

-----Forwarded Message-----

From: Jack Larson

Sent: Feb 1, 2007 4:29 PM

To: blwarren4690@netzero.net

Cc: Tara Booth , chanoew@peoplepc.com, Charles Chase , David Jones , Don Gill , Don McCann , Ernest Palin , Harriett Dietz , RJ Eldridge , Bob Smart , Reverend Rodney Waller , Steven Sorensen

Subject: RE: Timbering Ordinance

Bill, Thank you for the feedback. I believe Bill Pennell put it best when he said that you do not control growth with the extension, or denial of extension, of wastewater treatment/water lines, but you control it through zoning. The lines should go where they are needed. I am sure you noticed the big writeup in the paper today about Greentown. Right now there is only one alternative for giving those folks sewage treatment. My proposal would allow a second alternative, Kilmarnock, if such an arrangement could be negotiated. Bottom line, there are those who need it right now, so, as Bill says, we need to separate future density allowances from that issue. Having said that, I know you are correct when you say that there are those who tie the two together. That is unfortunate, but we will just have to deal with that.

As to the density proposed by Land Design of 6 to 8 dwelling units per acre, I think that is a figure that needs to be "thrown up against the wall" to see if it sticks. I don't know what the right figure is but that one seems reasonable, especially for townhomes, condominiums, or "patio homes" that would be developed in accordance with a nice plan that included buffering, open space, amenities, etc. I think we need the option for this kind of development in the primary growth area where the Waterfront Overlay does not take precedent. That is not to say that there would be this same kind of density elsewhere in the County. I would ask you and others who have the same concerns to consider the Primary Growth Area separately from the rest of the County, to consider simple subdivision separate from planned development, and to present some densities and conditions to the Planning Commission from which common ground can be obtained. The Planning Commission will have to give guidance to Land Design as to what should be said in the implementation chapter.

As you consider density, please remember that the Planning Commission has been pulled both ways on this issue. An effort by the Planning Commission to increase minimum lot sizes in the existing zoning districts some four years ago went for naught because one supervisor felt that the very modest, by comparison to some minimum lot sizes that have more recently been proposed, would price persons of limited means out of the housing market; they would have to buy a large, expensive lot instead of being able to buy a small, inexpensive lot. I think that most realtors would agree that location and demand have a lot more to do with price than size of lot. Hence, I do not accept Joe Urban's point that increasing density increases cost. The cost of those Florida lots was demand driven like anything else.

Enough said, I hope this has given food for thought. I look forward to the February 15 meeting where we can nail many of these things down.

Jack

-----Original Message-----

From: blwarren4690@netzero.net [mailto:blwarren4690@netzero.net]

Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2007 9:00 PM

To: jlarson@lancova.com

Cc: chanoew@peoplepc.com

Subject: Re: Timbering Ordinance

Jack,

Thanks for the heads-up re your position on this topic !!

PS -- *You and Bill did an excellent job of explaining the Comprehensive Plan, the process, R-WC options, etc. at today's meeting.* Hopefully, it will result in the citizens along Old Mill Cove participating in the up coming meetings.

I also agree with your answer to my question, but please recognize that the "draft" Plan, which now specifies a density of 6 units per acre, is intended as a guide which will spawn revisions to the ordinances (including the Subdivision Ordinance). So, eventually developers like Sowder may submit, or revise, their plans to take advantage of densities up to the 6 unit maximum allowed.

That, in turn, could result in significant harm to the "rural character" of our county. However, we likely don't have to worry about Sowder's development as it will probably go final platt prior to such changes to our ordinances.

Nevertheless, I believe that *many of us would be much more comfortable with the proposed wastewater treatment extensions into the PGA if the maximum density was somewhat reduced from 6 units per acre.*

Thanks,

Bill

PeoplePC Online
A better way to Internet
<http://www.peoplepc.com>