

A G E N D A

**JOINT WORK SESSION OF THE
JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

and

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

County Government Center Board Room

September 27, 2005

4:00 P.M.

-
1. Background for Upcoming Work Session with Economic Development Authority

092705BosEDAws.age

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2005
TO: The Board of Supervisors
FROM: Keith A. Taylor, Secretary, Economic Development Authority
SUBJECT: Background for Upcoming Work Session with Economic Development Authority

In preparation for the Board's September 27 Joint Work Session with the Economic Development Authority (EDA), I have been asked by EDA Chairperson Virginia Hartmann to forward the accompanying suggested "Discussion Notes." They represent a consensus of the EDA Directors' thoughts articulated during the EDA's July 21 Regular Meeting and August 16 Work Session.


Keith A. Taylor

KAT/gb
Bkgd.mem

Attachment

JOINT BOS/EDA WORK SESSION
DISCUSSION NOTES
Revised 9-9-05

Establish Joint Task Force(s)

Background

The perception of James City County's attractiveness/receptiveness to business and industry might be fairly characterized as variable. To enhance our County's success at facilitating the three tenets of economic development—retain, expand, and attract—the Economic Development Authority (EDA) believes that a more uniformly held perception of James City County as a friendly and desirable place to do business is required.

Purpose

To define, consider/study, and identify opportunities for removing obstacles to predictable, efficient, and expeditious nonresidential development policies, review, and approval processes.

Composition

Comprised of one or more groups, with membership targeted to specific challenges, general representation should include at least one person from the following: the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, Senior County Staff, Economic Development Authority, general citizenry, business/industry, engineering/design community, Chamber of Commerce, and special stakeholders specific to a particular issue.

Potential Work Efforts

1. Establish listing of desirable business/industry categories
 - a. Small, medium, and large
 - b. Commercial, industrial, tourism-related, service, other
2. Evaluate/Improve the Development Review (DR) Process
 - a. Minimize subjective plan review processes; increase objective standards and technical specifications
 - b. Increase the use of form-based or performance zoning regulations
 - c. Increase resources for in-house commercial building plan review; enhance third-party review opportunities
 - d. Establish County ombudsman empowered to advance identified economic development swiftly through the review process
 - e. Clarify expedited review process—which projects qualify (type, size)

3. Business Climate/Sensitivity Training
 - a. Importance of economic development, generally
 - b. Relative contribution of small and medium business/industry versus large industry
 - c. Existing business/industry—loyal clients, heavily invested, overly restrictive regulations unnecessarily preclude efficient expansion

4. Geographic considerations
 - a. Fresh look at where certain uses should/should not go
 - b. Pro-active investment in infrastructure to entice desirable development in desirable locations
 - c. Forward-thinking recognition of inevitability of future rail—plan for higher-intensity uses in areas capable of being efficiently served by rail
 - d. County-sponsored regional stormwater management solutions
 - i. treat previously untreated areas; in so doing, allow for expansions of existing businesses
 - ii. minimize proliferation of smaller, less efficient facilities

5. Review regulations/policies—eliminate those which do not by definition advance the causes they purport to advance, but which are viewed as hindrances to economic development.