

Meeting 2 SUMMARY Windham Village Planning August 29, 2022

Meeting held from 6 p.m. to approximately 8:15 p.m. at Renee's Roadhouse, 1747 Black Diamond Rd SW.

Attendees

Approximately 24 members of the community as well as County officials and staff, including County Supervisors Rod Sullivan and Pat Heiden; and Planning, Development and Sustainability (PDS) staff: Josh Busard, Director; Nathan Mueller, Assistant Director; Joseph Wilensky, Assistant Planner; and Maya Simon, Assistant Planner.

Recap of Meeting 1 and Goals of Meeting 2

Assistant Director Mueller welcomed everyone and introduced County supervisors and staff. Mueller summarized the previous village planning meeting and outlined the current meeting goal to obtain feedback and answer questions on the draft vision statement and goals and the draft village boundaries, which had been distributed via mail a few weeks prior and also shared at the venue.

Prior to reviewing the vision statement, Mueller briefly reviewed what a village plan does and does not do and how it is used.

An attendee asked if the proposed village plan process could be abandoned so that no plan was adopted and no village boundary created. Mueller reviewed the direction provided to PDS by the Board of Supervisors. Further conversation centered on the rationale for establishing a plan and advantages that could accrue to the area if a plan was established. Additional discussion centered on prior village planning in River Junction, including the plan adoption process, and how having a plan helps the Board of Supervisors make sound land use decisions. Both Busard and Sullivan spoke to this point.

Mueller addressed several questions on land use restrictions and home business restrictions within a village boundary and the intersection of land use, county regulation and village planning.

Draft Vision Statement

Mueller presented the draft vision statement and requested feedback.

An attendee who was familiar with other village plan vision statements said the presented draft statement was a more conservative one, which he thought was a good thing. Supervisor Heiden noted that the draft was drawn from community feedback both at and following the previous meeting in July. An attendee said the vision statement was accurate, but that the same vision outcomes could be accomplished under a small boundary. In response to a question, Mueller explained what businesses and services are considered "low-intensity commercial," such as a small service garage (low-intensity) as compared to a gas station (high-intensity).

Goal Statements

Quality of Life: An attendee asked how the plan would protect the quality of air and water if the plan/County cannot control the placement of CAFOs. Mueller acknowledged that village plans have no impact on DNR actions related to CAFO placement.

Additional discussion continued questioning the need for, and purpose of, a village plan. Busard said there will be additional public input opportunities for residents prior to and as part of the public hearing process with the Planning and Zoning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Infrastructure and Services: No feedback was provided by attendees on the proposed goals in this category.

Land Use and Growth: No feedback was provided by attendees on the proposed goals in this category.

Boundary Discussion

Mueller reviewed the size of other village growth areas then introduced four potential boundaries of various size for discussion. Three of the four proposals had been previously distributed, while the fourth was created in response to feedback received since the first meeting. Mueller reiterated that any land use changes can happen only with action by the landowner; having a plan and boundary does not require anyone to change their land use.

- An attendee shared two comments: (1) development south of Black Diamond Rd would have to involve a great deal of fill, and this need should be considered when drafting boundaries, and (2) given that the intersection at Orval Yoder Tpke and Black Diamond Rd has a great deal of drainage from the north, it would be good to pull the eastern edge of any boundary further to the west to avoid including that intersection.
- Another attendee asked if the existing residential zoning south of Black Diamond would be impacted by any of the proposed boundaries. Mueller noted that zoning categories would not be changed by the plan and that zoning can only be changed by request of the property owner and Board of Supervisors' approval.

Specific feedback was received only on Boundary Map #4:

- An attendee commented that the fourth boundary was unlike the three others and questioned the origin of the map. Mueller said it was influenced by community feedback received by PDS.
- An attendee noted that allowing development along a gravel road (Eagle Ave SW) may not be as preferable as keeping development on paved roads.

Mueller said that any map is subject to modification, and the overall plan itself is subject to additional input opportunities.

An attendee asked how land owners would know that their property was subject to map or plan restrictions. Mueller and Assistant Planner Joseph Wilensky noted that while certain property information such as existing zoning or Future Land Use Map designations are not included in property descriptions, the area's real estate professionals routinely consult the PDS office about zoning and development restrictions and considerations related to these designations.

Additional Discussion and Conclusion

An attendee asked if an adopted village plan could be altered. Mueller said the oldest plan dates from 2008, and while no village plan has undergone a revision or reconsideration process, upon community request and at the direction of the Board of Supervisors, this could be undertaken by PDS.

Mueller summarized the next steps for plan review and feedback opportunities for attendees, other residents and interested parties.