



MACHINE TRANSCRIPT • CORAGGIO CONSULTING

Albemarle County Board of Supervisors AC44 Work Session - Final Draft Review, Wednesday, September 10, 2025

Date Wednesday, September 10, 2025
Place Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, Virginia
Length 4h 37m (video)

- Official meeting video (Granicus): https://albemarle.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=1390
- Official agenda: https://albemarle.granicus.com/AgendaViewer.php?view_id=1&clip_id=1390

Machine transcript (speech-to-text) produced by Coraggio Consulting. Not an official county record. Names and numbers may be misspelled; check the video at the timestamp before quoting.

Speech-to-text: whisper.cpp, model large-v3-turbo. Produced 2026-10-14. Each paragraph starts with its time [HH:MM:SS] in the meeting video.

[00:00:03] to call to order this meeting of the Board of Supervisors this September 10th at 2 p.m. in room 241 of the County Office Building. Our supervisor, Ann Mallett, from the Waymole District, the B. Lupisto-Kirtley, from the Mariana District, Supervisor Diane McKeon from the Jack Jewett District, and I'm Jim Andrews, representing the Samuel Miller District.

[00:00:29] Orem is present in person. Supervisor Galloway is unable to be here today. Supervisor Pruitt, I understand, would like to participate remotely. And since he has requested to participate remotely in accordance with the applicable board rules of procedure, rule number 8B1D, enacted pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, Mr. Pruitt, if you will, you need to announce your reason and your location.

[00:00:58] Yes, I am on Rolling Road in Ryko County and request to participate remotely as I am indisposed here for work. Motion to accept Mr. Pruitt as remote participation.

[00:01:14] Second. How was that? Wait a second before we get that? No, no, she nodded. She nodded. She nodded. Not again. But we have a motion from Supervisor Malek, second from Supervisor Lupista Kirtley.

[00:01:30] Without objection, the clerk will call it. Ms. Lupista Kirtley. Aye. Ms. Malek. Yes. Ms. Bekeel. Yes. Welcome, Mr. Pruitt. So also I want to mention that we have our Deputy County Executive, Mr. Trevor

Henry.

[00:01:49] We have our County Attorney, Mr. Andy Herrick. We have our Clerk, Claudette Bargerson. And we have many members of staff that will be introduced as we go. We also are joined by Lieutenant Angel Jamerson and Master Police Officer Dana Reeves.

[00:02:05] Thank you for being here today and what you do on our behalf every day. So the purpose of this meeting is to discuss AC44, which we've seen it, but this is the first time we've really seen it all together.

[00:02:22] And I understand that we'll be certainly introduced to this topic by Jody Filardo, our Director of Community Development. Thank you, Chair Andrews and Board of Supervisors. As you mentioned, I'm Jody Filardo, Community Development Director.

[00:02:40] Joining me today at the table, I have my deputy director, Bart Swoboda, to my left. To his left, I've got Michael Barnes, our director of planning. Our presenter today will be Tanya Schwartzen-Druber, our planning manager. And behind her is the rest of the long-range team.

[00:02:57] We've got James Wilkinson, Ben Holt, and David Benish. So thank you all for being here. It's going to be a fun afternoon. Supervisor LaPeso Curley, I promise it will be fine. I just wanted to take a minute to thank everybody who has gotten us to this point.

[00:03:20] Certainly you all as supervisors have been relentless in your review of everything we have thrown at you, and we know it's been volumes and volumes, and we're very grateful. As the Planning Commission has also supported this effort, but the community has come out to all sorts of stakeholder engagement opportunities, both online and in person.

[00:03:42] And we've had agency partners that have weighed in as well, and certainly all of our colleagues here at the county, too. So just wanted to say thank you to everyone and acknowledge all the work that's taken to get us to this point. I believe we are going to go through section by section, and our hope today is to reach consensus.

[00:04:09] Sadly, we know that Supervisor Galloway can't be here, and so what we're hoping to do is move forward with items that you all in the room and Supervisor Pruitt online feel aligned with will take as consensus and move forward with those.

[00:04:27] If there are things that for some reason you all just cannot come to consensus on what we're going to do is take note of those and set them to the side after this meeting we intend to get with supervisor gallery on both the build-out analysis that we that he has questions on and was unable to bring them up at the board meeting that where we last considered that and also give him a chance to weigh in on any considerations he might have.

[00:04:55] If there are things he shares with us that don't align with what we've heard in this meeting today, it's our intention to make a list of those things. And as we move forward into October 15th, which we hope will be Adoption Day, what we're going to do is start with that list and bring those to your attention.

[00:05:14] We don't really anticipate that there will be many of those topics, but we thought we'd bring them back to you so that the whole entire board could consider whatever these particular items might be, just as a rule of thumb for managing this process.

[00:05:31] And hopefully we won't have any of those things, but just in case we do, we've got a way of managing them for you to come to consensus finally on adoption day. So with that, I'd like to turn this over

to Tanya Schwartzendruber, who's going to start us with a short presentation.

[00:05:47] Good afternoon. I am Tanya Swartzen-Druber, Planning Manager for Community Development Department. We are here today to talk about the initial draft of AC44. Our agenda, I'll go through a little bit of a phase recap and also go into our last phase, Phase 4.

[00:06:09] Go through our schedule, a few of the updates that were made to the draft document, as well as the PC feedback that we heard a few weeks ago. Just a little reminder on tracking and reporting and then we'll get into our discussion as usual we've got a couple of questions that we have that we'd like for you to answer that last one is a very specific one that we wanted to get some clarification on and anything else as we go through each section so just as a reminder this is a four-phase project and we are in the final

[00:06:49] phase, that last phase four. Just as a quick recap of those initial phases, beginning with phase one, we developed our AC44 framework, our guiding principles of what type of community we'd like to be over the next 20 years. We also took a look at our growth management policy, which included our 2022 build-out analysis, which was updated, as you heard, last week, to establish a baseline for growth capacity within the existing development area and provide guidance for future decisions

[00:07:24] related to our development area. We also identified land use topics that needed further consideration or guidance such as rural interstate interchanges and rural area land uses. In phase two we drafted goals and objectives for each topic chapter and developed planning toolkits as a way to coordinate land use and transportation planning, which included identification of activity center locations and other topics. In phase three, we drafted actions to support those goals and objectives,

[00:07:58] which included, we also talked about and created our implementation strategies, which included big moves to prioritize plan recommendations, guide resource allocation, and also investments. That brings us to our current phase four with a focus on the final plan document and we'll get into a little bit more detail in a moment. Just as a reminder in phase three that we just recently

[00:08:32] wrapped up you know our engagement really as part of phase three the engagement really played an important role in developing the plan that we're here to discuss today. During phase three we finalized our nine topic chapters which were reviewed in work sessions with both the planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors from fall of last year relayed through June. This was followed by the implementation chapter and big moves presented in July. Our public engagement for the plan content included a series of open house meetings and virtual check-ins to review

[00:09:09] each topic chapter. In phase four, we've already gone ahead and published that draft document as you have seen online and has been sent to you in your packet. During this phase we'll also review and gather input both from the planning commission and yourselves as well as the community which I'll talk about in a moment. Then we'll update and finalize that plan according to that

[00:09:38] input and hopefully get the plan adopted soon. So in phase four we had our final public engagement which was an open house held. We had an open house held August 21st. We had approximately 30 attendees. This included folks in person and online. We reviewed the plan content,

[00:10:17] went over a few materials about the plan, how it's organized, that sort of thing, As well as some of the feedback that we've heard. So as part of that effort, we had take-home QR code flyers where the participants could scan a code that took you to our Phase 4 website and provided an opportunity for input, as well as if they wanted to provide input at the time.

[00:10:49] Some of the topics that we heard about were transit, development area expansion, housing density, as well as public schools and child care. So our online engagement for phase four included a feedback opportunity, but also, of course, we published our plan document.

[00:11:18] And at last check, we had over 600 visits to this webpage and well over 100 downloads for each part one, two, and three. To gauge input or participants, to gauge some feedback, we included a tool that assessed participants' comfort level with a plan document.

[00:11:44] And this tool was available until September 5th. We received about 16 responses and honestly heard some of the same topics that came up during the open house. Here's our schedule. We just reviewed the public engagement input box.

[00:12:04] As far as work sessions go, we were in front of the PC, the Planning Commission, about a week and a half ago, two weeks ago now. On the same topic, we're here before you today. Last week, you heard from Mr. Newberry giving an update on our build-out analysis.

[00:12:23] And then we're looking to our public hearings. And currently, we have those scheduled for the Planning Commission on September 30th and Board of Supervisors on October 15th. So during that public hearing from PC, we'll be looking for a recommendation to adopt the plan.

[00:12:39] And hopefully on the 15th, you all will see fit to adopt the plan. I wanted to mention a few notable edits or additions to the plan document.

[00:12:57] We did hear you on the seventh big move that focuses on social connection and building a sense of community. In the growth management chapter, we added content for the development area utilization review and criteria for evaluating our development area boundaries for your direction.

[00:13:17] In the rural areas chapter, we added content supporting agricultural and forestry uses, which includes distribution and aggregation facilities. The Thriving Economy chapter has been updated to align language to support our economic development strategic plan and incorporates language to support our local agricultural community and updating our target industries.

[00:13:46] For cultural resources, we incorporated your feedback related to actions involving incentives and potential funding, as well as identifying cultural resources and what that means. As one of the longer chapters, content for community facilities chapter has been consolidated and shortened.

[00:14:08] The transportation chapter now includes additional content related to recreation on rural roads. Just as a reminder, we did touch on this, I think, the last time we talked about implementation, but we will be incorporating metrics to monitor trends and patterns associated with the big moves.

[00:14:31] And for example, these metrics could include population growth and where it occurs, tracking affordable housing units, both preserved and new, as well as tracking cost burden households. These metrics and tracking will be incorporated into our annual report that we deliver.

[00:14:51] get into a little bit of the PC feedback. In general, the comments were, you know, we still needed to go through and do a little bit of editing for clarity and a consistent voice.

[00:15:09] Those objectives should be achievable, which we will update those. And as we're going through, make sure that we take out the less suggestive language and be more deliberate for the objectives and actions. Part one, in general, PC agreed with all the content that we provided. They did suggest maybe a slight reordering of the chapter to make it read and flow a little bit more

[00:15:39] logically. For part two, they thought we should highlight the success of the growth management policy in preserving the rural area, as well as we should clarify the intention to maintain the current development area boundary as it is currently. They did voice some concerns about removing and adding land within the development area. In part three, pretty much comfortable with

[00:16:14] the content, they suggested that we include some zoomed in or blow up sections of the future land use map as it is a pretty small scale. I will note that once the plan is adopted, that layer will be available for use as part of our online GIS interactive tool so folks will be able to zoom in and zoom out as necessary. They also suggested that we ensure that all the data and statistics are up-to-date which is currently

[00:16:47] what we're doing. It's going through that path. So I am going to put these questions back up on the screen. I will also mention that at PC as Director Flotto intimated, they went through part by part. And so they have a round of, you know, for each part, commissioners gave their general impressions and thoughts, and then they would go through and kind of section by section state if they had any comments. This seemed to work pretty well,

[00:17:25] if you all would like to adopt the same thing. And as Jody suggested, we'd like to pause after each part so we can summarize what we heard and make sure that we can confirm consensus on those items. With that, I will turn it back over to you, Paul, and take your questions and comments.

[00:17:45] Thank you. That's pretty focused topics except for the third one. So what I would propose is that we go through the document chapter by chapter, starting with the plan policy. And I would only propose that We start with our order, but afterwards we'll have a whole discussion.

[00:18:06] I would propose that the wish to study further Shadwell and Yancey, that goes in the rural chapters. So we try to make sure we come back to that when we get to that chapter rather than trying to hit it right away, since we've got a lot to do. Does that make sense?

[00:18:22] It does make sense. It's also in the gross management, so we'll take care of it one way or the other. If I may just mention one more thing, we do have PDFs of all of the content that you have in front of you. So as we're discussing each part, yes, yes.

[00:18:38] Okay, so we'll be ready to show public policy or plan policy part one. I think that's it. There's a lot there. And again, just starting with our speaking order. And when we get to free flow, make sure, Supervisor Pruitt, that you jump in if your mic's live.

[00:18:58] Otherwise, put your hand up and I'll try to make sure you get in. But we'll start for now with Supervisor Malik, if you're ready to get us started. I need to get to the right page. I've tried to be organized by just putting notes. And you will all be thrilled to know that I have many of you with me.

[00:19:17] So I've done lots of homework to try to keep it. The only comment I have on plan policy, if it is we're talking about this first 20 pages or so, is on the Monacan Nation history.

[00:19:42] Excuse me, Supervisor Manley, could you give us a page number so that we can get to where you are? It'll be on the bottom right corner of your page. One I did not paste in. Oh, sorry. No, no, it's my mistake, not yours.

[00:20:00] It was mine on the old one. Aha, okay. I'll help everybody else get organized. Will? I feel like it might be page 18, at least that's where we start about the brief history.

[00:20:21] Yes, the image is different, that's what threw me off. Very good, thank you. The point that I raised originally, and I think it's important to make sure that we, part of the part is definitely upgraded about Monaco's descendants have reclaimed their identity and tribes' organization. They didn't all leave, and this is the point that my neighbors who are descended from the original here say, we never left, please don't act like we went away, because

[00:20:56] while the larger settlements did have to move in order to not be in danger. I know you will figure out a way to stop in that comment, and that was the only one I had for this chapter. Thank you.

[00:21:14] Okay, thank you. Thank you. Wow, she finished so fast, huh? Oh, dear. Many more chapters to go. You set the bar for me, Anne, so anyway. It will not be that way. just wanted to say in general nicely done and easy to understand I appreciate that and with that I'll make a couple of comments on page 12 I'm going to mention this during this part portion

[00:21:50] of the discussion I was going to mention it later but I the small area plans I would pretty much insist that the Lambs Lane campus small area plan be included when we're talking about the Rio small area plan we also have a small area plan for the Lambs Lane campus and it is in the Places 29 part of it so that's why I'm bringing it up now we actually discussed a little bit I don't know if this would be acceptable it's something that's kind of part of the school campus it is and I get that oh you would prefer you already heard that idea well go ahead finish

[00:22:28] but I do agree that it's part of the school property, so go ahead. And I interrupted you. I'm sorry. That's fine. The community facilities chapter talks about facilities, schools, and stuff like that. We thought maybe that was the appropriate place to sort of have any campus plans that we do for school facilities associated.

[00:22:47] Not necessarily as a small area plan that we would normally do over multiple parcels or, you know, an area of several dozen to hundred parcels. this one is more like something that might be more appropriate to planning effort that went forward for a capital facility that is a school campus we thought we might include it in that part of the plan put it in the plan but put it in that section I guess I have to think about that that seems appropriate to me my concern is that we went through and we have a we have a transportation project that is based on that small area plan right and I don't

[00:23:26] want to lose sight of it because it's critical to both the schools and Alomar County so not losing track of it is what I'm trying to do. Not to make too much of a fine point on it but like the schools, the elementary schools that are down between Avon and the one we're building, they're talking about having a pedestrian connection between the two schools. I could see that be something analogous. We might go to VDOT, try to get a safe house of school grant and try to make the connection and it might reside in the campus plan.

[00:23:55] associate. We haven't had a full chance to talk about it so we can continue to take it under advisement. But that was, broadly speaking, something that staff kicked around yesterday in a meeting. And I think that's fine. I'll leave that up to you. I just want to make sure that we end up with it in the document. So it's not a plan that goes on a shelf and somebody says, well, in 10 years, wow, we didn't even know we had this. Because that can happen.

[00:24:18] Okay. All right. That's excellent. And I'll keep going then. That LLC here under small area plan there, so I'll keep going. On page 16, I know I have problems with my eyes at my age, but I think these

maps are out of focus if you look at them.

[00:24:42] So you'll get that clarified. That's really just a simple thing, but I looked at it and I, yeah. Well, yes, that'd be great. Thank you. See, this is easy stuff. Thank you. On page 21, I think all of us understand neighborhoods one through seven, but I think a better adding some what are the neighborhoods one through seven rather than just referencing them for folks to be able to understand where actually one through seven, where there's neighborhoods.

[00:25:17] All right. And land use and climate change, I thought was really good. And on page 28, I'm not sure how to word this, but I'm looking at multimodal transportation choices. And it mentions transit. And I think it's really important to clarify. And I don't know what adjective to use, but timely transit. We can have transit and expect everybody to walk a mile, right?

[00:25:57] or but if we can somehow or another clarify timely transit or maybe you all have a better adjective to go with that reliable it is another one there you go something like that because we have transit now but it is not timely it's not reliable so i and it's a little thing but i think it could be important yeah um and then keeping on with mine regular and reliable it's that I think that's it because picking up folks once an hour is not going to cut it.

[00:26:35] You know, you understand why I'm going to do that. And I'm almost on pace with Ann. That's it. There was somewhere, and I was looking for it and can't find it, a map that had the numbers for the neighborhood that I found very, very helpful.

[00:26:55] Maybe you can find that somewhere and stick it in. Yeah, I just think when you're talking, the first time you reference something, it would be good to have that. That's a good point. Thank you. Perhaps it is. Supervisor Malik, were you thinking of this one that was actually in the build-out analysis?

[00:27:11] I remember seeing that one too. Yeah, so maybe something like that would help. We'll see about adding that. To you, Supervisor Pruitt. Excellent. I will similarly try and keep brief like my peers.

[00:27:33] Two pretty simple things, and one will not be a little familiar. First, on page 16, I'm just going to highlight, you know, I think you've done a real, I know the staff has done several things about the graphics and legends, but I think we're in generally a really good place with graphics and legends.

[00:27:54] I like that the graphic has a legend, I think, but I appreciate that. I appreciate them seeing very few images that aren't from the county. I would just raise that this first image is too low-quality, too usable, but I think we probably need a vector or pin graphic here.

[00:28:10] That is, I don't know, for example, what it says about area A, and no balance isn't able to fix that. It's also not clear if it's even got information that's not available in the next graphic, so I'll just raise that up as that it is not an appropriately high-quality image to appear in this plan.

[00:28:33] On page 17, another fairly minor thing, but in the discussion with Thomas Scott's book, we say that we will send a link to the Scottsville Comprehensive Plan in the appendix, which is all well and good, but it contains within it a presumption, right?

[00:28:50] This is going to be a static document. You know, it's going to be PDF'd. And so the Scottsville Comprehensive Plan, if they're on different, you know, update periodicities, it assumes that the link to that plan will stay live. I don't know what the correct way to solve this is, But I would just raise up the concern that a link to something run by a different organization is in no way guaranteed to remain bad.

[00:29:20] I think a solution would be that we could create an archive link, create a permalink, and note in this that it is a link to the current Congress Constable Comprehensive Plan as of date of adoption.

[00:29:40] Finally, I think I might have discussed this previously, but I'm sure it's not lost on others here on the board and staff joining us, but looking at page 12, going off of the previous discussion on, you know, our additional plans, right, that occasionally, in fact, I feel like the context in which I most frequently hear small area plans in vote is when they contain, normally through oversight for omission, language that contradicts language in the comprehensive plan.

[00:30:20] A classic example is some small area plans discuss a feathering count of density toward the border with the rural area, whereas the comprehensive plan expressly disannounced that. I wonder if it might be appropriate to include language in here about how, in the possibility, of an inadvertent direct contradiction contained within the plans, basically what the order of supremacy is,

[00:30:59] which I normally think of in the event of a contradiction that the comprehensive plan is superior and supersedes subordinate plans. But others might say that a subordinate plan provides additional context or clarity and therefore is across the comprehensive plan.

[00:31:16] So I raise that up as something we should probably clarify. that and say that that is a note that we're planning, that we intend to include for our future land use map, but it would also be, should be included here. So I think that's a really great point that will ensure that the comp plan should, what do we call it?

[00:31:42] Supersede. Supersede the small area plans. Excellent. Thank you. That's all I have. Okay. Manager LaPheece-Tro-Cartley. I'm going to piggyback on to what Supervisor McKeel said regarding the maps.

[00:32:02] I mean, I do believe as I looked at them, I think it's important to include the major thoroughfares, 250, 29, some of the major ones, so that if people look at this, they can basically tell, okay, where that location is.

[00:32:20] You know, not all of them, but some of them. And maybe it's important enough maybe to have a full page of a map, if it's important. Otherwise, I really don't have those words.

[00:32:38] My comments, I will compliment the staff because we've been going over this a year. And the many times the more I read it, I actually, I'm going to say this out loud, but I actually like it.

[00:32:54] And I think it's good. You've got to vote for it. And I mean, I think it's really good. I mean, we're in the process now of tweaking. But otherwise, I think staff has done an incredible job, frankly.

[00:33:09] It's not easy. Those are all my comments for this section. Okay. Leave it to me. You're under a lot of pressure. Again, I also think you've done a great job.

[00:33:25] And I'll be back then wherever possible. Imagine somebody reading this printed and anything below six-point type. I'm going to be juggling two pairs of glasses today already. As I get more tired, it gets harder and harder to read the fine print.

[00:33:46] I like the way you've incorporated, I like a lot of the comments made by the Planning Commission. I really appreciate what they have to say about this. I like the way you've incorporated a bit of history in here, leaving the more detailed history to the appendix.

[00:34:02] However, I think that it might be also appropriate to include a little bit of a demographic description here. I don't see anything for an intro. It seems like not just having a little history, but also having some snapshot of our current demographics summarized in some way here would be helpful to the reader to see as a context for the plan.

[00:34:25] And I probably will bring up more details about some of the history as we look at the growth management because there are some statements there. But page 23, and I should have made this comment in the earlier review, I realized, I have trouble fully comprehending what's going on here as a number of different numbers have changed dramatically.

[00:34:50] I imagine Biscuit Run and other things have had significant impact on how you delineate percentages. is, I will say this now, to maybe preface saying it again, there are a number of cases where I just think that the actual number of acres or approximate number of acres is more meaningful than the percentage.

[00:35:11] I could tell you that I have a lot out somewhere that 2% of it's developed, and you don't know what that means. That could be 20 acres. 20 or 200. Right. And so that's just a kind of different way to look at this. I also look at this and say, well, you know, if we're going to do this process of delineating all of the different comp plans, can't we include this one?

[00:35:36] Or is that somewhere else already that we lay out? You know, so if we're going to see how these things have changed, we have some sense of what this comp plan is doing, not just end in 2015 and leave me guessing as to where we are now. So to address that, because basically what we've been doing with the future land use map is consolidating those categories and essentially translating category for category, one for one, those percentages will likely not change maybe but a tenth of a percent just because of some minor tweaks.

[00:36:16] So it will be very similar to what we have for 2015. And I think that's really helpful information for someone to look at it and say, oh, you know, we kind of settled in to an expectation here. I know there were some comments at the Planning Commission about ordering, and I'm not sure what the best answer is there.

[00:36:38] I do think that guiding principles kind of appears as an afterthought at the end of the, if it's really guiding principles, I'm not sure where, well, I'm not sure where it belongs, but it just dropped in there.

[00:36:50] Not to get too much. Yes, and we appreciate that. And one advantage we have is Mr. Wilkinson, who's our new employee, is a long-time editor, writer, and he's spent his first couple of weeks coming through the plan and doing it again, looking for first-person voice, you know, getting to see a voice and catching errors and picking up some of the comments we've received in planning questions, but also heavily sort of editing the first part of the document, addressing some of those concerns.

[00:37:21] So when you see the final plan, don't be surprised to sort of see it reordered. We've sort of, we can take your all's comments a little bit, tweak what we did. You know, we have to be quick on this turnaround, so it's already rewritten and it's like that section's moved up closer to the front. The same content, just a different batting order of the content.

[00:37:38] I think that's what the Planning Commission really wanted from us, so it is done. Okay, thank you. Are there any other, Supervisor, any other comments from anyone on this first section?

[00:37:55] Well done. So the next section would be the gross management policy, which I know is a topic of considerable interest, and we'll again go through our order first, but then open it up, and if you're - Are you ready, supervise them out.

[00:38:20] - Okay, good, good. - You can't go first on their own. - And the part three, I've shot myself in the foot

[00:38:30] by having all these times.

[00:39:18] It's not gonna be a change to the boundary right now. It keeps coming back over and over again, earlier chapter, this chapter. So just pointing that out, while boundary changes, blah, blah, blah, in the second paragraph to the end.

[00:39:34] I just don't know that that doesn't really go anywhere. On page eight, the last paragraph of number two, Development areas, and I have a suggestion about including unused commercial space in parking lots when we're considering the capacity of the development area, rather than just because this was unchanged between the previous draft and now.

[00:40:04] So I'll leave that page with you if that's helpful, so you don't have to look similar to the making sure that when we have the build-out analysis, big improvement in the books, and we're looking at the whole perspective of things that may not have been in the original

[00:40:39] Kim Lee-Horn analysis, as far as they may have something on there, but it's going to likely change in 20 years. We need to be able to consider that information now in order to have a really valid understanding of going forward. So that's, again, just like I mentioned on the other one, number four. All right.

[00:41:01] Excuse me, Supervisor Malik, for clarification, are you hoping that we would add in language from the 2025 build-out analysis? Is that what you're saying here? I'm not quite sure I'm following you. Well, on page 8, what I was mentioning is that it came up all the way along, even a year ago, that we were not talking about all of the open parking lots, the parking lots, the things that are not doing anything. They were all excluded, and that was one assumption that one could use,

[00:41:34] But I think it was far better, raised by many, many people throughout the process, that to be valid, it needed to incorporate all of them. To get a true capacity, we needed to have the unused commercial space and parking lots as well. So that's basically the element of page eight.

[00:41:55] Sure, sure. I just want to make sure I understand. So what you're saying is the parking lots and the development areas that were identified, parking lots were not identified. Yet that space could conceivably be used for commercial or residential.

[00:42:13] Is that right? Yes, exactly. Okay, that's okay. The oceans and oceans of parking for an empty shopping mall. That could be something else. And do we need to specify where available and where empty? Because if a business is thriving, you don't want to consider their parking lot.

[00:42:31] But if, I agree with you, if you have these empty malls and they have a lot of parking available, I agree with that. I just wanted clarification. I don't think, I'm not suggesting that we go in parcel by parcel and determine who's thriving and who's not.

[00:42:47] But if there are huge parking lots, then there is a potential that sometime in the next 20 to 40 years, something else will happen there other than, I mean, just looking at Barracks Road, for example,

they now have all these interim buildings that were not there 10 years ago. And so I expect there'll be many other properties where the price of the land is more valuable to go up on and put a garage on than it is to keep 500 parking spaces.

[00:43:11] And so I'm hoping that that generates, I think, considerable capacity that we were not considering in the first build-out analysis that we saw. Well, just a word of caution and then yet sort of a word of reassurance, if you will. A word of caution is, I mean, when we start talking about individual parcels and the build-out analysis, I think we sort of get away from really what it's supposed to be doing.

[00:43:31] It's a tool that globally looks at the development area and tries to not on a parcel by parcel. It's supposed to be, it definitely takes in parcels, there's no doubt about it. And its intent is not to be granular to say, oh, hey, Mr. Jones' parcel is going to redevelop, Mr. Smith's is not.

[00:43:51] With that said, the build-out analysis, the parcels that we did, I don't think the law was referencing in your concern. and some of the ones on 29, there are plenty of those that did make it into the build-out analysis. All I'm referring to, and I said right at the beginning, I'm not talking about...

[00:44:07] Individual services. Yes, ma'am. When it's listed as an exclusion, that's what I'm pushing back on. You excluded them by policy for the first study, and there was considerable interest in re-evaluating that throughout the process.

[00:44:23] Okay. Thank you so much. Page 11 is the first place where the boundaries come up, And many people have suggested, in addition to me, that this would be perhaps better off as a separate document rather than, because it's not as well-developed as the rest of

[00:45:00] the text is that we've been used to working with, that it would be better to have this as a separate document and give it a chance to mature and have us sort of have a better understanding of what is going on.

[00:45:17] Rather than having something vague and sort of on with, I mean, some of the comments were, you know, the terminology is weird and says one thing in one paragraph and not in the next. I didn't go through it to that detail. But one solution is to give this more time to be baked properly.

[00:45:36] Certainly, another comment was to just flip those first two paragraphs because one is the general introduction and the second is an action. So, something that I know you've heard already. Then we're talking about, on page 12, criteria for removing underperforming areas.

[00:45:58] That's relating to your question. This is the first time it's coming up, so I will speak about that now. In the old draft, what I had written down for myself in the notes was, if an area is already developed with water and sewer, it should not be considered for a swamp.

[00:46:15] And that was the basis when people brought up the village of Urbana. It's already got its amenities, so that is not a valid swamp situation. And this is another situation where this topic needs to grow and evolve and be considered deliberately, not rushed and thrown into the comp plan with the level of confusion that I think it generates in its current state.

[00:46:43] So, I mean, we have draft criteria. We have a lot of things that raise a lot of anxiety in the public that is not necessary. So that's perhaps come back to that in another place where I might have some other notes written down.

[00:47:00] But I think that these two, page 11 and page 12, would really benefit from being in a separate section, either work to be done in the beginning of the appendix or something, so that it's not considered to be as well completed as all of the other work that we've worked so hard on all this time.

[00:47:22] And the other general comment is, when land has constraints, it should affect its use, not changing the rules to make those constraints go away, or getting other land from someplace else to take the place of those constraints.

[00:47:39] So that's a philosophical approach so that we're not just using this as one way to basically expand the growth area without benefiting. So that's my comments on those two pages. And now we're going on to more criteria.

[00:48:04] Not yet incorporated in the first round. First priority, transportation. Have existing development areas caught up in needed services? sidewalks, parks, and transit. As far as criteria, before one expands and expands the geography in which you're going to provide services, have you already taken care of the geography with the budget that you need?

[00:48:31] It's important. Public water and sewer, this seems to indicate we'll just keep spreading on and on and on with those services. There's already a \$200 million CIP in Romana for the next 20 years. The rate payers have to incorporate it to their fees in order to pay for the work that was postponed from 2000 on and now we're having to do it. It would have cost a whole lot less if we'd done it at the right moment before 2010, but that didn't happen.

[00:49:00] So this is, I just wanted to provide a little extra reality on that we shouldn't be too glib about expanding, expanding, expanding water and sewer service because it is at great cost to the rate payers. 14, and this is again the potential water supply of watersheds. I would encourage this section in the bullets to be much more strident because in areas where we are a

[00:49:37] little bit more nebulous about our goals we have compatibility issues around Beaver Creek where there's residential people do not follow the rules that the county staff has laid out the CDD has laid out saying you cannot scarify with a weed whip all the way down to the water's edge they do it all the time and it is an enforcement nightmare but it causes erosion trouble things like that So if a potential area is in a water supply, watershed, that needs to be an out, in my opinion, because otherwise we are settling ourselves in for a world of hurt going forward as far as trying to keep it protected.

[00:50:15] I'm not sure you want to take that whole section out. Well, I'm just saying if we're still talking about criteria and not postponing that chapter until later, I'm just putting all these things in while I have a chance, it should be a pretty important hard no.

[00:50:32] where? Potential areas in the water supply. 14. Page 14 in the middle of the page. Because it's hard to dance around. If it is, it's a problem. And it shouldn't be allowed to then have a whole lot of things happen to it, impervious surfaces, erosion, etc. When we know what's going to happen is that erosion will happen and it will damage the water supply.

[00:50:58] Excuse me, Supervisor Mal. My understanding then that what you're suggesting is we should probably still consider whether the potential area is in the water supply watershed, but you're saying if it is, do not allow it.

[00:51:17] That should not be something that then goes to step two. We'll listen to everybody and then this will be our first come back around to make sure we've got consensus on stuff.

[00:51:35] One person's view. On page 16, talking about number three on page 16, I would suggest adding a fourth bullet that says, has current development area caught up on services such as bus shelters and transit before we increase the size of the judgment?

[00:52:04] That just was mentioned in two different places in the chapter, so I mentioned it as well. I will stop there. Thank you.

[00:52:15] Sorry. Okay, here we are. On page four, the first paragraph, I agree with what you say here, but I think there's some redundancy. I remember our consultant recently saying that we had a lot of resentment between our documents, right?

[00:52:46] And so it looks like to me that where you have forestry and natural environment in the rural area, I think the rest of that paragraph is redundant. That's all I'm saying. Think about that. I'm not, it's an absolute, I'm just saying that I'm trying to shorten this and make sure we're not being redundant in our discussions.

[00:53:08] Down in the last paragraph, high quality of life to entice current and future community members to live in the development area, period. period. Instead of the rural area, I think is, sounds like we're really trying to direct people where they're going, and maybe that is what we're really trying to do, but I find that we want to entice them to live in the development area, period. I just take out the rural area.

[00:53:43] On page six, second paragraph, it says, it talks about the 1970s, which I lived through here.

[00:54:05] I'm not sure that everybody did, but I did. And I can say that the, so when we say possibly due to concerns about annexation, as well as previously abundant supply up, I'm not sure. When we say we don't have any proof of that, I just take that off.

[00:54:23] I don't think that adds anything to the discussion. We don't have any proof about that. Certainly there was chatter about annexation, but I think I just, it works just as well without that. Because if I had to prove that, I'm not sure I could. All right. Page seven, when we're talking about development in the development areas, meaning the objectives, I would look at including, there's nothing that captures transit here.

[00:54:54] And I think transit is really important. Walkability, bikeability, sidewalks, greenways, shared use paths. But we don't have anything about transit. I just slip transit in somewhere. I'll leave that to you all to work your magic, right? But you know me, I'm trying to get transit in everywhere I can.

[00:55:14] Page 8, for the example, 22 land use build-out analysis, I would add something very simple there. About 58% of the maximum number of units recommended is not, you know, we're not building out.

[00:55:36] I would add something similar, something simple about consequences. What's the consequence for clarity, right? So then when people are reading it, they say, oh, well, we've only been approving at 58%.

[00:55:54] So what's the consequence? Right, on page 8, right here. That would mean like the consequences are that we are not fulfilling what we're able to. And that's on us. Yeah, and I was absolutely, but I was just going to let you work your magic about that language.

[00:56:12] Page 9, it says, and I'm looking at the 1, 2, I guess the second page. paragraph down the cost to redevelop parcels is missing it seems like to me because the analysis doesn't take into consideration the cost of development thinking about we're dealing with

[00:56:44] that all the time so i might just add again work your magic and work that into the discussion there um and then let's end um first paragraph under six i would change can to will uh limiting the supply of available housing will drive up the cost.

[00:57:23] It doesn't, it's not can, it is will. I'm being a lawyer now and those words of can and will and should and won't and all that, I think it will drive up. And going down the next paragraph, increasing demand for non-residential space will lead to cost rising.

[00:57:45] Because it seems like to me that's what we know. Page 11 and 12, Ann was talking about removing these and moving them I would not agree with that I think they're in a fine place where they are and page 15 I like the the language around the public water and sewer so I would not as Ann was suggesting change that I would not push back on that potential if a potential water

[00:58:18] area area is in the water supply watershed now on page 14 I think Ann was saying that she wants that to be an absolute and I would not do that and I think the example that we talked about recently a woolen mills would be an example we had absolute multiple experts tell us do that and maybe i'm convoluting something here but i'm just simply saying that i like the language here

[00:58:49] and i would um and i guess that's it trying to be brief again with the kids and the shells and the wills yes thank you um i will also try and be brief um very minor technical thing but Again, I can't tell because of just graphical fidelity, but that looks like an uppercase I in higher in the caption, which would be, I truly can't tell.

[00:59:28] Oh, this is on page eight, sorry. Tell us again, Mike. I'm not following. I think that is an uppercase I in higher in the caption. I promise the other comments will be more substantive.

[00:59:47] So let's cut. So I want to preface most of these comments by saying I actually broadly quite like where you arrived at here. I think it's representative of where I feel, and I hope my peers share that.

[01:00:07] Let's turn to page 11 and kind of get into where I think the interest is here. I want to begin by saying, you know, Anne brought this up, but, you know, the first paragraph there, it's pretty kneeling-mouthed, perhaps because it was representing this ward's own, like, indecision.

[01:00:31] But it is not clear as a reader where we're going with this, and I think it's correctly observed that the next paragraph actually does begin, like, by actually introducing you to the facts of the case, right? I actually don't know if this first paragraph is needed, though.

[01:00:49] I think we can jump in just a little bit. I think we should agree as well. Yeah, to strike it. Exit. It's gone. Glad to hear such a resembling agreement. So I heard, you know, some concern that the criteria for removing underperforming areas and adding new areas, right, it's that we are maybe gelding further than we should in a comprehensive plan.

[01:01:26] I personally think it has to be in here, because otherwise it feels too consequential and too substantive, right? This is what a comprehensive plan is about, right? I don't think if we did not include this, it would seem to me inappropriate to have such considerations during the lifespan of this comprehensive plan.

[01:01:50] If we did want to entertain a conversation about removal or reallocation of development areas and that on that, I would feel like we could not. If we did not, because it is such a consequential help, it would run contradictory to the growth management plan if the growth management plan stopped at page 10.

[01:02:10] So I personally think this needs to be in here, even while recognizing, I think, as it does quite clearly, that this is kind of a preliminary draft of what the core kind of evaluating criteria should be. I do think these are the right evaluative criteria, and I'm not sure that it's appropriate, you know, in the list for removing underperforming areas, I'm not sure it's appropriate to have guidelines at this stage, because I, for one, you know, I don't know that I agree with Supervisor Alex's contention that if there's been an extension of the water and sewer, then that should serve as a guideline to remove people.

[01:02:51] I personally do think that places that have extended water and sewer are otherwise sort of policy failures in how we want to realize the problem. If they are a policy failure in a way that's significant, then I think that should be something we're going to say. I also, you know, I do, moving to page 14, I am sympathetic and interested in,

[01:03:21] I'm sorry, Supervisor Malik's suggestion to add that as a right line, but I think my concern would be I don't know how we quantify or depict what is and is not a watershed area.

[01:03:38] I don't have that right to know just how much clarity or granularity you would have with such a thing to know whether or not I think that would be an appropriate right line, if that makes sense.

[01:03:54] I just, is a water supply, watershed, a potential area, is that a massive paintbrush that covers hundreds, thousands of acres, or is it a specific width around a, you know, a particular inter-industry?

[01:04:12] I don't know. I don't pretend to know, and I'm not sure I would be happy to include it in that. I do agree, though, especially that this whole section, you know, demands of further serious thought.

[01:04:31] I think we will engage in further serious thought, especially if we're seriously contemplating the removal and reallocation of acreage. In, frankly, some specific conversations on actually how to implement that policy.

[01:04:47] I don't think we need that level of commitment, I think, here. And I also do agree with kind of the conviction that the pragmatic elements of the growth management policy can be too easily overlooked and not discussed. Things like cost, things like the necessity to protect our own watershed.

[01:05:09] And this is not me giving this feedback, but like a very simple example, we have the caption on page four, which reads, you don't have to change the page. the growth management policy directs density in the development areas to protect the character of the rural area. I think that's probably kind of the popular understanding of what our growth management policy is doing. And I also think that might mischaracterize it because it frames it as protecting the character of the rural area and overlooks the, and character feels effectual,

[01:05:43] it feels spiritual, aesthetic. And I think that overlooks the actual pragmatic reasons we have road to control the expansion of costs of direct costs related to capital improvements or to protect and manage neutrification of our owners, that's relevant and I don't think we want to de-emphasize that because that other than a particular quote, I'm not sure that there are substantial changes that we propose in the draft as written, although if

[01:06:21] on a pass checking for consistent voice staffs these opportunities to further emphasize the very tangible and right now purposes of the development area for the more abstract character and cultural resources. I think that's all right. Thank you. Supervisor McPurley. Yes, I'd like to ask for a point of clarification with Supervisor Pruitt. So on page 14, if a potential area is in a water supply shed, Are you agreeing that it should be taken out or left in?

[01:07:03] I don't think anyone was talking about it being taken out or left in. I believe Supervisor Malek suggested it remain in, but be a right line rather than a criteria. So if it meets any component of that, it would automatically not be eligible.

[01:07:23] And I am suggesting that it remain as a consideration, but not the... Which I think is also what I heard from Supervisor McKeel, but I apologize if that's in this paragraph. Okay, thank you. Okay, I just wanted that clarified.

[01:07:43] All right, on page six, on the right-hand side, the last paragraph in the middle, it says food access slash community gardens, and elsewhere in the document it says food access comma community gardens.

[01:08:00] So I suggest that we take out the slash and replace it with a comma, which is better in grammatically. I do agree with, I think we, the second paragraph on the left-hand side, we took out that part, which I don't disagree with anything where we refer to, I mean, back in the 70s, that would be, what, two generations ago for some people?

[01:08:31] Be careful. My generation is very much alive. No, no, I'm not saying we're not alive. I'm just saying we're definitely alive.

[01:08:47] But we go through this. I don't know how much we have to refer to. maybe even have a link to like past history because things are, my point is things are changing so fast nowadays even from you know 20 to 25 in five years things have changed a lot and you can't a lot of people it's like well maybe they should care but a lot of people don't care they want to know what's going to happen what can I do so I would just be look at that wherever you can remove it

[01:09:25] if it doesn't flow. On page seven, Supervisor McKeel keeps bringing up transit which I'm very much in favor of but I do know we have we don't have a lot of the population so I guess leave it in because of the fact that we want more transit but that's something we're gonna have to cart up it's really gonna have to work hard on to be able to get that and it's basically it's a reality check. Are we going to be able to deliver on this transit? That's what I worry

[01:10:02] about. I don't want someone reading it and saying well we don't have this this and this when actually it's going to be a long process to get there. You know maybe microcat helps and I mean hopefully we will have a robust transit system at some point in the future. So we're talking, I'm just confused about what you're saying. So we're talking about the development area and we're talking about miles of sidewalks greenways and shared use paths and all I said was I think it should include transit connection. Well you mentioned transit a couple times and I just I'm just kidding. Yeah yeah no no no I just don't want people to have an expectation that tomorrow

[01:10:41] we're going to have a lot of transit but I'm not against. We're in expectation of miles of sidewalks greenways or shared use paths. Well that should. I'm just saying wait one hundred dollars. That may not happen tomorrow. yeah yeah that may not happen okay as long as you know okay I can look at

that's fine um I agree with on on page nine five taking out shortening and that goes back to the history um and page 10

[01:11:14] so I'm going to I will tell you when this issue came up about swapping land development versus rural I think it was brought up by supervisor Pruitt and others seem to like it at first I was against that. I was a hard development area boundary person. I've never changed my mind as I understand it more because we do have guardrails. We have guardrails. We're not swapping forestall

[01:11:51] land, farming, agricultural land. We're not swapping that out. We're swapping areas in the rural area that wouldn't be appropriate for housing with development land, you know, where or in areas, I think Ned brought it up, Supervisor Galloway brought it up, that along the river, that's all development area, but you're not going to be putting houses, you know, right along the river because of the street buffers.

[01:12:21] So because of that, I'm not seeing a problem with doing some swaps that make sense. For me, that would be what makes sense in this area.

[01:12:40] Otherwise, we're just having, frankly, vacant land because of a label. So we have unused rural, we have unused development land. Whereas, in reality, if we swap that and keep in the same basic percentage, we could make use of that land.

[01:12:59] My story, and I'm sticking to it. So the one, it's page 12, the last paragraph. I think that's a really good statement.

[01:13:16] It kind of says it all, frankly. page 13 public water and sewer I agree with that I like that page 14 I agree that it should be left in there also because as we as we lose we have less and less development land and we want it for commercial we want for housing but especially especially commercial and light industry we're gonna have to make

[01:13:49] some decisions and some tweaks to be able to get it uh what we want as far as um commercial light industry and i'm going to reference again the the woolen mills what happened there uh we have to weigh things that's it for me about the speed with which we're going through as our official time keeper okay okay i'm going to have some pushback on some of these as well so i guess i'll go through

[01:14:26] in order, page six, and this was just an issue I had a number of times that this comment has been made in meeting after meeting, that we had a number of acres, this is a very first paragraph on page six, the very end of it, it says, you know, starting with 48,000 acres in the development area in 1971 to 23,800 today, makes it sound as if we're slowly chipping away at the development area. Whereas I think that there was a massive rezoning in 1980, down zoning in 1980, and that without reference to that, this is very misleading to me.

[01:15:06] And I really think that that little data point needs to be in here so that somebody doesn't look at this and say, oh, then gradually eroding. It was a major thing in 1980. So a question before I go into other comments, what is the plan with respect to the 2025 update of the land use build-out analysis?

[01:15:32] There are numerous references in here to 2022 and references to the 58%, and then we heard last time about how that's 56, no it's 70, depends on how you measure it. There are issues with that, and I would love to see some of that nuance better reflected in here than just throwing this out.

[01:15:49] The reason why we asked for that update is because we felt that this information had already gone stale. And so what's the plan? That's a good question. What did you say?

[01:16:06] Oh, the way we intended to address all that was to go ahead and update any references to the 22 build-out analysis with current updated information that came out of the 2025 build-out analysis.

[01:16:21] This draft, we weren't, the 2025 analysis wasn't complete as we were publishing this draft, so we recognize that we need to go back. Sure, and I understood that. I just wanted to know, you know, between now and October 15th, I guess, how are we going to deal with this?

[01:16:38] And I would caution, for example, that even in referring to the 2025, that if we throw the 56% out there without the caveat that, you know, this depends on one parcel and how you calculate that one parcel, that it's not helpful. So I'll leave you to thinking that one through and how it should be handled.

[01:17:00] I appreciate all that. We'll be updating it. And I appreciate the comment about recognizing generally without parcel by parcel the capacity for redevelopment represented by oversized parking. Just as a recognition. Yeah, and the land use building analysis keeps coming up again and again.

[01:17:26] And also on page nine, the first paragraph, it talks about 7% of land, 0.3% of the land. And again, I think it'd be nice to have actual acreage or square miles or something.

[01:17:44] We know the numbers we're talking about. With respect to, I'm not going to disagree with Supervisor McKeel's comment about will or can driving up the cause locally.

[01:17:59] But I do note that in the Planning Commission meeting, the opposite is not necessarily true. Mr. Murray said it is not a proven fact that prematurely expanding development areas would necessarily lead to housing affordability, noting that we already have in the pipeline more units than we need, but will they actually be built in what time frame?

[01:18:24] And so it's, I don't think, I think there's some nuance here as far as how the economics works and how the builders will build. Yeah, I think there's a way that probably works with that because there's some market influences where rents might be affordable based on demand, but change.

[01:18:46] So we'll see what we can do with that. Yeah, you can do it. installation of it to say is that are the numbers helpful or are they creating more of a mess that then you have to deal with than is being a comp plan and the guide. This is what I think we all want to avoid is anything that's written that seems to slam in one direction as far as making it easier to expand or easier not to expand. I mean this is the 58 based upon the 6 to 34 units I talked about at the last meeting that still has no basis, is all a number that doesn't

[01:19:25] really help us. So please think about that issue going forward. We can chase our tails round and round and round with numbers, but it doesn't help. Influencing value rather than determining whether it's greater or lesser. And certainly recessions have a great thing on rents, but it's a terrible circumstance to have, so we don't need to go there.

[01:19:45] It's political at the end of it. On page 10, last paragraph, you'll love this comment. I understand that, you know, we have a determination in this comprehensive plan that we are not currently expecting to expand the development areas, and this is a 20-year plan, and we're not trying to go beyond that, and it's going to be looked at again, presumably, you know, over five years.

[01:20:07] So I would prefer that it said if the board determines changes to the development area, we should be considered to win rather than win, because we haven't, in this plan, said that this is an event. It may be, in some future sense, inevitable, but it's not in this plan.

[01:20:25] Do you have a clarification? So what you're saying is if we say if, then that could mean that there could be a swapping of land or... Well, then we go on to all the rest of the discussion, which is a lot of criteria for deciding how and when this should happen. It doesn't rule that out.

[01:20:41] It doesn't rule it out, but you'll hear me respond on that in just a minute. I'm thrilled that that first paragraph from page 11 is going away. I do think that the criteria for removing underperforming areas from the development area, the idea of this swap, if you will, I understand why it's in here, and I know it should be, but boy, I do feel like we haven't really nailed it down yet.

[01:21:21] I don't think we really have to go out through compliance, and I find this page 12 a little bit vague. As a policy. As a policy. That's different from 13, 14, which you're talking about adding.

[01:21:38] I do want to make the note, and this is where I'll make it. There already were development area utilization review, one through six, that I think establish a framework that I appreciated, which is that we want to look at how well the development area is being utilized and think about ways to utilize it better.

[01:22:05] And that's something we should be doing before we start setting up the development area. And so when we get to this page 13, I even see in here, if you read the impacts and standards to assess, they're not all just suggestive of, oh, let's add land to the development area.

[01:22:29] A lot of them are saying, again, these are standards based on how well we're utilizing the development area. So I would suggest changing the heading of page 13 to instead of criteria for adding land, something like criteria for assessing the adequacy of land in the development area.

[01:22:49] That way we're not basically saying, as we read this, it's all about adding. It's all about really looking at these criteria and recognizing that these are the standards. Well, that would help me. I can love you. Don't you all collapse.

[01:23:10] Okay, on that note, I'm going to stop. Supervisor Andrews, could you repeat the where it says criteria for adding, I would say, criteria for assessing the adequacy of land in the development areas.

[01:23:29] Because it still leaves flexibility. And it's not saying we're not. It's just saying we have a lot of criteria that we want to look at to see whether we've done this appropriately. I appreciate that, thank you. And like I said, I was looking at the Planning Commission meeting to see if there was anything I really want to highlight.

[01:23:53] Again, I really appreciated their discussion, although I didn't think that they came to a consensus on a number of things. They would tell you they don't have to. And if you're through, I have one more thing that I want.

[01:24:14] But I'm not trying to rush. No, I'm through, and I'll continue to look and see if I have additional comments. And I'm not sure, and the reason I didn't bring this up, I wasn't sure whether to bring it up at this point or to bring it up under the development area piece. But I believe, number one, we have never voted to expand the development area, period.

[01:24:37] The community seems to think we have, but we have not. Having said that, we have talked about swapping land in the development, between the rural and development area, for some appropriate pieces that, as B said, will never be developed. Having said that, I think something that would be helpful is when we talk about capacity analysis, could we just have a map of the developable area in the development area?

[01:25:11] Could we have a map of the parcels or the land that is possibly developable, am I saying that correctly, in a development? Could we do that? Wait, let me have this. I know that members of our community are very interested in such a map as well.

[01:25:41] Well, here's the tricky part to this. And there was some discussion, not at this most recent planning commission, but golly, maybe months ago now, when we were talking about naming names on which parcels even might be swappable, there was some real concern that we didn't want the government to put our thumb on the scale on, like this parcel versus that parcel because it may wind up doing market things and so we've

[01:26:14] resisted that for that reason now certainly if you all direct us to do that we can build that and do it but but I think we're very we've been very cautious about not doing that for a purpose to just hold that in abeyance the criteria are all in here so you know if you have a parcel it's more than two acres, and the land value is more than the value of the improvements, you kind of know that you're probably one of the ones we chose.

[01:26:50] But we have been reluctant to do that because we didn't want to put our things in place. And I will accept that explanation, but I do think it's good to ask the question so that you have a chance once again to answer it. Ready? Thanks. Okay. Yeah, piggybacking on that, I think we have a number of parcels that would be developable, privately owned, and we don't know if the person wants to sell or not.

[01:27:16] We also have a number of developments that have been proposed that never get developed. So it's almost like a fast-moving, slow-moving target. Yeah, the criteria is very hard to establish what that actually means.

[01:27:32] There's so many variables that include the condition of the property, location, all the different things. There's some things, and probably all done, if we're going down the road and say, why'd they take that building down? Yeah. Why not this one next door? Right. So for us to, as Judy said, put our thumb on the scale makes that.

[01:27:54] Yeah, and I accept that answer, and that makes perfect sense. Thank you. A couple things to go back to you. The cost to redevelop. question it's i'm guessing always more expensive than greenfield but we're never going to get to redevelop at all if we're continually offering a less expensive alternative i just want to throw that out there because that was mentioned as something that was should have been meant on page nine regarding the map on a watershed watershed are delineated by usda and have been

[01:28:32] for hundreds of years and very very clear maps from height of land to height of land is what a watershed is. So we would have no trouble at all establishing that. And certainly the water planners have been doing that ever since RWSA was founded. And the other, in addition to the thumb on the scale, the constraints on a parcel, staff would take years to figure that out. I mean, the burden of doing that is worse than development rights, and that is a terribly burdensome thing for people.

[01:29:07] Yes, it is. I mean, the \$500 doesn't begin to cut as far as the cost for staff time to do that. So I just wanted to share those thoughts. Thank you. Yes, I want to. Yeah. You're looking for consensus, and I know you have things that you want to highlight.

[01:29:25] Well, I was just wondering how we would like to tackle this. I think we can just go piece by piece. I feel like we've gotten consensus on most things. I think the question that is still out there that I

would like clarified anyway is on page 11 and 12 that has been suggested to be removed into a separate document, and I'd like to make sure we understand whether y'all would like to keep it or...

[01:29:50] Well, the first part, I understand, is the first paragraph on page 11. Nobody likes, so it's gone. That's at least a point of consensus. I so far haven't heard consensus about removing the whole thing to a different document yet.

[01:30:11] Supervisor Manley. I agree with it for the purposes of looking to see where the board members are. Agree with what? Removing it to a different level. I was not suggesting throwing it out, but perhaps in a work to come, you know, in the appendix or whatever.

[01:30:31] Inclusion in the body, to me, means we really nail this down, and we want our citizens to trust what they read. So that's why I was thinking it needed to be given more time to make. I'm quite taken with the suggestion to change the title, which I think helps a lot.

[01:30:53] So if I fail to get it moved to the appendix or work to do or whatever, then that is at least helpful. But I don't think it's of the same quality that the rest of the document is, and that's why I was suggesting that it needs to be moved. So I don't think it needs to be moved.

[01:31:09] But I do agree, and I will compromise on changing the title, which is why I agreed to change the title, because we're going to leave it in this part of the document. I think changing the title seems fine.

[01:31:26] I mean, the linguistic tweets that we include just seems appropriate, right? Yes. I said this previously, but I'll reiterate it. I think it would be inappropriate for us to contemplate these changes regarding the development area if this wasn't included in the conference.

[01:31:49] So I think it is, I see it as being necessary. So I'm hearing that the title on the top of page 13 will change to criteria for assessing the adequacy of land in the development areas.

[01:32:08] No, and then it stays. And then it stays. Then the other thing I just want to get a little bit more, I'd like to have a little further clarification on, is on page 14, where we're talking about the potential area is in a water supply watershed.

[01:32:23] I'm hearing that you all like that criteria being there. I'm hearing that Supervisor Malek would like for that to be, if it is not, if it is in a water supply watershed, you would like that parcel removed from consideration for, and I'm not, I'm seeing shaking heads on two of the four in the room.

[01:32:49] Supervisor Pruitt, I have a note that you were, I think, okay with leaving this in like Diantha. That's correct. Okay. All right.

[01:33:06] So we're not voting for Supervisor Maligan. Jim, I don't know. Yeah, I'm not confident that I fully see where the limits are going to be. Well, I know, but we're looking at evaluating.

[01:33:24] So I think that it can stay remained in. Okay. Thank you. That's cool. I'm just trying to draft language now. You and I have well water. It's the rest of these folks. Yeah, that's right. Protecting the drinking water is what rural people have been trying to do for years.

[01:33:41] So we're carrying on. And I want to go on record saying I put public water and sewer everywhere because that's how we're going to protect our groundwater. That's how we're going to protect our rivers, oceans, everything. people, everyone being on public water and sewer, and you don't have failing septic tanks and such. I would agree with that. I look forward to you finding that billion dollars.

[01:34:03] We understand that's the problem, but that is the way you protect the water. Yeah, we understand there's a cost. I do, thank you. All right. Thank you very much. It's a nitty-gritty, because some of these chapters are really significant and have taken a lot of our time, and others would I'll talk a little more quickly.

[01:34:30] I think you still should go chapter by chapter. Okay. 4-3. Oh, yeah. Starting with development areas. Land use. All right. You can find them out. Find my art. Nope, that's not it. It's pink.

[01:34:45] It's the pink one. Pink. Pink. Not a good one to go first. I did work to be prepared. It just doesn't feel like it now that I'm trying to do it. So, sorry for the stumbling. If you don't like this chapter, just leave them.

[01:35:02] Okay. I'm saying it's hard to go first on the issue of it. Well, you all are talking about how much time this one's going to take out. Well, it took a lot of time. We spent a lot of time on it. That's what I'm saying. We don't have to revisit all that.

[01:35:19] Okay, let's see. I'm a little more organized here. Page 11, middle residential. Please look for ways to incorporate reductions in the minimum lot size. I stuck my thing down here at the bottom for cottage colonies to succeed.

[01:35:41] I mean, we've had two failed ones in Crozet because the minimum lot size was too big to work for people to be able to have very small houses with common land, a small parcel that they could own and therefore have equity on as opposed to a rental.

[01:35:59] So basically, I'm not sure which of the various places that's where I started. Oh, page 13, same thing, middle residential. This page 13 focuses on the housing unit size, and please add the focus on the minimum block size to go along with it for tiny houses of permanent income restricted purchasers.

[01:36:26] As the Crozet Master Plan already incorporates middle residential, you're expecting that will go to all the other areas as well.

[01:36:41] I appreciate very much the local images. There's still one of the Navy Yard in there somewhere that needs to come out.

[01:37:15] They're recognizable as a Navy Yard. I said, "I had lunch, right? Let us know because I don't recognize that." Okay, implementation, 38, sorry.

[01:37:39] The same comment as was in the comment about the, did not do the master list.

[01:38:26] I'm sorry, I've already clarified that the initialization of the new question is about that. Now, 2.6, page 39, seems to assume that everything has been finished.

[01:38:54] And so that will still come through. I mean, my suggestion would be, well, we just haven't resolved it. I mean, I'm still lobbying for special permits in the development areas and locations for industrial uses.

[01:39:11] So that's just a little prejudicial, it seems to me, that 2.6. Excuse me, Supervisor and Alex, I understand what you're saying, and we were trying to figure out timing on some of these things because we weren't sure when we were all going to make it together.

[01:39:31] So relative to data centers, are you thinking we should say something about consider allowing data centers in the development area kind of period? I mean, consider is a really soft, squishy word. Well,

we have the phase one.

[01:39:47] We do. So do we need 2.6? Does it say anything to us that doesn't just cause uproar? We know that there's more deliberation to come.

[01:40:04] This sort of gets swirled in. It gets swirled into this and this gets swirled into that. And so keeping it clean is helpful. Yeah, why don't we just strike it? So that's a thought. You guys are in the middle of the policy discussion on it.

[01:40:20] You're going to decide it in the next year. of the year, so we'll just get rid of it. Yes, thank you. And thank you to the last one in this, page 40, 4.1. I'm so grateful that we now have appropriate spacing of trees, because this is something for 15 years we've been trying to fix.

[01:40:42] Because when left off to the developers, they put in fewer big trees that are then way too big for the spot. And the only person making money is Roger Baber out there in our life, trimming old trail trees every single year get them all back. And the groves, 4.4. Protect clusters or groves of healthy native canopy trees, especially in the buffers. This is going to take a real determination of enforcement and more

[01:41:16] draconian penalty for enforcement because currently people just go oops and smash them all down with a bulldozer and there's really no consequence because they're putting back a teeny little thing like this, it doesn't do any good. So stop overlooking, removal of roads, demolition, forgiveness. So those are just my notes on that. I know it's a miserable job that you all are trying to chase after all these people. They're working very hard on Sunday afternoons with the bulldozer.

[01:41:44] And this is rampant and has been for a long time. Thank you very much. Thank you. All right, let me just get back to my first page. And jump so far back into the document now trying to find the very beginning.

[01:42:02] This is Roy. And I feel like some of these are nitpicks, but anyway. On page three, activity centers which are explained later in this document. Could you say where later?

[01:42:26] At the very bottom of the third paragraph. It says activity centers which are explained later in this document. Let's tell them where. Yeah, that'd be great. I said this is nitpicky, so anyway.

[01:42:42] No, that's good. And it says walkable activity centers, and then my comment here was see previous page. I think I'm trying to make sure that people that read this know where to go to find things. In other words. Are you on page four?

[01:42:58] I'm on page four now. Okay. Sorry. That's okay. And the other nitpicky thing is we talk a lot about one university where they've studied and we're citing a 23 study about Rutgers University.

[01:43:16] I think we need to cite it properly. Every time we mention it, it needs to be cited. If we're going to mention one study, then it needs to be cited. Because you're identifying the university and their study, so let's cite it. And I won't have to mention that every time I go through because I started circling them when it was on.

[01:43:38] All right. Then let's see. I had to figure out why on page 6 I made a note, schools follow housing. Let me think about why I said that in my notes.

[01:43:57] Because you don't get housing first. I mean, you don't get schools first. So I don't know why I made that note on this page. Maybe you all are. There was a lot of discussion about schools that...

[01:44:14] Yeah, yeah, and I just was reading this, yeah, and I made a note that you always have the housing first. It's like you have the developments first, and then you have transit. You don't have transit into empty properties, which the community seems to think we would do, but having said that...

[01:44:32] Well, they want it, for sure. Well, they always say, oh, you can't put any development there because there's no transit. Well, excuse me, there's no transit because there's no development. So I'll go on with that, but page 7, I wasn't sure where these errors were going.

[01:44:51] So activity centers, community design, where does that third, I'm just, maybe we need to take a look at the errors. It should be down to land use categories, just slightly off. Yeah, just straighten that up a little bit. I think that could be a little confusing.

[01:45:08] I said these were a little deadly things. I'm glad I didn't even notice that. And I agree with Anne bringing up where it says on page 11, middle residential, I said our county houses permitted. So I guess I'm going with, and the small lot size, I agree with as well.

[01:45:33] Because I've actually had people in the community say to me, how dare you put that development behind my house? I rent hotel rooms larger than those parcels. So we need to make sure that small parcels are okay, right? And houses are okay, regardless of the size of people's hotel rooms that they rent.

[01:45:54] And I'm getting snippy, but I've actually had people in the community say that to me. Okay, let's see. Again, neighborhood mixes, missing metal permitted here as well, right? I'm on page 15.

[01:46:10] Your tiny ones you want. Yeah, I'm just going through. Yeah, just sort of. I think it's important because we need to be in this infill. It's sort of what we need with infill. Yeah. Yeah. and let's see. He's going to line up on page 19. I have transit connections should be added. We encourage transit connections, right? I agree. For office flex, research, and development. It was left out under the description. I just think if we could say we encourage transit connections as

[01:46:48] well, something like that. Can we get bus covers? There you go. Maybe we should say covered transit. Okay, let me keep going. I'm trying to go fast here. This was a big one.

[01:47:05] I'm sure on page 24, let me go back in the notes. I think that was just me writing for something.

[01:47:24] I'm going to ignore that. Keep going. Oh, again, on 27, site Rutgers. I'm splitting through this a little bit.

[01:47:42] I don't even know what to do with this.

[01:48:01] On page 38, it talks about coordinating with VDOT's approval of Urban Street standards. and Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation. I have a meeting scheduled right now with DRPT because they have changed their standards on art on roadways, right?

[01:48:25] Certain intersections because it slows down traffic and they see it as a... So I'm not expecting you to change this. I'm just using this as an opportunity to say that art, as far as DRPT is concerned, and certainly perhaps VDOT as well.

[01:48:47] They're changing what they used to say, oh, you can't put any art here, you can't do this. Those criteria are changing. So, yes, I know, and I have an area that I'd like to go after, and that's a whole other discussion, which we're not going to go down into now.

[01:49:02] But when I saw that, I thought about my meeting that's coming up with DRPT. And I know when you put it on the lead, the transportation chapter, this was a major thing you're trying to work through, this multimodal plan. We do it the way that the TRPT regulations are, and then it opens the door to a whole lot of urban design standards.

[01:49:21] And the VDOT regulations allows us for more urban streets, and that's why that's a key thing for us to have in this thing. I appreciate what you're talking about. It's a difficult connection because there are two or three steps of logic. Yeah, because in our urban areas, we could use that to slow down traffic right without—anyway, this is what it is.

[01:49:38] Okay. 39, let's see. On 2.6, what Ann was talking about data centers, I have no problem with taking that out.

[01:49:54] What I really liked was, though, just for the future, the stress of using performance standards. I want to go on record for saying that because we talk about data centers. We're not talking about willy-nilly, letting them do whatever they want. We have performance standards.

[01:50:10] Yes. And that's critical in our discussions. Should we add that in there? Well, no, I'm happy because we're in the middle of those discussions. I just wanted to make a statement that performance standards make a big difference. And I actually was thrilled, like Ann, to see all of the references on page 40 to trees, tree coverage.

[01:50:34] Excellent. I went through and made a bunch of stars on that, so I think that's great. And with that, Jim, all of them. All right. Yeah. In the interest of helping us get caught up, I think I'm going to have not very many changes or things I want to bring up.

[01:50:56] I would support the previously mentioned idea of striking 2.6, the object theory that 2.6 cuts from the data center-related one.

[01:51:15] And I think I mentioned this before, but as a general philosophy, I think we should be using our company's plan to do it like long-range visioning. And I don't see it as always appropriate to use it as a place to, and I understand how this is a seductive thing, but it's not a place to put things that we're already doing so we know we can take credit for having to accomplish them, which I see a bit with 2.6.

[01:51:41] But additionally, I would raise 4.6, which I think might have been fantastic to ask out a challenge, because that's the one that references Biophilic Cities. I've been a champion for us joining Biophilic Cities Network. It is also, frankly, a very snickle-pritzing thing for us to do.

[01:52:02] It is not a substantive, it is not the kind of thing that in 15 years we are going to look and say, ah, yes, the grand work of, we joined Biophilic Cities. I would bet it could, but I just, it is something we're already doing.

[01:52:18] I expect to honor a consent agenda any day now, and I don't know that that is something that we need to try in a comprehensive plan that might be related to, like, for the next 10 years, 20 years, who knows how frequently we will actually update it.

[01:52:36] So, Supervisor Pruitt, for clarification, I think I'm hearing we want to remove 4.6, And I think there may be consensus in the room if you are saying that. We're good. We're good. Great. We're going to join the bio. I assume we're going to join the bio.

[01:52:54] The Cities Network is a thing that I think will probably happen the next year regardless of whatever our decision point is. It's got to be the next year. I don't think it lives in the company. Thank you. I actually don't know that I have other substantive changes that I would raise in the development area of the NDIS chapter.

[01:53:16] Okay, on page 11, Supervisor Malik, I think you mentioned something about you. What I mentioned was two projects which failed to go forward because the lot size minimum of the county regs was too big.

[01:53:51] That's why I was asking to have consideration of smaller minimum lot sizes, so that those kinds of things, because in finance, the banks all have, you can only have X percentage of the value to be in the land, but if the lot's too big, then it's possible in the house.

[01:54:05] So I misunderstood that because I know I've worked in my area and very successful but I do agree with the smaller lot size and tiny homes because I think we need to really look to address people's needs and we can get homes on smaller lots or have some smaller lots. Half acre is actually not a bad size.

[01:54:36] I want to mention on page 28, right-hand side, first line, to overcome these issues, the AC44 plan proposes only 22 activity centers as opposed to what, 957, but no, that's just teasing.

[01:55:18] But, I mean, kudos for reducing that as much as you did. And I love, on the left-hand side, the second sentence, the purpose of a center is to concentrate the provision of physical services.

[01:55:36] I like that statement. Well, that whole thing. Okay, on page 36, I keep hearing from constituents about wanting to put a, Well, frankly, they want another bridge from the Pantop Shopping Center into Charlottesville.

[01:55:57] I mean, that'll probably be done probably in the year 35, 35. I don't be pushing that day. Yeah, none of us will be here. But they want a pedestrian and bicycle.

[01:56:14] There are sidewalks on both sides of Free Bridge going across. So I'm not getting it because there's a sidewalk that now is a wide sidewalk. Is it a boulevard? No, but there's a sidewalk on each side. It came to me, I'm wondering whether or not we could work with VDOT when they redo from Broken Road down to 20, if there's any way to maybe narrow the lanes a little bit and add a wider sidewalk, which would make it more convenient for bicycle and pet.

[01:56:46] And then I wouldn't hear the comments I hear. But, I mean, I'm just, I don't know if that's possible. That doesn't need to be in the plan. That was an opportunity to bring it up. That was an opportunity. An opportunity to bring it up.

[01:57:05] I cannot resist, exactly. Ministrans and slip lanes do not make sense. So, and I agree with removing 2.6 and 4.6. And that's it.

[01:57:22] Okay. I'll jump to page four just to note that we have no references to the 22 build-out analysis from 58%, and most of the things that I hope will just be clear. I'm going to have very few comments because you can have more time to finish through this than it is for me to make my comments, so I apologize.

[01:57:46] Okay, the future land use map. I would visit page 2425. I'd be remiss if I didn't mention that there are I'm going to be requests to effect changes on parcels designation and account plan from time to time.

[01:58:08] And I just want to ask what the procedure might be, if there's been a discussion of the procedure for any consideration, if it's just to come forward from an owner, developer, or whether it's through us, or I'm suggesting to make any right at this moment, just to ask the question about how that might be accomplished.

[01:58:31] I think the short answer would be yes, we heard you all talk about this, we're working on a policy that would allow for private individuals or developers to nominate a change of the conference's plan for future land map for the parcel.

[01:59:03] I guess before just turning the page on this, I want to bring up the Planning Commission discussion, and I know in your slides you had highlighted some of the things that they talked about at length, and I thought that some of that hit this chapter, and I wanted to know whether there was anything you particularly saw or heard from them that you'd say, well, we need to get the board's reaction on this.

[01:59:34] whether it's related to schools or otherwise, there was a slide in your original presentation that outlined a few things. Just a moment to page through things to see if I'm just going to review quickly.

[01:59:55] Mostly trying to remember from slides 12 and 13 what you have on your list in the original 14 slides, and then the things that they discussed. Would you be able to put your presentation slides back up?

[02:00:11] Slide 12 and 13 is one of the two that I'm thinking about in this content. Looking at the slide currently, the text for part three is future land use map shows development area neighborhoods in larger scale, multiple pages of maps, and it shows that data statistics sent.

[02:00:33] This slide? It was a part three future land use map. Oh, okay. No, I'm... That was one of the questions we talked about, the map that was here. - It's hard to read.

[02:00:50] - Right, yeah, it is hard to read. - Okay, this isn't what I thought then. Another comment, what's the next, oh, that's 12, okay. That's 13, 12 was earlier sections, so. - In general.

[02:01:05] - Okay, I'm good, sorry. - No worries. - But I will ask, in the interest of people's comfort, it's four o'clock, which means that we are taking our time and getting through this. We'll use up our whole lot of time

[02:01:19] do we need a break? Please. Okay. Can we do ten minutes? Is that a reasonable amount of time? Okay. Ten minute break. Another cup of coffee. Clarify whether there's any, ask for any additional items that needed clarification. Aye. I'm satisfied. Me too. I think we're good. Great. Then we'll go to the real area ladies.

[02:01:58] So, again, this is the bottom of page 5, suggesting the boundaries of the growth area is still coming up again.

[02:02:15] We need to figure out what the approach is going to be. So, Professor Malik, so you're thinking that last bullet on page 5, you just assume you have us approve? I mean, there are other places where it's being considered, so that's what I would suggest.

[02:02:34] Okay. Yes, thank you. Awesome. On page 7, I stuck my cover sheet down here.

[02:02:50] Okay, as someone who does raise local food and sell locally, I'm going to just push back again. There seems to be this agricultural products depends on the availability of local distribution facilities. It really, in my opinion, does not.

[02:03:07] It's assisted by, for sure, but to say that all of a sudden we have to build all sorts of stuff. I mean, we have the local food hub came out of a 10-year effort. Page 7, on the left side, about six lines down from the recommended supporting.

[02:03:26] Right. Thank you. So we have had the food hub, which ended up going belly up. I don't know why. But anyway, so aggregation is something that has been helpful. And so the distribution and aggregation, if it depends on, is what troubles me.

[02:03:49] Because I don't think it's accurate. Many farmers sell directly. Others go to Augusta, Rockingham, Dade Proos, where there's all these established things already. Assisted by is a perfect solution. We intended to change that. That was just a mistake.

[02:04:07] And you already put in the aggregation, so I thank you for that. Okay, that's all on page 7. Okay, page 8. I mentioned this earlier in the work sessions when we talked about study at Yancey.

[02:04:28] Study at Yancey was done in 2010 and again in 2015. And it is settled. It already has agricultural support industries there in that blue area. And so everything in the white area, south of the blue area, is directly to the drinking water.

[02:04:48] It's a slope like this. It's not flat, so that cannot be built on. And so I would just propose that there is not a time to, in amongst all the other master plans that are in need of renewal that the NC thing needs to be done again.

[02:05:08] Supervisor Malik, I have had feedback from other folks about the possibility of just removing these studies altogether. Because you all just passed the Economic Development Strategic Plan, perhaps there's a way to come at this with language that speaks to something like the board would be supportive of projects being brought to them that are in support of the directions established in the Economic Development Strategic Plan, something like that, and take this out.

[02:05:47] Well, I'm happy to have it come out, but also I'm happy that what you just said, we don't need that either. Okay. Because people are going to bring things forward. We don't need to give it a long, long, long, long thing to say, you know, go over here, I would just suggest we take it out and it will stand very well.

[02:06:05] Thank you. Point of clarification. Supervisor Malek, I understand you taking it out, but the second part of what Ms. Florida said, what is your reaction? I didn't get that.

[02:06:21] I don't know that it's necessary to have anything other than let the economic development thing stand on its own. I mean, in the rural area, we don't have to have it. We have a master plan. have activities that are there right now does that meet what you were saying if it pleases the board i'm fine with that because i know you've adopted the economic development plan as it is um we were when this whole thing came forward staff was trying to bring forward the notion that something

[02:06:55] could happen at those interchanges but we've had the you know we've had pushback and feedback on Yancey being not necessary. We've had pushback and feedback on Shadwell not really being necessary. I'm wondering if this was one of those great ideas we thought we had that we really don't need. I think we basically, we kept talking about it because we have a fair amount of existing stale zoning out there. It's about how to deal with that zoning and do a study to try to sort of

[02:07:27] solve or contextualize this issue. But I agree with what I'm as far as I said. I think, Michael, with what we've got in the economic development strategic plan now, we can use that as the framework through which projects can come forward to y'all.

[02:07:46] And maybe more over back on page 7 where it talks a lot in there about these kind of supporting... We were just talking about it with Malik's discussion of the Kenyan suburbs there. I mean, that's what we're really talking about. I think he's sort of supporting non-residential uses that support agriculture and forestal uses.

[02:08:08] I mean, there was a wonderful thing eight or nine years ago. There was a yogurt. People were interested in the high ground to the south of Yancey. And once they did the air quality thing there, they realized they couldn't do it because of the dust in the air from the lower yard.

[02:08:24] Now, since Patrick has taken over, the lumberyard has just taken off. And so it is very successful, very busy, and really important to our timber industry. So they seem to be very secure in their operation, considering also their massive investment that they've done in the last 10 years.

[02:08:42] And I'm sorry that the yogurt people couldn't come, but something else may come along that will be true agricultural in that area there that would be more compatible with the land. So thank you. The brand will go on now. Can I make comments, since it's all the same?

[02:08:58] I mean, it's all the same. Yeah, these two respect us. Well, if we can make it so that we follow the economic development plan and see what parcels, what pieces of land, what people come to us asking.

[02:09:17] So we're not saying nothing, nothing, nothing. But what is your idea? Is it feasible? Does it make sense? Would it fit in here? That's something I'd like to see. Supervisor, I think that is what we do bring to you all when we bring you development projects.

[02:09:36] So I think that would be in keeping with what our normal practice is. So I think we're good. Thank you. Is this the moment we're now just trying to have it out on the rural interstate interchanges? Because I know that's like one of the live issues.

[02:09:51] Yeah, I mean, this is a chapter where we have to hit that question. Should I hold fire until the court, Supervisor, now? Because they will actually get out. Yeah, I think so. We'll go around, and I do think this topic should be part of your comments.

[02:10:09] Okay, very good. So next, I'm on page 9, and that is 2.1, a great improvement. But somewhere in there it was mentioned that the minimum lot size was 5 acres from the 1980s.

[02:10:30] So it's 2 acres, not 5 acres, somehow. So I'll just leave that thought in somewhere when someone finds it, they can improve it. And in addition on 2.3, it's very much appreciated. 2.5. Oh. Yeah.

[02:10:47] Okay. Transfer of development rights. Painful discussion in 2008, 9, and 10. We never got anywhere. Everybody spent years and dozens, hundreds of hours of staff time on this. Other counties have maybe done something.

[02:11:03] Everybody waited for the state, and I think Stafford adapted something. But it's not ready for prime time at all to be in here. I really strongly suggest that this be put in the future work category.

[02:11:23] The absolute problem is receiving areas would be in the rural area. They cannot be. They have to be in the rural area. It has to be rural area transferred to development area, not rural area to rural area.

That is a non-starter as far as what, because the conservation losses, et cetera, would be incredible.

[02:11:44] But I'm also very happy to have 2.5 put into the appendix of future work. Thank you. So let's see the second. Now, all right, page 11, question for you.

[02:12:03] 4.5, revised regulations for special events, so they are only possible on registered historic properties. Is that really what you mean? Where are you? 4.5, page 11. And I must admit, I have a question about that, too.

[02:12:20] So because, I mean, the special events, one that probably we all remember was back in the 90s, Panorama Farm came forward. They were the first ones. They wanted to have the old barn for high school reunions and also then later on bicycles and stuff like that. But they did a full special permit, met all the criteria for the special permit, was approved, blah blah blah. So I don't know what this means. I don't remember the word only being. That's what's bothering me. It seems like the only perhaps should apply to when you have a public road direct access because you may

[02:12:59] remember Wavertree Hall a few years ago that was a neighborhood HOA Street they were trying to dump all that traffic on to and that was the non-starter there. So that may have been the goal but anyway I'm just putting that in the needs work category or takeout. What if we strike only, the word "only" from that would that make more

[02:13:24] sense to you? It would make sense. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Okay. 5.1. In the end of the first paragraph, adaptive reuse is not feasible. That is just a handover to demolition because somebody who wants to tear something down is always going to say, oh, it's going to cost me 25 cents to fix it. And so I'm not going to, I'm going to tear it down instead. And so I would prefer that that last

[02:13:58] sentence go out and have the focus be on adaptive reuse restoration whatever we have plenty of successes no one can convince me that this is not possible so that's just i'm leaving that on the table so so if i'm i just need a point of clarification with that are you thinking that for example if there was a 1 000 square foot old country store and it could be adapted into a wine tasting room for example, but they wanted more than 1,000

[02:14:36] square feet, could they reuse the 1,000 and then add more to it? Would that be okay in light of this? Is that what you're thinking? Or are you thinking you just don't want them to bulldoze the initial 1,000? I'm concerned about the bulldozing.

[02:14:53] I would know that Dave Wyatt told me that they wanted to add a new cooler on the back of the oldest family-owned country store in the United States and they were not allowed to because of this strict interpretation. That was five years ago. So if that's what we're talking about is being able to add a small addition to to make something viable without losing the proper property, the old property, that's great. And I think that's where we were trying to get... Okay, then I misunderstood in which case, but please clarify because a lot of other people read the same thing.

[02:15:29] If you are not interpreting the way we had hoped it would be interpreted and we need to fix it. So we will work on coming up with language that allow some moderate 50% increase or something like that.

[02:15:55] In the third paragraph, I wrote in the margin, where did this come from? When you talk about when proposed use as a restaurant? I mean, I'm channeling Joan McDowell here, and some of you in the

room will remember her. You know, we don't have restaurants in the rural area because if you allow them, you will get a Buc-ee's, and you will not be able to stop a Buc-ee's because you have allowed somebody else to have a little tiny restaurant on Friday nights.

[02:16:21] So that is a great concern. I mean, Buc-ee's are tearing people, tearing counties apart over at Ruckingham and Jameson County. I didn't know what a Buc-ee was. I'm sorry. It's like bigger than a football field truck stopper.

[02:16:37] You know, tracker barrels, barbecue, all this, tens of thousands of cars a day, that kind of thing. But that's what comes into the rural area, so we don't need to go there. And so anyway, the one, two, and three, I guess, go with the restaurant.

[02:16:59] And certainly only in existing buildings, period. If I lose on the not having restaurants, then only in existing buildings is what I would propose. Otherwise, we're going to, I mean. The one thing that I've heard everyone talk about is beyond just in an existing building, as wines is a little bit, it's adding as an accessory use to an existing building.

[02:17:31] So, for example, if you have a wine tasting room and you have a small prep kitchen for snack foods or finger foods that we allow in wineries, you may need to add a grill or something like that if you wanted to do hamburgers or something along those lines which would add to the existing facility but that would be an accessory use to the existing use that's already in that building that's where we were trying to go but we don't have any accessory use or secondary use or

[02:18:07] something like that and bar and i'm looking to you to help me so describe that way i mean i know that we have at least two that have just been operating and nobody stops them, but so that and others who have just said, oh, I'm following the rules, I'm not going to do that, but the carriage house at King has a full commercial kitchen that's used by caterers, so it's not that they're being precluded from doing anything with proper BDH approval. I mean, people just don't want to do the triple sinks, et cetera, et cetera, that you have to do to have a licensed

[02:18:42] kitchen um so a little extra food it's even in little washington is one thing but you know some monstrous great big things out there is and that was truly an extreme example trying to get people's attention but what i do know from from a whole series of county attorneys over many many decades is you can't pick and choose if you have a rule allowing something you can't say you can have yours, but you can't because they will run you to the courthouse so fast.

[02:19:19] So I'm trying to avoid that kind of disaster. With the ability to look into it, there's kind of performance standards that we can put on where we have limits in square footage. This square footage, you're the silver thatch in, or the little Washington. You're on that square footage, then you're this other thing that's not permitted. So we do something similar with country stores versus convenience stores allowed in the development areas and commercially zoned property country stores so it's a similar kind of

[02:19:56] differentiation that we would there may be a maybe it's not a winery maybe it's in a state that has equine, right, that build the board. There's no food production there. Right. No, but is there something there that we want? The restaurant does not belong.

[02:20:12] Right. If you have one of the old mansions, right, what's on up on Round Top, right, not does that one would ever have the traffic capability for that, but the old 15-room mansion to make that viable to be able to keep the estate.

[02:20:28] I don't know if that's worth it or not, but there's ways to put either accessory or limits on it, more like a country store style regulation? That's a can of worms the size of Montana. We've had things come up over the last little while that exactly that sent everybody around them into complete turmoil because it was just buying an old historic property to then be able to turn it into something completely different than what it was. So I'm not keen on that personally since it was since you asked my turn, and I think, oh wait a minute, one more.

[02:21:09] While Ann reads that, I just had a text from somebody that said they're really having trouble hearing us. For the people that are listening, and we've had problems with that in this room. I think as we're going on, our voices are getting lower, so if everybody would speak up.

[02:21:28] Hello. Thank you for the reminder. Page 12, 7.3. Another case of spending three years with Gore Griffiths, not getting any sleep, trying to figure out something where across the board we could deal with this commercial steel zoning and I would beg everybody to go back to just case by case and take this out because when there's an interest in a particular landowner coming forward and doing something they can do a CMA or they can do a special permit application just like we don't need to try to waste your staff time figuring out something that's going to work for

[02:22:07] all 19 properties when the 19 properties are completely different from each other And that was the problem that we had back then. Okay, 7.5, we've already wiped that out, so that's good. And I will take away my Nancy now.

[02:22:25] Okay, thank you very much. All right, let me see here. I don't think I have very much of this one, but let's go to that part. On page 4, the very first paragraph, local agriculture has remained relatively stable.

[02:22:56] So relatively stable, you can interpret that however you want, and we have data to talk about that issue. So per the 2022 U.S. Department of Agricultural Census, from 17 to 22, the number of farms in Almar County decreased by 5%, and the amount of acres and farming decreased by 8%.

[02:23:24] So I'm just saying that that's really not stable, and that is data that we know exists. So I would suggest using, rather than relatively stable, I would add the data. I mean, I think that's truth in advertising.

[02:23:41] We shouldn't be saying it's relatively stable when we've lost 5% and 8%. But you can check it. Check those numbers. I'm not saying believe me right off the top of my head, but that's a change I would make there. And I think that's all I had on that page.

[02:24:01] And then, yeah, I'm moving, so this is good. So we're going to take out page 8.

[02:24:17] So we've agreed with that. So that's good, and I agree with that. And so 2.5, I don't disagree with her on that.

[02:24:33] She's talking about the, that's the transfer of development rights. Yeah, I'm agreeing with that one. And I had the same note on 4.5. Do we really want special events only in?

[02:24:49] So we've already dealt with that one. Just making sure we're here. And 7.5 is gone. So that's really all I have. Yep. Yes, so I'll begin by saying let's dive into the rural area interchange here.

[02:25:15] So I guess I take some caution with the idea of just completely deleting the criteria or the action that we have about it and take along with it and saying that we're referring to the economic development plan for the uses that are identified in there because then we would still find ourselves in a

position where when those people bring forward those applications, those applications would, I mean, correct me if I'm misunderstanding this,

[02:25:52] I would still say when that application comes forward and it gets marked as, you know, staff does not recommend it because it does not comport the confidence, because if we are not incorporating anything into the comprehensive plan, or if we're not saying that there are uses outside of work that we are using for these interchange areas, then that would be, you know, contradicting the consequences.

[02:26:22] I hear Supervisor Malek talk about how E.M.C. Mills has already had multiple studies that have outlined what is and is not possible. That's a political history I'm not as familiar with, and I certainly don't like it.

[02:26:39] But I guess the thing I would raise is if we're going to talk about a yogurt shop that we were very excited was, or a yogurt place that was, we were excited that almost came here, then we should also recognize that without a study that does potentially impact land use sites in these areas, though I would not assume that they come forward to us regardless of what the other factors on the ground really slow to summer, because they would know that they're going uphill against something that is not providence.

[02:27:18] I certainly, as a developer, would not want to apply a permit here in the current state with any plan I had that we might think we might, we might think is consistently done, but they really don't have this firm guidance on whether or not that use would actually be permitted by the board.

[02:27:37] So I think if we are going to entertain even the possibility of any use type in these areas, then we need to try something saying that we will actually create a roadmap for how people use those.

[02:27:56] So it sounds like I think this section, or at least at very least, staff's compromise, like pointing to other plans.

[02:28:12] Because outside of that, I just anticipate anything that comes forward in these areas would just be marked as non-recommended. Mike, can I interrupt you and ask a quick question? Because I don't disagree with the points you're making.

[02:28:28] What if we took out that last paragraph based on evaluation of the four interstate, interstate, blah, blah, blah, and leave the first two paragraphs? Would that work? Because I think that leaves it open in the comp plan.

[02:28:47] With reference to the economic development strategic plan. And Tonya is saying, and add a sentence with reference to the economic development. Yes. That's kind of where I was trying to get to. Let me just take out that last paragraph, leave the first two in, and then add a comment about the economic development plan.

[02:29:06] Would that work? Potentially. Are you saying you think that there should not be small area plans for these two areas? I'm just saying at the very bottom, based on evaluation, take out the Shadwell and Yancey, right? Yeah, I see that.

[02:29:23] And leave the first two areas. I'm also just observing as where on this page it says that we would come up to small area plans for these two areas. Oh, you're talking about a small area now. Back in the south side. Yeah, I see what you're saying.

[02:29:41] Supervisor Pruitt, given that we staff are going to be coming back to you all. Supervisor Pruitt, staff is going to be coming back to you all with thoughts on how to amend land use designations in the

future land use map.

[02:30:04] In the near future, would that provide the coverage for developers in these areas if somebody wanted to bring forward a project that was not lined up with what the future land use map indicates?

[02:30:23] It seems like that will provide the coverage you're looking for for our developers without needing to go down the road of having these studies performed. Would that work for you? I think that could be fine, yeah.

[02:30:41] I want to balance the need for preserving stack time, and if it's going to be stack time that's spent on something you might not have to be able to do anything about, then that sounds like stack time wasted. So I recognize that, but at the same time, wait a minute.

[02:30:57] If we want to do literally anything in these areas, I think we have to either have a small area plan or we have to acknowledge that we will invite or welcome to certain types of use systems. Okay... Sorry, that did not directly answer the question.

[02:31:15] No. So... I should also just add, I'm not actually having trouble hearing anyone in the room, so I think there's no need to do that. Sounds good. So, okay, tying it into the economic development, strategic economic development, the future and the process that we will be bringing back to the board for comprehensive plan amendment.

[02:31:46] I think the two elements I'm hearing you say is, one, we would entertain something that advanced that economic development plan, agricultural, forestal type uses in these areas. And to do that, someone had to come in with a comp plan amendment, and we'd evaluate that and change the situation for them.

[02:32:06] Except the yogurt people were rural area use, so they didn't need anything. I mean, there was no CBA required for them. That was my example. So I don't know if there is any reason. I don't know that there's an obstacle. Let's put it that way, unless you're going to change and put up a tire store or something like that.

[02:32:24] I think what we're talking about is there are these uses that could happen that would support the rural agricultural economy. Your point taken, you can still have a rural food producer that may not need an aggregation facility, but if somebody wants to do an aggregation facility, this may be a good spot for something like that.

[02:32:44] The county would recognize that in consistency with the economic development plan. process to do that, would come in and do a cop plan amendment there first. Is that what I'm suggesting over here? Or a cop plan amendment as part of a project coming forward, because we...

[02:33:02] They can do simultaneously. Yes, that's what I was trying to suggest. That's what I was trying to suggest. Okay, all right. Well, why don't we, why don't we, if there's general consensus that that may be a, without getting to the details, give us a chance, we can rewrite that, and then we get back forward.

[02:33:25] Supervisor Andrews, you haven't had a chance to weigh in on that. Are you okay? I'm okay with that. I like that idea. I was a little bit skeptical about pulling it all out. Okay, all right. We'll come up with some wording there then. Thank you all very much.

[02:33:40] Okay, I think we were still at Supervisor Pruitt. Yes, we are still at Supervisor Pruitt. That was the main thing I was going to actually dig into. I will endorse the 4.5 removal. I think that sounds like it

was everyone's desire, including the desire of the person who wrote it to not include it.

[02:34:06] So the one thing I think I might dive into that seems to be potentially an issue, I do think comprehensive plan is the exact place for future work. reference to the phrase something I don't want to miss people's words but this isn't very good conference plan this should be put in the future world file but I think that being exactly what an action or objective in comp plan should be it should be us identifying that is you know visioning our what we want to do in the future so I think yes the idea of how we might engage with

[02:34:46] a transfer of development in this program is unfinished, and that's why it should go in the comp. So I would like to see that retained. And similarly, 5.1, I recognize that 5.1 is going to be refined further as we kind of realize how we'll, as we actualize that .

[02:35:11] I actually think 5.1 is remarkably, maybe even problematic. And I generally endorse the concepts and considerations. It includes, I would just note that, you know, when we look at paragraph 3 of 5.1, I read that as almost certainly precluding a box, right?

[02:35:30] Because it does consider waiting for appropriateness, the impact on water, fuel facility, growth capacity, and impacts, like every single one of those criteria of that piece. And these criteria, this is why we have these criteria, so that we can try and, you know, get Dr. Hoax 2.0 rather than a bucket.

[02:35:55] It's a place of a bucket, which I never heard of. It's an experience. Is there anything else? That's actually all I have. Okay. Good chapter. Supervisor, what do you think? Okay, going back to page two, I would increase the adaptive use of existing structures in rural communities for uses that provide essential services. I

[02:36:30] take out the word essential because that's subjective. It's essential to you, which is not essential to me, and daily needs. I would end it there, period, and take out four rural residents because we have a billion-dollar industry in our tourism bureau, and between Charlottesville and Alabama County, a billion dollars a year, and tourists go out in the rural area.

[02:37:01] And so I would just not say for rural residents. You want it for whoever's out there.

[02:37:08] Then I would go to, we're not maybe necessarily, we agree to remove it, or we're just looking at that to see that area, what comes in, but with severe restrictions.

[02:37:45] For example, in the pantops area, you can't connect the water and sewer, as per an agreement, unless we break that, but see what comes in. I thought you were discussing that too, to allow, according to the economic development plan, what we can have.

[02:38:04] You know, what's feasible? I think where we're sitting at this moment is that staff is going to come back with some kind of language that talks about entertaining projects that advance the Economic Development Strategic Plan, and we would engage on a process to update the Comprehensive Plan Amendment for that area.

[02:38:28] To leave it open. To make it flexible. That's right. And I agree. I mean, I agree with Supervisor Malek in the Yancey area. There's probably not as many opportunities, but there might be something that comes up that would be economically.

[02:38:46] Just one last point. On the Shadwell area, you'll notice that the area is smaller on the map. Yes. Underline that. The quarry came out, the VDOT property came out, and the third portion of the street

outside is excluded from that.

[02:39:03] Okay, right, because I think the line goes to the VDOT way. And we're stopping just before that. And we're stopping just before that. Yes, ma'am. I just wanted to unroll all of that. Right, no, yeah. Then on page 2.5, I'm, I mean, probably everyone else got this, but I'm just, I'm not understanding creation of the Transfer Development Rights Program for the rural area.

[02:39:36] Can you just explain 2.5, excuse me, someone, 2.5, okay, yeah, so, in a nutshell, the process of discussing this plan, the idea came from you all of the Transfer Development Program, and broadly speaking, that is an idea that development rights in one area are reduced by another area purchasing those rights from another area to transfer the development rights.

[02:40:08] I think the reason we wrote it this way, recognize that the development area, typically the receiving area, the places it takes it, is an area of development. In the development area, we're trying to maximize that development. Sort of to make it something that somebody in the development area actually had to go out and purchase development rights to do what they wanted to do.

[02:40:28] Sort of didn't make a lot of sense. So if we're going to have something like this, I think the only logical construct is to have some receiving area in the rural area. And that may be determined to be a bad idea. But I think that that's what the construct is proposed that gives sort of a reflection of some of the discussion we heard from the board.

[02:40:50] So, I mean, I think this is a good time to, I guess we can get further into the weeds of what it is at some point in the future. If we leave this as a work item, we'll get to the end. Okay, thank you. 4.5, I agree with King and Ann Oakley.

[02:41:10] On 5.1, the first paragraph, I know we talked about taking that out. And this is what I'm having a problem with is if adaptive reuse is not feasible then, and I agree that there may be some developers who say, well that's not feasible, tear it down.

[02:41:34] Okay. We don't want that. Okay. But what if it truly isn't feasible and this building remains because you can't tear it down or replace it and it really shouldn't be it shouldn't remain I'm just thinking on a practical scale maybe it could be determined by staff whether or not it's feasible because I see a supervisor Malik's point that developer is going to say just tear it down but what if that

[02:42:07] is a reality so I think with the striking of the last sentence in this paragraph not the whole paragraph just the last one okay i don't think you're losing anything because the the purpose of this was supposed to be encouraging people who have an antiquated or unused structure to rehab it and bring it back to life right and the purpose was if if it's if you're bringing it back to life there may be there may be a reason why it went out of business in the first place

[02:42:43] and it may be too small or it may need some adjustments or it may need something else that wasn't ever contemplated in the original building. But by taking out that last sentence, it doesn't encourage people to bulldoze it. Okay, got it.

[02:42:59] And that's, I think, that was the bright line I was hearing from Supervisor Malik. Okay. But I think the encouragement for people to come in and reuse existing buildings is still in the first couple sentences. But I think you're okay without that last sentence in this.

[02:43:16] Okay. That makes sense because we're not talking about dilapidated buildings or semi. Okay, good. Got it. Okay. We could be, but you don't want people to just claim it's not feasible. Right. I mean, it's because to some people that would be just an excuse. Okay. Right. Yeah. Okay. Got it. All right.

[02:43:38] The next one is, no, the second paragraph, the last line, local artisans, crafters, daycare, post offices, emergency shelters, and access to, I would just say, and access to food.

[02:44:00] I take out affordable and healthy because what's your definition of affordable and healthy? I agree. The next one is, I disagree with my colleague in Malik regarding the restaurants.

[02:44:28] Once again, tourism brings in a billion dollars a year in this area. People gather where there's food. I mean, even in the rural areas, people go to pockets of areas where there is food. I've heard from the people in Stony Point.

[02:44:47] You have Stony Point Market, which is a little tiny venue, but on Friday nights they bring in people and they play, you know, fiddles and it's a jam session and everything. And it's really popular. That's the only thing in Stony Point, the only thing.

[02:45:04] Otherwise, people in the rural areas have to get in their cars. They've got to drive it to Charlottesville. So, and I agree, I don't want anything like Buc-ee's or anything like that. But I can see where it makes sense or if someone applies for a small, like mom-and-pop type restaurants, Dr. Ho's, that's in a rural area.

[02:45:29] It's very popular and all around. Also, adjacent with wineries, that can do it. With criteria, what I think, what I really like what you all did is you put in criteria.

[02:45:45] Impact on existing water and sewer. We don't want to do that. Road capacity, okay. Impact to adjacent neighbors and surrounding rural character. I think those are good boundaries that people would have to respect if they wanted to have something like that.

[02:46:03] But why in the world are we saying no restaurants where it might fit, where people can eat, where people can gather? May I? They don't gather around a gas station. At least not the ones I know. Supervisor Lupito Curley, I'm going to, like, phone a friend.

[02:46:20] I'm going to phone Bart here. Phone a friend. Because this paragraph started out with small-scale uses, So by definition, it's limiting it to buildings that are one to two stories or footprints of 5,000 square feet or smaller by the fact that this proposed restaurant use is nestled in this paragraph.

[02:46:46] Does that mean that that use is being informed by those earlier sentences? Yeah, so to the Supervisor Ballard's point, it talks about it in there or suggests maybe one way of reading it is that it's a standalone use and it's not associated, say, with an event venue or a country store, right?

[02:47:12] So arguably, we take Dr. Ho's in its infancy, way back when, right, as a more of a country store that morphed into a restaurant, Yoder's in Madison is probably a similar example, right? They had things like that. So I think the ability to be able to do this with the right performance standards is beneficial to us if we want to compete tourism-wise with the 151s of the world, but at the same time not get out of hand where we have just a plain restaurant somewhere else.

[02:47:49] And so I think it's worthy of being in there to have the discussion, where are we somewhere between why and store in the homestead, right, in the rural areas? What is it that we want to see in those rural areas when it comes to tourism?

[02:48:05] And then how much of that is enough for us as a community, as a county? Is there an obstacle today for Dr. Hoek in a crossroads situation such as that? So there's only probably two places that that could happen, where it is now, or in Arleysville, because those are both on commercial.

[02:48:30] So if I pick on Batesville for a minute, say the store goes out and somebody wants to open up a sandwich shop, you can do it. You have to do the whole full store. So there may be opportunities where kind of the neighborhood gathering place, similar to what goes on in Stony Point, goes on in Batesville, right?

[02:48:51] Or Dave's, or Alliance's. But if the store popularity becomes less for whatever economic reason, but the food sales hangs on, arguably more like a country store, then you want to have that ability to keep that one structure, property, and that type of community viable.

[02:49:14] I think this will help us get there, but we have to be careful on how we write that. So accessory is the word that I missed. If it's in there, I miss it. Otherwise, that would make it. It's not in there. That would make it. This would also include the size restrictions, or is that separate for, like, wine-raised people?

[02:49:35] Yeah, and remember, this is a guide in kind of crafting what we want. The real stuff is in the zoning. So the example I used earlier with the country store, that's really where the meat and potatoes is, and how we regulate that doesn't even qualify to be this thing.

[02:49:53] It has to have certain stuff. So we decide through discussion and crafting of regulation. That's where the teeth are. So we're not going to say you can do this based on the comp plan with the right of regulation that mirrors the discussion we had that the comp plan says we want to experiment or we want to investigate this and come up with the right language and get some opportunities that may exist after.

[02:50:24] We may go through this and find out that there's only one place this could happen and it's not it's not worth it we may investigate it and say oh we had one down south one in the north you know we have some opportunities to spread out our tourism so there's a circuit that folks can run doing certain things i don't know but i think it's worthy of having the having the discussion if we were to add the word accessory into this sentence so it would read when the proposed accessory use as a restaurant, the following factors should be considered.

[02:51:00] Would that make it okay for Anne, and would that make it okay for you? I'm just wondering, why would you use accessory if someone puts in, let's say, the Batesville store. Okay, that store goes out of business. Someone comes in with a nice little restaurant or sandwich shop.

[02:51:18] That's not an accessory use. You're completely switching the use. I mean, my point is, why limit us? Now, yes, in character and everything, we don't want McDonald's. We don't want Denny's. We don't want that all over the place.

[02:51:33] Absolutely. That doesn't fit in. You can't keep them out. You cannot. The franchise is the reason back in the 80s when they had this rule started because they did not want to have the countryside covered with franchisors. But I do believe that we can word it so that, you know, even if it has special use permit.

[02:51:52] Yeah, to Supervisor Malik's point, we have to be careful. but we were successful in the difference between country store and convenience store. - Yeah. - Right, so that's why I keep going back to

that. Similarly to that, all I'm saying is it may be possible that it's probably worthy of looking into as part of our one economic development plan.

[02:52:17] We don't want a restaurant on every corner in the rural areas, 'cause that takes away from it. That's not what we want, right? But is there some criteria that makes it work? And like I said, we may go through this and find out that there isn't. We may go through this and find out that there isn't.

[02:52:33] And would the term accessory be, let's say, fit the... So accessory, if I use Little Washington as the example, that would imply that unless I'm staying at the inn, I can't eat at the restaurant.

[02:52:48] That, I don't believe, that's too narrow a scope for the discussion. The old big breakfast rules that we threw out a long time ago. Yeah, so I think we need to be a little bit broader than that. But at the same time, we don't want to open it up too broad. I think you can work that out.

[02:53:06] I'm happy with that. 7.5. Are we picking out that whole thing? I don't know that we've got it.

[02:53:22] Dan and Diantha are four striking 7.5s. Yes. I am. Are you, too? I am, too. Okay. And that's it for me. Okay. I guess I just want to know whether there are open issues from what has been discussed because I'm okay with most of what I've heard.

[02:53:49] I think that there is an issue still remaining with 5.1 where it says increased adaptive reusing structures, reuses that provide essential services, and then it says most couple of uses that provide essential services. I heard the word essential being taken out, and then for rural residents also being taken out.

[02:54:06] I don't want the words for rural residents being taken out because it's not going to also serve those rural residents, And I don't want to say, oh, yeah, you can do something that's not really going to serve anybody in the rural area, but have it in the middle of the rural area. But that was a different thing.

[02:54:22] It's also on page 11. It's the same thing. It's, of course, the same. The objective. The objective is repeated throughout the implementation section. But services and daily needs, I mean, that's taking out, you're only taking out the word provide instead of provide essential services and daily needs for rural residents.

[02:54:42] you're talking about provide services and daily needs, period, which would include everybody. I'm saying it can include everybody and I have no problem with that, but if it's not something that the rural residents can benefit from, then I'm not really interested in allowing it. That's where I see for rural residents as part and parcel of saying that we're going to have this redevelopment in the rural area.

[02:55:12] And so, in other words, the way Tavern Gas Station comes to mind at exactly that point of view. So I was pushing back against the removal of those words. I still think there are significant issues here with trying to open the door a little bit to what we want and not open the door to what we don't want and trying to specify what that is.

[02:55:33] So I'm a little bit worried about that. And clearly, I think already in 5.1, we have a contradiction between essential services and then talking about restaurants and things like that, as whether or not they are categorized that way. But I think that's wordsmithing at this point.

[02:55:51] I don't think that I have disagreement with what's being discussed as far as allowing this to be considered. And that's where I am with this. So are there things that you feel that you need to have additional feedback on?

[02:56:09] On 2.5, I'll just say, assess the creation of a transfer development program for the rural area, sending and receiving areas. I don't mind if you take the whole thing out, but if you just look at that first piece, it's just leaving open a door to looking into whether there is a viable DER program.

[02:56:31] First sentence? Just the first sentence. Just the first sentence. And we're not specifying already what are the receiving and sending areas. Review of 2.5, leaving the first sentence only, and remove the rest of it. That's been in for four or five editions.

[02:56:49] I can live with that. Okay, so are there things that you need clarification on or to determine if there's a consensus? I do want to say that the EDA board was supported, not, they want to let, you know, a country store talk.

[02:57:07] My problem is not the idea. My problem is opening the door without recognizing what our limits are on the... Okay, well, that's... That's why I think it has to be... Yeah, that's the zone. Well, yeah, that's part of the conflict. Yes, yes. You get it right.

[02:57:23] Yeah. Yes. I do have one thing. Thank you. Ms. Malik suggested that we remove the last bullet on page 5. On the right hand side of the page. Oh, to consider adjustments to development area boundaries to align existing uses in infrastructure.

[02:57:43] I had that marked for removal, but the main point is that, you know, when talking about new permitted uses for the rural area zoning district should be evaluated based on the following. If it's going to be in the rural area zoning district, then that doesn't make any sense.

[02:58:00] Right. So I think taking it out would be a lot of money. Well, good. Point of clarification. Could you, Objective 5, could you give me an example of, you're saying the Boy Tavern would come under that? You mean the gas station that they wanted to do there?

[02:58:23] It didn't really benefit the local people. They were very upset about it and it would benefit the people on the highway. But there were also a lot of people in the area, not the immediate area of course, but in the area like Glenmore said, that wanted to have that.

[02:58:39] As you know, anytime you propose any kind of a development or house or even shed, you're going to have the people next door yelling and screaming, possibly.

[02:58:56] Do we need to reach a consensus on whether for... I thought I heard the middle ground would be by services, not narrowed down to essential services, but back in, I thought it was coming out.

[02:59:13] Can we say for residents? No, I wanted to say for rural residents. Mike, do you want to weigh in on this or not? Mike? I think that makes sense.

[02:59:31] Which one? For rural residents? For residents or rural residents? I think keeping it for rural residents. It doesn't prohibit other folks. And again, this is just kind of a guide for us in how we analyze rural residents.

[02:59:48] So then on 5.1, I'll take essential out of that first paragraph. and add back in rural residents. Very good. You're deliberating on the zoning phase. 5,000 square feet is really big for Batesville.

[03:00:07] So you're throwing a cap in there. I'm not sure that's the right cap. So anyway, I think it would be up to. We're going to have that discussion when we talk about the regulations.

[03:00:23] Right, thank you. Is there anything else on this chapter? All right, thank you. Then I want to see if we can move on to transportation. And then I'll move to Supervisor Alec, who must carry the burden while the rest of us get the toilet and the rest of us.

[03:00:40] That's right. And prepare for that, we're going to say, bye.

[03:00:45] If we're going to have maps, what happens to me with my newsletter,

[03:01:24] when I do a snip of something and then try to put it in paper, and when people explode it, it goes, whew, whew, blurry. Okay. We've got a general note about making sure our maps are legible. Thank you. Take a pass.

[03:01:41] I think I said everything I was going to say in the earlier edition, so thank you. Oh, my gosh. Maybe I'll judge my memory, and then I'll have to jump up in that later. No pressure.

[03:01:58] And actually, I don't have very much for transportation. I think I just have a couple of things. On page six, my red flag went up when we started talking about micro count. So, because micro count right now is, as you know, the trial, the file.

[03:02:21] It is going to be or would be very expensive if we decided to do it. I'm just saying. And we're going to be making that decision next year or some point. And this acts as if it is a done thing and it's kind of affirmative.

[03:02:38] And so I might add re-evaluate at each budget cycle. I don't know. But I'm just saying that I'm not comfortable with the way microCAD is described here. Is it associated with the company and the service?

[03:02:57] Is it the service or is it the company? Because it could be jaunt to provide a similar service. No, it's the what it is. And right now it's fare-free. and we have to decide as a board not me but you guys have to decide next year whether we're going to keep it are we going to start charging for it is it going to remain free and if it's free to riders like it is now it is going to be super expensive in addition to cap i'm just saying so i'm just uncomfortable with the way it makes it look like it's there and we've got it

[03:03:35] Supervisor McKeel, would it be all right with you if we added a sentence at the end of the paragraph on the right-hand side of page 6? So it would read, funding for microCAT will be reviewed with each budget cycle.

[03:03:51] That's fine. I just want to make sure that people understand that the way it is right now is not. Thank you. All right, page seven. I just clarified for me design. Oh, I'm sorry. Under safety, last sentence, design infrastructure with safety in mind for all road users. I think about that as vehicles, but we need to make sure pedestrians are in contact with you.

[03:04:15] I think that's why we use the term all road users. So it's okay. As long as that's what your intent is. I'm happy with that. We don't have to worry about that. And I think, I'm not sure I have anything else. Hold on that one. Just keep going. Turn my notes. I love seeing...

[03:04:41] improve transit access to the airport. I think I am okay and I like charging stations increase. That's good. Oh, I did wonder just because of our discussions at the RTP 2.3. Do we want to add Virginia Breeze under 2.3? It's just a

[03:04:59] Junk, Connect, Afton Express, Virginia Breeze, 2.3, rural area, yes, we might want to add Virginia Breeze, sorry, rural area, 2.3, Virginia Breeze, I think, might just be added, and then I'm done.

[03:05:21] Thanks, I have immensely little, in fact I'm looking at actionable things that I've already brought up. The only thing I have is, this is going to feel pretty easy.

[03:05:45] 4.1 Rural, I don't know, I'm very excited about the Three Munch Trail. I don't know what the action verb prioritized even means. So we've had another supervisor mention, support would be a better verb there than prioritize, perhaps.

[03:06:12] Would that be suitable to you, too, Supervisor? I think that's, I think, yes. Yeah, sorry, I gave a thumbs up, and then I realized that's. That is actually all I have.

[03:06:29] All right, and I will get on page eight. Whoever wants to help me, it's the one, two, third paragraph in the middle, efficient vehicular movement over other modes, okay, with wide travel lengths and minimal traffic calming, minimal traffic calming measures that can lead to higher travel speeds.

[03:06:57] I'm not understanding how traffic calming measures lead to higher travel speeds. Minimal traffic calming measures do so that they don't want to put in minimal traffic calming measures that can lead to higher traffic speeds.

[03:07:18] I think when we're trying to do that paragraph, we're trying to outline some of the challenges that we face working with VDOT. I was just at something today where we're trying to talk about ways to slow down. How about art? Can we talk about art? I mean, but I think we were just, this was sort of like to contextualize some of the challenges.

[03:07:40] Got it. Thank you. I appreciate that. So, sorry if I... No, I mean, it's the balance of getting the traffic to go slow enough, not slow enough, fast enough to keep it.

[03:07:56] Right. And on page, well, I guess it would be 13, the map, just for consideration, there's a lot of colors, which is good, but there are colors that are similar which make it difficult and maybe you on some of them you could put that you know like a dot dot dot yeah change the line dot whatever that's a suggestion

[03:08:33] okay on 2.4 on page 19 um i ensure bike facilities are separated from vehicular traffic where appropriate, I'd also put in or feasible or just take out appropriate and put feasible because it might be appropriate but it may not be feasible. It may cost a ton of money, kind of like the bridge over the Rivanna River instead of 16 that we thought it might be. I didn't worry about that. So feasible?

[03:09:10] I think poor feasible is good. Poor feasible. Well, in New Zealand, where they go off the road and through a corn patch, and they build them bridges, and then they come back out on the road. Wow. They're just driving the median whenever they feel like that.

[03:09:27] Well, I'm just saying, in New Zealand, they spend a lot of money on those sorts of things. So I would put appropriate and feasible because, you know what? We're going to get everybody advocating for bike lanes, and if we can't afford it, they're going to get upset. : "And or or?"

[03:09:44] : "And." I'm saying "and." : "Alright, got it." : "Then on 6.7, I would proactively reduce speeds to improve safety, investigate installation."

[03:10:01] I would put, as a suggestion, prioritize. Because I think red light cameras for speeders, we have a lot of people running red lights. We had it on Rio in 29, and then it was taken care.

[03:10:21] We built a whole great separation. And I know, pardon me, if Supervisor Galloway was here, he knows the intersection I'm talking about, which is 250 and 20, which a lot of people go through the red light.

[03:10:40] So I would just say prioritize installation of red light cameras at high crash intersections. I think that's okay with everything. What was that? 6.7.

[03:10:56] 6.7 in the development. That was 6.7. Page 22. Thank you. And I guess I don't really have a problem with it, although I don't know whether if we've got speeding cameras, whether prioritize suddenly changes what we're going to be doing. I had fun trying to figure out what was new and different here compared to before. There were a lot of little things moved around and changed, but they all look good to me, so I'm not going to add anything to what anybody else was saying.

[03:11:27] Note that upon commission, they did say which affected the one that people liked, which was improved transit access to the airport, which suggested we improve or add the transit access to the airport. I don't agree with that. There isn't one. So on to the next, if there are a couple of things to be clarified.

[03:11:46] Okay, driving economy. Rebecca. As top players, you have employment sectors in both.

[03:12:23] Third bullet? No, it's page four, the left side, just before the third, just at the third bullet, not the black bullet, right.

[03:12:38] Okay. It says employment sectors in the county. And you mean employers. And those are actually employers. Okay. That was an easy one. Now, page five, last paragraph on the right-hand side.

[03:13:08] I'd love to see some mention of due to the efforts of our family vineyard owners, winery owners, but the assistance of the CACVB recognized the tourism for the Wine Enthusiast Award because this reads like the CACVB did the whole thing, and it's the winery people who actually earned it.

[03:13:28] I'm sorry, Supervisor Malek, I didn't make a note of what you said at the lead-in on that. Due to the efforts of who was it? Of the CACVB, page five. I've got the CACVB, she's adding something. Due to the efforts of our family vineyard and winery owners, with the assistance of the CACVB, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

[03:13:49] That would be, I think, respectful of their efforts. I don't have a problem. Okay, next, page 8. Right-hand column, middle paragraph. Office, industrial and hotel use and manufacturing.

[03:14:11] It's next to the last sentence. We don't have manufacturing anywhere, so I would love to add manufacturing in that. We don't have it anywhere in the document. Because I was going to say, we have some manufacturing. I want to have it here. I got you. I see what you said.

[03:14:26] I was confused at first. Okay. So it's the non-residential land, middle of the middle category. So take away and hotel use. Take away that and and move it to after hotel use. Or put manufacturing in there somewhere, anywhere you want to put it.

[03:14:46] Manufacturing. Okay. And the end of the three bullets below, somewhere, please consider putting in avoiding converting light industrial and manufacturing to residential. Because that's the

creation of our lack, is the fact that we've given away hundreds of acres of formerly LI and HI land, Wegmans, et cetera, to residential and other uses. Okay, now I'm...

[03:15:20] Is that light industrial and commercial, Senator Malley? Did you say avoid converting light industrial and commercial or

[03:15:28] Certainly light industrial.

[03:16:01] I wrote at the top, emphasize redevelopment somewhere, but I don't know if that's... Oh, okay, last paragraph. These studies identify the need to ensure. How are we going to ensure any of these things?

[03:16:17] So please consider how to make that something that's realistic. Support? Maybe. Let us see what we can come up with. I'm just leaving that on the table there for you.

[03:16:33] And stop. I'm going to be brief with this one because I really don't have anything to say except that I love the diversify the economy and tax base.

[03:17:01] That was great. Thank you very much for that. And really, I don't think I have anything else. Yeah, so I'm good. Thank you. 3.3.

[03:17:17] Have we discussed this thing yesterday? I know this is a fairly new member of the Gallery of Losser. I'm just trying to remember if this was previously included, or if this was added to the last time we had a chocolate. We have talked about a defense production zone many times in different contexts, but I don't believe we've ever brought it to the board for your consideration and a vote.

[03:17:49] So I don't know if that answers the question for you. Is there, maybe we need to define it, talk just quickly here about what. Would that help, Mike? Other, on page 11, 3.3, Supervisor Malek?

[03:18:11] No, I was looking online to see when this thing was created. Oh, okay. If I might, I was just looking on our previous phase of our website, and there is no 3.3 in that draft. So that was the previous draft that was presented at work session.

[03:18:28] So this is a new action. Great. Thank you, Ben. But this is new for the state. It looks like it's 2025 in LIS, so that doesn't say when it was adopted. So this is Supervisor Pruitt's question.

[03:18:47] So, Supervisor Pruitt, we haven't brought it to you or discussed it with you, presented it to you as a board. So it's not a thing completed if that was the same category you were looking to lump it into. No, I guess I was just, I realized I did not remember us having, I didn't remember seeing this previously, and candidly, I don't know what all a defensive production zone entails.

[03:19:15] I think just going off the words, it sounds fine, and I have no reason to oppose it, and just when I was looking through these, I realized this was new to me, and I didn't remember a previous discussion on it, and that was the only question we had.

[03:19:31] Otherwise, I can add to that. - Supervisor Pruitt, the staff team over here has offered a friendly amendment to that 3.3 verb. Instead of pursue, change that to consider a defense production zone.

[03:19:53] - So that that gives us an opportunity to talk about it. - Yes, yes. - Great. - Okay. - On the board? Okay, so my only one is 4.3. I would suggest because of possible changes by the CACVB board that we scan to map Charlottesville, Albemarle Convention and Visitors Bureau or Local Visitors Bureau. And then that way we don't have to. I know, I know, I know. So that way, I mean,

[03:20:33] think the word convention may be struck but we don't know that decision may be made soon and once the if the name is changes done by the CACDB board then I would inform you and then you can just go through the document okay so that may be a global replace that we wind up having before we go forward for adoption I think we were talking about allowing something in this

[03:21:13] they had me small subscribers or changes things like that we would staff would have be empowered to change the small things like that and just to keep things current. Post-adoption, you know. Things like that. I know we've talked about that.

[03:21:33] That's all I have, thank Greg. And I have almost nothing additional beyond what's said, except that I do note again, you talk about the build-out analysis in here. And then there's also a discussion about regularly updating over two or three years, but there was a discussion last week about a tool and I love that.

[03:21:54] Maybe this needs to be a message to reflect the current thinking. Programming note, I think we probably were thinking about it on our side. I know the Planning Commission talked extensively about elevating the need of child care. Yeah, yeah. So I just let you know, I think that's something that's...

[03:22:10] Yeah, I had no problem with that, too. I'm sorry, I should have mentioned that. I'm just keeping track of the Planning Commission. Okay, on to housing. Okay. We have to send that for pizza.

[03:22:40] Dr. Holmes, in the rural area. So, yellow on page 2. Others may veto this, but to me, objective 7 should be number 1, objective 4 should be number 2, and objective 5 should be number 3. Just because of importance, we should be increasing accessible housing options in the community before we get into all the other stuff. But that's something I'm offering.

[03:23:12] On page 7, the note I made there was, under modular, these structures can acquire equity

[03:23:47] for owner. And so personally I would very much like to prioritize use of modular whenever possible because of that very fact. Whereas the mobile and manufacturers are treated as personal property and therefore do not have the financial benefit as the sort of equity ladder than the modular.

[03:24:16] - That's great. - I don't want to let it go. - Okay. - But I still think they need to be mentioned, right? - Oh yes. - Yeah, I just would love to, if you can add something about that in there, that would be super. And missing middle, page 12.

[03:24:39] You may have forgotten to ask about this last time. It says in the second paragraph, zoning ordinance restrictions could limit or prohibit development of these units. Where? Because I don't know of any. I mean, we have Ava Grove, we have Emerson Commons, already in existence, I don't know where, in Albemarle.

[03:24:56] Now, some of this may have been copy-pasted from someplace else where there are restrictions that are preventing these, but I don't know of any in Albemarle. So I would just ask us to focus on what is Albemarle restrictions that we should deal with. Because, Malik, what page are you on?

[03:25:13] Page 12, and second paragraph, begins, however. No, I do. However, the last sentence. However, so I was going to get got it.

[03:25:28] The very last sentence of the paragraph. If it's real, then I'd like to know what they are. And if it's not, let's take it out. That's all. And I don't need an answer right now. I just found that was really... We

can take a look at it. There's some perspective involved in there as a large is a large yard and how small is a small yard.

[03:25:47] Okay. So you may just want to look at that one sentence, the however sentence. A quarter of an acre is small, but it could be smaller. But for Arlington, it's huge. You've got to talk about that. Right, right, right. So we'll take a look at it. and i just 1.5 i just wrote in add smaller lot sizes where appropriate um similar to what i

[03:26:25] talked about and 1.6 reuse of existing structures upper floors over 14 foot first floor uh would be what i would support for commercial because then it can always go back if we're similar to what's done in rio right now you can see that that first floor next to photo works is quite high because that was supposed to be commercial and then they're allowed to put residential in there until it figures out what's happening you're on one and one this was page 15 1.6 1.6 i don't see

[03:27:00] page 15 page 15. you want to it's like this you want to add yeah you want to add sign a chart Oh, it's hard to say. No, no, no. Turn it over. You don't have it. I'm on page 15. I'm on page 15.

[03:27:16] 1.6. 1.6. She wasn't looking at the page she was holding up. I'm so sorry. Okay. My apologies. No. The 1.6, assuming that it's referring to keeping the first floor structurally good for commercial, even though it might be residential at the beginning.

[03:27:37] That's all I was trying to say there. But you're essentially okay with this as it is. Yeah. I should have asked, is that what it is? We're getting tired. Yeah, we all are. We're getting tired. Should it say for conversion of upper floors as housing?

[03:27:55] In that case, they could build something. I just wanted to make sure. As long as they can structurally go back up, that's the best we can get right now. And that, I think, oh, page 18, 7.1.

[03:28:15] I think these also exist already. But I'm glad to have them promoted. But I've never said comments that they have the original farmhouse where they have a big kitchen and for parties and stuff. So I think there is nothing in our zoning ordinance that prevents this right now.

[03:28:31] I may be wrong, but promoting is fine. I just want to make sure that people weren't thinking that that wasn't allowed right now. Thank you, Madam. Yes, exactly. OK. I don't have very much here, but hold on.

[03:28:47] I think I have put something, and I agree with all those things. And another one on page 8 is Rutgers, cited, yeah, just to help you find them. Going to 10 and 11, I really appreciate this information.

[03:29:10] Thank you, and I really appreciate you adding the ALIS data because the ALIS data is magisterial specific, and it only includes employed people and not students, which is really important.

[03:29:27] And I will say that one of my friends who is an economist says we ought to be referencing the Economic Policy Institute Family Budget Calculator because you can go into the county level and it's more current than what we are using here.

[03:29:51] So I'm sorry. So on page 10. Yes, I'm with you. And we referenced, of course we referenced, it's the orange dot report and blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. But his suggestion is the Economic Policy Institute Family Budget Calendar, and that is current by county.

[03:30:10] So I'm going to let you guys look at that. Yes, I'm not sure I have the name of that. So Economic Policy Institute Family Budget Calculator. More current. Yeah, Calculator. Maybe I said calendar. I'm tired.

[03:30:26] And it's possible to search by calendar. So you might want to take a look at that because it's always good to use the most card. And so I probably said that when I was just tired. 1.6, I just wanted to say Neil should be fine. We just said that to each other, too.

[03:30:44] Putting that into the record. He left us already. He's gone, but whatever. And I think that's it for me. I'm good. Dr. Pruitt? Yes, so I'm generally pleased with this chapter.

[03:31:00] Like a whole, there's a few things that I would raise, and I'm going to go straight to, let's start at 16. You know me, I like to go straight to the objectives and actions. I think we discussed this previously.

[03:31:21] I don't remember how it ended up, but I would suggest that if we are going to have a serious policy conversation about manufactured housing and how we're going to allow it.

[03:31:37] I think that conversation should be broader than this constrains us to. I would worry that manufactured and mobile both aren't economically feasible in the development area. And I feel like that is a concern that I've heard from some of my people.

[03:31:59] thinking, I don't want to preview things to anyone else. So I would personally want this to be something that ends up the word manufactured homes by right, and then just in some zoning districts. With my understanding, that would be a much more thorough conversation you would have to have as a board collectively in the later days and probably establish some zoning districts for that purpose.

[03:32:27] Mike, they're struggling to figure out where you are. I'm sorry. - 2.1, I'm sorry, did I say 2.1 at the beginning? - You probably did and I just got lost. Okay, I did. - Point being, if we're going to have a serious conversation about manufactured housing, I think we can't constrain ourselves to develop areas only.

[03:32:53] I would want us in the conversation we have in a possible modification to zoning or an ordinance to consider this. I think we would need to consider the possibility of a manufactured housing district being allocated somewhere in New York.

[03:33:12] Because purely in the development area, I don't know if it's economically feasible. I'm not saying we're committing ourselves to that. I'm just saying if we're going to actually have that conversation, that 2.1 commonplace, because 2.1 is commonplace in future legislative action, I don't want it to constrain that future legislative action to only considering the development.

[03:33:32] Okay, so we'll strike the development areas off the back end of that. I think that's a good catch. Okay. Include all three of the types that were in the pictures? Or only manufactured? It only is saying manufactured, but it really should.

[03:33:49] If it includes manufactured, modular, and mobile, then that would complete the picture. Yes. Okay. I assume it did. Maybe it didn't. I feel like, yeah, when I read this, I understood this at least to probably actually encompass I mean modular, I don't know if I'm modular, I don't know the way it's legally distinct.

[03:34:13] Supervisor Pruitt, Bart just reminded me that really the two types of these sorts of homes now are manufactured and modular. Mobile is the old kind that we don't want to encourage them to come back.

[03:34:31] Yeah absolutely. So be manufactured or modular. Should we take that picture out? Well it kind of differentiates what it is, so maybe we still put your part in there, but not encouraged.

[03:34:48] I think once they include all the types, I want to make sure that we get the right verbiage in there to do that. That makes sense, super much approved. I saw the phone again. I got you, I got you. Okay, we're with you. okay what else do you have for us i had one other thing oh yes so um uh this is this is minor and i i don't think there's any controversy page 17 uh action for decimal four um i like this the

[03:35:22] only thing i would add is um we talk about uh reducing involuntary displacement increasing access to equitable relocation options, a tool that is in some localities toolkit is also, like, various things like requiring relocation plans, other types of things.

[03:35:45] I wonder if we could simplify this by just saying reduce and ease involuntary displacement without having to get into, you know, particularities, but a redisplacement, a local option regarding displacement go beyond just trying to reduce this particular action as a reference to housing albamarle is this language from housing albamarle if it were word-for-word from housing albamarle would have been highlighted in orange. So I think this is a doubt. So we're okay to change it? I think so. We'll check with Dr.

[03:36:24] McVissel. And that is actually the last one.

[03:36:54] Well, the last paragraph on the right side, we're talking about form, you know, mental housing and focus on form rather than density. I'm wondering, guys, because remember we had that, we spent money and had a whole plan for form-based housing where Fashion Square is.

[03:37:18] Form-based code. I'm sorry. Excuse me. And I'm wondering whether or not we need this anymore. This last paragraph? Pardon? The paragraph you're talking about? Yeah, or the first sentence.

[03:37:35] I mean, density is what we want. I think what it tries to help is, especially if you're doing this thing in an existing neighborhood, You can have something that kind of looks like a single-family house, but may have multiple units in it.

[03:37:53] So the actual form of the building is resembling its peers in the neighborhood. Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that. Page 14, left-hand side, second sentence, "the purpose of housing at the borough," blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

[03:38:14] The last line, using the policy's implementation tools to meet the diverse housing needs. How about using varied instead of diverse? You know, I'm trying to, you all know what I'm going to say.

[03:38:30] But using varied housing needs. I'm tired of it. That's fine. She's worn down. Okay. Yes. All right. Then 16, page 16.

[03:38:48] All right. This is something I don't know for factually or not, but I understand that the legislature has given churches the right to put on residential units or, you know, like a duplex, quad, triplex, something like that, you know, if they have the land in the back.

[03:39:13] And so maybe allowing, which would also help with our low-income, very low-income housing needs, and then maybe to have something in there where we're allowing those units by right in church, you know, if there's enough land.

[03:39:34] Yeah, I mean, we'd have to look at any legislative changes to the code and see what that is. If not, if it's not there and we're interested in doing something like that, then there's, you know, possibilities

to look into that as far as code changes.

[03:39:51] But I think that's... As opposed to this. Yeah. Yeah. That bill hasn't passed. And frankly, I don't. I said that bill hasn't passed. It has not. It has not, and I'd be very surprised if they get this message.

[03:40:09] Okay, so if it has, I mean, if it hasn't passed. We'll keep an eye out. Okay, keep an eye on it, because, you know, that would be, I think, a lot of people would mind that. Okay, then the other thing.

[03:40:25] Okay, on 3.1, bullet 3, tenant protection efforts, what does that entail? A bullet. Oh, this. I'm on page 16 still.

[03:40:41] 16. That would help a lot of my constituents and farm companies. And I don't mind tenant protection if I just, if it's very comfortable. I know we've had some conversation about the Tenant Protection Act and how we don't enforce that.

[03:41:04] And there was work afoot down in Richmond to change our ability to enforce the Tenant Protection Act. I don't know where that stands, but I think this is where that comes from, because we've had several people come to the county asking for help, and we say, we can't do anything for you.

[03:41:25] And multiple calls from people in the older neighborhoods. Maybe look into it and then, you know, see what that is involved in. If it did pass, that's great. Hopefully it passed. We'll just leave it as is.

[03:41:41] We'll leave it as is for now, and then... That's fine. When it passes, we'll change. The 6.2, I know we're singling out LGBTQ+.

[03:41:59] Would we want to say, you know, for all other groups, I'm just wondering why we're singling out one group and not everybody that maybe has problems or concerns or...

[03:42:17] I believe this came from statistics that we had seen, staff has seen, that LGBTQ plus individuals are the most highly discriminated against.

[03:42:38] But when you think about this in context of the next 20 years, perhaps the way to go at this is just remove the LGBTQ plus part because then we can work with anyone, work with local advocacy groups to improve staff training and all of those things. Would that suffice so that we're going to help everyone? I want to help anyone that's being discriminated. Okay. Mike? I would push back against this pretty strong. There are pretty unique challenges, especially in the shelter context

[03:43:15] for LGBT people and young people. So both the data is there, but also the barriers. I mean, we're We're talking about it quite in a major way in our current college, because it's one of the key partners for shelter services, Grolo Barrier Shelter, is one that I told very recently did not permit LGBT.

[03:43:41] That's no longer true, but there are still ongoing concerns. There's especially ongoing concerns specific to trans people in shelter contexts, which is further complicated by a really muddy direction from the current federal administration.

[03:44:01] I say this as someone who works in housing and who works with discrimination in housing. In those contexts, and again, this is about shelter and housing programs, right? And so this is, in Stacey, in Dr. Pethia's continuum, we're talking about the furthest on one side of that continuum.

[03:44:22] In those contexts, the barriers that face LGBTQ people are unique and differentiable and do not apply to other protections. If we're talking about being where else in the housing spectrum, this would be appropriate. In fact, LGBTQ people have faced very, very low levels of discrimination in other parts of

the housing sector, but this is primarily talking about shelters and the internally supportive services where those barriers are unique, and I think this needs to be continued to be differentiated.

[03:44:57] Supervisor Pruitt, would it be okay with you if it said LGBTQ plus and other advocacy groups so we don't leave out people? In the next one, 6.3, engage individuals with lived experience of homelessness in the design of rapid rehousing programs.

[03:45:22] Is that going to be feasible for staff to do that? I have reached out to Dr. Pethia. I think she was unable to join us today. So I think I would rather lean on her expertise because I do not know the answer to that question.

[03:45:44] So let me check with Stacey and modify as needed. How about? Okay, thank you. And I want the Rapid Rehousing Program. I'm all in favor of that. I'm just engaging with this one.

[03:46:02] Unfortunately, I think we do know some people who have helped us with that. Yeah. I agree with everything I've heard, I like the LBPTQ+ and other, it's great.

[03:46:22] The only comment I'll make is based on the Planning Commission and maybe you've already addressed it, is Mr. Fleibor, I'm worried that another potential loss of affordable units came due to lack of community awareness And I didn't know whether there could be an objective seven point or action 7.2 or something that we worked on community awareness of affordable housing opportunities because we don't want to get in a situation where, again, people aren't aware of the opportunity for their affordable housing.

[03:46:52] And so if that's already addressed in here, I didn't saw it in kind of, kind of, but I thought maybe consider it if you do it. I've got a note to add a 7.2 for promote affordable housing awareness.

[03:47:08] Awareness, right, to make sure that we'd all lose people because they just didn't know that they could get it. And I apologize, Jim, but I have one more quick thing because it was in my notes and I overlooked it. We have talked about, as a board, but I don't think, I know we didn't have a vote on it, I don't know if there was good, but we talked about funding to purchase derelict houses, specifically in the development area, I think it was the development area, to provide more affordable housing options.

[03:47:41] Because we have all these Daryl accounts, and if you can buy them cheaply, and it would provide more affordable, should that be included? And I'm sorry, I just forgot this. I think it's something you would write in a way that says we're going to study it.

[03:47:56] Yeah, Ned and I have talked about this over and over again, because we see them in the Ryo and Chewet districts. So, great. Well, see, I'm not sure that we'll look back through to see if there's another place that talks about pursuing affordable housing options.

[03:48:15] Yeah, if you'll do that. I just don't want to lose that piece because it's a great opportunity, and I think it ought to be in there somewhere. Yeah, it's the whole blighted properties. I mean, I can give you three examples right now off the top of my head if you'd like to put them in there. Thank you, Supervisor McKeel.

[03:48:35] Sorry, I missed a page. Just an update on the church properties. One of the reasons that they failed last year was because you're not allowed to treat somebody differently than another in the same zoning category and so treating church properties differently in zoning was not a lot.

[03:48:52] Oh, interesting. So I do not know if it's going to come back. What about churches in the development area? To have them buy right period. It's just, that was what we were told in Richmond and

Ico, so I want to share that. And what I forgot to ask, because I couldn't find it, where are we talking about preservation of no one's the naturally occurring affordable housing?

[03:49:12] I wrote it down in 2.3 but I don't know if that was where it's supposed to be or not. So I'll just leave that thought with you because I don't want it to get lost. And that one may have come. And the last one on page 17, does that include rural area?

[03:49:38] When you say all residential and mixed use in the district. No, it's a zoning district. Okay, so that's development area only because I was going to worry about the small lots when there's no water and sewer, but you've taken care of that. And I will stop. Thank you very much.

[03:49:55] Anything that needs to be clarified? And we will move on to environmental security. We're almost certain that we're good. Good thing I'm here. Start driving.

[03:50:23] This is on page 13.

[03:50:46] Since I grow grass-fed beef, there's a huge difference in emissions between pasture-raised cows and feedlot ones. So be careful what your terminology is. Okay, now jump on. A couple of things that stars say, thank you, thank you, 0.8 for sure.

[03:51:13] 2.6, especially on the food sludge ordinance. We talked about that a little bit. I was so grateful to see it in here because every time there's one of these renewals with a certain percentage only increase, we're getting another 500 to 1,000 acres that's covered.

[03:51:32] And more and more information is available all the time about the contents in the sludge and what is going to be happening in taking huge numbers of acres out of food production altogether because it's now poison. So I hope that we will consider. And the Don't Spread on Me people did supply to everybody the draft that they had worked very hard on to give Andy a jumping off point based upon the one that Fakir has had for 25 years.

[03:52:05] and so hopefully that will speed things along to be able to help with that. Now, 3.2 on page 17. This is a really great idea and I would just want to encourage that county well, bringing back the monitoring of the county well and also cooperative agreements with private well people who can either have somebody come and read the depth of their well or do it for you and report similar to our stream health civilians who do all the monitoring for the streams.

[03:52:41] we could get a whole lot more widely distributed information about groundwater by well depth that was lost when the county abandoned to keeping track of the well out on the Meacham's River back during the recession in 2009.

[03:52:58] 3.4, do we have the authority to require that septic systems be attached to the public service when the property is being sold?

[03:53:15] And I don't know the answer to that. That's a someday question because that means that it would help to reduce those numbers of things that are not the top. And we did talk about that at one point a couple of years ago. Let's see, page 18. Oh, 4.1, one thing I would strongly support is that impacts to biodiversity be considered as part of the site review process.

[03:53:42] Something has been talked about ever since the first plan came out in 2006 or whenever it was. So that would be a big, big step forward, and actually get people to have enough information to make the

very best recommendation and decision. 4.2, I would suggest adding in some way, avoid new roadways for all construction, because that would carry out lots of those bullets.

[03:54:10] And in 4.4, there seems to be a duplicate of the third and fourth bullet, bottom on page 18. Second sentence and third bullet. The second bullet and third bullet is the same as the fourth bullet.

[03:54:31] Somewhere in the previous draft, around 5.3, I guess, there's, I'll hand this in, like,

[03:55:17] restore degraded streams and wetlands to improve habitat and flood resiliency was on some earlier draft. I don't see it here. Remove obstructions such as the Meacham's pump station, which causes downstream erosion. So I know that in 5.3 you're talking about migration barriers, but also erosion causes.

[03:55:42] Who would like to give us that? We can check to see over to you. Weird that's gone. And 6.7 on page 20. Think about some language to raise the standards for stormwater facilities, because some of the ones that are like 20 years old are failing, and you have A neighborhood of 12 or 15 residents is now responsible for \$300,000 in repairs because something that got an engineering stamp a long time ago was basically a pile of egg crates in the ground.

[03:56:18] It's totally collapsed, and so they're up in the corner. So what are you, what's your ask? So just to raise this, somehow figure out a way to improve the standards for strong water facilities. The current standards, okay. Whatever's going forward, that's under 6.7. Because what happens is that these things get turned over to the HOA, even though it has a pitifully small number of members.

[03:56:41] And then they can't possibly keep track of the order for support. That's how they get to be private, is that they're built with county approval, and then they fall. And... Yeah, I'll probably have to talk with you on the side on that, because the regulations are drastically different now than they were 20 years ago.

[03:57:04] But it's already been accomplished? That's great. So like a corrugated riser pipe isn't permitted anymore, you gotta use concrete, things like that. Ann? I'm sorry, part of your information. Aren't we sending down cameras into all of our sewer pipes, big, large drainage pipes, stormwater pipes?

[03:57:24] Aren't we sending down cameras to see what needs to be repaired? I remember seeing that. Those are on public. It's public. Through our stormwater maintenance program through FEZ, we have inspection processes, which can include up to the telescope in the pipes to see what's in there when we're going to inspect.

[03:57:45] The last thing, until I find that I've forgotten one, on 6.13, on page 21, think about a way to emphasize tree conservation as well as planting more. Because saving big ones does a whole lot more for the canopy than something that's going to be big in 50 years.

[03:58:04] Is this tree planting and preservation? It has the word preservation. Well, then we'll figure out how to make that stick a little bit. That's the enforcement problem. It's your problem.

[03:58:20] The problem we have is all of our victories are dying. Okay, I'll stop there until I find something else. Thank you very much. I don't have a lot about this chapter. I'm going to say about this chapter is that it is excellent.

[03:58:39] And I agree with all this. I think there is redundancy. I'm just simply saying that, and I know there are a lot of people in our community who, if we tripled the size of this, they would be thrilled with that.

[03:59:02] Having said that, I think trying to see where there's some redundancy and skinning it down, because some of this is in other well-executed documents that we have is also, right?

[03:59:17] So I'm trying to, yeah. And I'm just simply saying that you're agreeing with me, and I'm going to go on record as having said that. Because while I don't disagree with anything in here, it's said multiple times, as our consultant said recently, we have a lot of redundancy in our documents.

[03:59:39] And so let's see if we can figure that out, because this one is just, in my opinion, too long. But it's not that I disagree with anything. But, for example, now what I want to point out is, and this is not exactly the same thing, but 6.5, provide education to private dam owners regarding best management.

[03:59:54] We're doing that now. That's an example of we can take that out. I'm not saying that we shouldn't continue to do it, but we're doing it, and we have a call of practice for that right now. So, but skinning this down for redundancy. We can't be everything to everybody all the time in all documents.

[04:00:13] I'm on a red line. Because otherwise, we will never know until it's too late that something's been taken. Well, I'm not joking about that. Some people could triple the size of it, and they would love it, but just dreading it. We can't be. And I'd be willing to, let's see what you all think the redundancy would be.

[04:00:34] I bet it's not going to be a horrible, I bet the stars will not fall from the sky. And we'll see what we can do to meet them. Yeah, thank you. You want to come? Nope, I'm good. Supervisor Provin. Sorry about that. I agree with Supervisor McKeel.

[04:00:53] Thank you. Well, the only comment I'll make is repeating some of the Planning Commission. There are some places where, throughout the document, that things become kind of unmeasurable. And I think the Chief Supervisor, I mean, Commissioner, Fire Rock, pointed out one is 7.3, which is support county staff and all departments to facilitate organization-wide and contact appropriate climate action.

[04:01:19] Wow. That's the name of you to me. See, we can take that one out. That's wrong. All for making action. I just want to make sure that you measure it. Anything that you need?

[04:01:38] I don't have anything that needs clarification. The only thing I will point out, just for your information, is in 4.8, I think it was planning commission noted that it looked like two actions got combined.

[04:01:55] So, just where it starts with increase county outreach to existing and new landowners, that will be a separate action item. Oh, we're going to add more. It's... I think they were previously separate and they accidentally got it.

[04:02:12] I couldn't resist, I'm sorry. I just want to make a topic. Of course, they have to be. Parks and Recreation.

[04:02:37] Okay, so it increases, decreases. It doesn't really help us much. So I know that during COVID, it went from 1 million to 2 million trail users, and that's enough for me. So I don't know what benefit that particularly offers.

[04:03:22] You're suggesting deleting the table? Well, I just, it's confusing. People have said to me, why is it some going up and some going down? And, you know, why are we taking place with that? So, anyway, I'm just sharing that's a thought. The overall trend is very important to show.

[04:03:38] But it's decreasing. We could replace this with a chart instead of a table, perhaps. A graph or something. One of them is a 1% decrease. Which will be very important to show everyone.

[04:03:54] Yeah, so, anyway. I'll leave that alone. I may be alone on that one, and that's okay. Now I stopped cutting and pasting and started sticking in extra paint.

[04:04:10] Okay, sorry. All right, page 23. Oh, no change, but I very much appreciate the additions to the 4.2 to update the Safer Chemical Policy to include current information because so much has been learned in the last 16 years about what's going on in those things.

[04:04:36] We still need to do a better job of keeping the fragrance and the antimicrobials out of our bathrooms. They keep appearing. I think individuals probably bring them in and plug them on the counter. 4.7, removal of invasive species.

[04:04:55] Certified county staff should be the only ones using chemicals to do that. I think it's dangerous liability-wise to be turning volunteers loose on county property or anywhere doing stuff because that requires certification and we should not be going there.

[04:05:15] So you want to strike, it says coordinated volunteer teams to support parks 4.7, page 23. So you want to strike volunteer teams and from that sentence? Or put some kind of an additive in there to say that Payne County staff are going to be the ones doing that.

[04:05:35] Or training, how about training? or they have trained volunteer teams. Where does it say they're using chemicals? It doesn't say that. It doesn't say that. Sorry, it doesn't say that. It says removal of invasive species.

[04:05:51] And sustainable land management. Well, the invasives actually require a lot of chemicals, too. So that's got to be chemicals. It's part of it. And the--

[04:06:04] During this law I would just like to translate one of those chemicals and actually have a discussion with parks and outcasts because there's a caveat created through law to allow the authorization of volunteers to meet that happen.

[04:06:32] Somewhere in there, couldn't find it, recognized use of gravel roads for accessible low barrier recreation in the rural areas. I don't know where it was supposed to go, and I was trying to find it if it had been put in since the last draft, which was updated.

[04:06:54] So I'll just leave that thought with you. I think that was addressed in the transportation chapter, but we can double check. Oh, okay. Because it's part of the Rural Rustic Program, we just kind of... Yes, it is. Yes, it's part of the... Yeah, for your reading enjoyment later, it's 4.3 in the Rural Section of Transportation.

[04:07:18] Thank you very much. Okay, page 24, and we're still in parts. 6.1, I would very much like future boards not to have to relive six years of misery with synthetic turf fields.

[04:07:35] And they're also in major lawsuits all over the country because of their content and what's happened to them. So that is something that I would very much support striking Evaluate Field Service, because we've also had great success with going back to natural grass fields, and we do not need to go relive that.

[04:07:52] - But how does that address synthetic fields? - That's what field surface is, isn't it? - I've had to check with Parks and Rec, it could be switching the type of ground from Bermuda to-- - Okay, well, a clarification, that's not what it means when you're-- - And I'm not gonna get into the-- - Because we do not need to go by the area-- - Two years, there may be entirely different.

[04:08:14] - Exactly. - It's kind of the middle of the percent. - Okay, I would not be in favor of changing. - A new, I will use my-- Seven points, I have two new additions to add, and I'll just hand those over to you to do what you want to.

[04:08:32] But one, encourage landowners slash neighborhoods to partner for community trails as exists today all over the county. So this is private property where landowners offer people to walk through. People access through their property. And so having some conversations, allowing park staff to be able to have conversations with people to develop more awareness with landowners' invitation to participate in these I think would be a wonderful thing.

[04:09:02] All right, I will hand over this. There's one last thing, and that is about access to park areas, limited access to park areas where resource protection is paramount unless extraordinary protection can be used.

[04:09:25] And this was talking. There is a bullet in here somewhere about more accessibility, more opening up more remote areas for people to visit. But there has to be some, I mean, Arrowhead is not the place to be doing that up on the rock out because those are, You know, there's like three places in North America that have the plants that are up there.

[04:09:45] So that's not a place where you can have public people without a guide touring them around. So anyway, I will hand this at the last page over to you, and you can do what you will with it. Thank you. Okay, I don't think I have a whole lot other than on page 11, a couple of things.

[04:10:02] On page 11, I'd like to see totals. I think it would be interesting to see totals, like how many acres, a total of the acreage. That would be very helpful. And I'd also like a separate line or column to show which ones have biking.

[04:10:27] And I don't know that I divided up a whole lot, but we have specific. Most of them are created. I think if I'm going to look at this, existing ones, it would be nice to know what allows biking, what doesn't.

[04:10:45] I don't think we need to get into horses, but I mean, yeah, well, maybe horses. I'm just trying to think of those. You have room for a couple more columns here, right? So I think that would be helpful, and along with the total for the acreage. And then I know I'm getting very thinking about, I have a lot of constituents that cannot possibly get to.

[04:11:20] Maybe they don't have cars, or they can't ride a bus one hour this way and one hour that way. And I don't know how to get at that with this document. Do we have something in here that says, and I'm not, because you guys know this stuff back here a lot more better than I do.

[04:11:38] Providing transportation doesn't work because they can't sit on a bus for an hour and then sit on the bus coming back. So I'm interested in what we're doing about in this document about pocket parks and trying to make parks accessible. And you can probably help me find it in here, but is there something?

[04:11:56] and just to think about that there is I believe 7.3 is the only place where I found the word so I really like something in here for the folks in the urban areas that need to be able to have some space and

telling them to ride the bus or to get transportation is not gonna work so that that's not and again

[04:12:30] hear transit accessibility establishing community connections i think fairfax says that there's a trail behind the house we have to provide i think they have some really absolute language in their ordinances because they got tired of people fighting over not providing trails behind you know just saying i guess it would okay and on page 18 i'm going back again to small area plan

[04:13:02] And I'm sorry, but I know it's a school small area plan, but when that Lambs Lane campus, looking at it through the lens of, there are all kinds of trails on that school property behind, and kids have built, you know, all kinds of bridges over the, I'm just saying that trying to connect that LLC, that Lambs Lane campus, I don't know if there's something you can do with this, but think about it.

[04:13:33] And if you think about it, what's happening with our water infrastructure that comes down hydraulic road, makes a right onto Lambs Road, then goes behind Alvaro High School campus, the Lambs Lane campus in the back, that's going to be providing what could be multi-access trail of some sort over those water lines as they go in.

[04:14:03] So just putting that on the table to think about that, because I'm not sure you all think about Almar County Public Schools property. And I get it, because we don't own it. I mean, the school system. But thinking about that connection. And moving on now, 3.7 terrifies me.

[04:14:25] Are we really talking about, in all of our public parks, we're going to be going in and putting in public restrooms? The maintenance, the expense, that one is really, I would add, we're feasible.

[04:14:41] Because we just can't. I mean, I just don't see that. I agree. We're feasible. We'll belabor it. And then, that's it. Brother Brooks. Yes.

[04:14:59] First, a very quick housekeeping thing that I forgot about previous section. I can't hear very well. I can't hear you. Oh, I apologize. Can you get me better now? Yes. Great. So, a quick housekeeping note on the previous section.

[04:15:15] I apologize for forgetting to mention that I made notes about things that I forgot to mention. We don't need to go back to them, but on 5.1 and 5.2, there is an extra period after the actions I listed in the previous section. Send in typos if you find typos.

[04:15:33] Yeah, the only thing that has not been addressed that I add on this is, this is my, but 5.6. And we talked about the, and I think the only mention of the three-notch trail actually in the actions, is specifically in the context of leveraging the study.

[04:15:58] This is another one of these things I feel like the comprehensive plan is supposed to be forward-thinking, visionary, and I think cabinining this to the context of the most immediate action that we have in front of us, which is a weird way to get the sites in, it is weirdly limiting for this, but a project that is certainly going to last years and a plan that is going to last years, I wonder if this should be more appropriate or something broader, just broader in language, frankly

[04:16:33] resembling the previous action that we looked at in the earlier rural areas, because the Rural Area Transportation Fund said prioritize the federally supported three-notch trail shared use path between Charlottesville and the village home.

[04:16:50] I wonder if something either similarly brought here or maybe even just not including something here and having to just live in the transportation section or moving the one that's from the

transportation section here. It's just the way it's not going to happen.

[04:17:08] Yeah, let's take it out. We've already got it. We're going to take it out. Anything else?

[04:17:23] No, I have none of this. Okay, on page two, objective three, it says, "Increase access to county parks and trails with an emphasis on universal access and public safety."

[04:17:45] I think I have a culture of inequity, because I think that's understood within universal access, unless that's my suggestion. Universal access means everybody, all kinds of people, everything and everybody.

[04:18:00] Yeah, but equity means something different. And I think that we've already said that we want to keep this document sort of focused on climate and equity. And I think we should keep back with that. All right. But if you want equity, to be honest with you, then you need to be provided pocket parks that they can actually access.

[04:18:17] Well done. And I think in all our new developments, well, that's new developments, you're right. On page 25, 7.1 and 7.3, the Parks Foundation, if we're saying encourage donations to the Alomar County Parks Foundation, which I don't have a problem with, are we doing that also for the Fire Foundation and Police Foundation?

[04:18:44] I don't think we should get into either one of those. I would take both of those out. I don't like either one of those. Yeah, I mean that's what, either you do them all or you don't do them. That's right. Okay, I just don't think this document is about raising money. It appears again at 7.3, but that's a very specific content.

[04:19:00] Well, and then at 7.3, for voluntary, okay, this is my concern about that, voluntary donations from developers directly to Apple Barre County or the Parse Foundation to meet green space requirements when it is mutually agreed that green space improvements would be more beneficial than on-site pocket parks. If you give it to the Parks Foundation I'm not sure and I'm not sure about Admar County either that you can specify what you want it for and I think what we're talking about is being able

[04:19:36] to create some green spaces and I'm not sure if this mandates that that would be used for that. The Parks Foundation I know they're raising for five different. You can give a gift to this specification that you're used for this.

[04:19:55] Yes, but the Parks Foundation is not, like I said, right now they're fundraising for five different things. That's going to be on a low list because there may not be someone to fundraise to have enough money to do what we want. But if it's a restricted gift, they can't use it for anything else anyway.

[04:20:13] I know, but it could be a while, years, before that money gets used. I think the intent here is this idea of being able to aggregate, as development happens, instead of having a little, I can hear Julian Bivens in the back of my head right now, instead of having a dog park on everybody's property and look about behind everything, can we sort of aggregate some of these things happening in development, use the Parks Foundation as the vehicle, and then put it into a larger county parks that would be close to neighborhoods that somebody could walk to.

[04:20:51] I think that's really the intent here of using that as a path through to create a larger and more equitable park. So if there's a way they can rework it? Well, that's what I'm trying to do. I agree with what you're saying. I'm just saying that the Parks Foundation is not going to be set up that way and you can

accumulate this money until they get to it, which could be a while because they've already got projects and it's not a huge, you know, foundation.

[04:21:23] And it is private. So they may say, well, you know, I don't know, we don't want to specify it for that. We'll put it in this general category. I think it's breaking the foundation from the document. Just because that was my concern originally was that they're doing their own thing instead of.

[04:21:43] So if people wanted to make a donation, they can donate it to the county and the county can carry it out. They can set up a separate account. They've always been able to do that for donations for various things. I think we could also add language suggesting publicly accessible green spaces, because I think that's the intent, is to move money that would go towards private green spaces and put it into spaces that are publicly accessible.

[04:22:07] And potentially by using the foundation, it can make it even a tax-to-doctor type of mechanism. So I think the Parks Department is trying to, I don't know all the details about this, but I think they're trying to be creative in ways that we can deliver larger open space.

[04:22:25] Okay, and I'm just trying to get you where you want to be, but that's okay. I mean, work with the Parks Foundation, maybe see if that's something they would agree to. Because I know working with the county, they're not going to have maybe specific byline just for that.

[04:22:45] And the Parks Foundation is the appropriate thing, just can they do it? So that would be, so we're striking 7.1. That's right, and that's all I have. Okay, and I don't have any really additional comments.

[04:23:05] I do note that the works pocket, or I don't know why they got dropped from objectives in other places from before. I mean, I think that they were important, so I'd like to continue that. And then Commissioner Firehawk had a great comment about encouraging participation in the Division of Wildlife Resources, Birding, and Wildlife Trails Program.

[04:23:25] My question about 7.3 on page 25 is to avoid the trap that we were in for years allowing affordable housing responsibility to be brought out by \$16,000. So if you're going to get cash for something, make sure that it's an upcash. It's good and not just a cheap cop-out.

[04:23:52] Somebody should, even a quarter-acre park, if it's right there in your housing complex, it's wonderful to have some swings right down there to take your kid to instead of having to travel anywhere three blocks away. So that's your ballpark.

[04:24:10] That's the implementation. It is. Can we move on to the next? I would raise, I don't think I had been expecting this to go this long.

[04:24:26] I do need to get on the road to get home, frankly, just in time to eat and take my dog. Do you have a lot that you would want to share in the remaining chapter? I will go through and see if there's anything additional that I would want to share, and if so, I can do it in writing.

[04:24:45] I don't have major critiques. Other than the board knows my position on the implementation and the concerns I have That would be overly inclusive in how many big, big rocks we're identifying, and I stay with that position, but I don't think, I don't think I've killed it.

[04:25:12] It's okay. We may stay a little longer. We'll have a quorum. We can get comments to you afterwards. That's possible, too. Thank you. Well, I mean, if you have to leave, we can, we can, we want a quorum.

[04:25:33] and we can continue this in a future meeting. That's also possible. Or we can also, I mean, the trouble is it puts staff in a tighter time frame for getting corrections. Let's just see if we can keep going and finish quickly. I mean, you guys can do more. Are you okay? You're happy to stay as long as you are willing to log it out.

[04:25:53] We'll just admit we've got a time frame predicated on taking the stuff from here and finishing a draft. Yeah, would you like to go through all of yours now? - We'll go all three years now. - Okay, I'll just do it through.

[04:26:10] - This is two chapters left, right? - Yes, ma'am. - Okay. - So we also have the implementation. - Implementation, there's three. - There's three, three tests. - That's a good one now.

[04:26:39] - Our plan is a long-term document, and so at the end of the first paragraph, under the age 14, perhaps not talk about things that are short-term, you know, the latest thing in the CBB. So, for example, the website. So you just have to take out that last sentence only because it's a short-term thing as opposed to something that's going to be around.

[04:27:08] So you're suggesting remove the last sentence of the first paragraph? Right. For example, a website. And you all can talk about that. Where it says, for example? Yes. Because it's looking at long-term overarching things.

[04:27:22] Now, resources, give them 17, 2.8, perhaps including murals.

[04:27:52] A lot of our communities have murals that are wonderful and we should encourage more. 4.8, I would stop after cemeteries. Just all the cemeteries need to be identified, protected, and I guess that's all I have.

[04:28:12] Boy, so you would take out, what, unfortunately? Especially historic black, African-American cemeteries? Just to leave all cemeteries. They're all getting demolished. Right, the left one. Okay, so then we're, whoops, community facilities, is that what I'm supposed to go to?

[04:28:35] That's next. Okay, community facilities, objective two, provide access to public water and sewer. I'm not sure, it's just because it's others who provide it. I wanted to clarify that.

[04:28:52] We wait to. Which one were you on in? I'm sorry. Objective 2, page 2 of the facilities chapter. The rural page. Page 2 of the facilities chapter. Community facilities chapter. Right there.

[04:29:11] Objective 2, at the right top of the page. Just add the word access to. Again, lots of stars. Good thing, good thing, good thing. Page 16, 2.1. I'm very concerned about number 3 because if things cost onsite, private water septic utilities are cost prohibitive is not a reason to extend sewer. People shouldn't be building there to begin with. So I don't know this this

[04:29:46] looks like it's encumbering the ACSA or RWSA to extend water in places where there was no intention of having buildings. So if that's just I'll leave that right about. I don't agree. Is there a clarification on that? Yeah that's just So the current policy, that's one of the factors that are assessed.

[04:30:13] We've had two for the 50 years or 30 years that we've been doing the jurisdictional area. It's adjacency and immediate failure, unremediable failure of the current system. It's never been for future building.

[04:30:31] So this looks like future building to me. There's a cost prohibitive connection, even if it's conventional, it's... And it's actually, it's either, I'm not sure if it's either way, maybe I'll just not. If you have the ability to hook to, it's cheaper to hook to than septic, you've got to hook to.

[04:30:58] More expensive to hook to it than put it in the septic system instead of hook to it. Okay, so if septic fields now cost \$30,000, which is twice what the hookup fee is, I guess I'm safe on that. So forget that one. Okay, 2.4, is it 2.1, what are we reading the law?

[04:31:17] Yes, ma'am. 2.4, who does this? Identify impacts from continued use and mitigation options. This sounds like an undoable task, considering the 40-some thousand.

[04:31:37] Actually, the Office of Drinking Water does that, won't even do that. Okay, then maybe since I didn't know that. Because those are centrals, not individuals. Exactly. They're central systems. And I'm 2.8 at the bottom of the same page.

[04:31:58] I'm very taken by RWSA not putting sludge on fields locally, but this is very much in support also of us adopting as quickly as we can the authorized by the state reporting requirements, which then get extra information on the applications which we're getting, and that may bring things under control pretty quickly, as it has in other counties.

[04:32:27] So that's part of the, please do your homework on the sludge thing. And 3.1, I would be very interested in the user numbers when it says provide resources for renovations in the Main Street Library, Central Library, which has been hanging around for 15 years, because we've always been told that there are more county users than city, but I think I haven't seen any update on that since a lot of circumstances for downtown

[04:33:04] have changed, and people have told me that they've changed which libraries they go to. So I would like to get more information about that at some point. Anne? Yes. I'm sorry, but I agree with you there. I said for that second sentence, provide some resources for the renovations of the main library, Market Street, as feasible, which means that we can do it as we can.

[04:33:32] I mean, there is an agreement that I've always been told we can't. back out of it. But we need to get real data to make sure that we have the reason to do what we're going to have to do. I know. That's all I'm asking. And I think that's, I think,

[04:34:07] a couple other things I marked, but I think that's great. So thank you all for your consideration. I appreciate that. We'll then take some shots. Oh, okay. Thanks.

[04:34:23] What? Okay.

[04:34:39] Five, the legislative decision. The last line under that paragraph, it seems a little prejudicial to say that things are going to be approved.

[04:34:55] So I will just leave that thought with you. I've never seen anything like that before in a cop land. And perhaps saying the message to applicants that only those applications in keeping with board policies would be approved, instead of saying, if you do this, then you'll get approved.

[04:35:11] I just don't want to raise expectations unfairly. I just have stars of good work here, so I'm going to stop.

[04:35:28] Thank you. Thank you, everyone, for all your hard work. And I should have said this at the very beginning, but I did say it to Tonya because I knew I would forget. Well done. All of you have worked so, so hard for all these years, and I'm so grateful that we've gotten here.

[04:35:46] Thank you for agreeing to stay. Well, actually, none of us can stay because once you leave, we no longer have a board on the way. Oh, okay. I forgot about that. Sorry about that. So, if Supervisor Malik would leave, we need to adjourn the meeting. We need to adjourn the meeting. I'm sorry.

[04:36:05] So, can we send in to you, because you are a timeline, can we send in email to you the few things that we have remaining for these? Right. And then evaluate them with the public hearing. Yeah, evaluate whether they are if we've met your intent there.

[04:36:26] I have very few. I mean, I've got... Well, I mean, as you know, we've got two additional meetings between now and October. I would suggest that if we get those to you by the next meeting, that you possibly could respond to them before the 15th and that's just comments. So as far as the timeline goes we have the Planning Commission's public hearing at the end of the month. Our intent was to take your comments, work over the next five to six days, business days, wrap up a final draft and put that for the Planning Commission to be considered and then we'll bring it to you on the 15th. But I think at this point if we delay another date for your wall it will push those ones back.

[04:37:06] It would be very comfortable if you all want to call me, and we'll walk through the pages where you have changes, and I'll make notes in the master. It's going to be a lot faster. And we're starting with cultural responses. Yeah, cultural resources.

[04:37:23] It's just those two, and I think I have three things. Yeah, I mean, me too. Okay, but we are going to adjourn at this point. We'll call Jody. Yes, call me, and I will talk to you. One at a time. Further from the county executive or from the board, then we will adjourn to September 17th, 2025, 1 p.m.

[04:37:44] I think we've done it.



Coraggio Consulting · aguyonx.com