

**Sustainable Planning Meeting Notes
March 6, 2009**

Members Present: Mark Mumaw
Jim Sullivan
Bill Feldmeir
Jim Wise
Thomas Reilly
Joan McClelland
Gene Kerkman

Development Services Staff: Chad Daines
Elise Link
Dawna Andersen

Absent: Matt Ackerman
Jon Barnert
Dava Hoffman
Bob Rothrock
Chip Norton
Bill Eich

The Committee approved the meeting notes of February 6, 2009.

The Committee discussed the drafts of Section 441 and Section 442 that were distributed. These would be considered voluntary ordinances to be developed as needed. Section 441, Open Space and Sustainable Development, is actually alternate 3 that was discussed at previous meetings. Alternate 3 had density reductions, conservation details, etc. Section 442, Cluster and Open Space Option, is a straightforward, 1 to 1 transfer. It has the same provisions as Section 441, such as the right to appeal and other aspects. Section 442 is a simplified ordinance to accompany the suggestions made by Carol Springer. It is a streamlined version of Section 441.

Discussion continued about the contents of Section 441 and the committee went through each item that was either changed or to be deleted. Parts A and B remain the same for purpose and intent. Part C is identical to what was discussed at the last joint session. Concerns were voiced about mixed use communities that would not only have residences but amenities such as stores, schools, etc. to accommodate the community. The impact of driving miles to pick

up something at the store would be eliminated because you could just walk to it instead and it would decrease the wear and tear on roads and air pollution.

Discussion followed about the reasoning behind the 640 acre limit. It was indicated that even after the ordinance is done, we can always come back and amend it as needed. Clear, concise standards are needed as far as the creative aspects are concerned.

There was concern about what percentage of property owners within a 300 foot radius of a proposed PAD would constitute the denial to build the development. If one person was against it, would that shut the project down? Do we require 50% of the property owners to appeal against it? We will need to come up with a realistic number. There is no cost involved with the appeal process except for the time and energy spent by the developer and county staff time.

Discussion then followed about some instances where a waiver might be requested, but caution must be used. A re-draft of Section 441 and Section 442 will be worked on and distributed prior to the next meeting, scheduled for March 20, 2009.

There will be two more meetings of the Committee on March 20 and April 3, to continue discussion and finalizing Section 441 and Section 442 to present to the Board of Supervisors at the joint session in April.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 a.m.