

**Sustainable Planning Meeting
August 22, 2008**

Members Present:	Matt Ackerman, Chairman Gene Kerkman Tom Reilly Jim Wise Dava Hoffman	Chip Norton Bob Rothrock Mark Mumaw Chad Daines, Staff Elise Link, Staff Margie Bryan, Staff
Absent:	Bill Feldmeier Jon Barnert	Jim Sullivan

The Committee discussed how density values should be calculated. They discussed giving credit for preserving sensitive areas such as hillsides and washes, as well as preserving 40% of the development as open space and what constitutes as open space. The Committee felt they should present two alternate Ordinances to the Board of Supervisors for consideration: (1) To keep the Ordinance as it exists currently with the density determined by the underlying zoning, and (2) to include in the Ordinance a decrease in density based on the preservation of sensitive areas.

They agreed that if they overburdened the Open Space Preservation Ordinance with regulations that the developers would not use it. The dilemma was how to encourage the clustering development so that the developers would voluntarily use the Ordinance. The Committee discussed whether the criteria for density valuation should or should not include slopes, hillsides, flood plains, washes, native plants, and cultural resources. They discussed developing a tier system, one that might give density credit for developing land below a 50% slope, and no density credit for developing on land with more than a 50% slope. It was mentioned that right-of-ways or easements, etc., would affect density and should not be considered as open space. Density and flexible lot sizes should be the focus and not building on hillsides. The Committee might consider having a flat number or percentage in the Ordinance to factor density values. The Committee agreed that the Ordinance had to allow development to be economically profitable for the developer to develop hillsides and one way might be to lower the fees involved or for every steep hillside or flood plain preserved, more density value might be given. The Committee also wanted public access and trails to be taken into consideration. They discussed the current Ordinance which does not allow residences in flood plains, they can have building envelopes with easements, or possibly animal stalls, but no residences; however, the flood plains might be altered and then possibly built on in the future. Staff will write new density value language for the Ordinance and email it to the Committee members for their review before they continue this discussion at their next meeting.

Some of the public comments were:

- That this was a voluntary Ordinance that needed to be approved by the Board of Supervisors and should not be given as a matter-of-right.
- The public hearing process needed to be implemented.
- The *Smart Growth* development was brought up and suggested that it should be up to the developers to look at their land and see where they could develop, as every piece of land was different.
- The Open Space Preservation Subdivision Ordinance should provide enough incentives to the developers to encourage them to preserve sensitive areas.

The Committee said that the County Attorneys would review the language in the Ordinance. It was suggested that another Attorney, other than one from the County, should also review the language in the Ordinance.

The Committee agreed to cancel the November 28, 2008 and December 26, 2008 meetings. The revised meeting schedule will be posted on the web and emailed to the Committee members.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.