STAFF MEETING MINUTES
LANCASTER COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
COUNTY-CITY BUILDING
ROOM 113
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2001
9 A.M.

Commissioners Present: Kathy Campbell, Chair
                         Bob Workman, Vice Chair
                         Larry Hudkins
                         Bernie Heier
                         Ray Stevens

Others Present: Kerry Eagan, Chief Administrative Officer
                         Gwen Thorpe, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer
                         Bruce Medcalf, County Clerk
                         Trish Owen, Deputy County Clerk
                         Ann Taylor, County Clerk's Office

The Staff Meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM

1   APPROVAL OF STAFF MEETING MINUTES OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2001

MOTION: Workman moved and Stevens seconded approval of the Staff Meeting minutes of September 13, 2001. Workman, Stevens, Heier and Campbell voted aye. Hudkins was absent from voting. Motion carried.

2   ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA

None were stated.

Hudkins arrived at 9:12 a.m.

3   COMPREHENSIVE PLAN WORK SESSION - Kathleen Sellman, Planning Director; Kent Morgan, Assistant Planning Director; Mike DeKalb and Steve Henrichsen, Planning Department

Mike DeKalb, Planning Department, reviewed *City-County Comprehensive Plan: 2025, A Work in Progress* (Exhibit A), detailing the following:

O   Major Work Task Schedule for Comprehensive Plan Process: 2001+
O   Where Do We Go From Here?
O   Community Outreach
O   Vision Statement for Economic Futures
O   Commercial Related Employment
O   Industrial Related Employment
O   Comprehensive Plan Committee
O   Comprehensive Plan Vision
O   Population Projection
O   Projection Assumptions
O   Projected Population
O   Futures Formed
O   Future A
O   Future B
O   Future C
O   Futures Evaluation
O   Urban Form
O   Transportation
O   Urban Infrastructure
O   Community Services
O   Purpose of Comprehensive Plan Committee (CPC) Draft Future
O   CPC Draft Findings/Recommendations
O   Conclusion
O   Draft CPC

DeKalb also referred to the following:

O   *Directional Growth: Urban Planning Zones* (Map)
O   *Comprehensive Plan Vision - Proposed by the Comprehensive Plan Committee*
O   *Future A* (Map)
O   *Future B* (Map)
O   *Future C* (Map)
O   *Draft CPC* (Map)
O   *Lancaster County's Land Use Plan Including Adopted Generalized Plans of Cities & Villages* (Map)
O   *Future Land Use: Lancaster County and Adjacent Environs* (Map)

Heier asked how the community survey was tallied.

Kathleen Sellman, Planning Director, said City and County information was tabulated separately.

Kent Morgan, Assistant Planning Director, said the number of individuals surveyed precluded a further geographic breakdown.

Heier expressed concern that separate entities in the County could influence the rest of the County.

Sellman said that is possible, but explained that the community survey is only one of the components considered.

Heier referred to the Draft - CPC map (see Exhibit B) and asked whether the urbanized area shown in red around the City is a "no build area".

DeKalb said the Comprehensive Plan Committee has recommended limitations on acreage development in the areas where the City intends to grow.

In response to a question from Heier, Sellman said the Stevens Creek Basin Initiative Task Force's recommendations for development of the Stevens Creek Basin are part of the Comprehensive Plan process.

Heier asked whether a land use map of Stevens Creek Basin was developed as part of that process.

Morgan said that it was difficult to do so because decisions had not been made on the beltway location and whether and when to allow development to proceed in the Stevens Creek Basin. He said the Stevens Creek Basin Initiative Task Force will probably be brought back in to meet with the Comprehensive Plan Committee to ensure that its ideas are being reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.

Campbell said that would be beneficial, noting one of the Stevens Creek Basin Initiative Task Force's recommendations was to prohibit acreage development on the west side of Stevens Creek.

Campbell asked whether the Plan Vision Tier I area, shown as red on the Draft - CPC map (Exhibit B), takes into account all of the recommended industrial and commercial development.

Morgan explained that the 18 square miles indicated in Future A and the 30 square miles indicated in Futures B and C were gross areas that did not take into account floodplain or existing development. He said the Comprehensive Plan Committee looked at developable area, which is reflected in the Draft - CPC (Exhibit B). Morgan said there is plenty of room in Plan Vision Tier I area for industrial and commercial development and said the Comprehensive Plan Committee is beginning to identify suitable locations for employment centers.

Campbell said the Economic Futures Task Force had envisioned that industrial and commercial development would occur along the transportation corridors.

Sellman stressed that this work is preliminary and said there will be changes to address specific community needs.

Heier said he believes that City Public Works/Utilities will be a controlling factor.

Morgan agreed that infrastructure is an important consideration and said Public Works has been very involved in the process.

The Board requested a revised Draft - CPC with color designations of what is already zoned or planned and what has been proposed by the Comprehensive Plan Committee.

Campbell asked whether the Comprehensive Plan Committee has discussed other criteria for acreages.

DeKalb said acreages are still an item of discussion.

Campbell said she does not want to see acreages banked on the outside of the City, creating a "fortress".

Heier asked "Why is it so difficult to grow into an acreage area if it's built to the specifications that the City has?"

DeKalb said there are ways to make acreage development more conducive to annexation, such as requiring clustered development, leased easements, input of sewer and water lines not yet in use, roads built for easy conversion to pavement, and lots arranged so that they can be split into smaller, urban lots. He noted, however, that this will increase costs to developers and lot buyers.

4   ADJOURNMENT

By direction of the Chair, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 a.m.

_____

Bruce Medcalf
County Clerk