

A G E N D A
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
March 3, 2016
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. MINUTES

1. February 11, 2016 Minutes
2. January 28, 2016 Minutes

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. FY2017-FY2021 Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

E. NEW BUSINESS

F. ADJOURNMENT

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 2/11/2016
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Planning Division
SUBJECT: February 11, 2016 minutes.

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
▣	February 11, 2016 Minutes	Minutes

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Policy Secretary	Secretary, Policy	Approved	2/26/2016 - 6:14 PM

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
February 11, 2016
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. John Wright called the meeting to order on Thursday, February 11th, 2016 at 4:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners:

Mr. John Wright
Ms. Robin Bledsoe
Mr. Rich Krapf
Mr. Tim O'Connor

Absent:

Mr. Heath Richardson

Staff:

Mr. Paul Holt, Planning Director
Ms. Tammy Rosario, Principal Planner
Mr. José Ribeiro, Senior Planner II
Ms. Leanne Pollock, Senior Planner II
Ms. Ellen Cook, Senior Planner II
Ms. Savannah Pietrowski, Planner
Mr. John Carnifax, Director of Parks and Recreation
Ms. Nancy Ellis, Parks Administrator
Ms. Tara Woodruff, Director Budget and Accounting
Mr. John Horne, Director of General Services
Ms. Fran Geissler, Director Stormwater Division
Mr. Marcellus Snipes, Senior Director for Operations
Mr. Alan Robertson, Facilities Management Coordinator
Ms. Nancy Ellis, Parks Administrator
Mr. Alex Baruch, Development Management Assistant

C. MINUTES

1. January 14, 2016 Minutes

A motion to Approve was made by Robin Bledsoe, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 4 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 1

Ayes: Bledsoe, Krapf, O'Connor, Wright III

Absent: Richardson

Ms. Robin Bledsoe moved to approve the January 14, 2016 minutes.

The minutes were approved 4-0-1, Mr. Heath Richardson being absent.

D. OLD BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. FY2017-FY2021 Capital Improvements Program (CIP) Review

Mr. Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner II, gave a presentation on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) stating that the Planning Division received five non-school and 10 school applications for CIP funding. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the application materials were submitted to the Policy Committee members to review and rank based on the Comprehensive Plan. The final rankings will then be forward to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for final consideration.

The Policy Committee began their discussion with the Parks and Recreation applications.

Mr. John Wright asked why the application concerning the Jamestown Beach shows a time horizon of FY21 to begin renovations for the restroom facilities and support services when it seems that the beach is being used for more events each year.

Mr. John Carnifax stated that the projected revenue in the budget will not be there until FY21.

Mr. Carnifax gave an overview of improvements to the Jamestown Beach that have been completed recently including changes to restrooms, walkways, parking areas and special event facilities.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe asked if Parks and Recreation has had to turn possible events away due to the limited facilities at Jamestown Beach.

Ms. Nancy Ellis stated that they have not had to turn any special event away at this point.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that she is very happy that citizens have Jamestown Beach as a resource.

Mr. Carnifax stated that he thinks some special events have not approached them because they do not have the infrastructure to do the larger scale events; however, those are the changes that will be made once the revenue has been saved up.

Mr. Rich Krapf stated that when he was deciding which project to give the higher priority he ranked the Marina higher because of some of the potential stormwater issues. Mr. Krapf asked if staff could elaborate on why they ranked the Jamestown Beach application higher than the Marina.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the Economic Development Authority (EDA) is looking into some potential Public Private Partnerships to operate the Marina and ancillary facilities.

Mr. Carnifax stated that they are not sure how much that business would be willing to fix up as a part of that agreement and if it would be the Marina, the buildings or both. Mr. Carnifax stated that we know that the beach is going to be staying with the County so by focusing on that, there can be tremendous use.

Mr. Tim O'Connor asked what the difference in traffic is between the beach and the Marina.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the beach gets thousands of people over the summer and the Marina has 68 slips plus a boat ramp from which citizens launch their boats. Overall, the Marina has a significantly lower amount of traffic.

Mr. Wright asked what the potential exposure would be from the Federal or State level if the Marina does not come into compliance with stormwater regulations.

Ms. Fran Geissler stated that the Marina is owned by the County and is covered under the municipal stormwater permit; however, because of the way the census determines an urbanized area, the Marina is not in the regulated portion of the County. Ms. Geissler stated that most likely it would not be a real issue in the short term but could be after FY19.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if that area gets developed quickly could that change the FY19 projection.

Ms. Geissler stated the area would have to grow much faster than the projected rate and as an example stated that Busch Gardens is not in a regulated area because no one lives there.

Mr. Wright stated the he weighted the Marina higher than the Jamestown Beach because of the stormwater issues and asked Mr. Carnifax which of the two projects he rated as more important.

Mr. Carnifax stated that he would rank the Jamestown Beach project as an immediate higher priority than the Marina.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that if the Marina is not addressed sooner, won't the expense be astronomical to the point where there won't be any interest to rent/purchase and fix it up.

Mr. Carnifax stated that was correct, depending on the severity of potential storms and other factors, the Marina could be impacted.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if the EDA has looked at the CIP application numbers.

Mr. Carnifax stated that he did not know; however, similar numbers were in the Shaping Our Shores Master Plan which they did review.

Mr. O'Connor asked if Parks and Recreation has started to fix up the moorings on the bulk heads and asked if the County knows how much it will take to replace it.

Mr. Carnifax stated that the County has cost estimates on how much it would cost per linear foot; however, no moorings have been replaced.

Mr. Wright continued the discussion to the third application from Parks and Recreation concerning the installation of a splash pad.

Mr. Carnifax stated that at Chickahominy Campgrounds there used to be two swimming pools. One had been leaking over the past few years so the decision was made to close the pool and fill it. Mr. Carnifax stated that the next best use of that area would be a spray ground/splash pad to be installed in that area.

Ms. Ellis stated that the ongoing cost of maintaining a splash pad is significantly less than maintaining a pool. It is also a revenue stream because there isn't a public splash pad available in Williamsburg, which makes it a unique feature.

Mr. Wright stated that there was no more discussion on the three Parks and Recreation applications so they would move on to the next application.

Ms. Ellen Cook gave a presentation discussing the revenue sharing application for the intersection of Olde Towne Rd. and Longhill Rd. that the Planning Division put forward for consideration.

Mr. Paul Holt stated that the Rev Share is a 50/50 match so every dollar the County brings to the table, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) will match.

Mr. Wright asked if the dollar amounts shown for FY17-21 are the matching amounts.

Mr. Holt stated that they were.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the funds being discussed for revenue sharing were approved last year for this type of project.

Mr. Holt stated that was correct and last year there were no funds for FY16, the funds start in FY17 and work their way forward which is consistent with a five-year plan.

Mr. Wright stated that once it is approved and we start building there is a commitment to continue funding the project.

Mr. Holt stated that was correct and that there are more projects in the queue that should be addressed.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the Rev Share should help with that because it shows a commitment from the County.

Mr. Wright asked how much we have in the funds currently.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that there isn't any funding at this point; this application would start the implementation of Mr. Bryan Hill's vision for funding.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there will be five years of construction that go along with this application or is this just the funding mechanism.

Mr. Holt stated that it was the funding mechanism.

Ms. Rosario stated that the intersection project would not take five years of construction; this is just reflecting five years of applications.

Mr. Holt stated that the project itself takes five to six years including engineering, relocating utilities, all of the work in the right-of-way, and then the construction could take two years.

Mr. Krapf asked if a more important project comes along and bumps this out of the way could we have a half-completed project on our hands.

Mr. Holt stated that in order to receive the Rev Share from VDOT you have to be able to complete the project in full.

Mr. Wright thanked staff for the information and moved onto the Stormwater application.

Mr. Krapf asked if staff had heard anything about a grant application that was submitted in December.

Ms. Geissler stated that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is still working through the applications and their timeline states that a decision will be made by February or March.

Mr. Krapf stated that he put a mark next to that application because similar to the Rev Share matching funds there are potential grant funds available for this application.

Mr. John Horne stated that the Stormwater Division has been successful for two years in receiving these funds; however, the number of applications have grown over the past two years so it is much more competitive.

Mr. Wright asked if the stormwater projects that are being taken on are outside of Home Owner Associations (HOA) and neighborhoods that have a funding mechanism.

Ms. Geissler stated that they are projects outside the purview of an HOA; they are stream restoration projects which give the County reduced pollution in our waterways. Ms. Geissler stated that the Grove, Toano and Forrest Glen projects are longstanding, not-organized drainage systems which frequently create localized flooding issues.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired regarding the quality of life in the Grove area and how great the impact of not having an organized drainage system is to the Grove resident.

Ms. Geissler stated that it is pretty pervasive, particularly in the Whiting and Jackson intersection. Ms. Geissler stated that there are photos included in the application that show how grave the situation is in that area because the water just sits; it does not have anywhere to go.

Mr. Horne stated that even if you can get the water moving along the roadway ditches the whole neighborhood suffers from not having a neighborhood outfall where the water can go to be stored. Mr. Horne stated that a part of this project will be to look at how the drainage of the neighborhood can be organized differently to make it better.

Ms. Bledsoe asked how realistic it is to think that with this funding we will be able to see

some significant changes in the Grove area.

Ms. Geissler stated that they just received the final version of a proposal to work on this project and are ready to submit a purchase order to start the data collection aspect.

Mr. Wright asked if there is an EPA criteria associated with these expenditures.

Ms. Geissler stated that there are; however, these projects address local issues regardless of what the state wants us to do. For example, in the Skiffes Creek area there has to be an action plan for Skiffes Creek to reduce bacteria much like we had to do for the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. O'Connor stated that he had it marked down as a special consideration.

Mr. Horne stated that one thing he believes will be important moving forward is that funding is coming from the Board of Supervisor's allocated funds from increased revenue to handle these types of projects.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that these projects are not going to get less expensive, they are only going to get more expensive.

Mr. Wright stated that there was no additional discussion on the stormwater plans and the Schools' applications were up next.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that he wanted to thank the schools and Policy Committee for working together to align the CIP timelines so they could occur concurrently.

Mr. Krapf asked about the Lafayette High School Accessibility Path and the rationale for ranking it ten out of ten applications.

Mr. Alan Robertson stated that if the path is built then it would need to be built to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements, we are not obligated to have the path in order to meet ADA compliance.

Mr. Wright stated that it appears that the majority of the applications have to do with entrance re-designs for schools. Mr. Wright stated that he is not sure where the rankings come from because they all look to be similar projects just at different locations.

Mr. Marcellus Snipes stated that the rankings are being done to meet the requirements of the CIP application and were done by the Superintendent.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the rankings are important to the Policy Committee because it helps us know what you would like to prioritize based off limited dollars.

Mr. Robertson stated that all of the new school entrances are designed so when you come in the front door a visitor is forced to go through the main office to sign in, whereas in the older schools a visitor would be buzzed in and could go anywhere in the school. The reason the costs are different is because the construction in the different schools would have to be different to meet the architectural elements of the entryway.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that this is a safety issue and wonders if the assumption can be

made that Jamestown High School's security is more of an issue than some of the other schools on the list based off the ranking.

Mr. Robertson stated that the projects become more economical if you combine them and do construction when there is other work being done to the school. Therefore, timing also contributes to where the applications are ranked.

Mr. O'Connor stated that because it is a safety concern he ranked them all equally; however, he is concerned with the ease of egress out of the building once more walls are erected.

Mr. Robertson stated that Hornsby Middle School has the ability to pop a door open as long as someone is monitoring people coming in and out for an athletic event or concert.

Mr. Wright asked if emergency personnel would have easy access to get in and out when the new entrances are built.

Mr. Snipes and Mr. Robertson stated that they have a lock box with a key that will still open the doors for access.

Mr. Wright asked about the bus canopy and if the Policy Committee could receive an overview on its use.

Mr. Snipes stated that the Stonehouse bus canopy has been in the CIP for a number of years, as originally requested by the principal. Mr. Snipes stated that the canopy would be over the walkway into the school from the bus circle to shield the students from the elements.

Mr. Robertson stated that typically the new schools have canopies when they are built; however, the older schools do not.

Mr. Wright asked why the schools could not build the canopies out of current operating funds.

Mr. Robertson stated that they are typically more expensive than what one would put in operating funds. It is also a site change that would need to go through the Planning Division for site plan approval.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if Mr. Snipes could elaborate on the auxiliary gymnasium.

Mr. Snipes stated that the auxiliary gym was placed back into the CIP based on citizen input from parents and other community members.

Mr. Robertson discussed some of the previous plans for auxiliary gymnasiums in the community and the history behind additional auxiliary gym requests in the past.

Mr. Snipes stated that the gyms are used all the time for various events, not just for sports.

Mr. Wright asked what was driving the need for the auxiliary gym.

Mr. Snipes stated that it was based on the school and what type of events are taking place at the school in the gyms.

Mr. O'Connor stated that at Warhill High School some of the sports will practice in the Commons.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are too many activities to fit inside the space available at the school.

Mr. Wright asked if they were all school sponsored activities.

Mr. Robertson stated that they were. Mr. Robertson also stated that the auxiliary gyms are just large gymnasiums with the space for bleachers cut off the sides, perfect for practicing sports or other activities.

Mr. Krapf stated that Mr. Snipes mentioned that principals were typically the driving force behind many of these projects. This could lead to a problem if a principal leaves to go to another school district and the next principal is not on board with the project. He asked what happens in that situation.

Mr. Robertson stated that the CIP process starts in two places, either the maintenance operations staff sees an issue or the principal at the school and their staff suggest improvements and it boils up. Mr. Robertson stated that any project under \$50,000 are typically funded through the operating budget and anything over would go through this process.

Mr. Wright stated that school aged students are only increasing here, not decreasing.

Mr. Robertson stated that the outside demand for space is unbelievable, seven days a week at almost every school.

Ms. Bledsoe asked why they feel that James City County is unique in its high community demand for our school gymnasium space.

Mr. Snipes stated that Parks and Recreation departments in other localities typically have dedicated facilities that can handle the community events, but we are very efficient in combining those resources.

Mr. Robertson stated that the kids now are not in just one activity but multiple activities, which increases the demand throughout the community.

Mr. Wright asked if the instructional use of the gym is only for sports or if it is multi-purpose.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are multiple classes going on in the gym at one time during the day and after-school meetings take place in the gym along with other non-sport activities/events.

Mr. O'Connor asked what the alternative is to building the accessibility path.

Mr. Snipes stated that students could take the sidewalk and walk around; however, it does take longer.

Mr. Wright asked what feature is there currently to prevent students from crossing the area directly.

Mr. Robertson stated that there is currently a ravine that is very steep where students can cut through to get to Warhill Sports Complex; however, it is not sanctioned by the school because it is not safe. Mr. Robertson stated that the edge of the track area at Lafayette would be where the path would start, but the grade from one side to the other if you go straight across would not meet ADA's standards because the slope would be too steep.

Mr. O'Connor asked if there is access and benefit to Seasons Trace and other nearby communities for them to use the path.

Mr. Robertson stated that it would be a benefit to them.

Mr. O'Connor asked about some of the safety concerns regarding the bridge such as if it would be open all the time and if it would be lit.

Mr. Robertson stated that the rest of the track in that area is not lit at the moment but the safety concerns are apparent.

Mr. Wright asked if there was a way to meet the ADA compliance in a different way to build the path in a less expensive route.

Mr. Robertson stated that there are alternatives to a walkway that have been discussed internally; however, if a walkway is going to be put in it would have to be in that location and comply with ADA regulations.

Mr. Wright asked if there is a way to continue to give the option for students to take the bus, use the sidewalk to get to Warhill Sports Complex or to use a non-ADA compliant path.

Mr. Robertson stated it would be discrimination if we tell one student that they would have to go a longer route than another student who is not handicapped.

Mr. Snipes stated that all students have to have equal access to what the other students are able to use.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that the schools have come up with this route as the safest way to get students where they need to be that is ADA compliant.

Mr. Snipes stated that was correct.

Ms. Bledsoe asked if they should be called auxiliary gyms or if they should really be called multi-purpose rooms.

Mr. Snipes said that the terminology is interchangeable.

Mr. Wright asked if the School Board has looked at these applications.

Mr. Snipes stated that they approved the applications on December 15th.

Mr. Robertson stated his appreciation to the Planning Division for all the help they provide through the process.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that the follow up meeting will occur on March 3rd at 4:00 p.m.

F. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to Adjourn was made by Robin Bledsoe, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 4 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 1

Ayes: Bledsoe, Krapf, O'Connor, Wright III

Absent: Richardson

Ms. Bledsoe made a motion to adjourn. It was approved 4-0-1.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:21 p.m.

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 1/28/2016
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Planning Division
SUBJECT: January 28, 2016 Minutes

Amended Policy Committee minutes reflecting the meeting being continued due to not having a quorum.

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Type
▣	January 28th, 2016 Minutes	Minutes

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Policy Secretary	Secretary, Policy	Approved	2/26/2016 - 6:31 PM

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY POLICY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
Building A Large Conference Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
January 14, 2016
4:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Robin Bledsoe called the meeting to order on Thursday, January 14th, 2016.

Mr. Rich Krapf made a motion to continue the meeting on Thursday, January 21, 2016 at 4:00 p.m. as there was not a quorum.

The motion carried 2-0, Mr. Tim O'Connor, Mr. Heath Richardson and Mr. John Wright being absent.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe called the meeting to order on Thursday, January 21st, 2016.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that there was not a quorum and made a motion to continue the meeting on Thursday, January 28th, 2016 at 4:30 p.m.

The motion carried 1-0, Mr. Tim O'Connor, Mr. Heath Richardson, Mr. Rich Krapf and Mr. John Wright being absent.

Mr. John Wright called the meeting to order on Thursday, January 28th, 2016 at 4:33 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners:

Mr. John Wright
Ms. Robin Bledsoe
Mr. Rich Krapf
Mr. Tim O'Connor
Mr. Heath Richardson

Staff:

Mr. Paul Holt
Ms. Tammy Rosario
Mr. José Ribeiro
Ms. Leanne Pollock
Ms. Ellen Cook
Mr. Maxwell Hlavin
Mr. Alex Baruch

C. MINUTES

1. November 12, 2015 Minutes

Ms. Robin Bledsoe moved to approve the November 12, 2015 minutes.

D. OLD BUSINESS

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. FY17-FY21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Kickoff

Mr. Paul Holt stated that staff would recommend postponement of this topic as Mr. Bryan Hill, County Administrator, could not attend the meeting.

Mr. John Wright asked if any of the Policy Committee members had an issue with waiting to discuss the CIP.

None of the committee members stated an objection.

2. Ordinance Amendment to amend and reordain Chapter 19, Subdivisions, Section 19-12, Vacation of recorded plat

Mr. José Ribeiro presented a proposed amendment to Section 19-12, Vacation of recorded plat, of the Subdivision Ordinance. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the proposed amendment introduces references to the Code of Virginia which are useful for the vacation of a right-of-way on a plat which has been designated but not utilized. Mr. Ribeiro stated that with the amendments, the section of the ordinance would be more comprehensive and in alignment with staff practices.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that staff recommends that the Policy Committee recommends approval of the proposed subdivision ordinance amendment to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe asked if this would automatically vacate paper streets or is it as needed.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that there is a process that would need to take place for a property owner to request vacation of the right-of-way.

Mr. Maxwell Hlavin stated that the process would start with a resident interested in purchasing a road platted next to their property that they know will not be built. At that point the resident would start the subdivision process and begin discussions with the County Attorney's office about the cost of the land. Mr. Hlavin stated that currently the ordinance states that the land would be split down the middle to the two adjacent property owners; however, the proposed ordinance amendment would spell out the process for one adjacent property owner to purchase the entire area.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that this process has already been in place over the past few years through State Code and staff would like to make it formally a part of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. Event Facilities in Rural Lands

Ms. Leanne Pollock and Ms. Ellen Cook gave a presentation on a proposed Zoning Ordinance amendment to add the "places of public assembly" use to the A-1, General Agriculture, zoning district. Ms. Pollock stated that this workload item was proposed as a part of the Planning Division's 2015-2016 work program at the October 2015 Policy Committee meeting. Event facilities currently fall under the use category "places of

public assembly" in the list of permitted and specially permitted uses (SUP) in the Zoning Ordinance. In the A-1 district various uses in this category are still listed separately, with "houses of worship" as a permitted use and the "lodges, civic clubs, fraternal organizations or service clubs" as an SUP. Ms. Pollock stated that staff has identified two possible routes for the Policy Committee to consider for addressing event facilities. The first option would be listing the use as a SUP whereby each application could be reviewed on a case by case basis and an individual judgment could be made on the scale of the proposal. The second option would be listing the use as a permitted use but include performance standards in the special regulations section of the district designed to specifically address the event facility component of the "places of public assembly" use. Ms. Pollock stated that staff is looking for direction from the Policy Committee on what would be consistent with rural areas in James City County.

Mr. Rich Krapf asked if there was a way to ensure that if a use becomes too intense for the permitted use on a property that it then becomes a SUP.

Ms. Pollock stated that a trigger could be added into the performance standards such as trip generation or amount of guests which would bump a permitted use to a SUP.

Mr. Paul Holt stated that we have a similar trigger with commercial SUPs where if you exceed a certain amount of traffic generation or size you are automatically kicked into the SUP process.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that she agrees with Mr. Krapf in having performance standards that starts with a permitted use and would tier to a SUP if performance standards are exceeded.

Mr. Heath Richardson inquired why Albemarle and Loudoun counties chose to use the SUP approach.

Ms. Pollock stated that both of those counties use the tiered approach where it starts as permitted at a lower scale and moves to specially permitted once performance standards are exceeded.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that in her opinion the easiest thing to do would be to have "places of public assembly" be a permitted use with performance standards that could build to a SUP if the business exceeds the permitted use standards.

Mr. Tim O'Connor stated that by allowing "places of public assembly" as a permitted use if a property owner exceeds the performance standards just once, they are going to need to get a SUP. Mr. O'Connor stated that this could cause an enforcement issue between the County and property owners that are utilizing the "places of public assembly" use on their property. Mr. O'Connor stated that he would be in favor of the SUP process.

Mr. Holt stated that as long as the Policy Committee is comfortable with the parameters set up for the permitted use it would allow the business to get off the ground without having to go through the SUP process.

Mr. O'Connor asked if a business group comes in for a one-time event that would exceed that threshold that we set up for the permitted use could we allow that one-time event or would they have to get a SUP.

Mr. Holt stated that they would not be allowed to hold that event without a SUP and it would be at that point that they would have a decision to make as to whether they want to go through the SUP process.

Mr. Krapf stated that an applicant could start with the SUP process if they know they are going to exceed the performance standards from the outset.

Mr. Holt stated that the performance standards have to be enforceable which is why the conditions would have to distinguish between do you meet the standards, or do you exceed the standards, and cannot be managed by exceptions.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that there should be something in the performance standards which would trigger a business to jump from one level to the next and the issue at that point is enforcement to ensure if a business does grow that they move to the higher performance standards.

Mr. Wright stated that he would like to have Ms. Jessica Aiken speak at this point.

Ms. Aiken gave a presentation on her experience over the past year trying to start a wedding/community event business in a rural area of James City County only to find out that it is not a permitted use. Ms. Aiken stated that she is a wedding planner in the area and grew up in James City County. Ms. Aiken stated that she had investors lined up and a property chosen but could not go through with the purchase as the use is not permitted in rural lands. Ms. Aiken stated that there is a need for wedding and conference venues in this area; in Williamsburg there are only two venues that can hold over 300 people. Ms. Aiken stated that if the correct restrictions are put in place then the tiered system can work but cautioned that in her opinion a wedding venue would be more of a specially permitted use.

Mr. O'Connor thanked Ms. Aiken for her comments and stated that if we allow a 200 person cap at the first tier of the permitted use process and a wedding comes along that says they want to have 250, people the business owner is going to think that there is a 10-20% drop off rate so it's possible that the number will be close to 200 on the wedding day.

Mr. Krapf thanked Ms. Aiken for her presentation and stated that he would be in favor of the tiered performance standard system with a SUP for more expanded uses. Mr. Krapf also stated that the tiered system would allow more businesses to hold wedding events of a smaller size to start and as they see demand adjust to the higher tier or apply for a SUP.

Ms. Blesoe thanked Ms. Aiken for her presentation and stated that she could support a use with performance standards with certain caps that could eventually lead to a SUP if the use exceeded the permitted use cap.

Ms. Pollock stated that through the special event ordinance that was adopted in 2015, any event in one location, for one hour or more, in a place with out a permanent installation, open to the public for over 200 people would need to go through that permitting process as opposed to this process which would be for private events at an event facility.

Mr. Krapf stated that he would like to see how the tiers and performance standards would be broken out and stated that he hopes staff can present potential tiers at the next meeting.

Ms. Tammy Rosario stated that one of the challenges of this process is to think about all of the different types of events that the ordinance amendment would cover and tailor the performance standards to the events.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that she thinks the tiered approach makes the most sense.

Mr. Krapf agreed with Ms. Bledsoe and stated that he would like to see sample performance standards.

Ms. Pollock stated that if the committee members have any additional suggestions from the example ordinances from adjacent localities to please let staff know.

Mr. O'Connor asked that some of his concerns include impervious cover, storm water management, parking lots, and maintaining the rural look/feel of the community.

Mr. Holt stated that staff will draft up a skeleton ordinance to discuss at a future Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. O'Connor asked if this ordinance would cover overnight accommodations as well or just event facilities.

Ms. Cook stated that it may be two separate uses, a "tourist home" to cover the bed and breakfast portion and a "place of public assembly" to cover the wedding/gatherings.

Mr. O'Connor stated that if we are going the performance standard route are we going to allow secondary uses or would it just be kept to the one use. Mr. O'Connor stated that he stayed at facility in Gettysburg, PA where they had stone lodges around the property for people to sleep, in addition to the event facilities which starts to trend toward a resort type of feel as opposed to rural lands.

Mr. Holt stated that staff will look into those issues and will bring an initiating resolution at the next Planning Commission meeting to formally start the process.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Krapf made a motion to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:34 p.m.

ITEM SUMMARY

DATE: 3/3/2016
TO: The Policy Committee
FROM: Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner II and Leanne Pollock, Senior Planner II
SUBJECT: FY17-FY21 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Review

REVIEWERS:

Department	Reviewer	Action	Date
Policy Secretary	Secretary, Policy	Approved	2/25/2016 - 8:26 AM