

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 13, 2005

TO: Members of the Rural Lands Committee

Jeff Barra	Victoria Fahringer
George Billups	Richard Krapf
Rich Costello	Gary Massie
Jim Daniels	Jack Schmidt

FROM: Tammy Rosario, Senior Planner II

SUBJECT: Rural Lands Committee Meeting #5 - December 14

Please find attached the materials for the next Rural Lands Committee meeting scheduled for December 14th at 4:00 p.m. at the **James City County Library Community Room** (7770 Croaker Road). These materials include the revised minutes from the November 2nd meeting, minutes from the November 30th meeting, an aggregate copy of the homework assignment, and the agenda for the December 14th meeting.

To start the meeting, the consultants will present the committee members' feedback from the homework assignment leading into a discussion on common themes and direction on the options. Renaissance will then turn the floor over to their sub-consultant, Earthworks Consulting Engineers, to continue the analysis of well and septic system costs and feasibility for rural residential development. During this time, the consultants will also provide an update on the environmental and fiscal impact analysis of the various rural residential development options. Finally, the agenda will conclude with a planning session on the second public workshop's agenda and format.

As this will be our last meeting prior to the holiday season, I'd like to take this opportunity to wish all of you a happy holiday and New Year. I hope you will enter 2006 well rested and ready to jump back into the Rural Lands Study. As a reminder, Public Workshop #2 is scheduled for Thursday, January 12, 2006, from 6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m. at Toano Middle School, and committee meeting #6 is scheduled for Wednesday, January 26, 2006 at 4:00 at the James City County Library.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me. I look forward to seeing you on Wednesday.

Attachments:

- Revised minutes from the 11/02/05 meeting
- Minutes from the 11/30/05 meeting
- Agenda for the 12/14/05 meeting
- Homework Assignment



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study
STEERING COMMITTEE AGENDA

wednesday december 14, 2005 | 4 pm

4:00 **OPENING** - Jeff Barra & Public Comments

Approve Minutes from November 30th Steering Committee Meeting

4:10 **RURAL LANDS POLICY OPTIONS**

Summary of Steering Committee Member Feedback

Summary of Other Feedback

Steering Committee Discussion

4:45 **ANALYSIS UPDATE**

Well and Septic Costs & Feasibility - Earthworks Consulting Engineers

Environmental & Fiscal Impacts

Field Trip Recommendations

Steering Committee Discussion and Direction

5:20 **PUBLIC WORKSHOP #2 (January 14)**

Draft Agenda & Format

Steering Committee Discussion

5:35 **CLOSING** - Public Comments

5:45 **ADJOURN**



MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 7, 2005

TO: Members of the Rural Lands Committee

Jeff Barra	Ginny Hartman
Rich Costello	Richard Krapf
Jim Daniels	Gary Massie
Victoria Fahringer	Jack Schmidt

FROM: Eric Wright, Renaissance Planning Group

SUBJECT: 11-2-05 Steering Committee minutes

The third committee meeting began with a public comment period during which there were no comments. The committee then considered the minutes from the 10-19-05 meeting, with Chairman Jeff Barra requesting 2 corrections – one concerning the question of private roads, which can be developed to state standards with in the PSA, and the second concerning the wording of “handout and digest” in regards to materials for the public.

After a brief introduction from Ken Schwartz, Eric Wright from Renaissance Planning Group presented responses to outstanding questions from the steering committee at the previous meeting. The guiding principles for the Rural Lands, as taken from the 2003 comprehensive plan, were then reviewed. The final figures for Scenario 1 were presented, with an explanation of the methodology used. Jack Schmidt asked about whether the vacant lots added back to the number of total units at the end was backed out under the lots and subdivisions step in the acreage calculation. The county replied that it was. Gary Massie then asked for confirmation that the total number of potential units (7,123) was half that presented at the first meeting. The preliminary number presented at the first meeting was 11,778 units, but that was only a first brush and did not include the refinements that went into developing the final numbers. Everyone was reminded that these numbers were for comparison purposes only, and not intended to be the definitive development potential analysis for the Rural Lands.

Vlad Gavrilovic, from Paradigm Design, presented Scenario 2 – Rural Cluster Development. He walked through the various clustering options (from higher density to density-neutral to lower density) as well as other options besides clustering. Milt Herd, from Herd Planning and Design, as well as Mr. Gavrilovic presented images of various clustered and non-clustered development from other localities in Virginia. Mr. Wright then presented related sewer and water options.

The presentation raised numerous questions from the steering committee, which are summarized as follows:



Questions/Concerns:

1. Sliding Scale:

Where is the sliding scale being used and how is it working?

What are the growth pressures in these areas and how do they relate to James City County?

Note: It is necessary to show alternatives to clustering and to provide both visual and specific locales where they were used and to discuss their respective effectiveness.

2. By-right ratios:

Why do we jump from 1:3 to 1:10? What about 1:6?

Note: illustrating the by right ratios with a consistent house size would help to show the difference. Also, show some examples with topography that is typical of James County, not hilly like the photos showed. It was pointed out that 1:6 does not really get to the "tipping point" where rural lands can be effectively preserved. 1:10 does, and that is why we have used the two examples for comparison.

3. Agribusiness:

What is the current status of agriculture in James City County?

Is there encouragement for agribusiness, like incentive programs to help farmers?

Note: example of farmers being more productive on less land in Loudon County. Some are not optimistic about increased or new farming in JCC's rural lands. The possibility of hobby farming would still exist however.

4. The Developer

How does each by right scenario affect the profit for developers?

Is conservation voluntary or mandatory? Is the land set aside permanently off-limits?

Note: Infrastructure costs may decrease through use of communal wells.

Permanent open space easements already exist for environmental reasons or because it is too difficult or prohibited to build upon certain types of land (marsh, etc.)

5. Septic and Water

Are any lands bordering the PSA connected to water and sewage?

What are the alternate systems (treatment in a tank, drain-fields) and their effectiveness/costs?

Note: Basic septic systems are not as effective at removing Nitrogen from the wastewater as alternative (treatment in the tank) septic systems. Alternate systems remove 85% of nitrogen in the box and 4% in the field. Basic systems remove 0% in the box and 28% in the field. There are a few connections outside the PSA, but it is not the policy of the county to extend the PSA, and this study follows county policy.



6. Education

What is open space? Define the term.

What does rural mean? What does a rural landscape look like?

What is a PSA? What are the rules of utilities, etc. in living in or outside of the PSA?

What are the options of clustering?

Note: Education the public on the issues, goals, and terms of this study.

Does open space include vineyards, eco-tourism, golf courses, and other non-residential options? Is conservation solely for the purpose of retaining a vista? Is it for use as drainage for wetlands?

Mr. Schwartz then raised the issue of the upcoming public workshop, and what type of model should it follow. The following thoughts emerged:

Workshop thoughts – suggestions to be considered by the team

Set the stage-

1. What is this all about? (Make sure it is understood that this study is only about residential development)
2. Provide Visual examples
 - a. Show consistent examples of scale, lot size
 - b. Offer handouts with definitions and worksheets for notes and reference. Video of the presentation maybe can be offered to people who don't attend the first meeting to catch them up to speed or to review some of the discussion points from another location; internet video stream?
 - c. Visually show breakdown of Rural Lands Total By – Right Development Potential units. Clarify difference between undeveloped and land platted for development. Show the PDR lands.
3. Other questions to address:
 - a. What are the impacts of non-residential development?
 - b. Who will care for the rural vistas, i.e. maintenance, mowing?
 - c. Why are we preserving the land and how will it be used?
 - d. What is the interest of the majority of those living in rural areas?

Note: Provide examples of land preservation and uses from other localities.

The meeting ended with another public comment period, during which a member of the public (Eugene Hoffmeyer) spoke regarding his feelings as a farmer in relation to the study. He requested another subtraction from the Scenario 1 (By-Right Development) figures to include permanent open space due to environmental constraints such as Simpson Island. He also indicated his opinion that the amount of land in the PDR program was pitiful and that the referendum to fund 1 penny towards it was a shame in a wealthy community such as James City County. The committee chairman then asked for and received a motion and second for the meeting to adjourn, with seven voting in favor and one nay.



MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 14, 2005

TO: Members of the Rural Lands Committee

Jeff Barra	Victoria Fahringer
George Billups	Richard Krapf
Rich Costello	Gary Massie
Jim Daniels	Jack Schmidt

FROM: Kristin Van Voorhees and Eric Wright, Renaissance Planning Group

SUBJECT: 11-30-05 Steering Committee minutes

The fourth committee meeting began with a public comment period during which Andy Bradshaw spoke with regards to the Board of Supervisors having full confidence in the work of the steering committee and this study. The committee then considered the minutes from the 11-2-05 meeting, with several clarifications and corrections noted. Rich Costello indicated a desire to see a correction to the section in the minutes regarding septic and water issues. He indicated he would forward a proposed rewording to the committee. Gary Massie asked to have an addendum regarding hobby farms.

The meeting followed the following format with discussion on each topic:

General Comments on Public Workshop #1

- There was a public perception that we came in with an agenda – to push clustering
- There is a misunderstanding about the purpose of the study – Why are we only considering residential land use in the rural lands and not looking at promoting agribusiness, etc.?
- We need more of a discussion about potential infrastructure impacts – roads, water, sewer, traffic, etc; we should compare these impacts in each development scheme.
- Is the purpose of this study to “redesign development possibilities?” What is our end goal? To increase or decrease density?
- We need to narrow the options.

Steering Committee Observations

- There is confusion over the intended impact and intention of study; property rights and land value fears.



- What is best for the community? Manage growth and the speed of development. There is not just one answer for the rural lands. What will happen to the conserved lands?
- The number process (# of build-able lots) is difficult to explain. What is the character of the rural lands' residents?
- There are a wide range of people and values contributing to this study.
- What does a cluster look like? Can we organize a field trip to see one in person?
- We should explore voluntary cluster incentives further.
- Look into economically viable uses of the rural lands and consider impacts on resources/infrastructure.
- Set the framework for why we are doing this study – what's broke?
- Visual impacts – create a clearer picture of what could happen if we do nothing to the current zoning ordinance and how infrastructure could be impacted
- We should go through the process (numbers) of how we got to the number of build-able lots.

Consultants' Comments

- A big part of this study is using the public's input to inform what we do. The proposed alternatives are being used to gain and guide feedback.
- What is broken? This problem is coming up in the public because there is not a visible problem today in the rural lands. Current zoning and the comprehensive plan are not in alignment.
- Our task was to look at rural residential options, which came out of the Comprehensive Plan's goal to preserve open space. We are trying to be proactive by looking at the potential for development under the current 1:3 zoning. In 20-30 years the rural lands will be developed and under the current ordinance, it will not remain as open space or rural.
- Infrastructural impacts are not the main focus of this study. Infrastructure will be stressed if there is no change to the current ordinance – it will be affected regardless.

Issues for Public WS #2 – Committee discussion and evaluation of options

- Financial disincentives won't work here. Water/sewer is affordable in developments greater than 25 lots. There is a demand to live in this area.
- Road costs as a financial disincentive could work in the beginning, but once built, the land is open for increased growth.
- The main development disincentive is process time or "time to market". Developers don't want too much time to pass before they can turn a profit.
- "What's in it for me?" This varies greatly among the public. We need to screen the options, offer the potential end result - Frame the overall goal better.
- "What's in it for the community?" What if my neighbor wants to develop and I don't? I may be forced to live adjacent to a cluster. We should maximize flexible rights, but consider how these possibilities will affect others in the community.



- What is the desired outcome? How can we judge the likelihood of success?
- Can you move development rights from rural lands to inside the PSA (TDR) or work with conditional zoning?
 - o This is not permitted currently in the state of Virginia and would be thus very difficult to execute
- At the end of the day, what is it that we want to do? The process is muddled. Do we want to control growth, rezone, increase population, decrease population, or maintain farms?
- Could we look into offering incentives/requirements to include a certain percent of development lots as affordable housing?
- What about population growth, water, expanding the PSA? We cannot look at residential development in isolation.
- Decisions are still up to landowners.
- Provide a tangible aerial/map example of suburban development today compared with its rural character in the past. It would help if people can see a place they know of and could see what it used to look like under 1:3.
- We should do what will improve the value of people's property.
- Why are people attracted to the rural lands? Commercially, viable agriculture is not a part of the future rural lands. It is not what we really are.

Public Questions/Comments

- Why isn't higher density an option?
- Should we be treating all the rural lands the same? Maybe there should be a sliding scale of density incentives. For example, land adjacent to the PSA could have higher incentives for increased density.
- Open space could be designated for economic use as an incentive for clustering
- Incentives could include requirements to include a set percentage of affordable housing.
- What types of rural lands are we trying to protect and to what extent? Is the value of the land as a vista or a habitat for endangered species? The rural lands could be categorized by value so that certain lands are given higher incentives for development than others. The residential-only focus and one-solution planning is a disservice. It is a "Euclidian" approach.
- Mixed use development should be encouraged. Some of the density goes to non-residential uses to reduce the need for driving. We should encourage bike paths and small convenience stores, etc.
- Residential development is not the only option for these lands. Open land is not just a vista! Equestrian centers, horticulture, and other economically viable uses could actually dissuade residential development in the rural lands.



Response to Public Comments

- This study is seen as a building block for the 2008 comp plan review. The focus may seem narrow, but is a part of the bigger picture. Educating the citizens is one important part and the scope is too large to accomplish all in one study. It will be necessary to focus on residential development and work toward an end goal in stages.

The committee chairman then asked for and received a motion and second for the meeting to adjourn, with all voting in favor.



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

Summary of Steering Committee Assignment

1. Summary of Optional Strategies evaluated:

1. No Change
2. Reward Low Density
3. Discourage Conventional 3-Acre
4. Rezone to Lower Density
5. Voluntary Cluster
6. Mandatory Cluster

A total of 7 Assignments were received from the Steering Committee members, and one from the general public (the summary below does not include the one received from the public, although it will be forwarded separately to the Steering Committee for their information).

2. Support for adding Options:

Five options were recommended for addition by a total of two Committee members:

1. A Mandatory Cluster Option with Special Use Permit and By-Right components
2. A Combined Mandatory Cluster for Major Subdivisions and By-Right for Minor Subdivisions
3. An Option that combined Voluntary Cluster with Rewarding Low Density
4. A Sliding-Scale set of incentives that is based on the use of the land
5. An option combining most of the features of Options 2,3, and 5

3. Support for eliminating Options:

Three Options received recommendations for being eliminated:

- # 1. (No Change) – 3 recommendations
- # 3. (Discourage 3-Acre) – 1 recommendation
- # 4. (Rezone to Lower Density) – 4 recommendations
- # 6. (Mandatory Cluster) – 1 recommendation



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

4. Summary of Option Ranking:

Note: A strict statistical analysis was not possible, due to inconsistencies in the results (some Committee members combined options and some only did partial rankings). However, the results below show the simple weighted ranking results from those that were received:

1. No Change (7)
2. Reward Low Density (21)
3. Discourage Conventional 3-Acre (22)
4. Rezone to Lower Density (9)
5. Voluntary Cluster (34)
6. Mandatory Cluster (14)
7. A Mandatory Cluster Option with Special Use Permit and By-Right components (6)
8. A Combined Mandatory Cluster for Major Subdivisions and By-Right for Minor Subdivisions (5)
9. An Option that combined Voluntary Cluster with Rewarding Low Density (6)
10. A Sliding-Scale set of incentives that is based on the use of the land (0)



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

5. Consultant's comments on Overall Results:

1. Overall, the Steering Committee members provided some very powerful and useful input - The results were multi-faceted and looked at the Options from many different angles, and provided very useful perspectives, from the standpoint of development cost impacts, water and sewer impacts, farming tax impacts, and others.
2. The Committee members began to combine Options together and suggest eliminating others. This will be very useful in beginning to work towards a unified strategy or set of recommendations.
3. There were a great deal of additions to the Pros and Cons lists – these provided additional insights and, sometimes, showed multiple viewpoints on the same issues.
4. While there was no single consensus strategy, there were levels of support for the elimination of certain Options, and further pursuit of other Options.
5. The purpose of the assignments was not to provide a voting exercise, but an opportunity for qualitative analysis and for comparing views about the Options among the Committee members. Once the public has also provided input on these general Options at the second Public Workshop, it is anticipated that the Steering Committee can proceed to defining a preferred strategy for the Rural Lands that may include combinations, elements from several of the Options, or from the new Options proposed, into a single consolidated set of recommendations.



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

1. NO CHANGE

Strategy:

Don't change any zoning, subdivision or land development standards in the existing A-1 and R-8 zones

*Committee disagreement with PROS and CONS in red; Additional Committee PROS and CONS listed on the following page

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preserves existing property values and current landowner perceptions of land values ▪ Maintains current expectations for use of rural lots ▪ Doesn't affect tax rates or fiscal impacts in the near term ▪ Allows spacious lots in rural subdivisions – doesn't force living close to neighbors ▪ Relatively easy to develop 'by right' subdivisions if they are small (less than 5 lots) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Doesn't preserve significant open space ▪ May lead to rural sprawl (dispersed large lot development) if extended over all rurally zoned areas ▪ Doesn't preserve traditional farming or forestry uses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ I see this as a PRO since there is no economic basis for farming ⇒ Disagree ▪ By right development may not 'pay its way' in terms of the cost of public services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Disagree ▪ No opportunity for proffers to offset development impacts with by right development ▪ Market for 3-acre lots could become glutted – typically seen as 'too small to plow and too big to mow' <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ Disagree



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

1. NO CHANGE – COMMITTEE ADDITIONS

Strategy:

Don't change any zoning, subdivision or land development standards in the existing A-1 and R-8 zones

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Driveways and traffic are spread equally throughout Rural AreasB. Allows for "family" subdivision of land	<ul style="list-style-type: none">A. It may increase the difficulty and cost of making infrastructure improvements in the futureB. 60-70% of land will be developed as 3A lots over the next 20 years. Rural area will look like low density suburbia.C. JCSA will have numerous independent well systems (non –PSA) that will need to be merged into their Central System (PSA) to reduce operating & maintenance costs (in 20-30 years) JCSA's Customers pay.D. JCSA will need to extend public sewer into the Rural Areas of the County to replace failing septic systems (within 10 yrs for some existing developments and 30-50 years for 3A projects) JCSA's customers payE. Pressure from 2nd/3rd generation of 3A landowners to subdivide their lots in 23-40 years due to taxes etc.F. County taxpayers will be responsible for upgrading ex. RoadsG. Currently many lots on existing roads are subdivided in narrow, deeper lots. This is poor use of land.H. Encourages as many 3 acre lots as possible on a parcel. Not what I would call spacious.I. Will result in loss of visual beauty and rural character in short time period.



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

2. REWARD LOW DENSITY DEVELOPMENT

Strategy:

Provide incentives or “rewards” for residential development that is lower than the ‘by-right’ density of 1 unit per 3 acres in rural areas

*Committee disagreement with PROS and CONS in red; Additional Committee PROS and CONS listed on the following page

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Doesn't change any existing 'by right' development rights for rural landowners ÿ Could provide a net environmental and traffic benefit over current 3-acre development if rural areas build out at lower densities in the long term ÿ Allows greater landowner flexibility to divide land in larger parcels without building expensive infrastructure improvements ÿ May allow more rural open space if landowners exercise this option over time ÿ More conducive to smaller 'farmette' lots although it probably doesn't help preserve larger scale farming or forestry uses <p style="margin-left: 40px;">⇒ Disagree ; a false PRO since large scale uses appear to not exist</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Larger lots on lower density developments may be less affordable than current 3-acre lots ÿ May 'use up' the vacant land faster if it speeds up the pace of residential development in the rural area ÿ Will not preserve significant areas of rural open space unless development density is much lower than 1 in 3 acres (e.g. 1 in 10 acres or below) ÿ May not be enough of an incentive to be worth it to landowners if market for rural lots continues to be strong



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

2. REWARD LOW DENSITY DEVELOPMENT – COMMITTEE ADDITIONS

Strategy:

Provide incentives or “rewards” for residential development that is lower than the ‘by-right’ density of 1 unit per 3 acres in rural areas

PROS:

CONS:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Less need for County services B. Land values for existing owners are preserved C. Driveways and traffic are spread equally throughout the Rural Areas D. Like to use a reward system. Prefer carrot vs. stick approach E. Results in a cluster which could bring benefit of community well, lower cost of cable T.V. and other utilities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. If by-right density not significantly different (1 unit per 5 acres) 60-70% of land will be developed as 5A lots over next 20 years. Rural area will look like low density suburbia. B. JCSA will have numerous independent well systems (non –PSA) that need to merged into their Central System (PSA) to reduce operating & maintenance costs (in 20-30 years) JCSA's Customers pay. C. JCSA will need to extend public sewer into the Rural Areas of the County to replace failing septic systems (within 10 yrs for some existing developments and 30-50 years for 3A projects) JCSA's customers pay D. Pressure from 2nd/3rd generation of 3A landowners to subdivide their lots in 23-40 years due to taxes etc. E. County taxpayers will be responsible for upgrading ex. Roads F. Not in favor of private roads with low density; hard to create the critical mass needed to maintain a road. G. Access is first key to safety
--	---



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

3. DISCOURAGE CONVENTIONAL 3-ACRE DEVELOPMENT

Strategy:

Provide additional standards for (but don't prohibit) conventional 'by-right' development at a density of 1 unit per 3 acres in rural areas. The additional standards may need to be supported by a detailed study and would be required in order to mitigate the long-term environmental impacts of this density of development over the rural areas of the county.

*Committee disagreement with PROS and CONS in red; Additional Committee PROS and CONS listed on the following page

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Doesn't change the density allowed in the R-8 and A-1 zone ÿ If used in concert with strategy 2. (above) – it could provide a net environmental and traffic if rural areas build out at lower densities in the long term ÿ Could provide long-term environmental benefits if development standards are tightened to be more environmentally sensitive ÿ May encourage farming and forestry uses by reducing the pace of 'conversion' to residential subdivision development ÿ Could be designed to exempt traditional small subdivisions and family subdivisions that are important to farmer's economic well-being 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Increases the financial and technical burden for those developing and subdividing land in rural areas ÿ Will require additional administrative review time and expertise for the County ⇒ Disagree ÿ Will not preserve significant areas of rural open space unless development density is much lower than 1 in 3 acres (e.g. 1 in 10 acres or below) ⇒ Disagree ÿ May not alter current development trends if market for rural lots continues to be strong ⇒ Disagree



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

3. DISCOURAGE CONVENTIONAL 3-ACRE DEV. – COMMITTEE ADDITIONS

Strategy:

Provide additional standards for (but don't prohibit) conventional 'by-right' development at a density of 1 unit per 3 acres in rural areas. The additional standards may need to be supported by a detailed study and would be required in order to mitigate the long-term environmental impacts of this density of development over the rural areas of the county.

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Ches Bay impacts reduced however Environmental Impacts of 3A developments are not very significant and spending developers monies in this way gets little "bang for the buck" B. Driveways and traffic are spread equally throughout Rural Areas C. Makes land development more expensive – therefore slows down the process. 20 year process may take 30 years 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Land Rights are not preserved B. Land Values for ex. owners are not preserved C. 60-70% of land will be developed as 3A lots over next 30 years. Rural area will look like low density suburbia. D. JCSA will have numerous independent well systems (non –PSA) that need to merged into their Central System (PSA) to reduce operating & maintenance costs (in 20-30 years) JCSA's Customers pay. E. JCSA will need to extend public sewer into the Rural Areas of the County to replace failing septic systems (within 10 yrs for some existing developments and 30-50 years for 3A projects) JCSA's customers pay F. Pressure from 2nd/3rd generation of 3A landowners to subdivide their lots in 23-40 years due to taxes etc. G. County taxpayers will be responsible for upgrading ex. roads



James City County Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

4. REZONE RURAL AREAS TO LOWER DENSITY

Strategy:

Comprehensively rezone the A-1 and R-8 zones with new lower density standards that encourage farming, forestry and open space preservation.

*Committee disagreement with PROS and CONS in red; Additional Committee PROS and CONS listed on the following page

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">ÿ Preserves significant areas of open space on private lotsÿ Preserves more opportunities for farming and the farm economy by reducing 'conversion' of farms to primarily residential subdivisionsÿ Reduces impacts on roads and County services such as schools and emergency servicesÿ May provide for lower landowner taxes over time if cost of service to rural areas is reducedÿ More conducive to smaller 'farmette' lots although it probably doesn't help preserve larger scale farming or forestry uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">ÿ Changes the existing 'by-right' expectations of rural landownersÿ May reduce the economic return of development on rural land if the reduced development potential is not offset by higher value of larger lotsÿ Larger lots on lower density developments may be less affordable than current 3-acre lotsÿ May not preserve vibrant rural economy if not combined with other economic development programs that support farming or other compatible uses



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

4. REZONE RURAL AREAS TO LOWER DENSITY – COMMITTEE ADDITIONS

Strategy:

Comprehensively rezone the A-1 and R-8 zones with new lower density standards that encourage farming, forestry and open space preservation.

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Less need for County services B. The vistas and viewsheds are beautiful C. Traditional farming as “we know it” is dead, therefore the space is used for 21st Century farming whatever that is or it goes to forestry and is logged D. Water and sewer systems are not an issue E. Driveways and traffic are spread equally throughout Rural Areas, however since there is significantly less development there is significantly less need for road improvements to be paid for by County taxpayers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Could lead to a firestorm of protest and an increase in distrust of the Planning Committee that it would undermine its effectiveness in dealing with this and other issues. B. Land Values for existing owners are not preserved C. When the Community stops growing, the local economy is in the “tank” and new replacement schools are needed and the choice is raise taxes or let a developer build a 1000 homes in a corner of the rural landscape for a new school our future BOS will decide D. **I see this solution as temporary – it doesn't really use the land effectively it just delays the decision. ** E. **While this may be a solution for “a portion” of the County Rural Lands it isn't a solution for all of the Rural Lands ** F. Farming is not economically feasible G. Open space that is not managed becomes a nuisance and an eyesore



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

5. PROVIDE A VOLUNTARY CLUSTER OPTION IN RURAL AREAS

Strategy:

Allow a cluster development provision as an option in the A-1 and R-8 zones or in the Subdivision Ordinance. The option would be voluntary and would not change the underlying density of the zone.

*Committee disagreement with PROS and CONS in red; Additional Committee PROS and CONS listed on the following page

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May preserve significant areas of open space if employed ÿ May preserve some large lots in farming, although they would be adjacent to a 'cluster' subdivision ÿ Provides landowners with more flexibility and options rather than restricting their current rights ÿ May allow wider range of lot prices (potentially more affordable ones) based on variety of lot sizes ÿ Provides more flexibility in site design to avoid development on sensitive areas of the site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May require additional level of review and approval to exercise the cluster development option ÿ May not be enough of an incentive to be worth it to landowners if market for 3-acre lots continues to be strong ⇒ Disagree ÿ May not alter current development trends if market for rural lots continues to be strong ÿ May preserve open space without preserving essential rural economy and character of the area ⇒ Disagree



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

5. PROVIDE A VOLUNTARY CLUSTER OPTION IN RURAL AREAS – COMMITTEE ADDITIONS

Strategy:

Allow a cluster development provision as an option in the A-1 and R-8 zones or in the Subdivision Ordinance. The option would be voluntary and would not change the underlying density of the zone.

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Land Rights preserved B. Land Values for existing owners are preserved C. If Ordinance written properly so developers use it, it can: D. Preserve vistas & viewsheds; Move development back off road & Reduce number road connections E. Deal adequately with water and sewer F. Rural area will not look like low density suburbia. G. Creates a mix of lot sizes which allows land to reset various demands for housing stock H. An incentive approach to obtain what you want I. Cluster permits community wells. Certain areas near PSA could include community sewer. J. Provides more flexibility in site design so development can be placed away from roads and/or vistas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Cluster is less expensive than to build than by-right development so it may increase rate of development. 60-70% of land will be developed as by-right or cluster subdivisions over next 15 - 20 years. B. Ownership of common lands an issue so pressure from 2nd/3rd generation owners do not result in a demand to subdivide the common lands in the future. C. County taxpayers will be responsible for upgrading ex. roads



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

6. REZONE RURAL AREAS TO REQUIRE MANDATORY CLUSTERING

Strategy:

Set a maximum lot size that is significantly below the density allowance of the rural areas, so that there is a 'de facto' clustering for all rural development.

*Committee disagreement with PROS and CONS in red; Additional Committee PROS and CONS listed on the following page

PROS:	CONS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Preserves significant areas of open space on private lots or in common ownership 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Changes landowner expectation to develop 3-acre lots, but doesn't change density
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May preserve some large lots in farming, although they would be adjacent to a 'cluster' subdivision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May result in a glut of 1-acre lots on the market if no other options are available
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Doesn't change underlying density of the rural zones (not technically a 'downzoning') 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May affect groundwater withdrawals without detailed standards for lot placement on the site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May allow more affordable housing options in rural areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May result in all the lots being placed along the existing road frontages unless standards dictate where lots may go on the site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ Provides more flexibility in site design to avoid development on sensitive areas of the site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ÿ May preserve open space without preserving essential rural economy and character of the area



James City County
Residential Development in Rural Lands Study

6. REZONE RURAL AREAS TO REQUIRE MANDATORY CLUSTERING – COMMITTEE ADDITIONS

Strategy:

Set a maximum lot size that is significantly below the density allowance of the rural areas, so that there is a 'de facto' clustering for all rural development.

PROS:	CONS:
<p>A. Land Values for ex. owners are preserved</p> <p>B. If Ordinance written properly it can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Preserve vistas & viewshedsb. Move development back off road; Reduce number road connectionsc. Deal adequately with water and sewerd. Rural area will not look like low density suburbia.e. Developer will be responsible for upgrading ex. roads	<p>A. Land Rights are not preserved</p> <p>B. Cluster is less expensive than to build than by-right development so it may increase rate of development. 60-70% of land will be developed as by-right or cluster subdivisions over next 15 - 20 years.</p> <p>C. Ownership of common lands an issue so pressure from 2nd/3rd generation owners do not result in a demand to subdivide the common lands in the future.</p> <p>D. Could lead to a firestorm of protest and an increase in distrust of the Planning Committee that it would undermine its effectiveness in dealing with this and other issues.</p>