

**MEMORANDUM OF THE
CODE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
MARCH 29, 2018 3:00 P.M.**

Brad Wolfe welcomed the attendees. He reviewed some general rules for the meeting and direction for the day.

Mr. Wolfe then summarized his estimation of the progress made so far and his thoughts on the interrelationships with the current Comprehensive Plan.

He explained the project for the meeting would be for the Committee members to generate constructive recommendations for what should be included in new code ideas. The group would be given five minutes to note ideas, and then three minutes each to explain their ideas to the group while Nathan Bilger recorded the major points on the whiteboard.

Mr. Bilger suggested that ideas should be creative, or ones not really discussed yet, and it wouldn't matter how wild they may seem as they could lead to other ideas. He offered the implausible example of "bubble domes" as a creative, although not practical, concept.

The Committee members then took time to prepare their ideas. Each member was given approximately three minutes to explain the ideas, which were summarized as major points on the whiteboard. This list is attached.

Thanks were given to everyone for the ideas and a productive meeting.

The meeting concluded at 4:10 pm.

Major Points from 3/29/18 Brainstorming Session

- Comprehensive Plan does good job for current and future
- Economic development is key for future fiscal sustainability
- Create new districts to match the Comp Plan map
- Create buffer zones between said districts
- Detailed development standards—“best practices”
- Zoning to protect environmentally sensitive areas
- Implement Comp Plan
- ¼ mile setbacks for CFO and Residential especially
- Strengthen covenants for current and new residents
- Keep current setbacks
- Compensation for agriculture voluntarily restricting its development in Transitional Ag areas
- Dense development in urban areas
- Require varying setbacks/filter strips based on type of land/soil
- Align overlay according to watersheds, not arbitrary distances
- Identify Ag owners who would voluntarily not develop for X years
- Identify/evaluate topography and conditions for land uses
- 2030 plan will generate pressures—how will we deal with them?
- Loss of agricultural industry; should that be a target for economic development?
- Build a bubble around the county to keep out outsiders
- Ditto: comp plan, 2030 plan, economic development/growth, school importance, being bedroom community
- Growth only near utilities
- Proposed uses should be compatible
- “If I were my neighbor—would I want to live by me?”
- Both sides like the overlay, so keep it.
- Ditto strengthening covenants and awareness
- Create program like classified forest for ag areas
- Definition of “environmentally sensitive”? What are the impacts of development?
- Complaints over existing CFOs?
- Setbacks for both Ag and Res.
- Ditto strengthening ag notification for current and new residents
- Overlay is ok for the lake area
- Environmentally sensitive areas make sense, especially the lakes
- Filter strips are already being done by some
- Ag preservation—based on acres?
- Overlay around lakes is ok
- Trans Ag. Buffer
- School concerns—loss of students
- Larger buffers for CFOs to allow for their growth
- Consider techniques for different land types
- CFOs and Res. Areas can coexist in close proximity
- Certainty should follow existing uses/owners
- Sewer often fix problems, but are not designed to accommodate growth. Ditto the new roundabout
- Comp Plan is legal guideline, not legally binding document
- Property rights
- “Big picture” – work together for future
- Economic development is the driver for everything
- Comp Plan is good, but must consider current conditions
- Variety of ag—all types; localize ag
- “Agri-community” design: hamlet/village development
- Property rights—takings/locking in
- Open and flexible in rezoning and land use
- Graduated adjacents—“transect”?
- Protect “environmentally sensitive” areas—lakes plus more
- New residential should be clustered to protect rural character
- Urban amenities vs. rural character

Attendance
March 29, 2018

Committee Members

1. Paul Mills (replacing Rita Harness)
2. Phil Walker
3. Pat Murphy
4. Scott Werstler
5. Emily Studebaker
6. Brooks Langeloh
7. Stanley Crum
8. Joan Null
9. Sonya Emerick (sitting in for Cory Schipper)
10. Mark Johnson
11. Ronda Salge
12. John O'Connell
13. Pete Eshelman
14. Brad Wolfe

Other Attendees

- | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Kevin Ousley | 24. Barb Hohenstein |
| 2. Brent Emerick | 25. Kati Dygert |
| 3. Mike Williams | 26. Valorie Stoltz |
| 4. Jack Dunifon | 27. Sandy Mann |
| 5. David Zettle | 28. Denny Mann |
| 6. Sharon Zettle | 29. Betty Mills |
| 7. Linda Parker | 30. Mike Mills |
| 8. Janel Rogers | |
| 9. Neal Schrimshaw | |
| 10. Tim Eshelman | |
| 11. Denise Heckman | |
| 12. Robert Kehmeyer | |
| 13. Patricia Kehmeyer | |
| 14. Gene Heckman | |
| 15. Brian Emerick | |
| 16. Carolyn Pepler | |
| 17. David Pepler | |
| 18. John Enrietto | |
| 19. Bob Rodocker | |
| 20. Nina Rodocker | |
| 21. Cathy Byrd | |
| 22. John Meister | |
| 23. Tim Dygert | |

Staff Members

1. Nathan Bilger
2. Scott Wagner

- COMP PLAN DOES GOOD JOB FOR CURRENT & FUTURE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS KEY FOR FUTURE FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY.
- CREATE NEW DISTRICTS TO MATCH COMPLAN MAP
- BUFFER ZONES BETWEEN
- DETAILED DEV STD'S - "BEST PRACTICES"
- ZONING TO PROTECT ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS
- IMPLEMENT COMPLAN
- 1/4 MILE SETBACKS - CFO/RES ESPEC.
- STRENGTHEN COVENANTS FOR CURRENT & NEW RES.
- KEEP CURRENT SETBACKS
- COMPENSATE FOR AG VOLUNTARILY RESTRICTION / TRAVEL AG.
- DENSE DEVELOPMENT IN URBAN AREAS
- REQUIRE VARYING SETBACKS / FILTER STRIP BASED ON TYPE OF LAND
- ALIGN OVERLAY ACCORDING TO WATERSHEDS
- IDENTIFY AG OWNERS TO VOLUNTARILY NOT DEVELOP FOR X YRS.
- IDENTIFY / EVALUATE TOPO. & CONDITIONS FOR LAND USES
- 2030 PLAN WILL EXAGGERATE PRESSURES - HOW TO DEAL WITH
- LOSS OF AG INDUSTRY - TARGET?
- BUBBLE
 - with 14. Comp Plan, 2030, ED GROWTH STRONG, BR Community
 - GROWTH ONLY NEAR UTILS
 - PROPOSED USES SHOULD BE COMPATIBLE
 - IF THESE MY NEIGHBORS - WOULD I LIVE BY THEM?

- BOTH SIDES LIKE OVERLAY, SO KEEP
- DITO SUBSTANTIATION COVENANTS / AGREEMENTS
- CREATE PROGRAM LIKE CLASSIFIED FOREST FOR AG AREAS
- DEFINITION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE? IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT?
- COMPLAINS OVER EXISTING CFO'S?
- SETBACKS FOR BOTH AG & RES
- DITO AG NOTIFICATION FOR CURRENT & NEW RES.
- OVERLAY IS OK FOR LAKE AREA
- ENV. SENSITIVE AREAS MAKE SENSE - ESP. LAKES
- FILTER STRIPS - ALREADY BEING DONE SOME
- AG PRESERVATION - BASED ON ALLEYS?
- OVERLAY AROUND LAKE OK
- TRAVIS AG BUFFER
- SCHOOL CONCERNS - LOSS OF STUDENTS
- LARGER BUFFER FOR CFO TO ALLOW FOR GROWTH
- CONSIDER TECHNIQUES FOR LAND TYPES
- CFO'S AND RES. AREAS CAN COEXIST IN CLOSE PROXIMITY
- CERTAINTY SHOULD FOLLOW EXISTING USES / OWNERS
- SEWERS OFTEN FIX PROBLEMS, NOT DESIGNED FOR GROWTH - DITTO RECOMMEND?
- COMPLAN IS LEGAL GUIDELINE, NOT LEGAL DOC
- PROBABILITY RIGHTS
- BIG PICTURE - WORK TOGETHER FOR FUTURE
- EC. DEV. IS DRIVER OF EVERYTHING
- COMPLAN IS GOOD, BUT MUST CONSIDER CURRENT CONDITIONS
- VARIETY OF AG - ALL TYPES, LOCAL AG
- AGRICOMMUNITY - HAMLET-LIKE
- PROPERTY RIGHTS - TAKING / LOSING IN
- OPEN & FLEXIBLE IN RESIDENTIAL LAND USE
- GRADUATED ADJUSTMENTS - TRANSIENT?
- PROTECT "PAIN SOFT" AREA - LAKES AND MORE RURAL CHARACTER
- NEW RES. SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO PROTECT
- URBAN AGRI-COMMUNITY VS. RURAL CHAIR.