of the progress would create accountability. She noted that she felt a clear vision was needed for the County and the evaluation should measure the goals according to the vision. She stated that the public needed an explanation as to why goals and projects were or were not coming to pass. She stated the need for flexible, but not open-ended goals.

Mr. Krapf stated that an update or progress report could measure the action items corresponding to the defined priorities.

Mr. Icenhour asked if a report could be generated that focused on major areas of progress and general exceptions to the Plan as a simpler approach. He stated that he was concerned about opening up the plan for amendment on an annual basis.

Mr. Fraley stated the point of the amendment process was to engage the public and allow the citizen input in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Kennedy stated that public input could be accomplished through the electoral process. He commented on land use predictability and the lack of this element in the Comprehensive Plan. He commented on density and population control and the possibility of transfers of development rights. Mr. Kennedy expressed concern for the protection of rural lands and proposed innovative ideas, such as transferring development rights within the Primary Service Area (PSA). He expressed a desire to allow growth where it was desired rather than creating sprawl. He stated concern about water needs and first-come first-served water supply. He commented on types of housing available, adequate public facilities, and green building. He expressed concern about growth and the job market in the County. He said that he would rather outline accomplishments in a report to explain to the public what has been done to steer the County in the direction that its citizens want it to go.

Mr. Henderson discussed establishing a projected population target to develop a plan for growth and how density affects the number. Discussion was held about allocating density in a way that would balance economic growth and sustainability. Mr. Kennedy expressed a desire to achieve land use predictability and Mr. Henderson noted that increased density was not necessarily a bad thing, as it provided for attractive economic opportunities.

Mr. Kennedy commented that there was a definite need in the County for more transportation funding, and alternate means of transportation, such as high-speed rail, to promote economic development. He commented on the percentage of equal opportunity housing in the County and how that affected those who live and work in the County. He reiterated his desire for creative solutions to density issues, such as transfer of development rights to manage growth and development. Mr. Fraley noted that PDRs and TDRs were included in this plan. He stated that there were provisions for pedestrian-friendly development and interconnectivity during the ordinance review, which would provide more predictability.

Mr. McGlennon commented on deteriorating infrastructure, including inadequate stormwater management systems. He commented that transfer of development rights from unbuildable, environmentally sensitive property inside the PSA in order to build on developable property outside the PSA may encourage unnecessary growth. He commented on promotion of economic growth and stressed that the Comprehensive Plan should provide incentives for better jobs in the County, rather than more lower-level service industry jobs. He stated that flexibility in the Plan would help address disagreements regarding the details. He commented that economic incentives to some degree would be beneficial, but incentives to develop outside the PSA may not be in the County's best interest. He commented that that Mixed Use development should have a reasonable balance of commercial and residential use.

Mr. Icenhour stated support for moving the comments of citizens forward in each section of the the Comp Plan. He suggested that comments be included in the vision statement from the 2007 citizen survey from the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) which indicated that 60-percent of citizens did not feel that the County was headed in the right direction, and 70-percent did not think the County was listening to their concerns. He stated that for the last 15 years, citizen comments on growth have been loosely

acknowledged. He stated this report was significant and he wished to see it incorporated into the Comp Plan so that these issues could be addressed.

Mr. Henderson commented on the development of a public facilities master plan, redevelopment needs in the County and failing infrastructure, desirable economic development and tourism enhancement, and the balance of non-residential versus residential tax revenue.

Ms. Rosario commented that references to a public facilities master plan had been removed by the Steering Committee in the draft Comprehensive Plan in favor of smaller, independent changes.

Mr. McGlennon commented on the difficulties in accurately measuring and ascribing the reasons behind changes in tax revenue proportions.

Mr. Billups expressed concern regarding water quality and testing in relation to chemicals and runoff.

Mr. Krapf adjourned the Planning Commission.

At 5:50 p.m., the Board took a short break.

At 6:01 p.m., Mr. Kennedy reconvened the Board.

#### **D. CLOSED SESSION**

Mr. Goodson made a motion to go into Closed Session for the consideration of a personnel matter, the appointment of individuals to County boards and/or commissions pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia, specifically the Social Services Advisory Board and for the consideration of a personnel matter, involving the annual performance evaluation of the County Attorney, pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia.

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Goodson, Jones, McGlennon, Icenhour, Kennedy (5). NAY: (0).

At 6:02 p.m. Mr. Kennedy recessed the Board into Closed Session.

At 6:39 p.m. Mr. Kennedy reconvened the Board.

Mr. McGlennon made a motion to adopt the Closed Session resolution.

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Goodson, Jones, McGlennon, Icenhour, Kennedy (5). NAY: (0).

### **RESOLUTION**

#### **CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING**

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, (Board) has convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3711 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge: i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies; and ii) only such public business matters were heard, discussed, or considered by the Board as were identified in the motion, Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia, to consider a personnel matter, the appointment of individuals to County boards and/or commissions and Section 2.2-3711(A)(1) of the Code of Virginia, the annual performance evaluation of the County Attorney.

**E. BREAK**

At 6:40 p.m. the Board broke for dinner.

---

Sanford B. Wanner  
Clerk to the Board

072809bosws\_min