

AT A JOINT WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION, OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, HELD ON THE 28TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2014, AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

Board of Supervisors

Mary K. Jones, Chairman, Berkeley District
Michael J. Hipple, Vice Chairman, Powhatan District
James G. Kennedy, Stonehouse District - ABSENT
Kevin D. Onizuk, Jamestown District
John J. McGlennon, Roberts District

Leo P. Rogers, County Attorney
Bryan J. Hill, County Administrator

Planning Commission

Richard Krapf, Chairman, Powhatan District
Robin Bledsoe, Vice Chairman, Jamestown District
Tim O'Connor, At-Large
Christopher "Chris" Basic, Berkeley District
George Drummond, Roberts District
John Wright, III, At-Large
Heath Richardson, Stonehouse District

Allen Murphy, Director of Development Management
Paul Holt, Director of Planning, Secretary to the Commission

Mr. Hill noted that Mr. Kennedy was on vacation and would not be present.

Mr. Paul Holt called to order the Planning Commission and called the Roll. All members of the Planning Commission were in attendance.

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*

Ms. Jones turned the meeting over to Mr. Krapf for the purpose of updating the Board on the 2009 Comprehensive Plan Review.

ADOPTED

NOV 25 2014

Board of Supervisors
James City County, VA

Mr. Krapf introduced Ms. Elizabeth Friel, the Chair of the Community Participation Team (CPT) and CPT liaison to the Planning Commission for this project.

Ms. Friel stated that the CPT held 16 meetings in 13 weeks and had a very interactive process with the community. She gave a summary of the CPT report included in the Agenda Packet.

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner, gave a brief overview of the efforts of the Planning Commission Working Group (PCWG). She stated that the first section that the PCWG wanted to highlight was Housing. She stated that 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.

Mr. O'Connor stated that the PCWG requested that the housing section be updated to include additional terms in the glossary, adding discussion on senior housing issues and the housing fund, adding linkages to the Community Action Plan on Aging as appropriate and adding action that would have staff examine ways that infill development might be made more affordable through hybrid funding and/or ordinance exceptions. He stated that having more affordable housing was a common theme heard throughout this process. He stated that those that work locally want to live locally, but most are not in the same bracket as the available housing. He stated that senior housing was a focus as well. By 2020, a majority of the citizenry will be age 65 or older. The group heard many comments on the availability of affordable services, long-term care, and transportation. He stated that the HOP was another area that was focused on. As it reads currently, it does not quite dovetail into some of the infill development that is currently happening in the community. He stated that PCWG members are not convinced that paying high Homeowners Association (HOA) fees every month makes the housing affordable.

Ms. Jones stated that the County needs more diverse housing available to maintain and promote a diverse community and believes that is something that is wanted by all. She stated that it is a challenge with infill development. She stated that she has always had a concern regarding the HOP, that it is not always applicable to high-price developments.

Mr. Hipple stated that affordable housing is difficult to do in the County. He stated that with the cost to build, the cost of the land, and the cost of the regulations, it is very difficult to build a home that would be considered "affordable." He questioned if looking at condos, townhomes, and apartments might be a better alternative than single-family homes. He stated that perhaps stepping our citizens up in stages to the point of being able to own their own home would be better.

Ms. Jones stated that even back in 2007 when she served on the Steering Committee, it was identified that more diverse housing options were needed in the community, including more rental options. She noted that there are incredibly good educational institutions around the County and we need those rental options to keep those graduates living and working here.

Mr. McGlennon stated that it bears mentioning that the HOP includes a "cash in lieu of" opportunity, so established neighborhoods that are looking at infill development could exercise that option instead of providing the affordable housing. He stated that the real problem is that there are a large number of people

employed in low-wage, service type jobs who are not going to be served by the single-family home model. He questioned if it would even be serviced by the private market apartments which are currently seeing their rents increasing faster than home prices. He questioned how we help people who currently cannot afford housing. He stated that the proffer that was done by the Stonehouse community for a housing fund, which could be used for housing vouchers, might be the way to go. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan should highlight the need to look for more creative ways to address the housing concerns in the community.

Ms. Rosario stated that the second section that the PCWG wanted to highlight was Public Facilities. She stated that 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 Williamsburg-James City County (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 of PF 1.5.6 to address the suggestion of a Public Facilities Master Plan.

Mr. Richardson stated that the PCWG requested that staff develop an action regarding the County's use of technology to improve service delivery, recognized a need for library space, and specificity in the wording regarding the public facility master plan. He stated that the general feedback on County facilities was very high. With regards to the schools, feedback was positive but many noted the issue of overcrowding. He stated that 30 percent of the survey respondents indicated that they would support paying higher taxes to fund a field house or aquatic center. Comments were received that were supportive of a County facility that could house sporting events. He stated that the development of a public facilities master plan was also high on the list of comments received.

Ms. Rosario stated that the third section that the PCWG wanted to highlight was Land Use. 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 (PSA) which looks at the land or parcels available for residential and nonresidential growth was revised with more up-to-date information. 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. 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. The Goals, Strategies, and Actions (GSAs) section has also been updated, though in most cases, the updates were minor in nature. 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.

Mr. Krapf stated that considerable citizen input focused on growth management. He stated that there was also interest in the Rural Lands program, specifically the Rural Economic Development Committee and its role in growing and supporting agricultural and forestry based businesses that can support our community. The PCWG requested future discussion on the PSA, including background information and any available cost-comparison data on the provision of water service, as well as the role of the utility service in controlling growth.

Mr. McGlennon stated that in 2009 the rate of growth of in the County was much lower than it is now. He stated that this section of the Comprehensive Plan will be very important as the process continues.

Mr. Hipple questioned if there were a lot of comments regarding slowing down the growth.

Mr. Krapf stated that the comments were regarding managing and sustaining growth.

Mr. Hipple questioned if managing the growth and development would be included in the Comprehensive Plan, meaning more direction as to where the growth and development should occur as we move forward. He stated that he would like to see a plan as to where the commercial and residential growth will be located in the County.

Ms. Rosario stated that the fourth section that the PCWG wanted to highlight was Economic Development. 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). 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. 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 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. Other changes to the GSAs focused on general language updates to more closely match with the strategic plan for the OED for those items associated with the OED. Updates were made to help promote business opportunities in the County, and redevelopment continues to be an important part of the GSAs. Tourism was also added as an area of importance.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the County has seen growth in new businesses as well as expansion of current businesses as evidenced by increases in Business, Professional, and Occupational License (BPOL) tax revenue. The Virginia Employment Commission reported that in 2012, James City County had 26,985 jobs. Of those jobs, 12,517 were in healthcare and social assistance, retail, hospitality, and education, which many of those categories are the lower wage type of jobs. Citizen comments included the desire to see new businesses and industries in the County offer higher wages, businesses to support green building techniques and have a minimal impact on natural resources, provide research and technology opportunities, and to provide opportunities for our skilled young workers. Citizens also noted that the County should promote redevelopment and repurposing of sites when new businesses are coming in to the County. There was considerable concern, by the citizens, that too many buildings are being left empty while new construction continues throughout the County. She stated that many citizens supported growth in sports tourism, agrotourism, and eco-tourism. The PCWG requested that staff examine the language, policies, and regulations included in the GSAs to ensure that they do not unnecessarily inhibit economic growth and development.

Mr. Onizuk stated that he has heard from citizens about the vacant buildings and retail space as well. During his conversations with Mr. Russell Seymour, the Director of Economic Development, he learned that the opposite is actually the case, there are not many spaces available for businesses to go. The County is starting to become challenged on available land, and many businesses want something more turn-key, and the County really does not have that to offer. He stated that the County's retail vacancies are actually very low, with the exception of one particular shopping center.

Mr. Hipple concurred with Mr. Onizuk's comments. He stated that discussion with the EDA has focused on the possibility of having ground-ready areas for businesses, meaning that the groundwork is done, all the business would need to do is build whatever building they need. However, the County is getting limited on its land resources, hence the need for more long-range planning for areas of the County.

Ms. Jones stated that there was considerable citizen comment about the need for more vocational educational opportunities which ties in to Economic Development. She stated that the manufacturing industry in the community is having a hard time finding skilled workers and many of our students are not even aware of these opportunities. She stated that the County would be well served to position itself with a qualified workforce for the manufacturing industry.

Mr. McGlennon stated that one of the main reasons that businesses locate here in our community is because of the quality of life. He stated that the manufacturing industry is very different than it was 20 years ago; it is much more technical and relies heavily on robotics. He stated that one of the reasons the community has such a vibrant manufacturing industry is that the decision was made years ago to locate those manufacturing sites out of the public eye. It has been a real success and there are still opportunities for development in those areas for similar types of enterprises.

Ms. Jones stated that in the previous Comprehensive Plan there was a significant focus on maintaining the character of the community. She stated that these mixed-use urban developments do not really distinguish James City County from any other localities around the Country. She stated that we need to be mindful of maintaining the unique character of our community.

Mr. McGlennon concurred, but stated that objective standards of what makes our community unique need to be developed.

Mr. Krapf clarified that this is just the first stage of the Comprehensive Plan review. The second stage will include land use applications which should be wrapped up by the January 2015 work session with the Board. He stated that the final stage involves the final revisions of the text, updating the land use map, and working the document through the approval process. He stated that the PCWG is very appreciative of the responsiveness of staff, and thanked the Board for the opportunity to provide an update.

At 5:02 p.m., Mr. Krapf adjourned the Planning Commission until the November 5, 2014, Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. McGlennon stated that he would like to propose a process for hiring a new County Attorney. Firstly, he would like to propose that Mr. Adam R. Kinsman, Assistant County Administrator, be appointed as the Interim County Attorney. He stated that a resolution to that affect would be forthcoming. Secondly, that the Board formally requests that Mr. Hill advertise the position and a plan for the search drafted and presented to the Board for approval. Thirdly, that the Board delegate the authority to conduct the search, including interviewing candidates, to the County Administrator who will then make a recommendation to the Board. Finally, while the search is going on, the Board can engage in a discussion regarding the delegation of authority to manage the County Attorney to the County Administrator.

Ms. Jones, Mr. Onizuk, and Mr. Hipple affirmed their agreement to the proposal by Mr. McGlennon.

Mr. Hipple and Mr. McGlennon agreed that having the discussion regarding the supervision of the County Attorney should happen sooner rather than later so that candidates would know what to expect.

Ms. Jones expressed her appreciation for the efforts of Mr. Kinsman and thanked him for being willing to take on this additional role in the interim and stated that he has the Board's full support.

Mr. Onizuk stated that he has had concerns, as well as others, regarding the meeting structure and efficiency of the Board meetings. He stated that there are business items that need to be addressed, and there are legal personnel and business personnel who are being paid for their time and are waiting while other business of the County is being conducted. He also noted that it is also costly to keep staff here late at night. He asked Mr. Hill to look into a different meeting structure to address some of these issues. He would like to see this item be on the next agenda for discussion. He stated that that the proposal from Mr. Hill would include starting the meeting at 6 p.m. and from 6-7 p.m. would be the roll call, pledge of allegiance, moment of silence, and public comment and interaction session. At 7 p.m., the business portion of the Board meeting would be conducted including presentations, public hearings, board considerations, board requests and directives, reports of the County Administrator, and closed session if necessary. With Mr. Kennedy not here, he would like his input and would ask that this be part of the next meeting's agenda.

Mr. Hill stated that he could put the agenda proposal together. He asked what time the Board would like to start the meeting. It could be 5 or 6 p.m.

Ms. Jones stated that she would like to hear feedback from the community on the start time. Either time would work with her, but she is concerned about the availability of the public for participation.

Mr. Onizuk concurred.

Mr. McGlennon stated that he questions moving the start time back to early in the afternoon and questioned how this would affect the work session start times.

Mr. Rogers recommended that the Board put whatever change into effect at its Organizational Meeting in January when the Board adopts its calendar.

Mr. Hipple asked to see how other surrounding jurisdictions order their meetings and start times as well.

The Board directed Mr. Hill to take their comments into consideration and put together a proposal that can be discussed at the next meeting.

D. RECESS – until the Regular Meeting at 7 p.m.

Mr. Onizuk made a motion to recess.

The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

At 5:23 p.m., Ms. Jones recessed the Board.



Bryan J. Hill
Clerk to the Board