

- CPAC Minutes August 16, 2012

Present: Bell, Coady, Payne, Lawrence, Parr

Absent: Bailey, Long , Moore, Drury

Also Present: Karen Davis, Sandra Benson Thornton, Peter Stith

By 3 commissioners in advance of meeting.

Meeting to Order 9:12 - quorum

Minutes: Aug 9 move Peter Lawrence, 2nd Bell approved unanimously – Correction to delete Peter Lawrence from minutes. Pat Coady 2nd - approved

- - July 26th – Dr. Kellam regarding the need to be open for business should be incorporated in some manner in our final conclusions.
 - Correct 1st paragraph of both minutes.
 - SB – questions submitted to the PC. Discussion last night about CPAC questions. Recessed meeting last night. Mr. Coady was in attendance. They declined to provide formal response reflecting the whole group position. You have comments submitted by 3 commissioners. Working documents. Haven't concluded review of all data – can't comment in a formal way. Are interested in scheduling a formal meeting –process, data etc. PC suggestion circulate a doodle poll with dates and times – they meet in the evenings, you meet in the day. When we can get majority of people.
 - Bill Payne – reasonable nexus of things we are focused on and PCs mission?
 - SB – 3,4,5 are all related and are rec. you would make based on the Comp Plan.
 - Parr – next agenda item comments.
 - Coady – I think we should have a joint meeting. Most telling thing was miscommunication and lack of understanding of their Vision document – only those 4 points under Vision. Part of it laid out the process and Public Input themes was partial comment they heard at meetings. In our response and questions – why are you all focused on these themes and ignoring all the rest? Same for stakeholders.
 - Sandra – That is what was said. When the PC received response back – didn't feel it was response to their request. Trying to check out whether in summary, public input themes were drawn, had we accurately reflected what had been heard at those 7 meetings. Did require review of materials compared to draft document to see if it was accurate summary. You gave back a broader response and they felt this wasn't really responsive to what was asked now.

- Coady – I don't know that I fully digested that cover and what the request was. The conversation last night revolved around they feel they are still in the data gathering process and not conclusion process. With survey etc, we are able to provide. Instead of working at cross purposes we should have a joint meeting. Our recommendations go forward together even if they are different. Come up with basis for Economic Deve. Plan which rolls into zoning changes. As long as the Comp Plan clearly lays out what those goals are, the zoning should follow.
- Coady – Plan as currently exists is not their plan, it is the BOS plan. Feeling under the gun, the BOS takes no ownership of the Plan.
- Sandra – main takeaway is the BOS adopts the plan. If they don't like the rec. from PC they can send it back, rewrite. The BOS makes the decision whether it is adopted or not.
- Payne –does the PC like it?
- Coady – more like it than dislike it but they are not a unified body. Opportunity to positively influence the process.
- Peter L – general strategic principles that at this particular point we could agree on. Before we have this meeting – have general concepts from this group. Speak on behalf of group. Wouldn't want to waste the meeting.
- Sandra – want to sit down with the County Admin. About schedule
- Parr – agreement with Pat and Peter and need to prepare ourselves as a group to meet with the PC. Principles to lay out – this is where we are coming from. Good idea to get clear articulation of the goals of the meeting. Dedicate one meeting in advance of the joint meeting to tune up. Might have milestones to meet before meeting, maybe alter our process to meet those milestones.
- Peter L – BOS asked us to do stuff to present to PC but also chance to have some give and take.
- Payne – What is reasonable – 3 weeks from now? I think we can get our principles on paper in an hour, maybe 30 minutes.
- Parr – great data we have collected. Good solid info from VDOT.
- Peter – someone who is good at this – guy with a flip chart?
- Parr – I think Ava could do it to facilitate the meeting.
- Coady – agree with comments – would flesh out a couple things – These were sent over because the individuals were comfortable answering. VDOT summary
- Parr – devolution. Important to get economy to get new tax base.
- Coady – can start a list of things that we need for joint meeting – have survey done and distributed, memos to BOS -. PC finding out about CEDS – To whatever extent we can find out about draft, want to work through today's agenda, flesh out first couple action items before we meet with them.
- Aug 27th BOS work session – got Joe list of all corrections and is aware of the date.
- Sandra – do you think the complete report will be ready?
- Parr – It is complete and about 200 pages.
- Peter – what is realistic? 2 meetings left in august? Get this done in 3 meetings?
- Payne – yes we have to – go through our notes, get Ava to keep us orderly.
- Peter – volunteer is great, but if you pay somebody you can get them to work.

- Coady – so moved to authorize Bill and Bill to contact Ava – if not Ava – Paul Berge. Authorized Bill to retain someone for our scoping session. 2nd Peter Lawrence. Approved unanimously.
- Facilitated work session – August 30th.
- Payne – when is the joint session reasonably charted?
- Sandra – both groups need to see a draft agenda to see the goals and objectives. 2nd week is more reasonable.
- Sandra - driving for formal presentation or general discussion.
- Peter – someone who is going to help us merge together. He is going to move us towards conclusion documents.
- Payne – more than 2 hours?
- Peter – yes –
- Payne –we still have time –
- Peter – goes a long way to getting to our conclusion.

Clarification of items 3,4, and 5 –

- Sandra -Charged with clarification of three items. Memo handout. Explanation of memo.
- Payne – TE within the political boundaries in the Town?
- Sandra – in the county –
- Parr – out of whack – inappropriately applied.
- Sandra – are going to have to look at maps –
- Parr – concept of TE is designated failure – predicated on towns coming together with the county –
- Sandra – 3 of the towns have expressed support for the concept. We can't claim any success yet.
- Coady – Item 4 – answer to a large degree needs to come from staff – conflict goes to staff expertise. 2nd part of item 3 – something we can address. But on item 4 both things – staff work with the towns and experience over last several years. Towns that have not been anti town edge – don't they view those TE, if developed would want to annex them.
- Sandra – natural areas that would be taken into town. No presumption they would be taken into town.
- Coady – intersection around cape charles develops 3 fold. If CC annexes that after it is developed, does the County lose all that revenue?
- Parr – annexation is fought tooth and nail. Not an invitation or plan for annexation. Land use plan to coordinate what is going on within the town and county. Don't think TE areas would be targeted for annexation areas.
- Payne –why was the concept conceived?
- Sandra – prior to new zoning maps – districts around the towns – community development areas – fairly expansive. County is not really going to provide intensive

services to such areas – TE was pulled in. TE in comp plan are county's main development areas. TE – primary development areas for county.

- Payne – natural evolution – ant hills just grow.
- Peter – example in CC – people would like to control what goes on in gateway in CC.
- Payne – advantage to TE?
- Parr – big picture – by right use most important to eco development. Rights controlled by two entities.
- Sandra – towns are more formally invited.
- Payne – would you be willing to throw out TE concept?
- Parr – nobody's used a TE parcel yet? Crazy concept.
- Peter – how could I possibly comment on zoning issues? Much better position to answer part 2 of questions. First part of questions above our pay grade. 2nd part of questions.
- Parr – I like Sandra's guide and clarification – this is a great guide - look back at charge.
- Payne – I am as confused as ever!
- Coady – too much work
- Peter – answer – we don't have the expertise – that can be our response.
- Sandra – that can be your response – legitimate
- Coady – item 3 – current comp plan that is restrictive to economic development. Says current comp plan. Contrast current zoning with new comp plan. What should be in the comp plan and most glaring things in zoning that prevent economic development
- Sandra – highway overlay district – Access mgt plan – based on VDOT –
- Parr – keeps tying us down to old document
- Sandra – part of review – we don't think it works because...
- Coady – 2nd part – need economic development department and director –
- Parr – consensus to use Sandra's document to use as a guide to accomplishing these tasks. Motion use as a guide? Bell motion – Peter L. 2nd – approved unanimously.
- Parr – Use charts in zoning ordinance- heartbeat of ordinance – Zoning administrator working with this chart – lot of experience – like Melissa Kellam to give us a list of what she thinks needs to be changes to use charts based on using and administering .
- Sandra – we have already been asked to do that by BOS – haven't completed review.
- Parr – Melissa's opinion as the official.
- Sandra – might suggest to help simplify work – think there are too many SUPs need more by-right, area limitations. Kind of level of comment the BOS would like to see from you.
- Parr – lot of things jump off the page.
- Payne – issue is far loftier than that –
- Sandra – at the staff level there are too many SUPs in the charts. Don't think BOS is looking for that level.
- Parr – anytime it will be finished for a working document?
- Sandra – floating districts are ones that have standards and requirements. Rezoned to established to be on the map. Need to be conversant with zoning.

- Coady - why do we have 2 distinct districts –
- Sandar – EI district – similar concepts – accomodate existing activity that do not appear on FLUM to be expanded in the future. Not intended to be extended in other property in that area. Continue to be used for those types of activities. Could change the use but the boundaries of the property have been set. The PID could be used other.
- Peter – if there wasn't a Floating district, is is SOL?
- Sandra – yes
- Coady – no industrial districts that are not existing districts – no districts that are PID.
- Bell – might be off the chart but when does a variance come in to play?
- Sandra – setbacks – not for uses –
- Payne –never seen bologna sliced so thin – 4 categories for crabs and clams.
- Coady – would like to see a copy of the 1980 zoning and comp plan and what was in effect in 1989.
- Sandra – in 1984 – each district had uses listed.
- Payne – work plan driven like you guys. Adopted this as our list of things to do – need to sit quietly and figure this out. More confused now than before – need to come up with specific work items – looking at zoning ordinance – so complex – why would you have 4 different line items for clams. Sit around and go through zoning ordinance.
- Parr – answer everything in Sandra's memo – let's get this done – and then figure out if we have more to do.
- Sandra – trying to suggest how you can approach the items.
- Payne – Coady is doing a white paper on principles – to take to joint meeting.
- Bullet points Peter – by Monday or Tuesday – try and do 100K ft level to these items –
- Parr – digest the PC items, Peter and Pat do things, Payne into therapy, Parr talked to Ava and Paul.
- Meeting next weeke same time next place. Payne move we adjourn Coady 2nd. Meeting adjourned at 10:52 am.