

## MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** November 2, 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:** Tammy Rosario, Senior Planner II

**SUBJECT:** Rural Lands Committee Meeting #3 - November 2

---

Please find attached the materials for the next Rural Lands Committee meeting scheduled for November 2<sup>nd</sup> at 4:00 p.m. at the **James City County Library Community Room** (7770 Croaker Road). These materials include the minutes from the October 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, the agenda for the November 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, and final figures for Scenario 1.

To start the meeting, the consultants will answer questions that arose at the last committee meeting and then return to a discussion on the guiding principles of the study. Renaissance (the will also present finalized figures for Scenario 1 as outlined in the attachment before moving onto Scenario 2 which includes additional clustering options and a few new options not covered through by-right or cluster development. Finally, the agenda will conclude with a discussion of the public workshop format.

Please be reminded that Public Workshop #1 has been rescheduled for **November 17<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 p.m. at Toano Middle School**; therefore, the committee meeting originally scheduled for November 16<sup>th</sup> has been cancelled due to its proximity to the November 17<sup>th</sup> commitment. We will have an updated schedule to pass out at the committee meeting.

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

Attachments:

- Minutes from the 10/19/05 meeting
- Agenda for the 11/2/05 meeting
- Figures for Scenario 1



## RENAISSANCE PLANNING GROUP

113 Fourth Street NE Charlottesville, VA 22902 • phone: 434-296-3025 • fax: 434-296-9567

### MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** October 28, 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:** 10-19-05 Steering Committee minutes

---

The second committee meeting began with a public comment period during which Linda Rice, a member of the public who lives on Forge Rd., said she would like the members of the steering committee to consider eco-tourism in the Rural Lands. She also mentioned that she would like to see the committee consider additional resources besides the PDR program for protecting rural open space. The committee then elected Jeff Barra as its chairman.

Eric Wright from Renaissance Planning Group presented the methodology being used for determining the number of units possible under current by-right zoning (Scenario 1). A question from a member of the public, Mark Rinaldi, was allowed, which concerned the use of the 20% site deduction figure. The figure was discussed and agreed upon as a reasonable figure to use. Jack Schmidt asked about how many approximate acres were open for development, was it in the 30,000-35,000 acre range. The response from the consultant was that it was likely to be below 30,000 acres and that final figures would be provided at the next steering committee meeting.

Scenario 2 – Rural Cluster Development was then presented. The objectives of Rural Cluster ordinances were presented, with Rich Costello adding that scenic vistas should be included as an objective. The basic structure of a cluster ordinance was presented, with different options discussed. These included “voluntary” or “mandatory” options, as well as a requirement for rezoning in order to implement. Examples of various types of cluster ordinances, involving a mix of voluntary and mandatory options as well as different densities and minimum acreage, from other Virginia counties were presented. Finally, the consultant presented a graphic example of what by-right versus clustering development would look like on an example property in James City County, the Hall & Temple properties at 2511 and 2611 Forge Road.

Committee members and staff had a number of questions and observations that followed. The first asked whether open space on an individual lot counted in determining the amount of open space preserved. This was followed by a member asking for a determination of what open



space is. It was answered that open space is an easement in James City County. What would happen to open space under various clustering scenarios was then discussed.

Another question emerged regarding private roads, which cannot be developed to state standards in the county. Someone asked about water development and how that affects clustering. Does clustering allow for higher density with regards to septic systems? What is the value to a landowner for clustering? Jack Schmidt asked what the infrastructure costs were and was there an infrastructure cost premium factored into the development scenarios? It was replied that this would be done as part of a fiscal analysis comparing the different scenarios

A committee member asked whether you can mitigate for different types of roadways. Another asked what happens to non-residential open space. Public sewer versus septic systems was discussed, with the county making it clear that this study is not for considering extension of public water and sewer service at this time. Rich Costello suggested having pictures of houses on 3 acre lots to show to the public.

Gary Massie asked whether there was something other than clustering that the committee should be considering for the Rural Lands development. As a follow up, Jack Schmidt asked whether the study should look at changing the limit of 1 unit per 3 acres. The committee asked the consultants to look into what other innovative options there were for rural area development besides clustering. A discussion followed as to what the name of the study was, and whether it was to consider only clustering or was to look at the entire Rural Lands. It was decided that the study was intended to look at residential development in the Rural Lands, not just clustering and not development other than residential in nature. Jeff Barra mentioned that some might see clustering as taking away their "by right" rights. This would be not be the case with a "density neutral" cluster development. Another committee member urged the group to consider that the answers to development in the Rural Lands may be on the outside or the edges of agricultural zones. Finally, a committee member suggested that handout materials for the public should be easy to digest.

Final matters regarding the first public workshop were discussed, including suggestions for revising the Public Workshop publicity flyer. The committee was agreeable to moving the workshop date and settled on November 17<sup>th</sup> as the first choice. Before adjourning, the committee heard from Mark Rinaldi regarding the perplexity of keeping open space as open space perpetually. He also mentioned the need for rural economic development incentives and questioned whether the study should be looking at future PSA expansion down the road. He also mentioned that one size solutions do not fit all for rural landowners. With that, the committee chairman adjourned the meeting after receiving a motion, a second, and votes to end the meeting.



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

wednesday november 2, 2005 | 4 pm

- 4:00        OPENING - Public Comments
- 4:05        RESPONSE - Questions from Previous Steering Committe Meeting
- 4:15        REVIEW GUIDING PRINCIPLES
- 4:20        SCENARIO 1 - By-Right Development
  - Final Methodology and Figures
- 4:35        SCENARIO 2 - Rural Cluster Development
  - Clustering Options
  - Other Options Besides Clustering
- 5:05        WORKSHOP FORMAT
  - Different Models
- 5:20        COMMENTS - Steering Committee
- 5:35        CLOSING - Public Comments
- 5:45        ADJOURN

## Scenario 1: By-Right Residential Development

Rural Lands	<u>44,808</u> acres
Zoning other than A-1 and R-8	4,085
Governmental and Educational Land	5,322
Commercial, Industrial, Multi-Family	558
PDR property (in A-1 + R-8 Zoning)	262
Lots and Subdivisions or < 6 acres	14,286
20% Site Improvement Deduction	<u>4,040</u>
Developable Acreage	<b>16,255</b> acres

## Rural Lands Total By-Right Development Potential

Lots from Developable Acreage	5,418 units
Vacant Lots	2,032 units
Existing Units on Developable Acreage	<u>(327) units</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,123</b> units

\* This calculation has been made to provide a reasonable point of comparison between different residential development scenarios for the Rural Lands. It is not intended to be a definitive development potential analysis for the Rural Lands.