



JOINT REVIEW COMMITTEE
for the Draft Community Development Code
Wednesday, May 8, 2013
3:00 p.m.

Executive Conference Room, County Administration Building
100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina 29902
Phone: (843) 255-2140

Committee Members:

County Council:

Cynthia Bensch
Gerald Dawson
Brian Flewelling
William McBride

Planning Commission:

Diane Chmelik
Mary LeGree
W. Edward Riley
Randolph Stewart

Staff:

Anthony Criscitiello,
Planning Director

1. CALL TO ORDER – 3:00 P.M.
2. REVIEW OF MINUTES:
 - A. February 27, 2013 ([backup](#))
 - B. March 27, 2013 ([backup](#))
 - C. April 10, 2013 ([backup](#))
3. REVIEW DRAFT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE:
 - A. Continued Discussion of Article 2 – Multi-Lot and Single Lot Community Scale Development
 - B. Summary of Requested Changes from April 24, 2013, Meeting ([backup](#))
4. OTHER BUSINESS
 - A. Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 22, 2013, at 3:00 P.M. in Executive Conference Room, County Administration Building, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, SC 29902
5. ADJOURNMENT

Notes:

- The Draft Community Development Code can be viewed on the County website at <http://www.bcgov.net/departments/Planning-and-Development/planning/cdc/>
- If you have any questions, please contact the County Planning Office at (843) 255-2140 or you may leave a comment using at the above link.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE REVIEW TEAM
February 27, 2013

The Community Development Code Review Team (CDCRT), also known as the Joint Code Review Team (Committee), met on Wednesday, February 27, 2013 at 3:00 p.m., in the Executive Conference Room of the County Administration Building, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

ATTENDANCE

Team (Committee) Members:

- County Councilmen: Brian Flewelling, Team (Committee) Chair; Cynthia Bensch, Gerald Dawson, and William McBride
- Planning Commissioners: Mary LeGree, Ron Petit, and Ed Riley / Absent: Diane Chmelik

Staff: Anthony Criscitiello, Planning Director; Delores Frazier, Assistant Planning Director; Robert Merchant, Long-range Planner; and Barbara Childs, Administrative Assistant to the Planning Director

Others: Jennifer Bihl, County Planning Commissioner; Linda Bridges, Town of Port Royal Planning Administrator; Jim Hicks, Planning Commission Chair; Alice Howard, consultant; Lauren Kelly, City of Beaufort Planner; Gary Kubic, County Administrator; Jason Mann, USMC Air Station; Paul Sommerville, County Council Chair; and Randolph Stewart, County Planning Commission;

CALL TO ORDER

Councilman Brian Flewelling called meeting to order at approximately 3:00 p.m. He noted that he would be chairing the Team (Committee). Mr. Flewelling stated the function of the Team (Committee) was to insure that the Code was:

- in a format that was acceptable to the County Planning Commission, County Council, and the citizens at large; and
- fully reviewed from all angles so that it can pass through the adoption process as quickly as possible so that the public can begin utilizing the Code.

Mr. Anthony Criscitiello addressed those present at the meeting. He noted that Mr. Rob Merchant would be presenting a power point presentation to the Team (Committee). This Code (zoning ordinance) is the second most important document for the County, the first being the budget. The Code impacts people's land and money, the natural resources of the community, and the whole fabric of the community. Mr. Criscitiello noted that he has just had a phone conversation with Skeet Von Harten, a former vice-chair of County Council, whose influence during his tenure was "why are we trying to look at our community (the unincorporated County and the municipalities) differently from each other." There should be some commonality in the development regulations, simplicity for the citizens. The Northern and Southern Regional Plans state such commonality. Mr. Criscitiello, noting the presence of Ms. Linda Bridges of the Town of Port Royal and Ms. Lauren Kelly of the City of Beaufort, stated that he saw the municipalities as partners in developing a compatible development code. He has outlined a timeframe for the

adoption of the code. The County received code from the consultant in February 2012 and the staff has been customizing the code to make it work for the unincorporated County. Mr. Criscitiello thanked his staff members for their hard work during this process.

Mr. Criscitiello also noted the presence of Mr. Scott Hansen and Ms. Joanne Romine of the County Management Information Systems (MIS) Department in the meeting, who will work with the Planning Department to link the code page by page on the County website so that the citizens may specifically identify their comments to the staff.

Mr. Flewelling noted that the Team (Committee) will consist of four members each of the County Planning Commission and County Council. The Team (Committee) will review the Code page by page checking everything—including spelling, data, etc. Team (Committee) changes may change the document. He noted that the Administration would break ties when issues arise. Each member was chosen for their talents and constituency they represent. Team (Committee) members are to go to their communities asking for their advice. Questions will arise and could occur as each chapter is approved and even after approval.

Note: Councilman Cynthia Bensch entered meeting at approximately 3:10 p.m.

Mr. Flewelling asked the Team (Committee) members for their agreement on:

- meeting on Wednesday at 3:00 pm every two weeks for a one-hour meeting for four months in the Executive Conference Room; and
- televising the meetings.

Discussion included:

- a possible conflict on the meeting location, date and time but the Development Review Team (DRT) that meets at 1:00 p.m. could be moved if needed;
- that televised sessions might promote or restrict Team (Committee) members from freely speaking their opinions; and
- that televised sessions do provide public involvement.

Mr. Flewelling asked those present to vote on the meeting schedule of Wednesday at 3:00 pm every two weeks for a one-hour meeting for four months in the Executive Conference Room and the televising the meetings (FOR: Bensch, Dawson, Flewelling, McBride, and Riley; AGAINST: LeGree and Petit).

Mr. Flewelling noted that the meetings were public meetings, and the agendas would be published on the website.

Mr. Criscitiello noted that ordinance included text and maps. He asked that the maps not be released until the St. Helena Island citizens had viewed the maps because of his earlier promise to show the maps prior to full public release. He did not want the St. Helena citizens to feel their earlier input has been ignored.

Councilman Dawson requested that the Burton and north of the Air Station communities also be allowed to view the maps prior to full release to public. Mr. Criscitiello anticipates such meetings to occur within the month.

When Mr. Flewelling asked for citizen involvement, Mr. Criscitiello asked for comment by Scott Hansen of MIS. Mr. Hansen noted that comments on the website regarding the Code will be reviewed by Mr. Robert Merchant prior to placing those comments on the county website, to avoid posting inappropriate comments.

Prior to Mr. Merchant giving an overview of the Code, Mr. Criscitiello noted the presence of Mr. Jim Hicks, County Planning Commission Chair, at the meeting.

Mr. Merchant introduced himself. He will be providing an overall framework of what will be in the Code.

Summary of the Slide Presentation by Mr. Merchant:

- Slide 1: Title page of presentation
- Slide 2: The purposes of the new Code were to insure that it is more user-friendly and flexible, is updated with because of the new Comprehensive Plan and the Regional Plans, and contains more tools in the development toolbox.
- Slides 3 and 4: The new code will contain the best of the existing ordinance and contain new tools for the development toolbox. The items that will be kept from the existing ordinance include the rural zoning, family compounds, cottage industry, Cultural Protection Overlay District, Community Preservation areas, existing Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), and resource protection standards.
- Slide 5: The new code will be more user friendly, have an improved use table with broader categories of land use, provide more predictability through visuals and illustrations, and have a fine-grained and responsive approach rather than a one size fits all.
- Slides 6 and 7: Most of the information for each district will be on four pages that will state the district purposes, setbacks, minimum lot sizes, parking standards and uses. The current ordinance has the applicant going through several tables throughout the ordinance.
- Slide 8: The Code will have the definitions and illustrations of each type of signs, referencing the allowable districts, and any additional standards, if needed.
- Slide 9: The Code will have tables that reference street standards for applicable districts.
- Slide 10: The Code will have stormwater standards for their applicable districts.
- Slide 11: The new tools in the toolbox offers coordination with municipalities for consistent development in their neighborhoods, provides a seamless regional approach between the County and the municipalities, using transect zones for in-fill and redevelopment, and are prescriptive not proscriptive – telling people what government wants instead of what it does not want.
- Slide 12 and 13: The maps will noted areas where the transact zones would be applied.

- Slide 14 and 15: The Lady's Island map noted how the community responded to the recommended transect districts.
- Slide 16: A list of the various articles of the Code.

Mr. Criscitiello noted that the Code was about 99.8 percent completed to be loaded onto the county webpage.

Mr. Flewelling asked that the Team (Committee) members have at least a week before the next meeting to read and review what would be discussed. The members would be provided a link to the county website; however if the written format was desired it would be provided.

Mr. Criscitiello introduced Ms. Jennifer Bihl, a new member of the County Planning Commission, who was part of the 16-member Technical Review Team (Committee) of the Code. That Team (Committee) consisted of professionals who donated their time and would be using the code, so their input was most helpful. He also introduced Mr. Randolph Stewart, another new member of the County Planning Commission.

Mr. Flewelling asked that the power point presentation and the calendar/timeline be published on the website so that anyone can review the documents.

Mr. Criscitiello asked which Team (Committee) member would desire to receive the Code digitally and noted that Ms. Mary LeGree, Mr. Gerald Dawson and Mr. William McBride desired the paper format. Mr. Criscitiello asked the Team (Committee) to be mindful of the Department's printing budget. There is a possibility of using electronic tablets in this review process.

Mr. Flewelling asked that those in attendance at the meeting to introduce themselves to the Team (Committee).

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting will be two weeks from today, March 13, at 3:00 p.m. in the Executive Conference Room. Mr. Flewelling indicated that a notice would be emailed to the Community Development Code Review Team (CDCRT).

Ms. Mary LeGree asked for clarification of the new title of the code—from form-based code to community development code.

Mr. Flewelling noted that the Code is a mixture of form-based and Euclidean codes.

Mr. Criscitiello noted that the County had a mixture of development, and the Code is a hybrid of the form-based code, thereby improving on the current development ordinance (ZDSO).

Mr. Flewelling noted that the members should familiarize themselves with both types of concepts because we (the Team (Committee)) will have to be able to defend the code.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Flewelling adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:58 p.m.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE REVIEW TEAM
March 27, 2013

The Community Development Code Review Team (CDCRT), also known as the Joint Code Review Team (Committee), met on Wednesday, March 27, 2013 at 3:00 p.m., in the Executive Conference Room of the County Administration Building, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

ATTENDANCE

Team (Committee) Members:

- County Councilmen: Brian Flewelling, Team (Committee) Chair, Cynthia Bensch and Gerald Dawson
- Planning Commissioners: Diane Chmelik, Mary LeGree, Ed Riley and Randolph Stewart

Staff: Anthony Criscitiello, Planning Director; Delores Frazier, Assistant Planning Director; Robert Merchant, Long-range Planner; and Tamekia Judge, Zoning Analyst

Others: Robert Semmler, Chairman, Beaufort County Planning Commission; Reed Armstrong, Coastal Conservation League; Brian Herrmann, Representing Town of Port Royal

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Brian Flewelling called the meeting to order at approximately 3:00 p.m. and led those assembled in the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America.
2. **MINUTES:** No action was taken on the minutes.
3. **REVIEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE: ARTICLE 1 – GENERAL PROVISIONS**

Robert Merchant gave a brief explanation of Article 1. He explained how the Transitional Provisions explain how mapping decisions were made. Mr. Merchant also explained that the Community Preservation districts are all listed even the ones where no changes are being proposed.

Mary LeGree said that the font was difficult to read and the ordinance will need to be more inviting. Mr. Flewelling said that the formatting issues could be addressed at a later time.

Diane Chmelik expressed concern that Article 1 refers to zoning districts that are not yet defined. She said that the first thing she wants to know is what are the zoning districts and what uses are permitted in each district. Mr. Merchant explained that Article 3 provides that information. She said that she was used to having definitions at the beginning of the code. Mr. Flewelling said that when we get to Article 10, we could address the appropriate location of the definition section.

Mr. Riley asked if the on-line draft of the code would provide a link of a word to its definition. Mr. Merchant explained that the current on-line draft consisted of pdf documents.

Mr. Flewelling stated it would be too much work if the links are constantly changing when the document is being edited. He said that once the ordinance is adopted, then hyperlinks will be looked at for ease of navigation.

Ms. Bensch asked for an explanation of the definition of the transect. Mr. Merchant provided a brief explanation. Ms. Bensch said that she was concerned that term would not be understood by the layman.

Mr. Flewelling reiterated from the previous meeting that in the table of contents at the beginning of each Article, he would like to see it clearly labeled which column listed the sections, and which column listed the page numbers.

Mr. Stewart asked what the relationship was between this code and the zoning maps. Mr. Criscitiello said that there are two components that make up any zoning code – the text and the map. He said that the map was not part of any specific article or section of the code.

Ms. LeGree was concerned that on page 1.1-1, it was redundant to list the section references at the top of the page and have them repeated below on the same page. Mr. Stewart explained that this format worked in other divisions where there were many sections and they appeared on different pages. She also said that as she proceeded through article one, it was difficult to tell she was still in article one because it was not indicated in the header of each page. Mr. Flewelling said that the words “Article 1: General Provisions” needed to be on every header in article 1. Mr. Stewart also said that he would like to have each article color coded so it was easy to tell where you are in the code. Mr. Flewelling called for a vote on whether to keep the formatting where the sections were listed at the beginning of each division. Mr. Flewelling, Mr. Dawson, Ms. Chmelik, Mr. Riley, and Mr. Stewart voted in favor of keeping the format. Ms. Bensch and Ms. LeGree voted no.

Ms. LeGree asked that the code state where the references to State laws can be found. Mr. Flewelling said that the state statutes were a very large library of books that are available in the County law library. Mr. Stewart said that we should have a hyperlink to the state statute on-line. Mr. Flewelling said that any changes to the State website would make the hyperlink obsolete. It would provide vigilance to continually update the link. It would be easier for the user to simply google the law reference.

Mr. Stewart said that the title of the code in Section 1.1.10 should be Beaufort County Community Development Code.

Ms. Chmelik said that on page 1.2-1, in section 1.2.10.A(4) it should be reworded to read, “Attempt to Secure Safety from Fire, Flood, and Other Dangers.” She was concerned that we couldn’t promise that we would achieve that goal.

On Page 1.2-1 in the first paragraph in section 1.2.10, several members expressed concern with the term “morals”. Ms. Bensch also expressed concern with the term “convenience”. The committee voted to remove the words “morals” and “convenience” from the first paragraph.

Ms. Chmelik asked about the reference to “urban agriculture”. She asked if it meant that people could have chickens in urban areas. Mr. Merchant explained that these issues are addressed in Article 3 where specific uses are addressed.

Ms. LeGree expressed concern with repetitive language in Section 1.2.10. Mr. Flewelling agreed and said that the section should be edited to eliminate repeating the heading of each item in the explanation afterward. For example, section 1.2.10.A(7) would be edited as follows – “**Promote Green and Sustainable Development.** ~~Promote green and sustainable development~~ through carbon footprint reduction...”

Ms. Chmelik suggested in editing section 1.2.10.B(2) reword to read – “...and integrate safe options for pedestrians, bicyclists, ~~connecting to connect~~ important destinations.”

Mr. Stewart requested editing section 1.2.10.A(8) To read – “Maintain Long Term, Comprehensive, Consistent, Effective, Efficient, and Equitable Standards...” Mr. Stewart also asked that section 1.2.10.B(2) reference “multi-modal” to include other modes of transportation.

Ms. Bensch suggested changing the wording “environmental justice” to “environmental preservation”. Mr. Merchant said that the term referred to making sure that we don’t located undesired land uses in poorer communities. Mr. Flewelling said his concern was that the paragraph didn’t really address the issue of environmental justice. Ms. Chmelik felt the term was too ephemeral or fleeting. Mr. Flewelling agreed, but didn’t know of a simpler way to explain the term without a much longer explanation that would be unnecessary in this section. He felt the wording should remain the way it is.

Ms. Bensch expressed that she did not like the word “hamlet”. She felt that few people used the term. Mr. Criscitiello said that it referred to the scale of a community and that subdivision or community would not be an appropriate substitution. Mr. Flewelling said that he encouraged committee members to find another appropriate word to substitute “hamlet”, otherwise, he does not want to dwell on the issue.

On page 1.2-2, Mr. Stewart requested rewording of section 1.2.10.C(1) to read - “...Promote, preserve, and enhance community design that reflects the distinct and diverse character...”

Ms. Bensch requested rewording section 1.2.10.C(1) to read “...and supports a range of vibrant ~~human habitats~~ communities.”

Mr. Riley requested adding a reference to “multi-modal” forms of transportation to section 1.2.10.D(2).

Mr. Stewart requested rewording section 1.2.10.D(2) to read “Reinforce and Promote Walkable Neighborhood Patterns...” Ms. Chmelik expressed concern that connectivity and

walkability were not universally popular. The committee discussed the issue of walkability. Mr. Flewelling said that his own neighborhood attracted residents from other neighborhoods to walk around because it was so inviting. He said that he invited the additional persons because it means that there are more people reporting if there are problems or potential criminal activity.

Mr. Stewart had a general comment about section 1.2.10.D(4). He said he preferred having affordable housing mixed within all communities. Ms. Bensch expressed concerns about mixing affordable housing in all neighborhoods. It would be difficult to establish property values.

In section 1.2.10.D(3), Ms. Bensch asked for clarification on what the term “incubate” was referring to. Mr. Flewelling suggested replacing the word “incubate” with the word “grow”. Ms. Bensch expressed concern that encouraging local businesses would not be appropriate for all communities. Mr. Flewelling said that at a minimum, allowing someone to have their insurance in their home is a way to encourage local businesses. Ms. Bensch asked if we could enforce this where private covenants would restrict businesses. Mr. Criscitiello said that if covenants are more restrictive, they supersede zoning.

Ms. Bensch requested to substitute the term “building fabric” in section 1.2.10.E(1) with “building context”.

There was general discussion about the applicability of the proposed code to municipal lands, Federal lands, and PUDs.

Mr. Flewelling requested an explanation of section 1.3.50.A which says that the State is exempt from subdivision requirements when land is acquired for public right-of-way. It was discussed that this mainly applied to State acquisition of right-of-way for the construction of new roads or road widening.

Mr. Stewart requested referencing inter-governmental communications in the new development code. Mr. Flewelling felt it was more plan language than code language.

Mr. Stewart reiterated his comment about tables in the code. He said having a different color for tables was helpful, but also, the title of each table should be in a larger font.

Mr. Stewart asked if the code should address incentives for economic development. He said that other codes have addressed this. Mr. Criscitiello said that not all economic development goals are achieved through this code, but by other tools or actions.

Mr. Dawson asked for an explanation of “compatible Lowcountry character” under section 1.4.10.E. Mr. Criscitiello said that it had to do with the context of the building. Mr. Flewelling explained that allowing for a diverse mix of housing types, it creates an opportunity for affordable housing.

Mr. Stewart asked if the language in section 1.4.10.G addressed the issue of beautification of our corridors. Mr. Flewelling felt that the term “retrofit and improvement of existing streets” addressed beautification.

Ms. LeGree said that where we reference other parts of the code, we should always state what article the division is located in. Mr. Flewelling felt that it may be redundant because the first number in a division refers to what article it is in. He said that it may get redundant if done everywhere in the code.

Ms. Bensch asked for explanation of the word “assembly” when referring to road types. Mr. Criscitiello explained that each road is made up of many components – right-of-way, sidewalks, swales, travel lanes, etc.

Ms. Bensch asked for a definition of a regional park. Mr. Merchant explained that Buckwalter Park was a good example of a regional park with a combination of active and passive recreation.

Ms. Chmelik asked if the position of “Community Development Director” would be a new position. Mr. Criscitiello said that it would be and that it would be up to the County Administrator to decide who would fill that position.

4. **OTHER BUSINESS:** Mr. Flewelling noted that the next meeting was on April 10, 2013, at 3:00 p.m.
5. **ADJOURNMENT:** Mr. Flewelling adjourned the meeting at approximately 5.00 p.m.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE REVIEW TEAM
April 10, 2013

The Community Development Code Review Team (CDCRT), also known as the Joint Code Review Team (Committee), met on Wednesday, April 10, 2013 at 3:00 p.m., in the Executive Conference Room of the County Administration Building, 100 Ribaut Road, Beaufort, South Carolina.

ATTENDANCE

Team (Committee) Members:

- County Councilmen: Brian Flewelling, Team (Committee) Chair; Cynthia Bensch; and William McBride (Absent: Gerald Dawson)
- Planning Commissioners: Diane Chmelik, Ed Riley, and Randolph Stewart (Absent: Mary LeGree)

Staff: Anthony Criscitiello, Planning Director; Delores Frazier, Assistant Planning Director; Robert Merchant, Long-range Planner; and Barbara Childs, Administrative Assistant to the Planning Director

Others: Reed Armstrong from Coastal Conservation League and Lauren Kelly from the City of Beaufort Planning Department

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Brian Flewelling called the meeting to order at approximately 3:02 p.m.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Mr. Flewelling led those assembled in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REVIEW OF MINUTES: The minutes of March 13, 2013, meeting were reviewed. Mr. Flewelling asked for corrections and none were received. The minutes were accepted as written (FOR: Bensch, Flewelling, McBride, and Stewart).

REVIEW OF ARTICLE 1:

1.5: Discussion included the zoning map being a separate exercise once the Code was fully reviewed, and the staff scheduling community meetings prior to the release of the maps, a clarification on the new position of Community Development Director, the merging of the Planning and Zoning Departments as the newly formed Community Development Division.

Note: Ms. Chmelik and Mr. Riley entered the meeting at 3:05 p.m.

1.5.20.B. Discussion included the process should a hurricane hit the County, the rationale for using the phrase “reasonable time” instead of stating an actual number of days, that reasonableness was relative to each individual, placing a caveat on the zoning map to note pending amendments may affect the zoning, the individual’s responsibility for insuring the

appropriate zoning/use for their property. The Committee voted to keep the word “reasonable”—the vote was 3 to 2.

1.5.30 Interpretation: Discussion included an explanation of the Community Development Director being responsible for all the items under his department, and the process for challenges to the staff interpretation going through the Planning Commission.

1.6.20 Transition to New Zones: Discussion included the number of zones involved, the differences between the character of Northern and Southern Beaufort County, customizing areas such as May River CP District with higher density than rural, new Code will gradually transition areas to walkable neighborhoods, legislative mandates vs. planning suggestions, Code provides flexibility to property owners, encouraging new walkable developments, concern for freedom to use current architect rather than only using the lowcountry look, research and development district transitioning to Hamlet Center, use of town versus hamlet since hamlet is not common usage, bring 3 different words to replace hamlet.

1.6.20.B. Recommend removing “the” in the fifth line to read “...sharing other aspects...”. No objection noted. Discussion included an explanation of transitioning Community Preservation areas, the involvement of the community in the Community Preservation committees but Council retaining the authority to discontinue the committee as needed, the “SI” zoning means special industrial, transitioning the Community Preservation District in the Code, and the joint Alljoy and Pritchardville CPs workshop where citizen input was received regarding transitioning to the Code.

1.6.30 Violations Continue: Discussion included not having Article 9 to compare with this section.

1.6.40 Nonconformities: Discussion included a clarification of reverting a use to conformity when it was previously nonconforming.

1.6.50 Complete Applications: Recommendation to review Article 9 in relation to this section.

1.6.60 Planned Unit Development (PUD) Approved Prior to...: Discussion included having a mechanism for the applicant to change their stormwater status, clarifying that the current code is to be followed if the PUD does not address a specific standards, that new PUDs will not be allowed by the Code since a PUD-like atmosphere like limited access development may be allowed without the negotiations of standards/density, the lack of tools in the Code that caused the reinsertion of PUDs in the current ordinance, the various development possibilities in the Code, concern that future developers would be deterred by the Code without the possibility of PUDs and develop elsewhere, the amendment process of the Code after adoption, and the Northern Regional Plan discouraging high density in the rural areas.

Recommend discussing retaining or excluding PUDs in the Code with the Planning Commission and County Council.

1.6.70 Other Development Subject to a Development Agreement: No comment received.

1.6.80 Other Approved Development Permits and Approvals: Discussion included previously approved PUDs, sunsetted PUDs, impact fees affecting buildings that are erected, and removing “approval” from this section for clarity. Staff recommended removing “approval” from this section.

1.7.10 Severability: No other comment except that this section contained boiler plate language.

Mr. Criscitiello asked the approval of the Committee for the Planning staff to study and develop a plan using the tools in the Code to see how the Code works for some areas of the county, for example the St. Helena Corners Area. He suggested using the Technical Advisory Group to do the study with the staff. The Committee had no objections. Mr. Riley stated he would like to be treated like a developer and have the staff walk him through the Code.

Further discussion included:

- Page 4 of the Preamble: Recommend reconsidering an alternative to using the phrase “family compound”, the pros and cons of the phrase, and the historical use of the phrase.
- A typo where “roughhouse” should be “rowhouse.”

OTHER BUSINESS:

- The next meeting will be in two weeks (April 24, 2013).
- Mr. Stewart asked the staff to forward the Articles of the Code in PDF format to him so that he can make digital notes and forward it back to the staff.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Flewelling adjourned the meeting, with no objections from the Team, at approximately 4:41 p.m.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE REVIEW TEAM
Summary of Requested Changes - April 24, 2013

Article 1

- Page 1.6-2. In 1.6.20.B – reword to read “Community Preservation areas are transitionable to a mix of rural and urban transect zones that can be further calibrated to respond to their distinct character, while sharing ~~the~~ other aspects of this Development Code.”

Article 2

- Page 2.1-1. In 2.1.10 – in the second paragraph, correct the punctuation in the quotations around “Community type” to include the period or comma within the quotations. Repeat this revision for all similar cases.
- Page 2.1-1. In 2.1.20.A – revise paragraph to remove the parentheses around “major and minor, remove the parentheses around the title of referenced sections, and do not capitalize the word “subdivision.” The paragraph should read as follows - “The Standards in Article 2 apply to all development that is subject to a land development plan, major or minor, described in Section 7.2.60 – Land Development Plan, or subdivision, described in Section 7.3.70 – Subdivision, unless specifically exempted in a subsection.”
- Page 2.1-1. In 2.1.20.B – revise paragraph to read as follows – Review of proposed development to ensure compliance with the standards of this Section shall occur at time the of land development plan, major or minor, described in Section 7.2.60 – Land Development Plan), ~~or~~ and at the time of subdivision, described in Section 7.3.70 – Subdivision, whichever occurs first.
- Page 2.2-2. Revise Table 2.1.30.A as follows:

Table 2.1.30.A Community Types				
Community Type	May be designed as a Multi-lot Example Community?		May be designed as a Single-lot Example Community?	
	Y/N	Example	Y/N	Example
Traditional Neighborhood Community Plan (TCP)	Yes	Subdivided mixed-use neighborhood comprised of Transect Zones.	N/A	N/A Not Applicable
Multi-family Oriented Community	Yes	Subdivided parcel comprised of Multi-family townhouses roughhouses in Conventional Zones.	Yes	Single-lot with Multi-family apartment buildings in Conventional Zones.
Single-Family Oriented Community	Yes	Subdivided neighborhood comprised of Single-family and Two-family residential in Conventional Zones.	Yes	Manufactured Home Community designed with blocks, streets, and civic sites that allow for an easy transition to other single-family oriented communities in the future.
Commercial Oriented Community	Yes	Subdivided parcel comprised of retail, service, or industrial oriented buildings in Conventional Zones.	Yes	Single-lot of retail, service or industrial oriented buildings in Conventional Zones.
Developments Within Rural Areas Oriented Community	Yes	Subdivided neighborhood in Rural comprised of Single-family and Two-family residential houses.	Yes	Single-lot Family Compound in T2-Rural.

Staff will also explore options on how to address Single-Family Oriented Communities since there is not a division in Article 2 that specifically addresses them. One option is to eliminate reference in the table above. The other option is to add a division in Article 2 that specifically addresses Single-family Oriented Communities.

- Page 2.1-2. In 2.1.40 first paragraph delete the parenthesis around “and adjoining land” and reference Comprehensive Plan as guiding document that supports the Community Design Principles.
- Page 2.2-1. In 2.2.20.A reword to read – *“These General Layout Standards apply to all development that is subject to a land development plan, major or minor, described in Section 7.2.60 – Land Development Plan, or subdivision, described in Section 7.3.70 – Subdivision, unless specifically exempted in a subsection.”*
- Page 2.2-1. In 2.2.20.B reword to read – *Review of proposed development to ensure compliance with the standards of this Section shall occur at time the of land development plan, major or minor, described in Section 7.2.60 – Land Development Plan), ~~or~~ and at the time of subdivision, described in Section 7.3.70 – Subdivision, whichever occurs first.*
- Page 2.2.1. In 2.2.30A.2(c) provide definitions for “street chicanes” and “neck downs” in Article 10 – Definitions.
- Page 2.2-2. In 2.2.30.E(4) reconsider whether planted medians within cul-de-sacs should be required.
- Page 2.2-3. In Table 2.2.40.A – Planning Staff will take another look at the maximum perimeter lengths for blocks in T4 Hamlet Center and T4 Neighborhood Center.
- Page 2.2-4. In 2.2.40.A.5 – Reword to read – *“Blocks intended for industrial development may vary from the elements of design contained in this Section ~~if the nature of the use requires other treatment. In such cases, to accommodate safe and convenient access to infrastructure, utilities, parking, and the thoroughfare system shall be provided.~~ Deviations from conventional standards shall only occur when necessary and shall be specifically indicated on the plan.”*
- Page 2.2-4. In 2.2.50.A.1(c) – Provide illustrations that shows lots with their primary frontage along a civic space.
- Page 2.2-5. In 2.2.50.A.3(a)(2) – remove parenthesis around “regardless of the average lot width.”

General Formatting Comments

- More illustrations would be helpful to describe community types, and to describe configuration of lots and blocks.