

**A G E N D A**

**JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**WORK SESSION**

**October 28, 2014**

**4:00 P.M.**

- 
- A. CALL TO ORDER**
  - B. ROLL CALL**
  - C. BOARD DISCUSSION**
    - 1. Joint Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Work Session - Update on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan Review, *Toward 2035: Leading the Way*
  - D. ADJOURNMENT** – until 7 p.m. for the Regular Meeting

102814bosws-age



## MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 28, 2014

TO: The Board of Supervisors  
Planning Commission

FROM: Tamara A. M. Rosario, Principal Planner  
Paul D. Holt, Planning Director

SUBJECT: Joint Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission Work Session - Update on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan Review, *Toward 2035: Leading the Way*

In accordance with the methodology for the streamlined 2009 Comprehensive Plan review, *Toward 2035: Leading the Way*, four joint work sessions are planned at the following milestone points in the plan's development to allow for discussion between the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors on the progress thus far and direction moving forward.

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| October 28, 2014 | Planning Commission Work Group's (PCWG) Stage I review of the Comprehensive Plan revised text and goals, strategies, and actions |
| January 28, 2015 | Stage II review and recommendations on proposed changes to the Land Use Map  |
| March 24, 2015   | Stage III finalization of revisions to the draft Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Map   |
| June 24, 2015    | Planning Commission's consideration and recommendation of the plan to the Board of Supervisors for adoption in July/August       |

To facilitate the discussion, a brief summary of the activities-to-date is provided below. Attachments with more detailed information and links to all public input and draft 2035 Comprehensive Plan sections are also provided for further information.

#### Community Participation Team (CPT)

The CPT met from March to July to assist in planning for community outreach and engagement and collecting input from citizens and organizations. As capstone activities, the CPT summarized the comments received through July 1 and compiled a list of all of the outreach efforts and participation statistics for the first phase of the update process (Attachments 1 and 2).

Given the large volume of input received, all of the raw comments, copies, and videos of CPT Forum presentations and the results of the Community Workshops are not attached to this memorandum, but can be found at the following link: <http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/what-do-you-think/survey.html>. As previously shared in May, the complete results of the Virginia Tech Citizen Survey are available at <http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/what-do-you-think/results.html>.


### Planning Commission Working Group (PCWG)

The PCWG, comprised of the Planning Commission plus a liaison from the Community Participation Team, began meeting in August to review the Comprehensive Plan section text and associated goals, strategies, and actions. To start its efforts, the PCWG received an overview of the public input, materials associated with the Historic Triangle Coordinated Comprehensive Plan review process, and the Vision section. Subsequent meetings covered the Demographics, Population Needs, Environment, Parks and Recreation, Public Facilities, Community Character, Housing, Economic Development, and Land Use sections of the plan. Each meeting was televised and offered two periods for public comment. Based upon the feedback provided at the meetings, staff will revise the sections and bring them back to the PCWG for final consideration.

Attachment 3 provides a more detailed accounting of the section updates and PCWG direction as well as links to the full text. The last section, Transportation, will be discussed at an upcoming meeting before the group moves fully into Stage II of its work. Stage II will focus on applications to change the designations of property on the Land Use Map and text associated with the Land Use Map.

### Conclusion

The Planning Commission has prepared a presentation to provide an update on its activities associated with the Comprehensive Plan review and to receive feedback from the Board of Supervisors. Several Planning Commission Working Group members will make the presentation, and all members and staff will be available to participate in the discussion and to provide additional information.



Tamara A.M. Rosario



Paul D. Holt, III

CONCUR:



Allen J. Murphy, Jr.

TMR/PDH/gb  
JointWS-CPUpdate-mem

### Attachments:

1. Summary of Input Received
2. Summary of Citizen Outreach Efforts and Participation
3. 2035 Comprehensive Plan Section Summaries

**To:** Members of the Planning Commission Working Group  
Members of the Board of Supervisors

**From:** The 2035 Community Participation Team

**Date:** July 25, 2014

**Subject:** Summary of Input Received

---

**Executive Summary:**

In March 2014, the Community Participation Team (CPT) was formed. The CPT met bi-weekly through July 2014 and assisted in outreach for the Comprehensive Plan update. The CPT's role was to be active listeners and help amplify the public comments heard and discussed. The process is outlined below and a summary of comments is included under the three main areas of the Comprehensive Plan Update: Land Use, Economic Development and Transportation. A final section reflects other issues that also arose during this process. The Community Participation Team, with much help from the County staff, received extensive input from a wide range of residents through several sources over a three-month period. The summary was approved by the CPT on July 23, 2014.

Overall, our first impression from the 2014 Virginia Tech Citizen Survey (Citizen Survey) is that County residents are largely happy with where they live: they feel safe (99%); the schools are good/excellent; they are afforded many recreational and cultural activities; they get good value for our tax dollars (72%); they like the services provided by local government (85%); and the location of the County provides easy access to an even broader array of services and facilities. Fifty-eight percent have lived here for eleven years or longer, offering another gauge of satisfaction. Although the Greater Williamsburg Chamber and Tourism Alliance reports a "sense that many in our community are either in the same place economically where they were five years ago, or perhaps have drifted backwards ...", the responses show little evidence of the economic angst that weighs on many of our citizens.

The most critical Land Use issues were growth, the environment and community character. In terms of growth, there was particular concern with commercial growth where new infrastructure, buildings and centers are being built when existing centers are unoccupied or under occupied. The most often mentioned Economic Development issues were tourism, balanced economic development and business and workforce needs. Finally, the most often cited Transportation issue was the need for improved capacity, be it roads, sidewalks, bike paths or public transit, coupled with a concern of how to pay for these improvements. Issues like Housing, Governance, Public Facilities, Parks and Recreation, Population Needs and Water were also mentioned in this process and shown below as "Additional Comments."

Please see the attached summary from County staff on the overall process and outreach efforts. Additionally, members of the CPT were part of the outreach efforts with thirty additional CPT-led public input opportunities including, two CPT Forums. Fourteen local organizations came to those CPT Forums to present their priorities regarding the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, representing a broad spectrum of viewpoints. Finally, CPT members participated in three public meetings (Community Workshops) in June 2014.

**Land Use Comments:**

The Land Use section is the nexus of the Comprehensive Plan, driving all other sections. None of the goals in the Plan, whether economic development, environmental, transportation, community character, housing or the others, can be achieved if appropriate land use goals are not set. For that reason, it should

come as no surprise that land use drew the most comments from residents. The land use comments can be categorized in three primary topic areas: growth, environment and community character.

***Growth:***

A primary source of information was the Citizen Survey on which the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and CPT were briefed. For the most part, the CPT saw that the public input aligns with some of the major findings of this survey. The 2014 survey revealed, “Land use findings are highly similar to those found in 2007,” findings which prompted the 2007 planning staff to conclude, based on the difference from the 2001 survey results, that “the strengthening of opinion on these issues indicates a call for action on growth management.” The only significant difference regarding land use in the 2014 survey compared to that from 2007 was a decline (from 68% to 61%) in the numbers of respondents who believed that neighborhoods should have a mix of housing options. Other responses include:

|  | <u>Strongly Agree/Agree</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|
| • Better to preserve farmland than to develop:   | 78%                         |
| • Residential development is happening too quickly:                                    | 73%                         |
| • Developers should pay a fee even if that increases the cost of services/new housing: | 70%                         |
| • Want less development even if it means higher taxes:                                 | 59%                         |
| • Want more homes on smaller lots to set aside more open space:                        | 56%                         |

The Citizen Survey also contained some key open-ended questions. For example, there were 589 responses to the open-ended question, “Over the next 20 years, what are the most important land uses and activities that should occur in rural lands in JCC?” Many respondents gave some variation on the answer: “Preserve, conserve, and maintain open space /rural land/water/historic and lands.” In contrast, very few respondents supported more residential, commercial and industrial development. Overall, the most frequent responses show a desire on the part of County residents to protect their present quality of life, open space, greenways, and historic sites and to slow development. Most respondents believed that the amount of residential development was either about right or too much, and that the amount of commercial development was about right or too much, and 57.3% thought the same about industrial development.

Many CPT Forum comments were related to growth with a specific recommendation from some to develop a public facilities master plan based on a population target and “promote the use of land consistent with the capacity of existing and planned public facilities and services.” Another specific suggestion was to map the entire County to determine which lands are developable and which need historic, archeological, natural resource and watershed protection. An additional comment was specific to not permitting any land use designations that result in a population increase beyond that already planned.

Another participating organization was similarly focused on growth control to maintain the character of the County with an emphasis on reaffirming the concept of the Primary Service Area (PSA). A specific comment dealt with the limitation of Economic Opportunity areas to within the Primary Service Area.

Another sort of public input came from the forms available throughout the process and on-line. These forms reflected that many individuals were interested in slowing residential growth, preserving community character and preserving green space. Additional individuals were concerned with slowing commercial development. However, others wanted faster commercial development. Others had concerns about traffic congestion.

Finally, some people responding to general open-ended questions, expressed concern about the pace of growth and the ability of public facilities to keep up with it. Schools were mentioned as a specific concern, as was the need to maintain our current high educational standards. Many public comments expressed the need to ensure there is a balance between growth and facilities.

At the three Community Workshops and the “Virtual Community Workshop” the critical land use comments seemed to mirror those reflected in the survey, forums and online or hotline inputs. The format of these meetings was a staff presentation on land use, economic development and transportation, as well as information on demographics and the process in general. Electronic polling was used to gather information from the audience throughout the presentation. Participants then were directed to land use, economic development and transportation stations. There was also a “thought wall” where participants could reflect on what they liked best about James City County. For these meetings, CPT members attended, listened and went from station to station actively listening to the discussions. In terms of the topic of growth as related to the Land Use section, some of the more common comments were:

- The speed of commercial development is too fast.
- The idea of redevelopment of existing under-used commercial areas before creating new ones.
- Residential growth happening too quickly was also mentioned repeatedly.
- Concern that public funds not be used for conservation land purposes.
- Concern that the County not own land.
- One specific concern expressed at the Grove area meeting was about lack of needed growth, commercial, business and new affordable housing.

#### ***Environment:***

Referencing again the Citizen Survey, 78% of respondents felt “it is more important to preserve farmland than to have more development,” and 73% felt that residential development is happening too quickly. Additionally, 66.8% of respondents rated James City County’s protection of the natural environment to be “excellent” or “good.” Further, a survey of 318 Jamestown High School students yielded many who want the County to do more to limit growth and protect the environment and small town feel. In terms of the environment, the CPT also heard from one Forum participant that the local housing market is strengthening, which will put more pressure on County open space. Another Forum participant discussed parks and recreational facilities as components of family friendly communities. Yet another Forum organization weighed in on the environment, with support for land conservation goals as stated in the 2009 Plan. Another speaker at the CPT Forums discussed the high cost of relying on Best Management Practices for stormwater control and further promoted modern agricultural methods as an alternative. Finally, a number of high school students expressed the desire to protect the water quality of the James River and York River.

At the three Community Workshops and the “Virtual Community Workshop,” the critical land use comments seemed to mirror those reflected in the survey, CPT Forums, and online or hotline inputs. In terms of the topic of environment as related to the Land Use section, some of the more common comments were:

- Protect our natural resources.
- Preserve green space.
- Desire for preserving agricultural character and the agricultural economy.

#### ***Community Character:***

The CPT heard from a Forum participant that the uniqueness of our area should be retained and our quality of life here should be protected. Part of protecting community character is to enhance resources such as historic sites, recreation, culture, arts and entertainment, appearance and the environment. Another organization further mentioned that greenbelts and greenspace should be preserved. Overall, the

speaker felt that the County should encourage inevitable growth in a way that compliments the area's strengths, preserving its character and quality of life.

Another CPT Forum representative echoed the concept of encouraging appropriate growth that enhances unique, small town character and preserves open space and rural land. Also discussed was the need to encourage agricultural economic development. One forum participant did not favor New Town-like development, characterizing it as "environmental terrorism" and a "stormwater nightmare."

At the three Community Workshops and the "Virtual Community Workshop" the critical land use comments seemed to mirror those reflected in the survey, CPT Forums, and online or hotline inputs. In terms of the topic of community character as related to the Land Use section, some of the more common comments were:

- The desire to keep the small-town feel.
- The importance of the County's unique atmosphere.
- Our greenbelt roads and trees are a community asset.
- The need to preserve, protect and publicize our historic resources.

In conclusion, the Land Use comments were numerous and varied. Most comments seemed to gravitate toward the topics of growth, environment and community character and are summarized above. Some of the comments were about issues such as housing, senior services and infrastructure for future generations. Additional comments questioned the role of the Comprehensive Plan and government in planning. Those comments are shown in the last section "Additional Comments." Comments more easily categorized under the two additional major update areas Economic Development and Transportation are shown below.

**Economic Development Comments:**

In addition to the summation above, many specific items were submitted during the community input sessions. The particular items residents listed provide areas for the County's focus. Each item needs to be evaluated, prioritized and developed into County personnel action goals with either local or state agencies. The most prominent Economic Development issues, as described in more detail below, were: tourism, planned development of commercial/retail/industrial businesses, workforce needs, transportation, agriculture and a balanced economy.

While 58% of the survey respondents believe the right amounts of resources are devoted to supporting tourism, strengthening the tourism sector through sports and agricultural tourism, the revitalization of restaurant areas and unique retail experiences were common themes in open ended responses.

Further, comments for planned development of commercial and retail activities were heard from both the Citizen Survey and the Greater Williamsburg Chamber and Tourism Alliance. These comments included incentivizing the redevelopment of properties to reduce excess commercial rather than developing new projects; using the Comprehensive Plan to identify the types of businesses and industry desired in James City County and through master planning make the best of use of land for economic development; and using the incubator to develop those new businesses that are compatible with or add to the area's quality of life. The need for new or revitalized business development was noted for the upper and lower ends of the County. Finally, for business development is the need for business opportunities to attract young professionals who will work and reside in James City County.

Comments were made regarding workforce needs including providing adequate quantities of workforce housing, enhancing transportation networks, providing affordable public transportation and strengthening the public education system to not only produce a stronger local workforce but aid in attracting businesses to James City County.



Preserving agriculture and the rural aspects of James City was a prevalent issue. In order to protect the agricultural economy, it was seen as important to develop and promote markets for farms, including agri-tourism and farm-to-table opportunities. In turn, this will help preserve rural lands as viable revenue producing entities and preserve the rural character of the community.

In summary, a balanced economy through the introduction of new industrial businesses along with a planned approach to retail/commercial development and the strengthening of the tourism sector was viewed as providing James City County with an appropriate tax base. Incentives for redevelopment and appropriate mixed uses were suggested to lessen the need for developing greenfield sites and would help in reducing the number of empty storefronts.

This summary represents the thoughts and opinions of the citizens who attended the Grove Community Workshop and who offered thoughts and opinions on the economic development needs of that community.

1. Create incentive programs to bring in more businesses.
2. Bring quality jobs to the area. There was a large interest in promoting quality jobs.
3. Improve the Abraham Frink Community Center by extending the hours of operation and adding a pool and more recreational areas.
4. Revitalize existing retail and restaurant areas.
5. Provide and/or remodel existing structures for community meetings and social functions.

Participants expressed that the Grove community has unique needs and would benefit from improvements to public transportation, a Community Center that is open daily and that provides services for the youth and senior citizens, and incentive programs to bring more businesses to the community.

**Transportation Comments:**

In the area of Transportation there were opposing views and priorities from County residents on the best way to address transportation issues. Generally, the Citizen Survey revealed that 59% of residents feel County roads are good or excellent and an additional 31% evaluate roads to be in a fair condition. In the responses to open-ended survey questions, a number of respondents expressed concerns with extending or expanding roads that would open new development areas but noted that road safety should be maintained. On the same Citizen Survey, 81% felt bikeways and walking trails were somewhat or very important, but with only 45% willing to have taxes increased to pay for improvements on non-motorized methods of transportation. Fifty-three percent objected to paying more to add bike paths and walking trails.

Specific recommendations centered on:

- Affordable and reliable public transportation/connections.
- Reserving rights-of-way for future corridors.
- Applying multi-modal lanes while maintaining the County's character.
- Prioritizing traffic issues with solutions appropriate for the locations.
- Widening of Route 60 in the Grove area.
- Broadening pedestrian accommodations.
- Increasing access to senior services for "on-demand" transportation.
- Shifting focus from moving automobiles to moving people.

Overall, 72%-87% of residents joining in the actual and virtual Community Workshops felt the County's transportation system, road conditions, traffic flow and safety were good to fair. Participating organizations and specific citizen input at the Community Workshops offered differing views on expansion of both primary and secondary roads with the main issues regionally being:

1. Relief from traffic congestion:

- Route 199 from Longhill Road to the York County line heading towards Kingsmill
- Monticello Avenue between News Road and Ironbound Road
- Pocahontas Trail south of the interchange with Route 199

Some suggestions for improving these areas of concern were to widen roads or synchronize signal timing.

2. Improved public transportation near major intersections and activity areas:

- Intersection of Route 60 and Forge Road
- Croaker Road/Lightfoot area
- Five Forks
- Pocahontas Trail in Grove

Many comments focused on increasing the frequency of WATA service as well as providing protective shelters to increase ridership and make it more convenient to use. A few respondents commented about a lack of ridership on buses leading to questions of whether the service is necessary or should be improved to increase ridership.

3. Upgrades/additions to bike trails and pedestrian walkways:

- Croaker Road to access the library
- Route 60 both in the vicinity of the Candle Factory and the Grove area
- Olde Towne Road
- Jolly Pond Road
- Forge Road

Diverse opinions were received with several attendees indicating a preference for no more facilities spending, while others asked for specific improvements with efforts being focused on addressing shorter gaps in the existing network. General identified problems were lack of or incomplete sidewalks, bike lanes, and crossing walkways/lights for pedestrians.

4. Required road maintenance:

- Fenton Mill Road
- Rochambeau Road
- Ironbound Road
- Monticello Avenue
- Pocahontas Trail

Generally, the maintenance improvement requests related to trimming trees to improve visibility, fixing drainage issues and realigning roads to eliminate curves (specifically on Olde Towne Road).

5. Increased safety issues and concerns at:

- Longhill and Route 199
- Casey Boulevard (New Town)
- Monticello Avenue
- Five Forks
- Anderson's Corner
- Mooretown Road extension
- Pocahontas Trail in Grove
- Stonehouse Elementary School

In each location, there were particular problems noted with the main ones being missing traffic lights or stop signs, obstructed views due to untrimmed trees/shrubs, deficiencies in traffic flow or narrow roads, missing sidewalks or crosswalks and driver inattention or speeding.

### **Additional Comments:**

Throughout the Comprehensive Plan update, citizen input identified several additional areas needing further review. Many of the topics feed into the three main categories of Land Use, Economic Development and Transportation, but because many of the citizen comments fell into areas that are not a main focus in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan update, they are highlighted in this section. Citizens remain concerned about the rate of growth, protecting our community character, providing affordable housing along with offering a diversified job market and providing additional opportunities for our youth and senior citizens. Additional specific comments were received in the areas of Housing, Governance, Public Facilities, Parks and Recreation, Population Needs and Water. Please see the summaries below:

### ***Housing***

Citizens responding to the 2014 Citizen Survey indicated they are seeing improvement in housing opportunities compared to the 2007 Citizen Survey findings. However, citizens also continued to raise concerns about the availability of affordable housing to include rental properties and home ownership. Citizen and organization comments also highlighted the need for an increase in housing diversity.

Specific comments relative to housing issues included the following:

- Need for low income housing.
- Need for more affordable housing for the disabled and senior citizens.
- If we have an aging population, then we need a different form and quality of housing to support this population, including transitional housing.
- Need for more modern housing, at lower cost.
- Need for more diversity in housing stock – more housing types at a variety of prices with more housing in mixed use areas.
- Need for more workforce housing so that people can live locally and work locally.
- Need to center housing where the infrastructure already exists.
- Census data indicated that James City County housing stock does not fully match the needs of the County. Much of the stock is 3 to 5 bedrooms, whereas, the average household size in JCC is 2.4 persons for renters and 2.5 for owners.
- There is the potential for a housing shortage in the County in five years, given that the pace of housing construction has been lower than that needed to accommodate future workers.
- However, without a sufficient supply of housing, that is diverse in type and price, the County will have difficulty attracting workers and businesses and may lose jobs to other jurisdictions as a result.
- The largest demographic nationwide that is purchasing homes is the GEN Y age group (age 33 and younger); the second largest home purchasing demographic is the GEN X segment (ages 34 to 48). The County should consider these age brackets in its future housing needs.
- However, younger workers and residents will continue to have difficulty gaining access to credit, which will continue to be a barrier to homeownership for some households.
- Current housing inventory for attached and detached homes in all price ranges in the County is 6.78 months; housing below the \$238,999 price point has an inventory of less than 5 months. The market is strengthening. Organizations expressed concerns that national builders have grabbed hold of the local market share, creating uncertainties for impacts on the local housing market and economy.

### ***Governance***

Some citizen comments reflected citizen concerns about the Board of Supervisors. Citizens desired a less adversarial tone from the Board of Supervisors and called for cooperation, less focus on perceived personal agendas and more constituent desired results. Citizens also wanted their County officials to focus

on tourism promotions and business development, leading to a diverse job pool, and the ability to travel via foot or bicycle without connectivity issues.

Specific comments relative to Governance issues included the following:

- Wished County Supervisors would get along and focus more on the community rather than the politics.
- More cooperation among the Supervisors. They seem to each have their own personal, individual agendas, which they put before their constituents.
- Governing bodies need to change; individual people on the Board of Supervisors do not act in the interest of the people.
- More compromise among the Supervisors.
- County leadership seems indifferent to the needs of our public schools.
- Less politics on the Board of Supervisors.
- Raise the tax rate to cover the costs associated with growth.

Also in terms of governance, there was some disagreement over whether the County should even have a Comprehensive Plan. One CPT Forum participant expressed concern about the cost of planning in terms of money, freedom and rights. Other Forum participants and individuals were opposed planning, claiming it is a vehicle for controlling land to advance social justice at the expense of the personal freedom of citizens.

### ***Public Facilities/Schools***

Citizen input indicates a high level of appreciation for County public facilities, with a majority of citizen comments stating that the library system is excellent. In addition, public school facilities are viewed as in good condition overall, however citizen input highlights overcrowding and the need for another school. Comments also mentioned a desire for a community facility that can house sporting events.

Specific comments relative to Public Facilities issues included the following:

- Utilize existing buildings that are empty instead of building new buildings.
- Quality jobs will drive the direction of our schools while greatly improving the local economy and tax base.
- Develop a public facility master plan.
- Need sports complex.
- More outdoor sports facilities.
- Desired to improve maintenance on County facilities.

### ***Parks and Recreation***

The citizens of the County overwhelmingly acknowledged the quality parks and recreation system we have. Citizens complimented the number and quality of parks, their accessibility, and the value the parks add to their quality of life. The majority of public input supported more bike paths and trails, with only a few indicating to spend no more money on bike trails, and several participants wanting more child friendly parks.

Specific comments relative to Parks and Recreation issues included the following:

- Bike, walking trails, especially along Route 60.
- Better parks for kids.
- Need a continuous system or network for people who want to bike to work.
- More sports facilities.
- Build an aquatic center to be a resource to our schools and to the community and generate revenue for local businesses in the process.

- Better recreational facilities and programs on the east end of County; don't have walking, biking trails like those on the west end.

### ***Population Needs***

James City County citizen input highlighted the strong desire for increased services for seniors and youth within the County. Citizen input also focused on better modes of transportation and giving more attention to area schools.

Specific comments relative to Population Needs issues included the following:

- Increasing activities for youth and seniors.
- More services and housing for citizens with special needs.
- Pedestrian facilities are needed that would serve seniors and children.
- Development of more schools.
- Need more vocational schools.

### ***Water***

Water, its availability and accessibility, are once again an important issue to the citizens of the County, as it was in 2009. Citizens wanted to be sure that reliable sources of clean water exist while also highlighting the desire for more accessibility to our local waterways for boating, fishing and kayaking.

Specific comments relative to water issues included the following:

- Build a public marina on James River.
- Need more water preservation.
- Need to decrease residential development in order to preserve water.
- Protect clean water sources as there is already pollution allowed in the James River.
- Improved water quality.
- Preservation of the water supply should be a priority.



## 2035 Comprehensive Plan SUMMARY OF CITIZEN OUTREACH EFFORTS AND PARTICIPATION

Updated as of June 30, 2014

### COMMUNICATION EFFORTS

#### County Publications/Communications:

- **eFYI citizen newsletter** – Sent to 1,204 email subscribers. Comp Plan articles were included in:
  - **April 1, 2014** – Dedicated Comp Plan issue with articles on what a comp plan is, results from the 2009 Comp Plan implementation, why it's called the 2035 Comp Plan, selection of the CPT and opening of the land use designation application period. (498 unique views)
  - **April 15, 2014** – CPT Forum info and applications (498 unique views)
  - **May 15, 2014** – Community Workshop meetings (1,028 unique views)
- **Ship's Log** – County employee newsletter.
  - March/April 2014 – Introduction to the Comp Plan, method and timeline
- **Adjacent Property Owner notifications for Land Use Designation Change Applications** (included Community Workshop information) – 366 letters mailed

#### Newspapers:

- **Press releases** sent to Virginia Gazette (circulation of 17,150 subscribers and 70,000 unique online visitors monthly), Daily Press, TIDE/WBACH radio (4,500 weekly listeners), Williamsburg-Yorktown Daily (online, 135,000 readers averaging 1 visit/week), Richmond Times Dispatch, WMBG radio, WHRO/WHRV and Pilot Online.
  - March 7, 2014 – CPT selection
  - March 13, 2014 – Citizen phone survey
  - April 1, 2014 – Intro to the 2035 Comp Plan website and update process
  - April 1, 2014 – Land Use Designation application period opens
  - April 9, 2014 – Organizations invited to participate at a CPT Forum
  - May 9, 2014 – Community Workshops
  - May 20, 2014 – Survey results released
  - June 17, 2014 – Virtual Community Workshop
- **Other articles:** Approximately 33 articles, mentions, and newsbriefs about upcoming meetings were included in the VA Gazette, Daily Press, and WY Daily.
- **Paid newspaper advertisements:**
  - April 5, 2014 – Virginia Gazette – Land Use Designation application period
  - May 24 and May 31 – Virginia Gazette – Community Workshops
- **Legal advertisements:**
- **Event calendars:**
  - All public events and PC, BOS and CPT meetings listed on the County's calendar
  - Included on WY Daily Hot Events page from May 27 to June 12, 2014
  - Included in the Virginia Gazette upcoming events calendar and WY Daily Talk of the Town calendar

#### Video Programs: (all also available on-demand online and posted on YouTube)

- **Stand-alone Shows on TV48 and YouTube:**
  - Answer the call video – began airing March 13, 2014 (173 views)
  - We Love JCC video – began airing April 1, 2014 (261 views)
  - Commercial for Community Workshops – began airing May 22, 2014 (100 views)
  - Virtual Community Workshop – began airing June 17, 2014 (34 views)

- **TV48 Scrolls:**
  - Community Workshops: May 27 Board of Supervisors meeting and June 4 Planning Commission meeting
- **CPT Forums:** Held May 8 and 24 and available on-demand. Provided opportunities for up to 14 groups to present information about their areas of interest or ideas for the future of James City County
- **Work Sessions and Public Hearings:**
  - January 9, 2014 and January 28, 2014 – PC and BOS meetings regarding the methodology and timeline
  - May 27, 2014 – PC and BOS joint work session about the Citizen's Survey

*Radio:*

- CPT members interviewed by WMBG Radio on May 15, 2014
- TIDE and BACH 0:30 radio spots over 2 weeks leading up to workshops (began airing May 26, 2014)

*Website / E-mail:*

- Launched April 1, 2014 and allowed visitor's to access information and videos about the Comp Plan, all public input, find out about upcoming events, learn more information about the Comp Plan and accomplishments from previous plans, submit their comments, read about Land Use applications, and download all meeting materials and Plan drafts. Average number of unique visitors per month was 287. Average number of total page visits was 767.
- JCC Planning and Development listserv announcements (347 subscribers):
  - March 7, 2014 – CPT selection
  - March 13, 2014 – Citizen phone survey
  - April 1, 2014 – Release of website
  - April 1, 2014 – Land Use Designation application period opens
  - April 9, 2014 – CPT Forum applications available
  - May 9, 2014 – Community Workshops
  - June 17, 2014 – Virtual Community Workshop available
- Land Use Application Update listserv announcements (9 subscribers):
  - June 27, 2014 – Land Use Application info now available online
- E-mails sent to all County staff
  - June 2, 2014 – Invitation to Community Workshops
- E-mail previewing the Land Use Designation change process and application was sent to list of 22 typical applicants for development proposals in JCC on March 27, 2014.
- Continual presence on social networking sites:
  - Facebook - 2,238 followers, Comprehensive Plan posts were viewed an average of 300 times
  - Twitter - 1,462 followers

*Distribution of Materials:*

- **Trifold Brochures (included detachable postage paid comment cards):** *(300 printed and distributed through various channels)*
  - CPT members distributed throughout Grove community, Rotary Club, Peddle the Parkway event, New Town Retired Men's Club, JCC Republicans, Literacy for Life
  - Distributed at Speaker's Bureau presentations
  - April 15, 2014 – Neighborhood Leader's Forum
  - April 19, 2014 – HR Green Litter Prevention Month event in New Town
  - April 26, 2014 – James River Fest at the Eco-Discovery Park
  - May 17, 2014 – Family Fest at Chickahominy Riverfront Park
- **Flyers:** distributed at...
  - Speaker's Bureau events starting mid-May
  - 2 CPT Forums
  - Williamsburg Farmer's Market on Saturday, May 24 and 30
  - Building A and Building F at the County Government Center
  - Abram Frink Recreation Center and James City County Recreation Center



- **Posters:**
  - Toano Farmer's Market
  - Buildings A, D and F at the County Government Center
  - Williamsburg Regional Library and James City County Library
  - New Town kiosk on Main Street
  - New Town pool house
  - Grove 7-11
  - Grove Christian Outreach Center
  - Grove community churches
  - Keystone
  - Toano Post Office
  - Toano bank building
  - St. Bede Catholic Church

*Other:*

- **Planning Commission Reports:** May 7, 2014 and June 4, 2014
- **New Town Residential Association Newsletter** – article in May and June editions, about 350 recipients each time
- **Windsor Forest Homeowner's Association email** – about 200 recipients
- **Kingsmill HOA (KCSA) email** – May and June, about 2,000 recipients each time
- **Williamsburg Area Transit Authority** – 23 buses and trolleys with signage advertising Community Workshops, including closest bus line and bus stop to each venue
- **Governor's Land letter** – about 66 sent with website information
- **Friends of Forge Road and Toano email** – about 100 recipients
- **J4C letters** – about 220 sent
- **Announcements** – New Town Retired Men's Club, Williamsburg Rotary, JCC Republican Committee, Regional Issues Committee, and the Colonial Area Republican Men's Association.
- **Speaker's Bureau**
  - J4C General Meeting – March 31, 2014 (about 27 people in attendance)
  - Jamestown High School – April 16, 2014 (3 government classes, about 71 students total)
  - Jamestown High School – April 22, 2014 (1 government class, about 20 students)
  - Kiwanis – April 30, 2014 (66 people in attendance)
  - Jamestown High School – May 15, 2014 (1 government class, about 26 students)
  - Williamsburg Area Association of Realtors – May 27, 2014 (about 23 people in attendance)
  - Greater Williamsburg Chamber and Tourism Alliance – June 2, 2014 (about 15 people in attendance)
  - Neighborhood Leader's Forum – June 17, 2014

## **CITIZEN INPUT OPPORTUNITIES**

- **2014 Virginia Tech Citizen Survey:**
  - The Virginia Tech Center for Survey Research's phone survey took a sample of 606 households and had a margin of error of 3.9%. This survey allowed comparison with some of the survey results collected prior to the 2003 and 2009 comprehensive plan updates to tell how citizen attitudes have changed on the same issues over the past ten years; however, several questions were modified, added or subtracted in this survey and were not comparable.
- **Comp Plan online comment form and questionnaire**
- **Comp Plan Hotline** phone number where citizens can record a phone comment – 259-4990
- **Mail-in cards**
- **Community Workshops**

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
|   | <b>77 total attendees</b> |
| ○ June 9, 2014 – Toano Middle School – 7 p.m.     | 28 attendees              |
| ○ June 10, 2014 – King of Glory Church – 11 a.m.  | 21 attendees              |
| ○ June 11, 2014 – Little Zion Baptist – 6:30 p.m. | 28 attendees              |
- **CPT Forums:** 14 groups including...
  - James City County Citizens' Coalition
  - Concerned Citizens

- Williamsburg Area Association of Realtors
- Child Development Resources
- Colonial Soil & Water Conservation District
- Williamsburg Land Conservancy
- Citizens for a Better James City County
- United Way of Greater Williamsburg/Housing Collaborative
- Greater Williamsburg Chamber and Tourism Alliance
- Friends of Forge Road and Toano
- Historic Triangle Republican Women
- Williamsburg Historical Tea Party Patriots
- Senior Services Coalition
- Williamsburg Climate Action Network

#### **QUICK PARTICIPATION STATISTICS TO DATE**

|  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| • <b>CPT Forums</b>                          | 14 organizations            |
| • <b>Community Workshops</b>                 | 77 attendees                |
| • <b>Virtual Community Workshops</b>         | 17 completed questionnaires |
| • <b>Jamestown High School comment cards</b> | 98 comment cards            |
| • <b>2014 Virginia Tech Citizen Survey</b>   | 606 completed phone calls   |
| • <b>Web Input Form</b>                      | 141 responses               |
| • <b>Web Rotating Question Responses</b>     | 16 responses                |
| • <b>Mail-in Comment Cards</b>               | 10 comments                 |
| • <b>Hotline</b>                             | 7 messages                  |

## **SUMMARY OF CHANGES TO 2035 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SECTION TEXTS, GOALS, STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS (GSAs)**

Stage 1 Work of the Planning Commission Working Group (PCWG)

October 28, 2014

### **Vision Statement**

Link to the 2035 Comprehensive Plan section text: <http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/080714meeting/Vision%20StatementDraft07312014-Vc.pdf>

The Vision Statement was first included in the 2003 Comprehensive Plan with the initial draft written by citizens. The Vision Statement remains substantially the same since 2003. Minor updates to the 2009 document have been made to reflect the theme of the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. The draft text will be revisited after the initial review of all sections to see if more substantive changes are warranted.

*The PCWG had no comments regarding revisions.*

### **Demographics**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/080714meeting/DemographicsDraft080114-Vd1.pdf>  
<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/080714meeting/DemographicsAppendices080114-Vd2.pdf>

The Demographics section has been revised to reflect the most current demographic data available from the 2010 Census and the 2012 American Community Survey (ACS) for James City County. More emphasis on the County's population growth and aging has been included to the text. Population projections for 2020, 2030, and 2040 from the Weldon Cooper Center and the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC) are also offered. A new topic introducing the discussion regarding the generational shift in the American population, its characteristics, and impacts to land use has been added to this section.

*The PCWG had no comments regarding revisions.*

### **Population Needs**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/080714meeting/PopulationNeedsDraft080414-Ve.pdf>

The Population Needs section underwent a major revision in 2009. The majority of the 2014 revisions have been focused on updating demographic trends. A major addition is language reflecting the Community Action Plan on Aging ([http://seniorservicescoalition.com/docs/CAPOA\\_Report.pdf](http://seniorservicescoalition.com/docs/CAPOA_Report.pdf)), which was included in the GSAs of the Population Needs section of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. Other revisions include updates as well as removal of items that have been completed or discontinued.

*The PCWG had no comments regarding revisions.*

### **Environment**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/082114meeting/Environment81414.pdf>

The Environment section has been revised primarily to reflect the implementation of and compliance with regulatory changes to Comprehensive Coastal Resource Management, the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) permit, the Virginia Stormwater Management Regulations and the Virginia Stormwater

Management Program (VSMP). Other text changes include the adoption of new Watershed Management Plans and the revisions to existing Watershed Management Plans. While much of the content and topical areas of this section are driven by mandates in various sections of the State code, staff will continue to look for opportunities to condense the text where possible.

*The PCWG requested that staff make several revisions: clarifying in ENV 3.6 what the County is accomplishing in relation to cultural and natural resources mapping, investigate adding quantifiable data (if available) and more specific measures to the text and GSAs related to climate stabilization and sea level rise, examining ways the text can be more specific about what that means for James City County (such as localized flooding, shoreline erosion and stabilization and impacts on planning public infrastructure projects), and adding information on all watersheds in the County. In addition, staff will be making several corrections and clarifications in the report.*

### **Parks and Recreation**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/082114meeting/ParksRec081114Formatted.pdf>

During the 2009 update process major revisions were made to the Parks and Recreation section based upon the recently completed Parks and Recreation Master Plan. Since then, there have been no major changes to the content of this section. The current update has focused on updating statistics based the new Virginia Outdoors Plan as well as new citizen input. The GSAs had minor revisions, such as the removal of items that have been completed and the addition of upcoming work items. Items that are included in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan as action items were also removed in order to avoid duplicated efforts. The Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee has reviewed the preliminary draft and has recommended approval.

*The PCWG had no comments regarding revisions.*

### **Public Facilities**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/090414meeting/PublicFacilities.pdf>

The Public Facilities section was revised to include current public input related to County facilities and to reflect changes in the County's facilities since the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. Revisions to the Public Facility and Service Guidelines have been made in legislative format for ease in comparing the standards to those in the 2009 plan. These include the removal of a statement that recommends new County facilities be capable of containing multiple departments as facilities that are designed to meet the functional and operational efficiency criteria set forth earlier may not be workable for use by multiple groups. Another change is the clarification that school site size recommendations may not be appropriate for neighborhood or urban schools. Adult education and career and technical education standards from the 2009 Comprehensive Plan have been removed as neither WJCC Schools nor any other County agency has adopted these. Finally, a statement regarding the continued need for library space in a digital generation has been added.

The goals, strategies and actions section has also been updated. One change is the revision of PF 1.5.5 and the addition PF 1.5.6 to address the suggestion of a public facilities master plan. In addition, an action item has been drafted that pertains to accounting for inflation in proffer payments. Last, the broadband service discussion has been moved and will be addressed in the Economic Development section.

*The PCWG requested that staff develop an action regarding the County's use of technology to improve service delivery, look into adding more specificity (assessing current facility adequacies/inadequacies on a County-wide level and district-wide level, adding a timeframe for start/completion) regarding the public facility master plan referenced in PF 1.5.5. In addition, staff will be making various corrections throughout the text.*

### **Community Character**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/090414meeting/CommunityCharacter.pdf>

The Community Character section underwent a major revision in 2009. The majority of the 2014 revision is updating public comment and statistical information and adding a section about places in the County that people feel are special. The newly adopted Community Character Corridor buffer design guidelines have been added to the text and the list of CCCs has been edited for clarity. The three areas that citizens felt were special include Grove, Croaker and the Forge Road area. A brief description about their historic, cultural, and natural contributions to the County was included. The goals, strategies and actions also had minor revisions, such as the revision or removal of items that have been completed or discontinued.

*The PCWG requested further discussion regarding the possibility of creating or using design guidelines or pattern books for residential areas in the County that have historic or distinctive features.*

### **Housing**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/091814meeting/Housing09122014FINAL.pdf>

The Housing section was updated to include current public input related to housing and to reflect changes to the County's housing characteristics since the 2009 Comprehensive Plan. Staff updated information pertaining to characteristics of the County's housing stock such as total number of dwellings, types of structures, tenure and physical conditions. These updates were made using the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau (2012 and 2013). Affordability remains a core subject to the Housing text discussion. Staff has further elaborated on the subject and incorporated language related to affordable and workforce housing found in the Housing Opportunities Policy (HOP) approved by the Board of Supervisors to the revised section. Working in partnership with the Office of Housing and Community Development (OHCD), updates were made to topics such as assistance programs, homelessness and housing successes and opportunities in the County. Changes were also made to the organization of the text. Much of the 2009 Housing text remained unchanged as its narrative is still relevant to this current update; however, staff has rearranged certain segments of the existing text in order to improve its readability and comprehensiveness.

The goals, strategies and actions section has also been updated. Certain actions were removed from this section because the intent of these actions has been met by the recent Zoning Ordinance update process (e.g., H 1.6, H 3.1, H 3.2 and H 3.11). Other actions such as H 2.2 and H 3.14 were removed as they are no longer applicable. Action H 1.5 was revised to offer a broader concept in housing diversity. Actions PN 3.4 and PN 3.8 from the revised Population Needs section were incorporated under Strategy H 4 as these actions are also relevant to the Housing Section. Other revisions to the GSAs were of minor nature.

*The PCWG requested that staff make a number of revisions: adding the terms “rent-burdened” and “universal design” to the glossary; adding more discussion on senior housing issues and the housing fund in the text; adding linkages to the Community Action Plan on Aging as appropriate; re-arranging/expanding a set of actions dealing with senior housing needs; and adding specificity to several actions (H.1.1- reference current green building incentives, H 1.5 – make more actionable, H 2.1 – explain in more detail, H 2.7 – make more actionable, H 3.5 – reword to reflect desire to re-examine the Housing Opportunities Policy, and H 3.7 – make more actionable. The PCWG also asked staff to add an action that would have staff examine ways in which infill development might be made more affordable, through hybrid funding and/or ordinance exceptions for items which might otherwise increase development costs and related homeowner association fees. In addition, staff will be making a series of clarifications and corrections throughout the report.*

### **Economic Development**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/100214meeting/EconomicDevelopment-DraftText.pdf>

The Economic Development section was one of three sections to be considered an area of focus for this Comprehensive Plan update. The Economic Development section benefitted from new citizen input gathered through the Virginia Tech Citizen Survey, as well as the Community Workshops, CPT forums and other formats, and that has been reflected in the updated language. Staff also worked closely with the Office of Economic Development (OED) and the Economic Development Authority (EDA). Specifically, the OED provided updates to key section text, including the *Major Employers*, *Business Growth*, *Principal Tax Payers*, and *Tourism* sections. The EDA appointed a two person committee to review the 2009 section text and provide comments on how to incorporate key EDA goals and strategies in the plan.

In addition to general statistical updates, many new charts and tables were included in the document to help give a more visual understanding of the County's economic picture. These new graphics include James City County employment by industry type, BPOL tax revenue, retail sales, tourism tax receipts, as well as a per capita personal income comparison chart. In most instances this new information helps the County benchmark itself against other adjacent localities as well as against those in the greater Peninsula area. The economic opportunities section was updated to reflect new regional partnerships and provide new references/name changes for existing programs. The agriculture section text was heavily updated to reflect work by the Rural Economic Development Committee (REDC). The Committee report provided new information about the state of agricultural uses in the County, as well as strategies for growing this sector of the economy in James City County. These recommendations were also referenced in the GSA section as well.

Other changes to the GSAs focused on general language updates to more closely match with the strategic plan for the Office of Economic Development for those items associated with the OED. In most instances, these changes represent language tweaks in order to mirror similar language in other parts of the Economic Development text or with OED documents. Updates were made to help promote business opportunities in the County (ED 1.7, 1.8, 2.2, and 3.7). Redevelopment continues to be an important part of the GSAs as represented by ED 5 through 5.7. Tourism was also added as an area of importance in ED 1.1 and 6.5.

*The PCWG requested that staff revise or add appropriate actions in ED 1 or ED 6.5 to reference sports tourism; expand ED 2.4 to encourage high-tech, corporate or medical research businesses; examine the language for ED 6.5 and other policies and regulations to ensure they do not unnecessarily inhibit economic development. In addition, the PCWG asked the EDA to consider creating a scorecard on initiatives from the Business Climate Task Force report.*

### **Land Use**

<http://www.jamescitycountyva.gov/jccplans/2035-Comprehensive-Plan/pdf/WorkingGroup-pdfs/100214meeting/LandUse.pdf>

Similar to Economic Development, the Land Use section was one of three sections to be considered an area of focus for this Comprehensive Plan update. The Citizen Commentary portion of the Land Use section was revised to include current public input related to land use issues. Information related to the Primary Service Area which looks at the land or parcels available for residential and nonresidential growth was revised with more up-to-date information. For the residential growth portion, the analysis used data drawn in large part from the residential subdivision build-out data/cumulative impact database (the source for the development status report updates included in the Planning Commission annual reports) and which has been brought on-line largely due to Land Use GSAs in the 2009 plan. The Rural Lands portion of the section was also substantially updated to reflect the work that has occurred in the past five years, including the completion of the Transfer of

Development Rights feasibility study, the Understanding Rural panel discussion and the Thinking Rural public input meetings, and the Strategy for Rural Economic Development recently created through the work of the Rural Economic Development Committee (also referenced in Economic Development). The four sections of the Current Development Trends portion were updated with more recent data, including the recently released data from the 2012 Census of Agriculture. Substantial revisions were also made to the Coordinated Planning and Regional Context portion, spotlighting the coordination work that has occurred over the last five years among the Historical Triangle localities, while acknowledging the importance of other neighboring localities and regional entities, but with somewhat more abbreviated text than in 2009.

The Goals, Strategies and Actions section has also been updated, though in most cases, the updates were minor in nature, such as reflecting that the cumulative impact database is on-going, acknowledging current studies (Mooretown Road Corridor Study) or the results of recent studies (the Strategy for Rural Economic Development). Certain strategies or actions have been struck where work on those items was accomplished over the past five years. In the instance of LU 5.3, given limited resources since the last Comprehensive Plan, staff recommends focusing resources on cumulative impact modeling and any public facility planning efforts.

*The PCWG requested staff resend information related to interaction between the Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights programs, send a link to the Crossroads Study for supplemental reading, examine the linkage between LU 4.5 and the ED GSAs, and solicit additional feedback from other divisions on pertinent GSAs as staff deemed helpful. The PCWG also requested a future discussion on the Primary Service Area, including background information and any available cost-comparison data on the provision of water service. Staff will be making a few minor grammatical and numbering corrections.*