

Appendix 2

Materials from Public Meetings

(Summaries of all CAC meetings and public workshops)

Kick-Off Meeting, December 4, 2003

Objectives of Meeting

Review the purposes and key elements of Comprehensive Plans

Review some of the emerging planning tools available for places like McGaheysville

Review the structure, process and schedule of completing the McGaheysville Plan

Provide citizens with an opportunity to discuss planning issues and ideas

Collect applications for membership on the Steering Committee for the McGaheysville Plan

What is an “Area Plan”?

An Element of the County’s Comprehensive Plan (policy guide, not ordinance)

Code of Virginia *requires* that all local governments adopt a Comprehensive Plan and review it at least every five years.

Virginia Code also provides that the plan “shall be made with the purpose of guiding and accomplishing a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the territory which will, in accordance with present and probable future needs and resources best promote the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity and general welfare of the inhabitants.”

Roles

Citizens at large (stakeholders) - input, deliberation

Advisory Committee - represent citizen stakeholders; advise Planning Commission

Planning Commission - advise Board of Supervisors.; prepare draft plan

Board of Supervisors - review, refine and adopt plan

County Staff & Consulting Team - technical support & facilitation

Process

1. Data Collection (Committee Meeting #1; Jan. 04)
2. Public Workshop #1: “Tools for Planning”
3. Public Workshop #2: “Future of McGaheysville”
4. Committee Meeting #2 (April)
5. Prepare Alternative Scenarios
6. Committee Meeting #3 (June)
7. Public Workshop #3: “Evaluate Scenarios” (July)
8. Draft Plan (August)
9. Committee Meeting #4 (Sept)
10. Final Plan (Oct)

Review of Planning Tools - Emerging Issues: How did we get here?

Historic Land Use Patterns:

Cause: the need for pedestrian access and the limited technology of the time

Features: “Human Scale” streetscapes with narrow streets “enclosed” by a wall of buildings that front the street, creating “Outdoor Rooms”

Parking was added later: behind the buildings and on the street.....

Mixed Uses occur within Buildings, within Blocks

“Fine Grain”, compact, interwoven land uses

Interconnected street grid (when laid out, these old streets were cheap and only had to provide for slow, small vehicles & pedestrians)

Open spaces are small and well-defined

Then What Happened?

First Zoning Ordinance - New York City, 1916
Euclid v. Ambler, 1926 = “Euclidean Zoning”
Increase in Motor Vehicle Use, post W W II
Interstate highway system 1950-1980
Higher incomes & cheaper gas = greater mobility
Industrial efficiency; economies of scale and higher incomes
National distribution networks
Telecommunications technology

Planning, zoning & land development techniques have tried to keep up - with mixed results:

Conventional Zoning tools separate uses and densities
Developers specialize and target “niche” markets
Highway engineers require wide streets and turning radii
Planners (and citizens) require plenty of parking
Citizens oppose street connectivity
Citizens oppose “density” (and “sprawl”)
The “Big Box” form takes over - stores, schools, etc.

A Major Challenge Facing Us Today:

To achieve the pleasing, human-oriented streets and public spaces that were developed before motor vehicles, while still conveniently accommodating our use of motor vehicles

To blend pedestrian convenience and safety with motor vehicle convenience and safety

However, it’s not so easy to do.

It seems that we now face many internal conflicts:

Citizens dislike SPRAWL and DENSITY
Citizens dislike TRAFFIC and NEW ROADS
Citizens dislike COSTLY HOUSING & CHEAP HOUSING
Citizens oppose street connectivity [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

The “Big Box” form grows: stores, schools, post offices, etc. (a “love-hate” relationship) [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

Again, these problems & conflicts are caused in part by:

Increasing Motor Vehicle Mobility (cars, trucks, cheap fuel)
Rising Incomes
Telecom technology is maturing

Thus, the causes are regional and national, but the tools are implemented locally.

This has in turn created pressures on localities to adopt the “NIMBY” philosophy, out of desperation and necessity.

Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) Techniques can solve some of these problems at the local level.

Other Tools:

Urban Growth Boundaries

Conventional Zoning Regulations

Historic Districts; Historic Entrance Corridors

Access Management

Agricultural and Forestal Districts

Use Value Assessment [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

Agricultural Enhancement (new products, direct marketing, agri-tourism) [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

Conservation Easements (purchase, donate, lease)

Limited Development [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

Cluster Development [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

Long Range Planning [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

Special Service Districts and Governance Agreements [added for public workshop 4-17-04]

Notes from Kick-Off Meeting December 11, 2003 McGaheysville Area Plan

Herd Planning & Design, Ltd., Purcellville, Virginia

Comments and Questions taken during the meeting from members of the public present:

- Will a build-out analysis be conducted, based on existing zoning capacity?
- Route 33 is very dangerous.
- Will McGaheysville incorporate as a Town?
- Should Massanutten be included in the study area?
- Will traffic counts be conducted?
- School Board should be represented on the committee
- Water and sewer is a critical element of the plan.
- What is the logic/rationale of the study area boundary as shown? Can it be adjusted?
- What are Agricultural and Forestal districts?
- What are Historic Overlay Districts?
- Who hired your firm and are you a U. S. company? Your company is listed as “limited” but that’s not a U. S. designation. *Note: Actually, “Limited” is a U. S. designation for a corporation and has the same meaning as “incorporated”; Herd Planning & Design, Ltd. is and always has been a U. S. company.*

Comments and Questions taken after the meeting by Milt Herd:

- Will the plan address changes in school district boundaries?
- Employees leave the area to head west to Harrisonburg, while school children leave the city to head east to McGaheysville = traffic.
- How will this plan work if it ends up conflicting with the new Comprehensive Plan?
- Will the ultimate build-out of Massanutten be taken into account in the plan? How do you get good data from Massanutten?

CAC Meeting #1, February 24, 2003

Reviewed tools and conducted SWOT

**McGaheysville Area Plan
Citizen Advisory Committee**

**SWOT Brainstorming Session
February 24, 2004**

STRENGTHS / OPPORTUNITIES

1. Three excellent schools within three miles of each other
2. Public water and sewer
3. Low traffic volume
4. Streets in excellent condition
5. Spotswood Trail (Route 33)
6. Elkton Rescue Satellite is located in McGaheysville
7. Best fire department in area is located in McGaheysville (It is a model for the County.)
8. Supportive County Board member – supportive of emergency services needs and supportive of the community
9. Proximity to Harrisonburg
10. Historic and natural resources
11. Scenic beauty – rural character, trees, quality of life (low cost of living, rural atmosphere, and proximity to City)
12. Train whistle, dark skies, quiet
13. Restoration of historic places (Old Stumps grocery was converted to Stumps Antiques & Collectibles and the old Town Hall is being refurbished by McGaheysville Ruritan Club.)
14. New homes blend in with old
15. GERC, Merck, and Coors are three top tax sources
16. Spotswood Trail is a commuter road, which is both good and bad
17. McGaheysville Road (Route 996 [old Route 33]) is a “service road” for the community
18. McGaheysville Area is being studied now, rather than later
19. Colleges and universities
20. Massanutten – huge economic opportunity

WEAKNESSES / THREATS

1. Schools are near capacity
2. Need park, recreation areas
3. High traffic volumes on some roads, such as Spotswood Trail (Route 33) and Bloomer Springs Road (Route 646)
4. Location of rescue squad is bad
5. Light pollution from Spotswood High School parking lot; light spilling out onto other property
6. Poultry house smells can't neatly mix with residences

7. Neighbors like cows but not smell, dust, etc.

8. Spotswood Trail splits the Study Area
9. Spotswood Trail is unsafe between Spotswood High School and Elkton – dangerous driving. Need signs?
10. Spotswood Trail is a commuter road, which is both good and bad
11. Biking and walking is unsafe
12. Development is moving this way (recent TMC, LLC commercial [B1] rezoning and Crossroads planned residential and commercial [R5] rezoning
13. Crossroads sewer goes to McGaheysville
14. City dwellers moving to McGaheysville
15. Cannot compromise the view of Massanutten Mountain
16. Karst geology means area does not have an infinite supply of water (may need to look outside County for water)
17. During Interstate 81 improvements, Interstate 64 to Route 340 may be designated as an alternate route – what impact will that have on McGaheysville?
18. Agriculture is under intense threats (market, regulations, etc.)
19. New regulations on poultry will decrease profit and change markets. Virginia will not continue to allow poultry litter to be spread within Chesapeake Bay watershed

STRENGTHS / OPPORTUNITIES / WEAKNESSES / THREATS

1. A lot of through-traffic on McGaheysville Road (Route 996)
2. Cell towers increase when the population increases – area has some good tower placements and some bad
3. Decisions made outside the Study Area may have significant impact inside it

GENERAL COMMENTS

1. Freedom to construct whatever one wishes is not good
2. Wants country to stay country
3. Uncertainty of future land use
4. Need plan for implementing land use or community desires - Need to add to the McGaheysville Study Area: Massanutten Mountain eastern slope (Great Eastern property) and the old Gerando campground (also GERC property)
5. Too many restrictions aren't good, need housing where water and sewer are
6. Land in Northern Virginia – consumed by large lots and lifting of sewer moratorium

Public Workshop #1 April 17, 2004

The major objectives of this meeting will be to:

- *Bring everyone up to date on objectives, process, schedule and results to date*
- *Share technical information about potential planning tools*
- *Obtain citizen input about issues and opportunities for the future of the area*

Brainstorm in Work Groups

Each group will:

- *Brainstorm a list of things about the McGaheysville area that should be preserved (structures, places, features, resources, qualities, etc.) (List on flip charts and mark on the base map)*
- *Brainstorm a list of things that should be changed (List on flip charts and mark on the base map)*
- *Brainstorm a list of potential “working assumptions” about the future of the area (List on flip charts)*

Summary of Results of Public Workshop #1

Held April 17, 2004 at the McGaheysville Elementary School

Group 1

Things to Preserve

- Natural, mountain views – Blue Ridge and Massanutten
- A “fair amount” of open space
- A variety of open space types and scales – from lot areas to neighborhood areas to larger “rural” open spaces – private and public
- Small town atmosphere even with some growth
- Sense of McGaheysville community feeling and identify as a community
- Agricultural character
- Agricultural, forestal, horticultural - green
- Low density traffic level
- Historic homes, particularly the McGahey house
- Protecting existing landowners expectations that this area will not become a metropolis
- Protecting other landowner rights
- Preserve the low density development pattern that exists
- Preserve the relatively low tax rate within the study area and surrounding area
- Realize that keeping low density and low traffic means having low expectation on community services

Possible Ideas/Solutions

- Create an Agricultural and Forestal District for the planning area

Things that should be changed

- Need to work on getting a second entrance to Woodstone (Rt. 602, 645 to Resort Drive)
- Change zoning patterns from fragmented to more consistent and compatible patterns
- Change community land use and development patterns to promote safer transportation (especially of school bus students, patterns)
- Provide direct access to Village Festival Water Park and shopping center development from Rt. 33
- Increase landscaping requirements for new development (required by zoning) ratio of residential homes to open space
- Consistently apply buffer areas between residential and other uses
- Proposed Massanutten access improvements currently four lanes down to two lanes should be changed
- Need to make Rt. 33 corridor as safe as possible as a part of land use plan decision-making
- Change the study area boundary to reflect water and sewer and developed areas
- Eliminate the division between the folks in Massanutten and those in McGaheysville especially in the planning process
- Encourage bus/transit use vs. single vehicle occupancy
- Encourage CART
- Commuter rail on Rail Road line? (Rt. 33 corridor)
- Provide economic incentives to Massanutten's undeveloped areas and encourage growth in designated areas

Working Assumptions/Expectations

- Focus business development along McGaheysville Road (old 33), Island Ford Rd., Resort Drive, and Rt. 33
- No R-3 townhouses
- No "strip" developments (cluster vs. strip)
- Commercial businesses should be PCD (planned commercial development)
- Want feedback to/from the community throughout the process

Group 2

Things to preserve

- Town hall
- Face of Massanutten
- Agricultural land (throughout area)
- Cemetery from development impact
- Historic homes

- Stage Coach Inn
- Creeks, Stony Run
- Quality of schools
- Rescue Squad facilities
- Maintain “local” post office facility
- Maintain balance between tourism – industrial – commercial

Things to Change

- Create sidewalk from post office to market
- Improve traffic flow for school
- Provide deceleration lane eastbound on Rt. 33
- Separate local and through (tourist) traffic
- Evaluate 996 to 981 connection
- More parks and recreation facilities

Assumptions

- Population growth
- Traffic growth
- Decline in farming
- School growth
- Demand for services
- Maintain “village” – do not bring in retail stores
- Massanutten – Water Park impact

Group 3

Things to Preserve

- McGahey home
- Lambert Hall
- Town Hall
- Quality of life – reasonable cost of living, open space, development with character
- Keep Massanutten inside the mountain
- Viewshed on mountain and from mountain
- Define / identify the village core – what is it?
- Historic registry sites
- Farms – which should be developed and which should not?
- Cemetery road – house on it
- Churches – Mt. Olivet
- Stumps Grocery – antiques
- Rural character
- Old barns
- New Hope Baptist church
- Agricultural uses of land – specialized products, etc.

- Right of community to defend what we want vis-à-vis large developer / landowner
- Need to better understand costs to the public of development
- We need to control what happens – whether we develop

Issues:

- Importing the workforce for Massanutten
- What is net cost/benefit of Massanutten?
- Massanutten constantly re-doing its master plan

Things to Change

- Rt. 33 – widen/double in width with service roads for local traffic [but median helps it feel rural]
- More connectivity – sidewalks, bike paths, roundabouts
- River bank upgrades – parks, trails
- Recreation area and recreation center – by the Fire Hall
- Bus service linked with train – Elkton to Harrisonburg
- Public transportation
- Improve safety of Rt. 33 – more law enforcement
- Extend water to trailer park
- Need stable plan, not ad hoc, with an open, honest, orderly process
- Prefer “circle” rather than “strip” development [around a central core or focal point]
- Afraid of strip commercial on Island Ford Road

Issues:

- Impact of public wells on private wells?
- They’ve contracted to sell water to Harrisonburg
- Massanutten private sewage system – old technology? – public health issue – priorities need to be set

Assumptions

- Great Eastern – what are plans for land on McGahey Lane?
 - New entrance to Massanutten?
 - Water demands?
 - Karst = water limitations
- Can’t stop growth – can control/shape
- Population and traffic will continue to increase
- Fear – Rt. 33 west with townhouses and satellite dishes every 15 feet – monotonous
- If we could grow at a reasonable rate – developers should phase development

Comments:

- Time shares approved more readily than single family detached units
- Consolidate village power base to influence plan and Great Eastern
- Lack of affordable housing for local workers

Group 4

Things to Preserve

- Cemeteries
 - Security
 - Traffic
 - Scenic view from it/them
- Schools – past and present – inventory in the plan
- Civil war history
- WW II history
- Quality of life
- Shenandoah River / Stony Run
- McGaheysville Town Hall
- Other old buildings
- Stage Coach Station
- Stumps Grocery/Antiques/Dance Hall
- “Core / downtown”
 - buildings complement one another
 - height limitations
 - town hall
 - WW II site / marker
 - Cemetery(ies)
 - Distinct core
 - Old store/bank/funeral home across from post office
- Keep residential
- RR depot at Rt. 649 / 340

Things to Change

- Safety features on all RR crossings
- Potential for fast food and gas chains
- Separation of emergency services created by RR tracks – change location of Fire Dept?
- Increase Elkton rescue staff
- Road improvements – Bloomer springs Rd., Cemetery Rd ?, New Hope Rd – pave-in-place
- Use 886 and 981 as service roads
- Create clusters on commercial development
- Design standards for commercial development
- Create parks

What we think could happen, NOT what we want to happen

- Strip development along Rt. 33 – Rt. 29 north of Charlottesville [Need aesthetics, access points on Rt. 33 and need Rt. 981 and Rt. 996 to be service roads.]
- Encounter sewer capacity issues
- 996 traffic volume increases

- 649 traffic volume increases
- 33 traffic volume increases
- Expansion of Great Eastern – could exacerbate strip development along 33

Facilitators

Group 1: Barry Carpenter

Group 2: Dick Keller

Group 3: Milt Herd

Group 4: Rhonda Henderson

Highlights of Results of Public Workshop #1

Held April 17, 2004 at the McGaheysville Elementary School

Things to Preserve

- Mountain views (to and from)
- A variety of open space types and scales – private and public; rural character
- Creeks, Stony Run, Shenandoah River

- Small town atmosphere even with some growth
- Sense of McGaheysville community feeling and identify as a community
- Quality of life – reasonable cost of living, open space, development with character

- Agricultural, forestal, horticultural – green
- Farms – which should be developed and which should not?
- Existing low traffic level, low development
- Low expectation on community services
- Historic homes, churches, old barns, cemeteries, registry sites
- War history (civil and WW II)
- “Core / downtown”

- Protect existing landowners expectations that area will not become a metropolis
- Protecting other landowner rights
- Right of community to defend what we want vis-à-vis large developer / landowner
- Relatively low tax rate

- Quality of schools

- Rescue Squad facilities
- Local post office facility
- Realize that keeping low density and low traffic means having low expectation on community services
- Balance between tourism – industrial – commercial

- Keep residential

Things that should be changed

- Need second entrance to Woodstone
- Community land use patterns to promote safer transportation (especially school buses)
- Direct access to Village Festival Water Park and shopping center development from Rt. 33
- Improve safety of Rt. 33
- Encourage bus/transit use, CART
- Separate local and through (tourist) traffic
- More connectivity – sidewalks, bike paths, roundabouts
- Public transportation
- Safety features at RR crossings
- Road improvements – pave-in-place

- Zoning patterns from fragmented to more consistent, compatible patterns
- Consistent buffers between residential and other
- Increase landscaping requirements for new development (required by zoning)
- Growth in designated areas
- Prefer “circle” rather than “strip” development [around a central core or focal point]
- Change location of Fire Dept?
- Create clusters on commercial development
- Design standards for commercial development

- Change the study area boundary to reflect water and sewer and developed areas
- Eliminate division between folks in Massanutten and McGaheysville
- Need stable plan, not ad hoc, with an open, orderly process

- Create sidewalk from post office to market
- More parks and recreation facilities
- Recreation area and recreation center – by the Fire Hall
- River bank upgrades – parks, trails

Working Assumptions/Expectations

- Population growth - can't stop growth – can control/shape
- Traffic growth
- School growth
- Decline in farming
- Demand for services
- No R-3 townhouses
- No “strip” developments
- Commercial businesses should be PCD (planned commercial development)
- Maintain “village” – do not bring in retail stores
- Focus business development along Old 33, Island Ford Rd., Resort Dr, and Rt. 33
- Want feedback to/from the community throughout process
- Lack of affordable housing for local workers
- Massanutten – Village Festival Water Park impact
- Impact of public wells on private wells? Karst = water limitations
- Massanutten private sewage system – public health issue
- Great Eastern – what are plans?

Public Workshop #2: Creating a Vision for the Future

May 27 and June 3, 2004, at the McGaheysville Elementary School
6:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.

AGENDA for May 27

The major objectives of this meeting will be to:

- *Bring everyone up to date on objectives, process, schedule and results to date*
- *Review Issues and Opportunities*
- *Review Draft Vision Statement*
- *Generate Ideas for Future Land Use and Infrastructure*

7:10 p.m. Review and Evaluate Draft Vision Statement

7:30 p.m. Planning Exercises in Work Groups

Break into work groups. Each group will use maps to:

- 1) Confirm key sites and resources to preserve
- 2) Identify the “core” of the village
- 3) Identify appropriate areas for new housing
- 4) Identify appropriate areas for new non-residential uses
- 5) Sketch locations of new streets and pathways

DRAFT AGENDA for June 3

The major objectives of this meeting will be to:

- *Bring everyone up to date on objectives, process, schedule and results to date*
- *Review Results of First Visioning Session*
- *Review and Affirm the Vision Statement*
- *Evaluate Ideas for Future Land Use and Infrastructure*

7:00 p.m. Review and Affirm Revised Vision Statement

7:30 p.m. Evaluate Results of Work Group Exercises of May 27

Each group will present results of first meeting to the full group:

- 1) Key sites and resources to preserve
- 2) “Core” of the village
- 3) Appropriate areas for new housing
- 4) Appropriate areas for new non-residential uses
- 5) Locations of new streets and pathways

Results of Public Workshop #2

Held May 27 and June 3, 2004 at the McGaheysville Elementary School

On May 27, the citizens reviewed and commented on a draft vision statement and broke into groups and marked up base maps and aerial photos to show key ideas about their preferred future for the area.

On June 3, the citizens refined and affirmed the vision statement and reviewed the group maps created on May 27. The discussion on the group maps included:

General Comments

- Need updated and refined sewer and water lines on the base map
- Need topography shown on the base map
- The map showing development over the past few decades is good, but it should show parcels as being developed only if they are indeed fully developed, and not show the entire parcel as developed if there is only one house on a small portion of a large tract. [example: Wissinger property]
- Need data about recent growth in school population (from school board, as reported in minutes of a recent Board of Supervisors meeting)
- We expect 50 to 100 additional time-share units per year
- Aging population will change (lower) the assumptions about number of people per household in the future
- Time-share population creates demands on local services (“temporary” residents)
- VDOT traffic study of Rt. 33 – look at that data
- Need to decide and clarify how we define the future growth rate and where/how it will be accommodated – is it based on local growth rate for the village area or a portion of countywide growth rate, or other?

Comments on maps created by the small work groups

Major common features as shown all the maps of all four groups

- Historic sites - preserve
- Views - preserve
- Water quality - preserve
- Residential nodes – development pattern

Major Features/Ideas Shown on the four group maps

- Connect old Rt. 33 with southern areas
- Provide for pedestrian and bike traffic
- Preserve core area
 - Little stores as infill in existing buildings
 - Community park; extra parking by church

- Don't really want more residential
- Allow access at rear of elementary school - pick-up of kids is the problem
- Expand historic core
- Extend and connect McGaheysville Road to the east
- New road to Woodstone/Village Festival Water Park north of Rt. 33
- Bike path toward the river
- Community Park behind firehouse
- Trail park along Stony Creek to the River
- Preserve southeast side of the Mountain
- Housing – in core, going out from the center
- Parallel road north of Rt. 33, north of the core
- Overpass over Rt. 33 on Island Ford Rd.
- Preserve the core
- New housing by middle school, water and sewer
- Non-residential development down Island Ford Rd.
- Agriculture at the edges of the village

Results of Committee Meeting #3

June 24, 2004 at the McGaheysville Elementary School Library

The committee reviewed the conceptual sketch plan (land use framework) prepared by the consulting team.

Comments/Discussion

- Site between Village Festival Water Park and Woodstone is committed for 500 dwelling units
- What size would “cluster” lots be?
- Why residential all along area between Rt. 33 and Old McGaheysville Rd.?
- We may not want the small lots and sidewalks like Northern Virginia – small lots = more school students [what kind of community do the citizens want to have, and what role does McGaheysville serve within the larger Rockingham County community?]
- Compact development = less land consumed, but larger lots = “rural” feel and greater value/cost of lots
- Did you consider pipeline development?
- Need topo map; need detailed map of utility lines
- Development modules – ridgeline to ridgeline if served by public sewer, valley to valley if served by septic systems
- Great Eastern will build more, post 2015 (their “pipeline” is to 2015)
- Protect Great Eastern from going up the mountain and north of the Fire House
- Big lot v. small lot issue – older population doesn't want to mow 2 acres and farmer doesn't want to farm less than 20 acres
- Enlarge study area as marked up (generally north to mountain and south to creek and river)
- “Rural” character v. “village” character of housing patterns – to some, “rural” means bigger setbacks; to some, “rural” means views of the surrounding agricultural landscape

- We need to define “rural”
- We’re no longer rural now
- Development will follow the sewer
- What lot size supports public utilities on site? (economically)
- Need a new “R-x” zoning district that is rural residential with larger lots than R-1
- “Hard” or “soft” edge to the village?
- Need numbers for sewer capacity and population forecasts [and land demand]
- Would a Mountain Overlay District be useful?
- New signal on Rt. 33 between resort drive and medical center – issue/concern
- Need new entrance into Woodstone Meadows

July 22, 2004, Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

At the McGaheysville Citizen Advisory Committee's July 22 meeting, the committee discussed slides depicting different styles of villages, village edges, conventional sprawl, compact designs, and rural clusters of residences. Each committee member was provided with a Slide Image Worksheet showing each of the slides and was asked to critique its appropriateness for McGaheysville.

August 26, 2004, Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting

The Citizen Advisory Committee met on August 26, 2004 to review a draft policy framework prepared by the planning team. This framework included an outline of broad policies (shown beginning on page 5 of this summary), as well as some revised sketches showing proposed land use patterns and key road improvements that reflect the collective input of the Committee to date.

The CAC was generally agreeable to these policy ideas and expressed comfort in going forward with a public workshop in September to get an evaluation of these ideas from citizens at large.

The Committee did have some specific questions and comments, which are noted below, along with a preliminary response from the planning team leader. These issues, and others that may arise as we move forward, will continue to be worked and refined as we proceed with the Plan.

Comments and Questions from CAC in response to Policy Ideas presented on 8-26-04

1. There is no market for 1-acre lots mixed with small lots; mixing the 1-acre lots with smaller lots would limit the value of the 1-acre lots.

Herd response: Mixing lot sizes may hold down the value of the larger lots, but it could also increase the value of the smaller lots. Such a mix is an attempt to meet the concerns of the Committee regarding retention of the character of the village even as population is added. Indeed, such an approach is a compromise and in some ways, breaks new ground and is not totally "conventional". Yet it reflects a balance of the desires of the various representatives on the Committee. It is essentially a version of "cluster" development, customized for the McGaheysville area.

2. Why not expand the core to the south and east first, before expanding to the west?

Herd response: The draft framework sketch does indeed show the core expanding to the south. Such expansion area could be further enlarged. Timing, however, will likely reflect landowner preferences given that sewer pipes are already in the ground in the area west of the core, as well as the area to the south.

3. People do want 2-acre to 3-acre lots [as opposed to the Committee’s critique of the 3-acre lots in the slide images]

Herd response: Indeed, there is a market for large rural lots in the 2 to 10 acre range. However, the Committee rightly acknowledged that such patterns consume more land for development than is necessary, undermine the amount of affordable housing, and create more visual impact per unit, than a more compact pattern. This is a “trade-off” the Committee has identified. Thus, the proposal to mix 1-acre and 2-acre lots with much smaller lots for an overall gross density of 2 units per acre in the expansion areas.

4. The two major intersections, as proposed, on Rt. 33 (existing one at Slate Road and new one at Spotswood High School) are too close together – don’t push the landowner south of the High School into developing their farm to provide such a road connection; why not just use existing Slate Road only?

Herd response: The connection through the France farm to the signal at Spotswood High School was suggested by the planning team as a way of providing a safer, higher capacity connection to Rt. 33 from the western expansion area of the village. It is envisioned as a long-term road connection that would not be done prior to the landowners wanting to develop that farm in accord with the Plan, with the road being constructed as part of any such development. It is however, just one possible alternative, and is certainly a long term concept. Improving the Slate Road intersection will be explored further. Note that the owners of the France farm are very concerned about showing any kind of roadway through their property. A reasonable alternative may be to show the future roadway into the France farm, but not show the actual connection to the Spotswood High School intersection at Rt. 33. In the future, if and when the County may deem it appropriate, the actual intersection at Rt. 33 could be added to the plan.

5. VDOT has recently re-designed Pineville Road as it connects to McGaheysville Road, and they’re not going to re-design it.

Herd response: This is understood, and thus any further redesign of Pineville Road to better accommodate an improved Slate Road/Rt. 33 intersection would likely also be a very long term prospect.

6. The speed limit on Rt. 996 (McGaheysville Rd.) needs to be lowered to 35 mph to reduce cut-through traffic.

Herd response: This idea suggests the merits of adding “traffic calming” elements to the Rt. 996 corridor. As access management improvements are made to Rt. 33 (new signalized intersections; reverse site access; consolidated access points, etc.) it would be logical to “calm” Rt. 996. The planning team will explore this idea further.

7. The speed limit on Rt. 996 (McGaheysville Rd.) should be raised back up to 55 mph!

Herd response: Comments #6 and #7 reflect the conflicting frustrations of the safety and capacity of Rt. 996. A strong parallel road system to Rt. 33 will allow Rt. 996 to have slower traffic movement, in keeping with its “village” character; however, slower speeds will not please everyone all the time. That road will still carry some cut-through traffic.

8. The higher density clusters shown in the land use framework sketch map are “spotted” in the area west of the core, rather than extended gradually outward from the core.

Herd response: It would indeed be logical to show the density extending steadily from the core, in a sort of “density gradient”. However, there are two reasons the higher density clusters were shown as they were:

First, due to the sewer pipes already being in the ground and serving the entire expansion area west of the core, it is likely that much if not all of this expansion is “in play” in terms of potential sewer service, once the treatment capacity of the plant is increased. Therefore, the plan needs to show a preferred “end state” for development in the area, rather than just phases of development. (A recommended phasing sequence, however, can be shown. The planning team will explore this further.)

Second, one of the desired aspects of McGaheysville that citizens have indicated they would like to see preserved, is the “rural” nature of the village. The village should not become a “town-like” entity, but should feel like a rural village for as long as possible. To achieve this, the low density, informal pattern of development along Rt. 996 should be retained to the maximum practical extent. This can be achieved by limiting higher gross densities to the core village area, and in the center of tracts in the expansion area, off of Rt. 996. Because sewer service is in place, the gross densities in the expansion area cannot be too low – they must reflect the fact that sewer service will ultimately be provided to each site in that area. Thus, it is proposed that moderate gross densities be shown, but with low net densities along Rt. 996 to preserve the existing character as much as possible.

9. Existing “wood lots” should be protected during the development process.

Herd response: This would be a good way to help retain the existing character of the area, even as development moves forward. Not every wood lot will likely be able to be preserved, but these resources could be used as key elements in an open space network, along with creek valleys and hilltops.

10. Extend Piano Lane directly to old Rt. 33, over the railroad line. Such bridge should be shown over the rail line, not under it.

Herd response: Yes, it appears that this proposed road connection could follow closely parallel to the south of new Rt. 33. The planning team will explore this further.

11. Need shoulder on Rt. 996, for bicycles, pedestrians and greater safety.

Herd response: The planning team will explore this further.

12. Get a detailed sewer line map from the County.

Herd response: Such a detailed map was requested from the County Department of Public Works, and the staff said that no such consolidated, small scale map exists. The team will continue to pursue this issue. It should be noted that the County staff has been extraordinarily helpful with all information requests throughout this process.

13. More soccer fields are needed in the area

Herd response: This issue will be noted in the plan and potential sites will be identified. However, in order to program specific number of fields, a countywide approach would be needed, which would be a component of a countywide parks and recreation plan.

14. We need people from the Rt. 602 area to comment on these draft proposals.

Herd response: We will try to get further representation from that area at the public workshop in September.

15. Show historic buildings in the plan.

Herd response: Key sites, as identified by the work groups this spring, will be shown in the plan; policies for preserving such sites during the development process will be added to the policy framework as well.

16. This area needs assisted living facilities [comment offered after the meeting adjourned]

Herd response: Potential sites should be explored as the planning process moves forward. Key issues will include access and density.

DRAFT Summary and Interpretation of Expressed Preferences – Policy Implications
(Policy Framework presented to the CAC 8-26-04)

Overarching Objective: “Grow Gracefully”
(retain essential existing qualities and character while gradually adding population)

Surrounding Farmland and Mountain

Implement all available farmland preservation tools, including:

- Agricultural and Forestal Districts
- Rural Cluster Development and/or “Conservation Subdivision Design”
- Conservation Easement Donation
- Selected Purchase of Conservation Easements
- “Limited Development” strategies (combines Conservation Easement Donation with Rural Cluster/Conservation Development)
- Agri-Tourism
- Specialty Products and Services (CSAs [community supported agriculture], direct marketing, low-input products, etc.)
- Non-agriculture rural businesses (home businesses, tourist lodging, etc.)
- Restrict development on steep slopes and mountainsides
- Negotiate service area limits with Great Eastern so as to limit impacts on the mountainsides while providing reasonable development opportunities

Entrances to Village and to New Projects

- Use traditional road entrances – small scale street sections; “rural” sections in lower density areas and at edges of village.
- Avoid reverse frontages; if and when reverse frontage is used, provide substantial setbacks and landscaped buffers.
- Provide trails for bikes and pedestrians, linked to surrounding trails.

Edges between Surrounding Farmland and Village (Southwest)

- Use a “Rural Cluster” pattern for areas adjacent to the village, but outside the sewer service area. This pattern would allow cluster lot sizes of one to two acres, mixed with large “conservation” lots of 20, 50 or even 100 acres, thereby preserving about 80% of each site in large parcels that can be farmed. Overall, average site densities should be about 10 acres per lot.
- Avoid entire subdivisions of dispersed large lots of 3, 5, 10 acres, etc. (“too small to farm, too large to mow”)
- Provide the appearance of a hard edge between the village proper (service area) and the surrounding rural landscape (“town and country”), through farm preservation and carefully designed rural cluster development.
- Provide trails for bikes and pedestrians, linking the village to the surrounding stream corridors and rural roadways.

Expansion Areas within Village Service Area (Southwest)

- Avoid suburban design patterns (wide street sections, garagescapes, etc.)
- Avoid reverse frontage layouts; if reverse frontage happens, use substantial setbacks *and* landscaping to screen the rear of buildings from the main roads
- Interconnect all streets within each subdivision and interconnect subdivisions with each other at no less than one point.
- Locate garages at the side or rear of houses (avoid garagescapes)
- Use alleys to help avoid garagescapes
- Provide sidewalks on at least one side of every street, except for areas of large lots with trails linked to the sidewalk network.
- Provide greens or equivalent internal open space that is spatially defined by adjacent buildings and/or landscape elements, on a collector street, so as to be true focal points of the neighborhood, rather than left over corners of the site that have no definition.

Expansion Areas within Village Service Area (cont'd)

- Allow densities on each site up to two units per gross acre, if a clustered, village pattern is used, with a wide mix of lot sizes, yielding net densities that range from three or four units per net acre along the new spine roads, down to less than one unit per net acre nearer to McGaheysville Road and the edges of the village expansion area. Less variety of lot sizes will receive less permitted gross density (about 1 unit per acre).
- This will allow many options for lot sizes and open space within a typical development project, including:

Conventional Option Example:

- 90% of the site in lots of 40,000 square feet each (120' x 330'), with 10% of site in roads. Open space would be in the form of large rear yards on lots. *Gross Density Permitted = 1.0 units per acre.*

Cluster Options (examples):

- 75% of site in lots, ranging from 15,000 sq. ft. (80' x 190'), to 20,000 sq. ft. (90' x 220'), with 10% of site in roads & 15% in common open space (greens);
Gross Density Permitted = 1.5 units per acre.
- 50% of the site in lots of 15,000 square feet each (80' x 190'), 25% in larger lots of 1 acre each, with 10% of site in roads and 15% in "greens".
Gross Density Permitted = 1.75 units per acre.
- 30% of the site in lots of 7,000 sq. ft. each 70' x 100'), 45% in larger lots of greater than 1 acre, with 10% of site in roads and 15% in "greens".
Gross Density Permitted = 2.0 units per acre.

Village Core

- Single family detached units as well as a smaller proportion of duplex units.
- Allow densities of up to four units per gross acre on each site, with internal densities ranging from three to five units per net acre within each site.
- Lot size typically down to 7,500 square feet (70' x 110').
- Allow zero-lot-line units, in return for usable common open space.
- Allow Duplex units, in return for usable common open space.
- All common open space must be greens as defined above.
- Provide sidewalks on at least one side of every street.
- Allow some mixed-use and small-scale commercial development in the core area.

Summary of Comments on Slide Images of Development Character and Pattern

Presented to the CAC on August 26, 2004; comments received on 7-22-04

#1 and #2 - Entrances to Village

Support for traditional road entrances

If reverse frontage is used, provide substantial landscaped buffers

#3 and #4 - Entrances to Village and to New Projects

Support for small scale (village scale) entry roads

Support for trails for bikes and pedestrians

#5 – Edge and Entry to Rural Cluster

Good pattern for edges of the village, not with central utilities

#6, #8, #9 – Large Lots (20 acres, 5 acres and 3 acres)

Not appropriate - wastes land – “too small to farm, too large to mow”

#7, #10 – Rural Cluster with smaller lots surrounded by conservation lots

Mixed comments – liked the scenic quality. Some lots too big. May be too expensive.

#11 – 3 units per acre suburban style

Mixed comments – liked the sidewalks, didn't like the monotony

#12 – 4 units per acre suburban style

Mixed comments – liked the sidewalks, didn't like the monotony and congestion

#13 – 4 units per acre suburban style

No - didn't like the cul-de-sacs, density, monotony or garage facing streets

#14 – 4 units per acre town infill

Mixed comments, but generally okay.

#15 – 4 units per acre in traditional pattern

Like the grid of interconnected streets, architecture and landscaping.

#16 – 5 units per acre in traditional town pattern

Like the traditional architecture, street median – “very nice for high density”.

#17 – 5 units per acre in traditional town pattern with green

Mixed comments - Like the green area – “very nice for high density”.

#18 – 5 units per acre

Generally favorable – traditional, affordable, pleasing concept; density may be an issue.

Notes from Public Workshop #3

To Evaluate the Draft Plan Framework
Developed by the Citizen Advisory Committee
September 23, 2004 at McGaheysville Elementary

(Questions and comments from participants are shown in plain type face;
consultant responses/comments are shown in *italic*)

- Is there a provision to provide only water service (rather than sewer service) to certain properties outside the defined service area?

That is not envisioned in the draft plan framework; however, it could be considered. From a planning standpoint, it is generally preferred to provide both sewer and water or neither in order to have clear distinctions between urban and rural areas.

- Quality of farmland – undesirable farmland could be developed, thereby saving the better farmland.

This is a good suggestion and consistent with the recommendations in the draft framework for cluster subdivisions and “conservation design” for rural subdivisions.

- How about “viewshed” restrictions as opposed to just steep slope restrictions?

In general, it is better to have multiple purposes for such regulations, and particularly to avoid relying solely on visual resources as the purpose of the regulations, although that could certainly be one of the stated purposes.

- “We aren’t as happy with sidewalks in the expansion area (outside the core areas) as you are”

There is consensus for sidewalks in the defined core area, yet still some debate as to what extent to have them in the expansion area. The team will be developing some sample “prototype” development designs for both of these areas to show some choices for streets, sidewalks and lot patterns for the next committee meeting.

- County regulations say you can’t develop on septic if sewer is on the property.

This clarification is helpful; such a regulation is very good and will help support the objectives and strategies of the draft plan framework. [Note that County staff has since indicated that this is in fact not the County’s current policy. Further clarification of this question will be provided to the committee.]

- Limit 3, 5, 10 acre lots in the village proper, but not outside the service area

The purpose of discouraging the large residential lots outside the village service area is to try to protect farming activities, as well as the visual identity and character of the village, as

an end in itself as well as an economic development resource. The committee will need to decide what specific recommendations to make regarding large lots outside the service area.

- Who would maintain sidewalks?

Either the homeowners association of the project or, if a special service district is established for the village, the property owners at large within the service area.

- Even shoulders or wider lanes would help pedestrian and bike safety on Rt. 996.

This idea will be noted.

- The average lot size in McGaheysville is 2 acres – thus, we need to talk about NET density.

Both “net” and “gross” densities are important and are addressed in the draft plan framework. This speaker’s concern was that the gross density of 2.0 units per acre in the expansion areas would yield very high net densities within the site, up to 3 or 4 units per acre. This is true, and is a technique for achieving the somewhat conflicting desires of various stakeholders. The committee will examine this issue further at the next meeting when it looks at the alternative prototype development models the team will develop for it.

- The proposed bridge over the railroad – how will it connect to the road to the east, and what impact will it have on the church?

It is expected to use mainly the (old) right-of-way and should have minimum impact on the church.

- Is VDOT on board with this plan to date?

VDOT has not attended any of the meetings to date. The draft plan framework will be shared with VDOT as soon as is feasible.

- How would the hospital relocation affect us?

We need more information to make an assessment of this issue.

- People like cul-de-sacs.

Many people find that living on a cul-de-sac is pleasant. However, there are trade-offs to the community. Too many cul-de-sacs will tend to cause excessive traffic loading on the few remaining through streets. Avoiding cul-de-sacs helps distribute traffic better throughout an area. However, there are also urban design techniques for creating some of the qualities of cul-de-sacs (quiet, safety, privacy) without the traffic impacts. These include “eyebrows” and “courts” which are essentially small protrusions off the main street, often with a green

in the middle, that create a cul-de-sac like environment, yet allow the overall street pattern to be highly interconnected.

- We want to protect the face of Massanutten mountain; I applaud your effort – the vision; the mountain is “who we are”; need to expand the concept of “facilities” to include soccer, la cross, etc. and also not just recreation.
- Use the flood plain areas for community action areas [recreation, etc.]
- People like the privacy of large lots.

True; yet there are trade-offs that we are trying to balance in this process. Affordability, efficiency of service provision, amount of land conversion per population, etc. The committee will continue to work through this issue to determine an agreeable mix of large and small lots in the study area.

- Elementary school is nearing capacity; kindergarten classes recently increased at Penn Laird.
- We want larger lots but also affordability.

This is the dilemma.

- Our community shouldn't be divided between the different elementary schools.
- Development is moving out toward us from Harrisonburg.
- The problem with a 7,500 square foot lot size is that you have to compare to what the zoning district will be - we don't want townhouses to be allowed along with small lots.

It is important to understand how these recommendations relate to the current zoning regulations, and also to determine what new zoning regulations or new zoning districts might be necessary to implement this plan.

For the next CAC meeting on November 4, the team will prepare some prototype site designs to illustrate some of the choices for lot size combinations, densities and street patterns, for the core and for the expansion area.

Summary of Input and Consensus of CAC at Meeting on 11-4-04

The Citizen Advisory Committee reviewed the refined Community Concept Plan (Land Use Framework Map) and the Illustrative Alternative sketches of site developments in the core and expansion areas. The Committee's comments are shown in plain type below; consulting team responses are shown in italics below each Committee comment:

Comments Regarding the Core Area

- I like the roundabouts – they are safer for bikes and pedestrians.

Consulting team response: Roundabouts do keep traffic moving along, and they reduce the number of conflicts between motor vehicles and pedestrians; however, VDOT may be very hesitant to approve the one shown at McGaheysville Road and Island Ford Road; further, if you have only roundabouts and no conventional intersections, sometimes traffic can move too smoothly and not provide enough breaks in flow to allow convenient turning movements at driveways and other entrances. We would urge the County to work hard for the two proposed at the east and west edges.

- Wouldn't roundabouts be a pain – having to make only right turns? (*see above response*)
- The illustrative sketch shows 150 dwellings in the core – this would constitute fully 1/5 of the total planned number of units for the entire village!

Consulting team response: Yes, the capacity of the defined Service Area for the entire Village study area is very large, due to the sewer pipes being in place and serving numerous subwatershed areas that all drain to the existing pipe system. It is not necessary to show as many total units as we have shown in order to accommodate the expected growth over 25 years; however, if lower density is planned, the sewer system will be less efficient and more costly per dwelling unit served, and more land will be converted to development per new unit built. This is the major dilemma the CAC is struggling to balance in the plan.

- 18-wheel trucks roll along Island Ford Road, plus commuter traffic – too many new intersections and cross streets would be a problem.

Consulting team response: We share that concern – we can and will adjust the drawing to show fewer new intersections with Island Ford Road, even in the core area itself.

- Larger lots produce bigger and more expensive houses.

Consulting team response: Yes, this is true, assuming all other things being equal. That is why the draft plan maps show a variety of lot sizes and densities, rather than a uniform pattern. The CAC has also wrestled with the tension between the advantages and disadvantages of small lots, and those of larger lots. So the plan shows some of both, although the average lot size within the village service area is aimed at being a reasonably efficient size for service by central public utilities.

- We're not gaining open space from packing the core area.

Consulting team response: It's true in the sense that the defined expansion area is "fixed" in size, based upon the existing pipes in the ground and the topography that divides the various subwatersheds. However, to the extent that higher density is located in the core, it will take a longer time to develop the expansion areas, and thus they will remain at lower densities for a longer time (all other things being equal).

- I'd like to see more green space along Island Ford Road.

Consulting team response: That's a good suggestion, especially for the areas farther from the center of the core area (the village green shown at the intersection of Island Ford Road and McGaheysville Road), and this can be done by slightly increasing the building setbacks along that road and by showing significant landscaping between the buildings and the road right-of-way.

Comments Regarding the Expansion Area

- Why not 1.0 dwellings per acre, with open space amenities?

Consulting team response: That's not a bad idea – again, the dilemma is the trade-off between the various benefits of having lower density within the village service area (higher lot values/prices, etc.), with the various disadvantages (greater land consumption, less efficient use of public infrastructure, less affordable housing, etc.)

- Why should McGaheysville have to bear the burden of density of the whole County?

Consulting team response: McGaheysville has been designated as a growth area in the County's Comprehensive Plan due in part to the public investments that have been made there – three schools, fire station, sewer and water service, highway improvements (especially Rt. 33), etc. Thus, McGaheysville has a role to play in absorbing some future development, although that burden should indeed be shared with other designated growth areas in the County, including substantial land around the City, as well as each of the incorporated Towns.

- What about having a cluster policy of 75% cluster lots and 25% large lots to balance both large lots and small lots within the new neighborhoods? That way, you could follow existing zoning ordinance regulations now on the books.

Consulting team response: The alternative sketches show 50% and 60% large lots/open space, and we're afraid if you go any less than 50%, you will not have enough land in large lots/open space to give the appearance from the existing roadways of a low density environment, which is one of the goals for the expansion area. Even at 50% area for the cluster lots in the center, the perimeter of large lots is rather "thin".

- Why not make smaller lots an option for the Board of Supervisors to approve on a case-by-case basis?

Consulting team response: That could be done by establishing clear criteria for such approvals - which this plan will do, but it could not be a matter of the whim of the Board – the plan would need to set criteria that are attainable in order to withstand a challenge to a denied rezoning application. However, the concept of approving rather than guaranteeing small lots is now implicit in the draft policy framework and it can be stated more explicitly. An applicant must meet the design criteria in order to achieve the higher densities and smaller lots permitted by the plan policies – it is not a guarantee.

- The pace of development is more important than density.

Consulting team response: Good point. It is more difficult to control the pace, although because of the constraints on sewer capacity in the McGaheysville area, there is a better chance to control the pace indirectly than is possible in most other growth areas. However, under Virginia law, the County cannot explicitly control the pace of development.

- Can you phase the provision of sewer service to McGaheysville?

Consulting team response: We believe the answer would be yes, that the allocation of the share of sewer capacity to McGaheysville could be phased in relation to the share allocated to other areas served by the plant. This policy would need to be established at the time that financing and engineering design of the plant is approved.

- There needs to be a policy for phasing individual development projects, too.

Consulting team response: Good point. That policy can be included in the draft plan.

- How about using a mix of R-1 and R-2 zoning to create the mix of densities for sites within the expansion area, and use the R-2 district in the core area?

Consulting team response: We will examine that suggestion in detail, in relation to the design policies that pertain to those areas. We suspect that using the R-5 with proffers that lower the overall density to match the plan policies might work better in terms of giving adequate flexibility in lot size, but we will give it a close look. The County may end up creating a new district for areas like McGaheysville.

The Committee had a thorough discussion of the density options for both the Core Area and the Expansion Area. There was consensus to retain a distinction between the two areas. Appropriate gross and net densities were discussed in depth. After much deliberation, every committee member present agreed to accept the following changes to the residential density concepts:

	<i>Maximum Gross Density for a given development site (dwelling units per acre)</i>	<i>Minimum Lot Size in the central Cluster Area of a site</i>	<i>Cluster area / Large Lot area</i>
<i>Expansion Area</i>	2.0 <u>1.7</u> units per acre	5,000 <u>8,000</u> sq. ft.	40% cluster lots / 60% open space lots*
<i>Core Area</i>	3.0 <u>2.5</u> units per acre	5,000 <u>6,000</u> sq. ft.	n/a

*a percentage split with at least 60% in large, open space lots is required in order to be permitted the maximum gross density.

Summary of Results of Final CAC Meeting, 12-16-04

Last night the CAC reached consensus on changing, clarifying or adding the following items to the draft McGaheysville Area Plan, according to my notes from the meeting. Please let me know immediately if you believe any of this is inaccurate.

Map Refinements

- The near term area (solid yellow) north of the railroad and east of the Fire Station will be changed to long term (slashed yellow).
- Strike the future road link through the France farm that connects to the intersection in front of the High School.
- Strike the alternative future road link off Pineville road
- Strike the alternative future road links north of the Fire Station that connect to Bloomer Springs Road – instead, improve existing Bloomer Springs road as needed. (Retain the proposed future short parallel road north of the railroad tracks).
- Move the village core line (orange area) slightly south in conjunction with adding policy language for buffering the residential core from the industrial area to the south, [with buffers on both the industrial and residential portions to ensure the buffer is in place when needed]. Add language noting the potential for a park site between these two uses, if it can be sufficiently protected from any conflicts with the industrial activities.

Policy Refinements

- Define “Near Term” Expansion Area to mean areas that have the first priority for receiving wastewater treatment capacity (these are shown in solid yellow on the Community Concept Map). “Long Term” Expansion Area means areas that may receive capacity after the Near Term areas are substantially developed.
- Add a policy to avoid widening of McGaheysville Road for motor vehicle traffic within the core area.
- Add language about protecting views from locations at the edges of the service area – including encouraging clustering of houses away from the edges. (such language is already in the draft plan text, but we will review it to make sure it is sufficient). Specially cite the desire to protect the cemetery and to provide for its future expansion.
- Note that the McGaheysville Area Plan will be reviewed annually and every five years.
- Add policy that the connecting roads between neighborhoods should be “calmed”.

- Define “community industrial” to be light industrial, small scale and generally compatible with the existing village character.
- Discourage cul-de-sacs but do not prohibit.
- Adjust the Development Guidelines for the Expansion Area as follows:
 - Protect the appearance and function of the existing collector roads by locating larger lots and/or open space along those roads, and clustering the smaller lots deeper within each site.
 - Limit each development site to a maximum of 1.7 dwellings per gross acres.
 - Require applicants to submit a binding Master Plan for the property which upon approval will place conservation easements on the large lots and open space areas prohibiting any further subdivision.
 - Permit Single Family Detached units and duplex units [as currently drafted].
- Prepare an addendum regarding protection of historic sites and viewsheds.

Edits/Corrections

- Don’t over-repeat the policy of discouraging garagescapes.
- Correct the colors on the Community Concept Map – the green for National Forest should be different than the color for the neighborhood greens; Industrial land use designation on map should match the color in the legend block.
- Regarding the access road to Woodstone Meadows, add also “to Village Festival”.

Other

- Add a glossary of terms to the Plan
- Gene Hauze also offered language regarding the pace of development in Massanutten – add this as a second addendum for consideration.

**WORKSHEET of Remaining Concerns –
Identified by Citizen Advisory Committee (thru 6-05)**

Major Policy Concerns and Suggested Refinements

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
No 5 - no 1 - ok	1.	Text: Adopt an overall, maximum ultimate residential density for the entire village (“core” and “near term expansion” areas inside the service area) as a “ceiling” on the total amount of residential development within the McGaheysville area – a density that is compatible with the existing core area – 1.0 dwellings per gross acre. This would be a “target” density, commensurate with available and planned utilities.	Sets an upper limit on the overall intensity of development within the service area, ensuring that the village as a whole will not become too “urban”.	Interesting idea. It recognizes that some tracts will not likely be developed as intensely as others and reinforces the notion of a variety of lots sizes, and densities within the area.
OK 8 - ok 1 - no DONE	2.	Text: Add a policy to phase the construction of the future wastewater treatment plant upgrade, allocating the treatment capacity of the initial construction phase to the “core” and “near term expansion” areas as noted above, while allocating the second phase of treatment capacity to the long term expansion areas and areas outside of the McGaheysville area. <u>The design of the plant should include both phases of construction for cost effectiveness.</u>	Helps to ensure that development will not happen too rapidly within the village and that it will be compact and in accord with the plan.	This could work but will require a commitment from the County to provide the capacity allocated to McGaheysville.
OK 7 -ok 1 - no DONE	3.	Text: The plan’s policy guidelines should result in a balance of housing prices, with about a quarter of new housing in the <u>price</u> range of Affordable values, about half in the <u>price</u> range of Moderate values and about a quarter <u>in the price range of</u> High values.	Provides a clear guideline for balancing the mix of housing values.	Interesting idea. Helps address the concern about housing affordability.
OK 5 - ok 1 - No DONE	4.	Text: <i>Revise Density and Pattern in the Expansion Areas</i> Adopt a compromise density for the expansion areas of 2.0 units per gross acre (like R-1) and 3.0 units per acre net within the cluster portion of the site (like R-2). Cluster developments in the expansion areas would typically be 50% of acreage in large lots/open space and 50% cluster lots. (Maintain the policy of ensuring substantial setbacks and large lots along the existing main roads).	Would provide clearer guidance and better ensure that the desired outcome is achieved; will use less land per new unit on average; and will ensure that the lots within the cluster are not too small. Also provides incentive for land already zoned R-1 to rezone to R-1 conditional and be more in accord with the Plan.	This is a reasonable option and has some advantages. There is no “best” option.

Major Policy Concerns and Suggested Refinements (continued)

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
OK 7 -ok 2 - No DONE	5.	Text: <i>Revise Density and Pattern in the Core Area</i> Adopt a compromise density for the core area of 3.0 units per acre gross and 4.0 units per acre net within the cluster portion of the site.	Would provide clearer guidance and better ensure that the desired outcome is achieved; will use less land per new unit on average; and will ensure that the lots within the cluster are not too small. Helps to concentrate housing within the core area, as called for in the Plan.	This is a reasonable option and has some advantages. There is no “best” option.
6 -Ok 1 - No DONE	6.	Text: Re-insert the policy for encouraging cluster patterns of development in the expansion areas, as reflected above. (keep the requirement for buffers along major state roads and at edges of service area).	This will provide clearer guidance and better ensure that the desired outcome is achieved.	Concur with the proposal and its rationale.
7 - No 1 - ok	7.	Text: Increase the allowable density within the core area to 10 units per acre, gross.	Will help create a true “downtown” for McGaheysville. Will make better use of the land, keep the village compact, take pressure off of the farmland, help avoid sprawl, and reduce average cost of new dwellings.	The vision created by citizens doesn’t call for a “downtown” character in McGaheysville, despite some benefits of the concept.
7 - No	8.	Text: Increase the allowable density within the expansion areas near the core to 5 to 6 units per acre, gross.	Will make better use of the land, keep the village compact, take pressure off of the farmland, help avoid sprawl, reduce average cost of new dwellings.	Would indeed require less land conversion, but would cause a major change in the character of the area.
7 - No	9.	Text: Increase the allowable density within the expansion areas farther from the core to 3 to 4 units per acre, gross.	Will make better use of the land, keep the village compact, take pressure off of the farmland, help avoid sprawl, reduce average cost of new dwellings.	Same comment as above.
6 - Ok 1 - no DONE	10.	Text: Generally, the more affordable units will be in and near the core of the village, but such units should be occur in small groups and mixed together with units of different sizes, types and prices. Smaller lots should generally be tucked in off the main road, with larger lots along the main roads.	Will allow for some affordable housing stock while still maintaining a “rural village” character.	This concept is consistent with the other policies of the draft Plan.

Major Policy Concerns and Suggested Refinements (continued)

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
OK 9 - Ok DONE	11.	Text: Add clear policy language that new growth should generally not occur north of the railroad that parallels Rt. 33.	Committee talked about this – existing utilities are mainly south of Rt. 33 and it’s best to keep traffic to the south.	This is consistent with the existing policies of the draft Plan.
? 3 - ok 3 - no	12.	Text: Clarify language for the agricultural reserve area surrounding the village service area to mean “agricultural reserve” and not “agricultural transition”.	The surrounding agricultural land is meant to remain in agriculture and very low density uses without urban or suburban growth patterns.	This is consistent with the existing policies of the draft Plan.
8 - No 1 - ok	13.	Text: Limit development in the agricultural reserve area surrounding the village service area to about one lot per 30 or 40 acres.	Helps preserve farmland, helps preserve the village identity, helps avoid sprawl.	The rationale for the proposed language is sound, although it has countywide implications.
OK 8 - Ok 1 - no DONE	14.	Concept Plan Map: Show a larger “near term” expansion area on the east side of the core area, south of Rt. 33 in order to balance the growth on both sides of the core area. If additional sewage pump stations are allowed, this area would be the first to be considered.	This would better balance the amount of growth and traffic on each side of the village core area.	The “near term” expansion areas were based on “gravity” sewer service areas. There’s a little flexibility in these lines, but not very much.
OK 7 - Ok 1 - No DONE	15.	Concept Plan Map: Eliminate the “long term” expansion area east of East Point Road on <i>south</i> side of Rt. 33 – not needed and not appropriate.	There are no utilities here and it is not necessary to designate this land for development.	This is a valid point. (This area was shown as long-term expansion due to its proximity to Rt. 33).
OK 7 - Ok 1 - no DONE	16.	Concept Plan Map: Eliminate the “long term” expansion east of East Point Road on <i>north</i> side of Rt. 33 - – not needed and not appropriate.	There are no utilities here and it is not necessary to designate this land for development.	This is a valid point. (This area was shown as long-term expansion due to its proximity to Rt. 33).

Other Policy Concerns and Suggested Refinements

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
5 - Ok 3 - No See Note at Right	1.	Concept Plan Map: Show the boundary of the service area to coincide with property parcel lines. <i>[The boundary was not changed in the 6-15-05 draft due to inconsistencies with other policies and uncertainties about precise lines. Planning Commission needs to review.]</i>	Land is rezoned and developed typically along property boundaries.	This point is fairly debatable. The line reflects a technical rationale (topography). The exact line has inherent flexibility due to engineering procedures in building sewer lines.
4 -No 3 - Ok	2.	Concept Plan Map: Remove any land from the study area that is located in Election District #3.	Most citizens in the area are in District 4. Those in District 3 have not been part of this process.	The Election District boundaries are not relevant to the planning policies, in our judgment.
4 - Ok 1 - No DONE	3.	Concept Plan Map: Two properties owned by the Fire Company – one to the north and one to the west of the Fire Station - should be shown as “hatched yellow” or Long-Term Expansion. Only those properties directly on McGahey Lane should be shaded in solid yellow.	Both these properties are zoned A-1 and will NOT likely be developed into residential areas. Additionally, they present a separate transportation issue. This was agreed to at the December meeting.	Expansion areas are based on existing sewer lines, not on who owns the property, because ownership can change quickly. On 12-16-04, the CAC decided: “The near term area (solid yellow) north of the railroad and east of the Fire Station will be changed to long term (slashed yellow).”
6 - No 3 - Ok	4.	Concept Plan Map: Add another small core area in the vicinity of the existing mobile home park.	Need commercial services nearby.	Such uses to be closer to the existing core.
6 - Ok 1 - No DONE	5.	Concept Plan Map: Show commercial [“village core” designation] use potential between Hank’s and the Fire Station.	Need commercial services nearby.	Consistent with the proposed road network. Rail crossing is a concern.
OK 5 - Ok 2 - No DONE	6.a	Concept Plan Map: Show the conceptual future road connection through the France Farm, connecting McGaheysville Road to Rt. 33 at Spotswood High School.	Need better intersection at High School to improve safety of bus and student traffic, and ultimately to provide better access to the village.	The consulting team has always supported this idea because in the long term the road will likely be desired. The road would be very unlikely unless the landowner decides to rezone and develop the property.
No 5 - No 3 - ok	6.b	Concept Plan Map: Don’t show the future road through the France Farm at this time – but do expect developers to give (proffer) the road corridor in return for rezoning.	Road is not needed now. Landowners don’t want it. Might de-value the property. Might encourage development.	See comment above.

Other Policy Concerns and Suggested Refinements (continued)

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
No 2 - ok 2 - no	6.c	Concept Plan Map: Show the alternate connection between Pineville and Slate Road.		
4 - Ok 2 - No DONE	7.	Text: Add a policy to reduce the number of crossovers of Rt. 33.	Consistent will all discussions to date and the desires for access management on Rt. 33.	Generally concur, although any reductions should be carefully analyzed.
3 - Ok 3 - No DONE	8.	Concept Plan Map: Delete crossover of Rt. 33 east of Woodstone, east of photographers house.	Minimize all crossings of Rt. 33	We believe that in the very long term, this crossing will likely be desirable. Refer to comment for #10 below.
1 - No 1 - ok	9.	Concept Plan Map: Discuss Bloomer Springs road extension to east, on north side of Rt. 33.	We never discussed this.	A good parallel road network to Rt. 33 is needed in order to limit the access points along it.
8 - Ok DONE	10.	Text: Define/clarify “expansion areas” as mainly for residential uses not for commercial uses.	Clarifies the intent of the committee. Will help ensure that the intended land use pattern will be achieved.	This would be a useful clarification.
7 - Ok DONE	11.	Text: Clarify the assumption that new pump stations for wastewater collection are to be avoided in order to support the service area boundary as shown, which is based on gravity flow.	Clarifies the rationale that has been relied upon throughout the process.	This would be a useful clarification.
7 - Ok 1 - No DONE	12.	Text: Add policy language that schools should be located in or near communities and not out in the farmland areas.	Will help reduce the pressures to violate the sewer service boundary.	This concept would be consistent with the thrust of the Plan to reinforce the vitality of McGaheysville and keep growth compact.
7 - Ok 1 - No DONE	13.	Text: Add language that clarifies that the Comprehensive Plan is a guide, not a law, in accord with the provisions of the State Code.	Will remind everyone that in Virginia the Plan is a guide and has some inherent flexibility.	Indeed, in Virginia the Plan is a guide. However, might also note that it is important to follow the Plan.
9 - Ok DONE	14.	Text: Add a policy to eventually provide <u>for</u> turn lanes for existing crossovers. (in conjunction with #7 above)	Consistent will all discussions to date and the desires for access management on Rt. 33.	Generally concur, although each case should be carefully analyzed.
5 – Ok 2 - No See Note at Right	15.	Text: Strengthen the Implementation Section by increasing the specificity of the action steps and by adding new actions (listed in specific concerns below). <i>[some adjustments were made in accord with comments, but further specificity will require guidance from the Planning Commission]</i>	Need a way to monitor or “police” progress to ensure that the plan is implemented.	Generally concur, although it’s important to recognize that there are limits to the detail that should be included in a long term comprehensive plan – it will be reviewed and monitored on a regular basis.

Specific Concerns Regarding Text or Policies

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
OK 7 - Ok DONE	1.	<p>Add specific language dealing with the future of Great Eastern and Massanutten Village, as follows:</p> <p>Policies for Surrounding Farmland and Mountain: Policy 2 -- <i>add the following bullet:</i> “• Managing the growth rate of the Massanutten Resort in synergy with the development of McGaheysville. This includes recognizing that, currently, the Great Eastern Resort Corporation (GERC) has approval to develop 1,350 timeshare units at Woodstone Meadows, and, presently, approximately 350 units have been built at a construction rate of 60 per year (planned construction rate = 50 to 100 units per year). At the current or planned construction rate, it will take 10 to 20 years to complete the currently approved units. Additionally, GERC has approval to develop the Village Festival Project (Water Park and Shopping Center) over the next 5 to 10 years. Additional growth of the Resort should be managed accordingly, allowing the impact of the currently approved projects to be realized before approval of additional growth.”</p>	<p>Recognizes the reality of Massanutten Village plans and approvals. The citizens of MV want this.</p>	<p>This is generally consistent with the strategic approach proposed in the draft Plan. (We have not confirmed the accuracy of the numbers shown, but have no reason to doubt them).</p>
8 - Ok DONE	1.a	<p>Add language that calls for McGaheysville, Great Eastern and Massanutten Village to work collaboratively on planning issues</p>	<p>Massanutten is part of the larger community.</p>	<p>Collaboration would provide a greater likelihood that the plan’s policies can be achieved.</p>
6 - Ok 2 - No DONE	2.	<p>When the CAC decided to go to just 1.7 du/ac and eliminate the minimum lot size, the discussion also de-emphasized cluster development. The text needs to reflect this by "encouraging" cluster development instead of requiring it. Additionally, with respect to duplexes, "a smaller proportion of" was used under the core area description. The same phrase should be used here to be consistent.</p>	<p>This will make the language more consistent with the CAC decisions on 12-16-05.</p>	<p>The more that development is clustered, the more likely the existing character along McGaheysville Road will be maintained. Language that supports cluster patterns should be as strong as possible.</p>
5 - Ok 1 - No DONE	2.a	<p>Add language specifically discouraging duplex units in the expansion areas.</p>		
7 - Ok 1 - No DONE	3.	<p>Don’t require sidewalks outside the core area; focus instead on walking trails.</p>	<p>Sidewalks are more appropriate for the core area.</p>	<p>But within cluster areas where lot patterns are compact, sidewalks will be very important.</p>

Specific Concerns Regarding Text or Policies (continued)

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
7 - Ok DONE	4.	Community Facilities within the Village Service Area -- include a parenthetical after telecommunication to ensure understanding that this is cell phone towers, etc.	Clarity for the reader.	Concur.
8 - Ok 1 – No DONE	5.	Community Facilities within the Village Service Area -- Add language to "plan and develop" in addition to "build" a new public park. The County should establish a committee to finish the work we started under this effort.	Planning must precede building.	Concur.
6 - Ok 2 - No DONE	6.	Add language that calls for protection of other valuable viewsheds in the McGaheysville area, such as the views of the Blue Ridge Mountains. (in addition to Rt. 996 which we dealt with by calling for set-backs and larger lots along the roads)	The view from the Cemetery to the Blue Ridge Mountains is a very important feature of the village, for example.	Concur – and would recommend including suggested techniques for achieving this in a “win-win” manner, such as on-site clustering, easement donation or purchase, etc.
8 - Ok DONE	7.	Add language that calls for mitigating the impacts of lighting that accompanies new development (front porch lights, night lights, street lights, parking lot lights to name a few) – call for downlighting without spillage off the property. To protect the privacy of residents as well as the rural view of a dark night sky.	To mitigate the impacts of growth on the character of the village and the safety and enjoyment of the citizens.	Concur.
7 - Ok DONE	8.	Add language that calls for noise regulation for this setting.	To mitigate the impacts of growth on the character of the village and the safety and enjoyment of the citizens.	Concur.
8 - Ok 1 – No DONE	9.	Add language that calls for Signage at commercial establishments to reflect a low-key "village" quality. No neon, flashing or brightly uplit signs. Signs should be lighted from within or from a soffit above the sign. <u>Signs should be limited in height.</u>	To mitigate the impacts of growth on the character of the village and the safety and enjoyment of the citizens.	Concur.
6 - Ok 1 – No DONE	10.	Add or clarify language calling for Greenways connecting all developments, connecting from one end of the village to the other, actually on both sides of 996 would be ideal...not necessarily along 996, but built into the new developments on either side.	For quality of life, transportation, recreation and many other benefits.	Concur.

Specific Concerns Regarding Text or Policies (continued)

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
8 - Ok DONE	11.	Add or clarify language calling for greenbelts and setbacks along public areas for both housing and commercial. Total tight buildout of all available acreage should be discouraged (except in the core), with more thought to the lay of the land and "natural" buildout.	To preserve the existing character.	Concur. The policies drafted to date are aimed at achieving this.
6 - Ok 1 – No DONE	12.	Add language calling for cell tower limitations in the McGaheysville area no more than 10' above tree line height, requiring tower and satellite sharing, using all available technology. [The Rockingham County Cell Site study committee agreed to this but it was scrapped by the County Attorney]. Favorable sites such as school lots, and public lands (fire dept./rescue squad, etc) should be given first consideration, both for views away from housing and income for public services. Ideal placements in hollows or on hillsides instead of hilltops and open fields should also be recommended. Definitely no towers that require lighting (this goes up to 199' though, so it's much higher that we should have in this area.)	To preserve the existing character.	State and Federal laws set some limitations on regulating towers – need to conform to these.
8 - Ok 1 – No DONE	13.	Add or clarify language calling for the “right to farm” in the agricultural areas, since some of the developments will back up to true agricultural land. An even better reason for some green space buffer around the entire development.	Will help encourage farmland preservation and a healthy agricultural economy.	Concur.
7 - Ok DONE	14.	Add language calling for the burying of all new utilities: phone, electric, etc.	Will help preserve the village character.	Concur.

Specific Concerns Regarding Text or Policies (continued)

OK/No		Concern / Recommendation from CAC Member	Reasoning	Consultant Comment
8 - Ok DONE	15.	Add language calling for the elimination of existing above-ground lines as an eventual goal (along with the sidewalks, bike trails, etc.)	Will help preserve the village character.	Concur. Yet, burying existing utilities can be very costly and will compete with other funding priorities.
6 - Ok DONE	16.	Recognize that suburban development actually does have a lot of open space and diversity of dwelling types – that’s not the issue.	Some of the references in the graphics are not completely accurate in this regard.	We do need to clarify this language.
5 - Ok DONE	17.	Don’t use the term “urban”.	McGaheysville is a “rural village”.	Normally, “urban” refers to places with public water and sewer.
3 - No 3 - Ok	18.	Eliminate all use of the word "avoid" – change to “discourage” (such as when referring to garagescapes)		This is a style question for the Committee.
3 - Ok 1 - No DONE	19.	Edges between Surrounding Farmland & Village Service: Policy #1 -- "encourage" instead of "use"		This is a style question for the Committee.
5 - Ok 1 – No DONE	20.	Village Expansion Areas and Village Core Area -- "allow" alleys instead of "use"		This is a style question for the Committee.
7 - Ok DONE	21.	Define "Zero Lot Line" in the glossary of terms.		Concur.
6 - Ok 2 – No DONE	22.	Define "garagescapes" and make sure that it only applies to higher density lots.		Garagescapes are out of character with McGaheysville and should be avoided or strongly discouraged within the area.
5 – Ok DONE	23.	Planning Policy Framework: Policy 2 -- change "available tools available to it" -- too many availables.		Concur.
6 - Ok	24.	Policies for the Village Service Area, bullet #6 -- you have placed the parenthetical "(conceptual)" -- this is redundant - should be deleted. <i>[the parenthetical note was retained simply for clarity and emphasis, because the title of the map is “community concept plan” and the term “conceptual” is a different word. The Planning Commission may wish to delete it].</i>		Concur.