Riley County Vision 2025 Committee Meeting

June 26, 2008
7:30 – 9:30 p.m. County Commission Chambers

Welcome & Review of Public Comments

- The meeting was called to order at 7:30pm by facilitator David Procter. Procter welcomed the group and reminded those in attendance that comment cards were available for public comments. Procter also re-introduced co-facilitator Dan Kahl to the Committee. Dan was substituting for Terrie McCants who is on vacation.
- Monty Wedel reported that there were no public comments submitted from the previous meeting and that there was no building report yet for this month.

Full Group Discussion on Implementation Strategies (continued)

- Last meeting, the Committee suggested that planning staff provide some development scenarios, utilizing some of the implementation strategies, hopefully illustrating the pros and cons of each approach.
- Monty Wedel utilized a PowerPoint show to examine four (4) different implementation options. Procter and Kahl suggested that the committee examine each option individually, listing the advantages and disadvantages of each.
- The facilitators noted the Committee's comments on flipchart paper and pinned them up for review.
- Following the exercise, the facilitators asked the Committee if there was any strategy they would like to eliminate. The Committee chose not to eliminate any option yet.
- The facilitators then asked the Committee to perhaps consider creating a hybrid option by blending certain strengths of one option with those of another, to be considered at the next meeting.
- A suggestion was made to compile all the comments on each implementation option and send them to each Committee member for review. Continue discussion next meeting.

Next Step

- Planning Staff to compile results of the implementation scenarios for the Committee.

Next Full Committee meeting: July 31, 2008, 7:30 PM at the County Commission Chambers

Adjourned

Attachments: Implementation Strategy Options

Implementation Strategy Options

OPTION I – Minimal Change

Advantages:

- Property owner retains current development rights
- Less land taken out of agricultural production
- Less infrastructure costs if development is clustered.
- Planning staff could influence when and where clustering should occur through requirement for a site plan and application of development standards.
- Easier for property owner to sell land in small tracts as opposed to the current minimum 20-acre requirement.
- Clustering would centralize development, minimizing fragmentation of agricultural land.
- Assumed to be the most popular option.

Disadvantages:

- Could cause conflicts with agricultural uses, with no public hearing opportunities.
- If such development were to occur in clusters and urban/rural conflicts were to develop, the political power favors the majority.
- LESA is not utilized to determine appropriateness of development.
- Development occurring by right could inadvertently increase LESA scores, thus promoting more development. (unintended consequences).
- Could generate unplanned, un-reviewed development.

OPTION II – Transfer of Development Rights

Advantages:

- It is likely to limit development because it is so confusing.
- It could raise the value of property located in the “sending” areas.
- It could benefit the owner of undevelopable land.

Disadvantages:

- Implementation of the concept is difficult to comprehend. Confusing!

- Property owner is limited to a “one-time” sale of a development right (1 right per 20 acres); subsequent owners would not have any development rights.
- The concept requires significant bureaucracy.
- It is assumed that the County would incur additional costs to administer the program.
- In order to establish the “sending” and “receiving” areas, arbitrary lines would need to be drawn on a map.
- Could lead to unplanned “negative” development.
- Appears that Riley County lacks the market for a TDR program to be successful.
- Uncontrolled Ag growth.
- Program denies development rights in “sending” areas.
- Restricts development in rural areas to the extent of negatively impacting tax areas and rural school districts, making it difficult for schools to re-populate the student body.

OPTION III – Tiered Zoning Districts

Advantages:

- All development proposals are reviewed.
- Removes uncertainty regarding the appropriateness of development; better clarity.
- Protects agricultural land.
- Directs urban/suburban development to urban areas.
- This option relies on the LESA/DGS.

Disadvantages:

- There is a concern for a loss of property rights?
- Could promote disinvestment by farmers in agricultural areas determined to be “transitional”, where preservation of agricultural uses are de-emphasized.
- Forces Committee to draw lines on a map to establish the districts.
- Could potentially create conflicts with areas that are currently zoned something other than General Agricultural.
- Concern that property located in a district zoned for agricultural preservation will devalue.

OPTION IV – Exclusive Ag District

Advantages:

- All development proposals are reviewed.
- Establishes the DGS as the primary tool in decision making, resulting in “planned development”.
- Protects agricultural land and agricultural operations.
- Doesn’t require lines to be drawn on a map.
- All citizens are given the same opportunity to have development proposals reviewed.
- Without a size requirement associated with development (20 acres), less land could be taken out of agricultural production, possibly minimizing further fragmentation of agricultural land.
- Option eliminates the 20-acre minimum lot size requirement.

Disadvantages:

- The balance between agricultural preservation and development is lost.
- Existing development rights may be lost.
- It may be easier to subdivide agricultural land and may lead to fragmentation.