

Appendix 4:
Public Input and Participation

***Bradfordville Sector Plan Process
Community Meeting***

Lawton Chiles High School

Thursday, March 9, 2000

4 p.m. – Open House

6 p.m.– Sector Plan Meeting

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions (Gary Johnson)
2. Overview of the Sector Plan Process (Val Hubbard)
 - Purpose
 - Status of Working Groups
 - Sector Plan Process and Schedule
3. Presentation of Preliminary Alternative Concepts (WRT)
 - Commercial "Center" Concepts
 - Rural Area Concepts
4. Preliminary Evaluation of Concepts (County Staff and WRT)
5. Public Comment
6. Closing Remarks

**Bradfordville Sector Plan
Community Charette
March 9, 2000 – Lawton Chiles High School**

Open House at 4:00 p.m.

Charette/Meeting convened at 6:03 p.m with approximately 90 persons in attendance (number increased throughout meeting and declined towards the end of the night – see sign up sheets)

Meeting Notes

Gary Johnson opened the meeting with a brief welcome and introduction of the team members, then turned the floor over to Valerie Hubbard, who provided an overview of the Bradfordville Area issues, the sector planning process and schedule, and the status of the court-ordered Working Groups. A member of the audience inquired how the sector plan intended to incorporate the results of the Stormwater Study into the development of scenarios, when said study has not been completed at this point. Ms. Hubbard responded that, while not all the data are in yet, some information is known and the issues understood well enough to allow the development of the scenarios to a conceptual level. Further, the results of the Stormwater Study and other data will be gradually incorporated into the planning process as we continue to refine/modify the scenarios based on their impacts.

Subsequently, John Fernsler of WRT was called on to describe the various concepts that have been developed. Mr. Fernsler first reviewed the firm's understanding of the basic goal the project and characterized key issues that have been identified so far, including those related to community character and context, environmental protection, and transportation. He proceeded to present five scenarios for the commercial area, and two for the rural area of Bradfordville, illustrating their general land use implications while explaining the underlying basis and assumptions of each. Members of the City/County staff then provided a preliminary analysis of potential impacts of the scenarios in other areas such as transportation and drainage/water quality. The floor was then open to questions and public comment, which is summarized below.

Public Comment Session

- What are the present day traffic counts? The alternative representing build-out at present zoning trends indicates a significant increase of trips on Thomasville, but by how much exactly?
- Because of the differences between scenarios (particularly extent of green space in A-1 and B-1), it would be useful to know what traffic counts are generated by the other alternatives.
- Who would purchase Lauder and other properties shown as parkland, and would the owners be able to get fair market value for their properties? A-1 or B-1 are acceptable, but these property owners should be able to obtain fair value in exchange for their land.
- How important really is the input of the stakeholders in this process? Is the Board willing to listen?
- The planning process is on too fast a schedule. The vote by the Board on the scenarios will occur before the Lake McBride study is even completed. The Board has the option of voting to give themselves 5 more months per IDO to work on this project and allow for meaningful public participation.
- WRT is not seeing the rural character of the area. Is the firm aware of the history? No more commercial is needed at all – right now, what stores there are can barely keep themselves in business! The community has more than enough as it is.
- There is concern over Thomasville Road lighting (both road lights and excessive business lighting allowances, e.g. gas stations).

- There is concern that the traffic analysis has not adequately addressed future traffic infrastructure needs.
- Additional opportunities are needed to absorb all this information – more meetings, and copies of the information (slides and graphics).
- It is assumed that almost everyone in the room is opposed to the high intensity scenario depicted in C, so could the discussion move to the lower intensity scenarios.
- Explain what “level of service” means.
- Shock was expressed at the fact that only one year was provided for the completion of the Stormwater Study, that this forced the study to be performed during a severe drought period, and that the consultant is not using Dr. Skip Livingston's 12-year study! If draft document is complete, where can citizens obtain copies?
- Even if water is pre-treated (as shown by the Bradfordville Corners Working Group studies), development shown in some of these scenarios could not be handled by current systems. What would the County do to improve performance?
- There is a great deal of concern about the length and timing of the Stormwater Study... particularly that it is based on 6 months of data collection during one of the worst droughts in the history of the County. Further, the scenarios assume that a certain additional amount of impervious surface will be acceptable before the Stormwater Study results are known.
- Stormwater issue is most important that we'll have to deal with – it is critical to address satisfactorily. One suggestion would be to combine greenway system with wetlands, lakes and stream corridors to manage water quality issues.
- Before more development goes on/is permitted, is the County going to clean up problems that have been generated by existing development? Isn't it necessary to remediate before we can talk about prevention?
- Please ask the Board for more time to do this plan, so that the Stormwater Study gets done – they waited for so long to get going on this study, so what is the rush now?
- North Hampton has concerns about the lack of market for existing retail and the fact that all the concepts show some additional commercial. This concern also applies to the proposed Bull Run development.
- The deadlines for this project should be for the residents to decide – not the Board.
- Residents should consider the qualitative impact issues related to prohibiting further commercial development – you may be willing to drive to farther off areas to do your shopping, but this means that you are also contributing and aggravating traffic problems, pollution, and stormwater/water quality problems.
- Will the plan control stormwater discharge (volume)? The County should encourage innovative quality, rate and volume control systems.
- This is not a charette. A “charette” is understood as a meeting where attendants can offer their input, and no opportunity has been provided for that! Residents should be given a chance to indicate what scenarios they like, what architectural style they would prefer... Also, residents need to know which of the scenarios deal with water quality issues and protection.
- None of the scenarios provide flood controls right now (lack of standards). The County's interim standards dictate that there will be no additional discharge from new development. If these concepts do not address this issue, there is a serious problem.
- What uses can be actually built under each of the zoning categories that are shown?
- The roundabout shown on Scenarios B-1 and B-2 is a good feature and very desirable to slow down traffic from Velda Dairy Rd. Otherwise, in all the scenarios, the more “orange” and more “green” the better.
- Is the audience going to be able to vote on these scenarios tonight? Is a vote appropriate when all the implications are not known?
- Regarding the “rural road” designation on scenarios A and B, please clarify what this means. There is mistrust because of what has happened on Proctor Road, and obviously this road is no longer rural nor can it be returned to its original condition. But maybe some of the r.o.w. width can be used to replant some of the trees that were destroyed. (John Fernsler explained that the

suggestion is that maybe different standards are needed to address the issue of improvements on existing rural roads).

-This plan process has been "shoved" in the community's face and both sides are paying the consequences. The property owners have been held back, but if somebody will buy their properties at a fair market value, they would probably be willing to comply with residents wishes for no development.

-There is deep frustration and resentment at the feeling that the decisions have already been made, and that the public participation process is just a pretense to placate the community.

-The following is a wish list for Bradfordville:

- An outright ban should be placed on all activities that are incompatible with the character of the area, including drive-thrus, gas stations, "big box" stores, industrial and other noxious uses, etc.
- Assurance is needed that Bannerman and Bradford will not be four-laned.
- Thomasville Rd. should be scaled down to four lanes with a wide landscaped median.
- Utilities should be buried.
- Canopy should be restored on all rural roads.
- Conservation easements should be pursued and these need to be preserved in perpetuity.
- The City should cease its annexation policy.
- The BSA boundary needs to be modified.
- A strong development code with strict standards is needed.
- The widened corridor of Proctor Road extension should be used as a trail/greenway/recreational corridor.
- The term "Bradfordville single center" needs to be clearly defined and the plan adhere to this until 2020.
- Historic preservation needs to be a priority.
- The Bradfordville Corners pond could be turned into a Lake Ella-type facility, with jogging paths, benches, old-fashioned lamp posts, etc.
- Enforcement is as important as the plan and regulations themselves.

-Rural road designations are greatly needed and clustering is going to be very useful in preserving rural character and environmental resources.

-Residents of Bradfordville moved "out here" for the rural lifestyle. They do not want services or urbanization. They are willing to sacrifice some for maintaining this lifestyle.

-The concept of the "village center" is very positive, and can work – it does in many places – but we need to change our ways: dependence on the automobile, etc.

This concluded the public comment session. Valerie Hubbard talked briefly about next steps, thanked the public for their participation, and concluded the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Bradfordville Sector Plan Process
Planning Commission Meeting
March 29, 2000

Meeting Notes

The meeting was convened at 6:15 p.m. Planning Commission Chairman Burt Davey welcomed the public and introduced the rest of the commissioners. Chairman Davey then turned the floor over to Ms. Val Hubbard, Chief of Comprehensive & Environmental Planning. Ms. Hubbard began by reminding the Commission what the purpose of the meeting is. It is important to keep in mind that the Bradfordville Sector Plan is an effort to comply with the Comprehensive Plan policies. Ms. Hubbard described some of the background issues of this effort, including those pertaining to the legal actions and their ramifications (i.e., working groups, plan amendments, land development regulations, etc.). Ultimately, the Planning Commission is not here tonight to make a decision on a final sector plan, but to provide direction on an alternative for further refinement and development into the plan – this is, therefore, an interim step in the planning process.

Ms. Hubbard went on to describe the schedule and milestones proposed over the next two months. The abbreviated schedule is driven by the outstanding legal issues. The County feels that it will be in a better position to deal with the lawsuits if it maintains this schedule. Ms. Hubbard described the steps that have been taken so far, including the stakeholder interviews and working group meetings, the scenario development process, and the community charette input. The alternative scenarios are based on the input received from the Commercial Needs Working Group. Although the group could not come with a consensus recommendation, they did offer a range of answers to the question of how much retail is needed, from about 34,000 to 208,000 to 304,000 s.f. This range is reflected in the scenarios which will be presented by the consultant. With this, Ms. Hubbard called on Mr. John Fernsler, of WRT, to describe the concepts that have been developed.

Mr. Fernsler started by providing a brief overview of the planning process. It consists of six basic steps: (a) taking input; (b) develop alternatives based on the input; (c) analyze the impacts of each alternative; (d) identify the preferred alternative; (e) articulate a plan on the basis of the preferred alternative, developing standards and regulations to implement the plan's recommendations; and (f) adopt both the plan and regulations.

Mr. Fernsler then provided an overview of the Comprehensive Plan policies related to the BSA and explained that the first challenge of the plan process is to interpret these policies. After describing how the team has attempted to do this, Mr. Fernsler described the manner in which the results of the Commercial Needs Working Group were used as a basis for development of the land use concepts. This working group followed the a three-step process, whereby demographics are considered first, then translated into retail demand/needs (but what is being measured? Neighborhood, community needs?); then a decision is made as to what the multiplier should be, and finally, the resulting footprints are translated into land area. No consensus was reached by the group, resulting in a range of conclusions rather than a single number. This range is illustrated by the commercial concept maps, which Mr. Fernsler went on to describe in detail. Mr. Fernsler emphasized the differences between the proposed alternatives and existing zoning, which is also presented as an alternative. Mr. Gary Johnson interjected to explain the basis for Concept B-1a, which is the alternative recommended by staff, and the reason why this concept has been introduced at this point.

Chairman Davey and Commissioner Pelham questioned why the Lauder agreement concept appeared to have been added as an afterthought. Mr. Fernsler responded that the 163 agreement was not originally considered to be a "given". Commissioner Pelham noted that the concept illustrated in B-1a is not the only possible solution in incorporating the 163 agreement. Mr. Fernsler agreed, but stated that there had not been enough time to propose iterations –some of which may not make much planning sense anyway.

Mr. Fernsler then turned the meeting back over to Ms. Hubbard. She introduced staff members who would present an analysis of the impacts of the scenarios on stormwater and transportation systems. Mr. Kevin Pope, with the County, explained that specific site plan designs do more in terms of impact on stormwater than overall zoning. General preference would obviously be for a scenario that preserve some open space for retention and irrigation purposes. But the standards may be the real limiting factor on development potential. Preliminary review of the Stormwater Study suggests that more stringent requirements that are recommended will not allow more runoff than would be generated by undeveloped property. Technological solutions would allow this, but it may become cost-prohibitive.

Chairman Davey inquired whether the stormwater principles recently used at the Post Office site could work here. Mr. Pope answered that potentially, yes, but it would depend on specific site geology. Many different solutions exist to get rid of stormwater on a site, but the cost goes up the more sophisticated the solution. Comm. Pelham asked if the alternative concepts were developed prior to the receipt of the Stormwater Study, and if so, how will this study affect the concepts. Mr. Pope responded to the effect that yes, they were developed prior to the completion of the study, but it is his professional opinion that the study will not be the determining factor, nor will it, by itself, invalidate any of the scenarios. The results of the study may, however, limit some site-specific development. Comm. Bouthillier remembered that at a previous meeting he heard that new standards could virtually preclude some of the development shown on the concepts. Are any of the scenarios, in Mr. Pope's opinion, unfeasible? Mr. Pope responded that, after receiving the study and reviewing its recommendations, the answer is no. While it may be difficult, and perhaps expensive, it is still possible to reach the level of treatment recommended by the study. Commissioner Bouthillier then asked if the study addresses financial impacts, to which the answer was also no. Finally, Mr. Bouthillier asked Mr. Pope to explain the considerations that went into designating the open space areas, from the natural resources standpoint. Mr. Pope explained that the Bradfordville Corners basin already has some problems, the existing pond has water quality and volume issues. In addition, there is a sizable quality forest there that is worth preserving. Finally, one of the property owners has presented himself as a willing (partial) donor of land for open space preservation. On the Lauder property side, runoff drains into the Lake McBride, one of the most pristine lakes remaining in the area..

Mr. Jack Kostrzewa then talked about the traffic implications of each scenario, describing how when you include the Bull Run project, this acts as a magnet decreasing the impact of the proposed Bradfordville development north of the screenline. He also pointed out that the scenarios that include a local connector road system tend to work better because they distribute the traffic load. Comm. Pelham asked which is the preferred alternative based strictly on transportation impacts. Mr. Kostrzewa stated that A-1, B-1 and B-1a would be the preferred scenarios from that perspective. Comm. Carr inquired about multi-modal or public transit considerations. Mr. Kostrzewa explained that such issues are not considered by this model, although transit could be an issue.

This concluded the impact analysis presentations. There being no other questions, Chair Davey called a break, announcing that the meeting would reconvene to take public comment prior to opening the commissioners' discussion.

Summary of Public Comment

-Speaker 1: The Planning Commission has made wise recommendations in the past, which have been ignored by the Board of County Commissioners. Speaker urges the PC to take their time to make recommendations on this issue... Speaker's main concern is Lake McBride. The Stormwater Study just came out and the Peer Review Group needs more time to review it and evaluate it properly. The alternatives were prepared before and without the benefit of the study. This process is therefore premature, the community is being forced into a rush-rush situation because of the County's failure to do what it had to do. Additionally, the Commission should consider that the 163 Agreement is under litigation, which has only temporarily been shelved because of the ISA. More information is needed.

Ms. Theresa Thompson, of the County's Attorney's office, responded to the comment regarding the 163 agreement that the plaintiffs agreed to dismissal of the suit without prejudice, therefore no litigation is pending on that issue.

-Speaker 2: Speaker agrees with previous speaker. The Planning Commission needs to wait for the Peer Review to be completed and then listen to this group's recommendations. There are planners on this group that need to be heard. Promises have been made by the County left and right. Yes, some were made to property owners, but at the same time, the County had promised not to change zoning on the Mixed Use A, which included a 70% residential component, and it did. Also, so far no mention has been made of the issue of phasing. Even if any of these alternatives were acceptable, it needs to consider the 20 year horizon. Speaker also agrees with Kevin Pope in that green space is needed to mitigate stormwater impacts, but the fact is that a pond already exists which does not meet standards, and worse yet, the County may try to grandfather it. This question needs to be asked.

-Speaker 3: Bradfordville has been commercial for 170 years. It used to be the center of commercial retail for the community until the automobile allowed dispersal. The demand for commercial is there. It is the only commercial center in this area that serves the neighborhoods. Projections are just that – projections. It is better to plan now, in a holistic manner, for what is needed long-range, than having to deal with piecemealing. In addition, contracts exist that have to be honored. Downzoning would not be fair to the players who have agreed to play by the rules.

-Speaker 4: Speaker represents several of the property owners, who favor retaining the existing zoning. This zoning is not new, it dates back to 1990. The property owners favor design standards that will protect the built and natural character of the area, but the County is just trying to reduce their liability. Policies are being interpreted to mean that existing rural character needs to be preserved, but the area is no longer rural. Infrastructure improvements that have been made contradict the idea of this rural character. On the Lauder property, a permitted use verification certificate outlined what the Lauders could do, and the 163 agreement actually limited their development allowed development potential. The same is the case with the Bradfordville-Phipps property. They fully comply with the Comp Plan. Concurrency agreements and court orders exist, and they must be honored. Speaker urges the Commission to reaffirm existing zoning.

-Speaker 5: The property owners have never been permitted to participate in the planning process. They have had to fight to be included at every step, and still nobody accepts their input. This meeting is their first opportunity. There is a misconception of what the sector plan is. The County's own legal consultant told the BOCC that the process actually was to take a look at the Comp Plan, but that they were not bound by the existing policies. New trends, new development, new needs were to be considered. You cannot keep rural what is already no longer rural. Speaker urges the Commission not to downzone.

-Speaker 6: Speaker wants to emphasize the need to wait for the Stormwater Study. Speaker reminded the Commission that the Bradfordville area was one of the best planned communities in the County back in 1990, the BSA plan was actually adopted into the Comprehensive Plan but the County has failed to follow it. The Stormwater Study was only received today. How can any reasonable person make a decision without all the information? Further, while water quality may be dealt with by the study, the flooding issue has not yet been resolved. Review of the study has to be completed to determine how reliable its results are, and how retrofit solutions can be incorporated. Speaker urges the Commission to demand the time that is needed to make this decision in a reasonable manner.

-Speaker 7: Speaker recommends Alternative C to the Commission. Staff has said that stormwater standards can be met through engineering, even if it is costly, and that the alternatives do not pose significant transportation differences. The commercial needs computations are subjective at best. Speaker urges the Commission to let the market dictate what the needs are. Residential uses are not viable in this area – he has explored that and failed.

-Speaker 8: Agrees with last speaker in that this area is neither rural, nor feasible for residential uses. His property has been in the family's ownership for over 100 years – they do not want to be downzoned. Alternative C is the only alternative concept.

-Speaker 9: Speaker, who lives near the proposed Bull Run development, was surprised to find out her neighborhood is within the BSA. She wants to point out that Bull Run was only exempted from the ISA, but it is still in the BSA, and needs to be added to the Commercial Needs computations – they cannot omit these developments.

-Speaker 10: Bradfordville is the gateway of the Red Hills. The Nature Conservancy recognizes these as one of the last greatest areas in the country. Speaker urges the Commission to consider the effect of their decision on the Red Hills.

-Speaker 11: Speaker has lived here since 1966, and seen the character of the area change. His house was taken for the Bradfordville Rd. realignment, but in exchange for keeping the commercial zoning. Now the County wants to change it!

-Speaker 12: It is premature to adopt any land use alternative. She urges the Commission to recommend that the Board take the additional 5 months they gave themselves. The lakes study is not completed, nor is it implemented. None of the scenarios meet the Comp Plan. The community charette only included 5 alternatives, the 6th one (the recommended one), was secretly produced only a few days ago. No consensus was reached by the Commercial Needs group. Alternative C is out of the question, B-1a is also above the top range recommended by staff themselves. Work groups are not finished. The talents of the consultant have been wasted as solutions were dictated from above. Also, it is not true that the rezonings go back to 1990, but only a couple of years ago. There is no vested interest by property owner in any zoning category.

-Speaker 13: Speaker represents CERCA, one of the plaintiffs, which in turn comprises a large area and great number of individual homeowners – not just a few “complainers” as one of the previous speakers tried to portray. Speaker wants to point out that property doesn’t accrue value simply because it is owned by the same owner for 100 years! With regards to the Commercial Needs group, she reminded the Commission that staff and the HOAs were not far apart, however, supply and demand must be balanced – not for tomorrow, but in 20 years... and what is vested determined.

This concluded the public comment session. Chair Davey subsequently opened the Commissioners’ discussion.

Commission Discussion

Commissioner Carr wants to know how staff feels about the five additional months. Ms. Hubbard and Ms. Thompson pointed out that staff has been given direction to complete the plan process by June, and there are a number of inverse condemnation suits pending that are pushing the schedule. Commissioner Pelham asked if the intent is to concoct a rational plan, or to produce a defense for the County in the inverse condemnation cases. Ms. Thompson responded that staff has invested an great deal of time and effort to this process, and are committed to produce the best possible plan.

Comm. Pelham asked about the Bull Run development issue. Did the County identify vested but not developed property? Mr. David McDevitt, with County Growth Management, responded that the only true vested development in this area is the Killlearn Lakes DRI. The Commercial Needs group was charged with looking at neighborhood scale uses only. Certain assumptions had to be made, applying econometric models to determine supply and demand in a closed area, which is in fact not closed.

Comm. Pelham then asked if the Stormwater Study made land use recommendations. Mr. Pope stated that the study does not make such recommendations, but only technical/engineering recommendations.

Comm. Bouthillier noted that the only point where all speakers agree is that this is premature. That raises a red flag. What is the force driving the sector plan? What is the plan for? Mr. Gary Johnson stated that the plan is required by the ISA, which stems from stormwater issues. Comm. Bouthillier asked if there is direction from the court or from mediation to complete the plan before the stormwater study. Mr. Johnson responded negatively, but qualified that the study should be an integral component of the plan. Comm. Bouthillier feels that the sector plan should not be resolved until the Stormwater Study is completed. Reversing this order may have dire consequences on the inverse condemnation issue, worse than present suits may bring. In addition, why has the focus only been this area, which is a tiny part of the BSA?

Chair Davey thinks that more information is needed on the 163 agreement. Is it a contract? It has been said during this meeting that it needs to be honored/reflected on the scenarios... to what extent is this true? Ms. Thompson asserted that it is indeed viewed as a contractual agreement, and the County could suffer substantial damages for not following it. Chair Davey also wants to know, with regard to the parkland shown on A-1, is the owner expected to donate this land? Ms. Thompson clarified that the County would be expected to purchase it. Mr. Johnson further indicated that the current fiscal situation of the County is not conducive to such purchase.

Comm. Butler likened this process to trying to work out the recipe after eating the dinner. There is too much information to digest in such little time. Can some (or all) of the transportation and stormwater impacts be resolved at the LDR level, rather than at the land planning level? He would be inclined, based on what is known, to support the C alternative.

Commissioner Davis disagrees that there is too much information – in fact there is not sufficient information at all. He feels he cannot vote for any of the alternatives today.

Commissioner Bouthillier states that he re-read Land Use 8. Nowhere does this goal suggest that changes in land use should be made. Rather, it talks about other things, stormwater, design, etc., that can be dealt with at the regulatory level. Therefore, he cannot support any concepts but that which shows current zoning.

Comm. Carr feels that critical studies are incomplete. She is uncomfortable making a decision with insufficient information. Comm. Pelham shares this feeling. This process is a reaction to the County's failure to do the Stormwater Study. This is an irresponsible way to do the plan. He cannot support any of these concepts until all the information is in. He would vote to withhold a recommendation and urge the Board to take the five additional months.

Comm. Davey, quoting Comm. Butler, feels that the meal actually has not been eaten –instead is in preparation, with too many cooks involved. The Commission has not been given enough time to review this information. However, he does feel that if the Study will recommend engineering solutions, then it is not necessary to wait for the rest of the results. But he is still uncomfortable being dragged in at the last minute to make a decision. He feels the sector planning process is critical, and that this needs to be done right. He asked of staff how important the Planning Commission's vote is.

Commissioner Bouthillier wants to know what the implications of choosing any of the scenarios are for the future. Commissioner Butler wants to go with Alternative C now, he doesn't think the stormwater or transportation will be dealt with here, but at the regulation/standard level. Comm. Pelham disagrees – he will not vote to recommend C. There is no need to do that, since the existing zoning will remain if the Commission does not vote on any of the concepts. Also, the cost of the stormwater solutions is important to him, he would like to get information on this matter.

Comm. Butler is not in agreement: studies can tell you whatever you want, but will not tell you about site-specific requirements. He would be willing to delay the process if studies would make a difference, but they will not. Let the market decide what is needed here. Therefore, he moves to recommend Concept C, based on available information and public testimony heard tonight. Also moves to qualify that this recommendation is made under duress because of the timeline given.

Comm. Bouthillier seconds the motion for discussion purposes. Comm. Pelham notes that this issue is about a sector plan, not a rezoning. He cannot support any of the alternatives. This is being done for the wrong reasons, and is not acceptable as a planning process. The County has set up this process and now is deviating from it. Let us do this right. Comm. Butler is concerned with saying that Alternative C is the best alternative. That is not known at this point.

Comm. Butler wants to know what the ramifications would be of not voting. Ms. Hubbard explained that the ISA does not require the Planning Commission to look at the alternatives, only at the plan, so not voting is unlikely to delay the process. Comm. Bouthillier feels, however, that

a strong message needs to be sent to the Board through a vote, and withdraws his second to the motion. With no second, the motion dies.

Comm. Bouthillier moves to reject all of the alternatives because the planning process and alternatives do not rely on sound planning reasons. Comm. Davis seconds for discussion. Chair Davey has problems with the narrative, as he does not know what the County's reasons are. His own reason for not choosing is not having enough information.

Comm. Pelham would recommend that the BOCC not vote on just one piece of the sector plan, but to wait until the process is complete. Chair Davey, however, reminded the Commission that the decision tonight is only about giving direction to the Consultant... but still he does not feel there is sufficient information to give such direction. Based on this discussion, Comm. Bouthillier withdraws his motion.

Comm. Butler then presents a motion to state that the Planning Commission is not comfortable making a recommendation at this time, based on the limited amount of information and time available. Comm. Davis seconds. There being no further discussion, Chair Davey calls the question. The motion passes unanimously.

The meeting adjourns at 10:50 p.m.

**Bradfordville Sector Plan
Community Charette
May 11, 2000 – Lawton Chiles High School**

Meeting Notes

Gary Johnson opened the meeting with a brief welcome and then turned the floor over to Valerie Hubbard, who provided an overview of progress on the sector planning process and reviewed the schedule for upcoming meetings. She then introduced John Fernsler, of Wallace, Roberts and Todd, who presented the Commercial Development Concept presented to the Board of County Commissioners at the workshop that afternoon. There were several questions and comments regarding the concept and process. Ms. Hubbard reiterated the need to move forward with the discussion of design elements, so that the consultants could consider community input on design while drafting the Land Development Regulations to implement the sector plan. Mr. Fernsler then presented information on types of design elements that could be considered. The attendees were split into three groups of approximately 10 persons each, facilitated by Val Hubbard, John Fernsler, and Michael Lauer (of Freilich, Leitner and Carlisle). These groups discussed their preferences for design elements and processes. After approximately one hour of discussion, the groups presented their results. There was a high degree of consensus between the groups on desirable design elements. The major points are summarized below. A full list of the results, by group, is attached.

Highlights of Results

- The village center should be very pedestrian-oriented. Non-major streets should also be very accommodating to pedestrian.
- The view of commercial areas from major roads should be heavily vegetated.
- There should be a unified architectural theme based on vernacular.
- Scale should be small. Preferred height generally no more than two stories.
- Primarily retail uses (no wholesale) with non-fast-food restaurants and outdoor cafes.
- Several uses proposed for deletion from village center.
- Parking should be screened; angled parking encouraged for side streets; shared parking encouraged.
- Civic uses such as public plaza/park, place for children—Lake Ella used as an example.
- Underground electric; hidden dumpsters and air conditioners.
- Stormwater ponds should be designed as site amenities.
- Pedestrian amenities such as covered walkways, shade, textured sidewalks, etc. should be provided/encouraged.
- Signage should be strictly controlled, and should be smaller and lower than what is currently allowed.
- Lighting should be controlled so as to avoid “light pollution,” and to provide appropriate pedestrian scale.
- Design standards should require retrofit of existing commercial uses, with schedule for retrofit based on costs.
- Two groups proposed an architectural review committee.