

Staff Contact:  
Planning Commission/Board of Supervisors:

Joan McDowell  
March 5, 2003

## **RURAL-AREA PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY**

### **Executive Summary**

This report summarizes the questions and responses compiled from the public meetings held during the winter of 2002 - 2003. Meetings were held in four locations across the County in order to educate the public about the Comprehensive Plan and the planning process, and to generate interest and input in its review. The results, then, are based only on responses from those who attended. They may not be representative of the whole community. In addition, the questions elicited a broad range of answers that were meant to generate discussion. The tabulation and categorization of these responses provide a general but not statistically valid assessment of the attendees' opinions. Complete lists of verbal and written comments are included at the end of this report.

The attendance (a total of 174 people) of the meetings was as follows:

- 25 – Scottsville Elementary (Rural Area 4)
- 39 – Stony Point Elementary (Rural Area 2)
- 62 – Broadus Wood Elementary (Rural Area 1)
- 48 – Red Hill Elementary (Rural Area 3)

Approximately 157 written comments were received. In brief, respondents answered with considerable consensus to several questions. The highest amounts of agreement were found in these responses:

1. Seventy six percent (76.7%) of respondents felt that stream buffers and habitat corridors should be common throughout the Rural Areas of the County.
2. Seventy six percent (76.2%) felt that the visual character of the Rural Areas of the County should be one of farms, forests and natural areas.
3. Seventy three percent (73.1%) felt that growth should be limited and well managed to maintain the rural character of the County.
4. Seventy one percent (71.6%) agreed with the policy that agricultural and forestal lands are critical County resources and the desired primary land uses in the Rural Areas.
5. Seventy percent (70.1%) agreed with the policy of directing development into designated development areas within the County.

These responses conform generally with the responses to some questions in the Albemarle County 2002 Citizen Survey:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Very Important</b>	<b>Somewhat Important</b>	<b>Not That Important</b>
Protecting water quality in reservoirs, streams, and wells	85.2%	13.8%	0.9%
Preserving natural resources and open space	65.1%	29.9%	5.0%
Preserving farmland and forested land	63.8%	29.6%	10.2%

## A Picture of the Community

One of the primary objectives for the community meetings was to gather information on the general character that residents would like to see the County maintain over the next twenty years. To solicit ideas, the question was posed in two ways. First, participants were asked to rank their preference for a spectrum of possible characteristics ranging from visual appeal to distribution of natural resources. Second, participants were openly asked a general visioning question of how they would like to see the County develop over the next twenty years. Community responses are tabulated and discussed below.

		Ranking:				
		1	2	3	4	
<b><u>Community Characteristic</u></b>						
<b>Level of Development</b>	<i>Rural - Little Residential Development</i>	73.10%	24.10%	2.80%	0.00%	<i>Extensive Suburban Development</i>
<b>Character of Development</b>	<i>Large-lot Subdivisions</i>	14.20%	10.40%	19.40%	56.00%	<i>Clustered Subdivisions with Protected Areas</i>
<b>Community Connections</b>	<i>Rural Residents Rely on Urban Areas</i>	25.00%	22.10%	20.70%	32.20%	<i>Rural Residents Find Connections in Rural Areas</i>
<b>Farms</b>	<i>Few, Scattered</i>	2.80%	11.00%	23.50%	62.70%	<i>Common and Widespread</i>
<b>Forestry</b>	<i>Few, Scattered</i>	29.90%	20.40%	19.70%	29.90%	<i>Common and Widespread</i>
<b>Natural Areas</b>	<i>Few, Scattered</i>	5.20%	9.70%	20.20%	64.90%	<i>Common, Well Connected</i>
<b>Stream Buffers/ Habitat Connections</b>	<i>Narrow, Uncommon</i>	2.10%	11.00%	10.30%	76.70%	<i>Wide and Common</i>
<b>Visual Character</b>	<i>Suburbs</i>	0.70%	2.00%	21.10%	76.20%	<i>Farms, Forests &amp; Natural Areas</i>

### Discussion:

Overwhelming (above 70% of respondents) support can be seen in three major categories. Garnering the highest support (76.7%) was the idea that stream buffers and habitat connections should be the norm throughout the County. Following closely was support (76.2%) of the idea that the visual character of the County should be characterized by farms, forests and natural areas as opposed to the idea of suburbs. The third highest ranking idea (73.1%) that received support from community residents was the desire to see as little residential development as possible. Although it was acknowledged that some development would be likely, there was 0% support for the idea of extensive suburban type development.

Falling within a middle range of support (50% - 69%) were the ideas of clustered development, distribution of farms, and distribution of natural areas. Under the topic of 'Character of Development' respondents indicated a 56.0% preference for clustered subdivisions with protected areas. The response to this question however was not one sided and support for larger-lot subdivisions was noted by some (14.2%). In regard to issues of 'Land Use Distribution', the majority of participants favored farms that were common and widespread (63.7%) and natural areas to be distributed throughout the County (64.9%). These responses were more one sided with idea of having few of either receiving little support (5.2% or under).

Two categories received divided responses. In the first category, 'Community Connections', a majority of respondents (32.2%) favored rural residents finding connections in rural areas. However, the opposite response of 'rural residents relying on Urban Areas' received support from 25.0%, a difference of only 7.2%. Responding with complete parity were answers to the topic of 'Forestry'. 29.9% of responses could be found for both the idea of having forests be few and scattered, to having them be common and widespread.

### **Vision Question**

**Imagine that you have lived in Albemarle until today. Tomorrow you move away for twenty years. What would you like to see when you return?**

In roundtable discussions, answers were gathered to the question of how residents would like to see their community develop over the next 20 years. The following list summarizes the main ideas that surfaced during the conversations:

Growth: A scenario of either no growth, or very carefully managed growth was supported.

Roads/Transportation: Residents wished to see safe roads that would maintain the rural character of the area. In addition, alternative transportation options were greatly desired.

Infrastructure/Services: Limit, but do not exclude, infrastructure improvements within the Rural Area. Have developers pay for infrastructure costs.

Land Use Tax: Taxation should be related to availability of services. In general, incentives rather than regulations (like taxes) should be used to control growth.

Clusters/Villages: Residents would like to see a rural 'village atmosphere' but are torn between support for small lot sizes and larger lot sizes.

Housing: Affordable housing should be dispersed throughout the Rural Area in order to best serve a range of income levels. The County should not become a place only for the rich.

Buildings: Many would like to see old buildings and commercial properties adaptively reused.

Business/Commerce: The Rural Area should contain limited amounts of clustered, small businesses.

Property Rights: Property rights should always be kept in mind when making administrative decisions.

Schools: Schools should be local and neighborhood based with an emphasis on quality education.

Farming: Residents wished to see support for working farms but realized the need for economic alternatives to traditional farming. They also wished to see support for more sustainable management techniques on farms.

Water Resources: Water supply protection should be primary. New residential development should be required to show adequacy of existing groundwater before approval.

Other Natural Resources: Existing natural resources should be maintained and improved. These resources include wildlife habitat, air quality and biodiversity.

Parks/Open Space: Residents wished to see more support for open space protection and passive parks. Active parks weren't as desired.

Conservation Easements: Conservation easements and the ACE program should receive greater attention and funding.

Mountains/Viewshed: Mountain vistas should be maintained. Viewsheds are primary assets of the 'rural atmosphere'.

Historic Resources: Residents wished to see more protection given to historic resources.

## **Policies and Tools**

The following summaries provide a description of community responses, grouped into the proposed topic areas to be included in the draft of Chapter Four. Summary responses are tabulated both statistically and qualitatively.

### ***Permitted Land Uses in the Rural Area***

**The County's growth management goal directs development into designated areas and conserves the balance for rural areas and resource protection. Planning efforts have been to focus on means to discourage development in the Rural Areas and support activities consistent with the character of the Rural Areas. Do you agree with this policy? (144 answers in total)**

<b>Yes</b>	101	(70.1%)
<b>No</b>	8	(5.6%)
<b>Somewhat</b>	35	(24.3%)

Discussion:

The general consensus (70.1%) on this question was that the County’s growth management policy, which direct development into Designated Areas, is supported. 35 (24.3%) respondents affirmed this policy, but qualified their answer.

Discussions from respondents revealed that many felt the current policy to be good in theory but they did not feel it was necessarily working. “Rural areas (are) growing quickly despite plans,” replied one participant. Concern was also voiced regarding the language of the policy statement. Many felt that words such as ‘discouragement’ were too vague. At the same time many called out for positive incentives to be used to direct growth policy rather than restrictive regulations.

Balanced concerns were also voiced for the need to support both private property rights and an acknowledgement of environmental limitation. These limitations, it was said by some, should be thought of in terms of natural resources more so than aesthetic concerns for a ‘rural feel’.

	<b>Land Use:</b>	Agricultural	Forestral	County Stores	Home Occupations	Bed and Breakfasts	Commercial Recreation	Special Events	Small Restaurants	Offices
<b>Rank</b>										
1		69.1%	25.5%	9.9%	8.5%	5.4%	6.3%	4.3%	6.3%	2.6%
2		16.5%	48.9%	10.7%	10.0%	7.7%	8.7%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%
3		7.9%	7.3%	25.2%	21.5%	16.2%	15.1%	6.0%	4.0%	1.8%
4		0.7%	2.2%	13.0%	24.6%	23.1%	11.1%	6.0%	11.9%	5.3%
5		0.7%	5.8%	11.5%	6.9%	26.2%	16.7%	13.7%	14.3%	4.4%
6		1.4%	1.5%	15.3%	9.2%	12.3%	12.7%	17.1%	12.7%	7.9%
7		0.0%	2.9%	8.4%	8.5%	3.8%	6.3%	23.9%	21.4%	11.4%
8		2.2%	2.2%	3.1%	7.7%	1.5%	11.9%	18.8%	16.7%	15.8%
9		0.0%	2.9%	3.1%	2.3%	3.8%	8.7%	9.4%	8.7%	44.7%
10		1.4%	0.7%		0.8%		0.8%	0.9%		6.1%
No							1.6%			

	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
# of responses / question	139	137	131	130	130	126	117	126	114	

The table above shows the overall distribution of responses that were gathered when participants were asked how they would rank the land uses they would like to have within the County. A fairly even progression of responses can be seen which rank community preference in the following order: agricultural, forestal, country stores, home occupations, beds and breakfasts, commercial recreation, special events, small restaurants, and finally offices. The strongest

response (69.1%) was in support of agricultural land uses. After which forestal land use (ranked #2) and office land use (ranked last at #9) both received the next strongest responses at 48.9% and 44.7% respectively. Land uses ranking from #3 to #7 (country stores, home occupations, beds and breakfasts, commercial recreation, special events and small restaurants) received moderate majority responses ranging from 16.7% to 26.2%.

In addition to the categories listed above, respondents also listed a number of items they wished to emphasize that were not included on the original list. A total of 63 responses were gathered under the category of “Other”. The strongest response in this category was a request for land conservation. Specifically, 20 respondents noted the desire for additional park land (31.7% for this question) or preserved forest land (22.2% or 14 respondents) that would not be used for production, but for conservation. Additional responses included the desire for the preservation of historic sites, and water protection reservoirs.

General comments focused on the need to blend a variety of land uses not just a few. It was also mentioned a number of times that the scale of any of these uses need to be considered. For example, large scale hog farming would not be considered (by one respondent) a desirable agricultural land use.

### ***Agricultural and Forestal Land Uses***

**Agricultural and forestal resources have been identified as the most critical County resources and the desired primary land uses in the Rural Areas. Do you agree with this policy? (148 answers in total)**

Yes	106	(71.6%)
No	11	(7.4%)
Somewhat	31	(21.0%)

#### Discussion:

As in the previous question, the majority of responses (71.6%) favored the County’s policy on designating agricultural and forest resources as the most critical within the County. A large number (21.0%), however, qualified their answer.

Discussions with participants showed that though many supported the idea of agricultural and forestal land uses, many held qualifying answers regarding scale. Large agro-industries such as hog farming, or large pulpwood tree farms were not viewed as favorable.

Qualifying responses were also seen regarding the environmental impacts of the two industries. Many felt that standard agricultural and forestal practices were, in fact, detrimental to the environment and therefore in conflict with the primary Rural Areas policy to protect natural resources. It was felt that small-scale alternatives such as vineyards and equestrian farms might be reasonable alternatives.

The play between property rights/livelihoods and environmental concerns was often articulated in terms of local farm issues. Many did not want to see farmers lose the financial resources and

the retirement security tied to their land, and supported program intended to provide assistance to farmers. At the same time the need for environmental regulations for the agricultural industries was supported, to a degree.

### ***Infrastructure***

**The County allocates limited funds to the Rural Areas for transportation improvements. Most of the funding is designated for the Development Areas where growth is encouraged. Do you agree with this policy? (147 answers)**

<b>Yes</b>	96	(65.3%)
<b>No</b>	24	(16.3%)
<b>Somewhat</b>	27	(18.4%)

#### Discussion:

A majority (65.3%) of respondents supported the County's policy to allocate most infrastructure funding to the Development Areas. However a large number (34.7%) either qualified their answer or responded 'No' to the same questions.

Discussion with the residents revealed that safety and maintenance were the primary concerns on most people's minds. Many did not want to see funds that could contribute to the safety of rural roads being channeled into the Development Areas, considering the fact that car fatalities occur annually along rural roads. Ideas such as shoulders and guardrails along roads such as Route 20 were mentioned many times.

In addition, some felt that infrastructure dollars should be spent where actual growth was occurring, which many times is in the Rural Areas. Or along the same lines, some felt that infrastructure dollars should be spent in the areas of those that pay taxes for them. In other words, rural residents should get no less than what they pay taxes for.

At the same time general support was given to the notion that 'more roads only encourage sprawl,' and that any additional roads which are built in the Rural Areas should be paid for by developers. Gravel roads were desired to be kept as gravel to discourage development along them.

A number of participants also voiced support for alternative transportation possibilities such as JAUNT, bike lanes, public transport stations, traffic calming or a possible train from Crozet to Charlottesville. A number of people as well called for more involvement from the University of Virginia to support alternative transportation options.

	<b>Infrastructure Improvements:</b>	Alternative Transportation Options	Safety Improvements	Widening of Paved Roads	Paving of Gravel Roads	Widening and Paving Gravel Roads
<b><u>Ranking</u></b>						
1		45.5%	42.3%	8.5%	10.8%	9.6%
2		17.9%	36.6%	16.0%	20.5%	16.9%
3		7.3%	13.0%	25.5%	24.1%	18.1%
4		5.7%	6.5%	22.3%	25.3%	16.9%
5		22.0%	0.8%	18.1%	9.6%	25.3%
6		1.6%	0.0%	3.2%	2.4%	4.8%
NO			0.8%	6.4%	7.2%	8.4%

Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of Respondents	123	123	94	83	83

The table above shows the overall distribution of responses that were gathered when participants were asked how they would rank possible infrastructure improvements for the Rural Areas. A fairly even progression of responses can be seen which rank community preference in the following order: alternative transportation options (ranked #1), safety improvements (ranked #1 as well), widening of paved roads (ranked #2), paving of gravel roads (ranked #3), and widening and paving of gravel roads (ranked #4).

The largest majority of respondents favored alternative transportation options and safety improvements (45.5% and 42.3% respectively) as the most strongly desired infrastructure improvement. Following with a more even distribution of support were the ideas of widening and paving existing roads. Support for widening and paving existing gravel roads received the least support of all with 25.3% ranking it lower than any of the other alternatives.

### ***Community Services***

**The location of new public facilities (including police, fire, schools, libraries, water and sewer) should be within the Development Areas. A public facility may be allowed in the Rural Areas only in cases where it is not reasonably possible to locate these facilities in the Development Areas due to physical constraints, the nature of the facility, or services to be provided. Those residents in the Rural Areas should not anticipate a level of service equal to that in the Development Areas. Do you agree with this policy? (148 answers)**

<b>Yes</b>	102	(68.9%)
<b>No</b>	24	(16.2%)
<b>Somewhat</b>	22	(14.9%)

Discussion:

A majority (68.9%) of respondents supported the County’s policy to allocate funding for most new public facilities to the Development Areas. However a large number (31.1%) either qualified their answer or responded ‘No’ to the same questions.

In general discussions regarding the nature of community services to Rural Areas revolved around two central themes.

*Theme One:*

This policy would help to discourage excessive development. However, although rural residents shouldn’t expect same level of service, they should still expect a *reasonable* level of service. The primary concern in these discussions was for safety.

*Theme Two:*

In these discussions residents felt that tax dollars should be fairly distributed and not disproportionately allocated to the Development Areas. Primary needs listed for the Rural Areas included fire and rescue, police services and schools. Some also felt that placing such resources in Development Areas would increase traffic along rural roads.

***Land Use Patterns and Density/Development Rights***

In addition to the primary questions outlined above, community input was sought regarding possible growth and development patterns. Nine possible growth control measures were given to participants to rank according to their level of preference. In addition, many of the community’s answers help us to understand the relationship between the resident’s vision for their county with those outlined in Chapter Two of the current Comprehensive Plan (Natural Resources and Cultural Assets). Attendees were asked to rank the list of tools from 1 to 9. To clarify the complex array of responses, staff has grouped the responses for each tool into the top (1-3), middle (4-6), or bottom (7-9) third of the rankings.

	Growth Control Measures								
Rank	Water Supply Protection	Land Use Taxation	ACE	Conservation Easements	Agricultural/For estal Districts	Increase Minimum Lot Acreage	Reduce # of Develop-ment Rights	Residential Clusters	Phase Develop-ment
Top third	48.60%	53.90%	60.60%	61.50%	35.70%	36.50%	34.80%	32.50%	16.20%
Middle third	37.90%	30.20%	34.50%	30.10%	38.90%	22.00%	22.30%	27.50%	34.20%
Bottom third	13.60%	15.10%	4.90%	8.60%	25.30%	39.90%	41.30%	40.00%	47.00%

Water-supply Protection Measures: These tools were relatively popular, with most attendees ranking them in the top or middle third.

Land-use Taxation: This program generally ranked very high, with over 50 percent ranking it in the top third, and another 30 percent in the middle third. Nearly 80% of respondents favored this approach in the 2002 Citizen Survey.

ACE: This program was ranked in the top third by over 60 percent of attendees. Nearly all ranked it in the top or middle third. (In the 2002 Citizen Survey, 73.8% of respondents favored the ACE program.)

Conservation Easements: This tool was ranked in the top third by more respondents than any other; another 30 percent ranked it in the middle third.

Agricultural/Forestral Districts: Response on this program was mixed, but weighted toward the middle third.

Increase Minimum Lot Acreage: Rankings were weighted to the top and bottom thirds, reflecting a divided response to this approach.

Reduce Number of Development Rights: Rankings were weighted to the top and bottom thirds, reflecting a divided response to this approach. Lower rankings were somewhat more predominant.

Residential Clusters: Rankings were weighted to the top and bottom thirds, reflecting a divided response to this approach. Lower rankings were somewhat more predominant.

Phase Development: Rankings were weighted to the middle and bottom thirds.

#### Discussion:

During discussions it was revealed that many participants found it difficult to prioritize all the measures and that many felt that an approach which incorporated multiple measures was the most sound. As one respondent wrote, “[The] best plan is one that coordinates land use controls (limited development rights etc.), tax incentives (tax relief for land kept in ag/forest use, tax benefits for donations of conservation easements), and public acquisition of conservation easements. All these tools must be used.”

### ***Rural Preservation Developments (RPDs)***

Community members voiced many, often conflicting, ideas regarding Rural Preservation Developments (or clustering).

When discussed along with the idea of preservation measures, the idea of cluster was generally well received, although responses were qualified. Many thought it to be a good concept, however it was said that it had the potential to be implemented either well or very poorly (as with any development) and that the County should remain aware of the possible aesthetic and environmental impacts. Many voiced the opinion that clustering was fine as long as the number of clusters remained low, the number of houses in each cluster remained low, they occurred away from the road, and they received no extension of public services.

Others felt that the concept of clustering ‘solves nothing’. The concept, in essence, would by its very nature still allow population growth in the Rural Areas and the visual impact and traffic impact would be detrimental to the basic goals of maintaining a ‘rural character.’

### ***Consistency with Natural Resources and Cultural Assets Plan (Chapter 2)***

Chapter Two of the Albemarle County Comprehensive Plan (Natural Resources and Cultural Assets), states that:

“This Comprehensive Plan recognizes that both the Rural Area and the Development Areas are subsets of the overall environment of Albemarle County, upon which the developed environment and its people depend. The maintenance and enhancement of our quality of life, our economic wealth, and the health of our citizens are dependent on our natural environment and the ecological services it provides. Ecological services are ways in which nature meets and fulfills human needs.” (pg. v, *Chapter Two*)

Although the topic of the consistency of community opinion with Chapter Two was not asked directly within the community forums, many of the participant’s responses indicate a strong backing for the fundamental concepts that it outlines.

In particular, many voiced strong support for water supply protection to be a driving force for future development decisions. As one respondent wrote, “water supply protection seems to be one of the best ways of protecting land and helping build the water supply. In addition, it will help wildlife & provide scenery.’ Concern was voiced often for the need to protect both ground and surface waters and to have methods for regulating that protection.

Beyond the idea of water, many residents articulated the desire for development decisions to be based on the need to protect other natural resources. Wildlife corridors, stream buffers, and biodiversity were all viewed as positive assets that could easily be lost to development pressures. Forest management was also an issue. Some attendees supported forestry as a rural use, but with lower-impact management techniques (i.e., other than clear-cutting). Others stressed the difference between forestry and forest protection, and favored maintenance of mature forest areas.

### ***Development Design Standards***

Conversations relating to design standards were generally articulated in terms of ‘aesthetics.’ Again, two major themes surfaced within discussions.

The first theme is that aesthetics are too vague to base regulations upon. Some suggested basing regulations solely on questions of natural resource management. Others suggested that regulations in general be less punitive and based more on an incentive or voluntary approach so that private property rights would not be over burdened.

The second theme found the notion of aesthetics to be very important to the idea of the ‘rural lifestyle.’ The rolling hills, farms and country (gravel) roads that define much of the County are viewed as great benefits. Conversations along this theme focused on specific ideas people would like to see implemented. These included:

- Houses (few) that blend into the landscape and are energy efficient
- Strong visual lines that serve as buffers to urban area
- Undisturbed vistas and mountain views
- Preserved historic resources
- Continuous forests and/or open spaces

### ***Adjacent County Issues Related to Rural Areas***

Discussions of issues beyond the County’s borders also arose. In particular, many residents wished to emphasize the point that local decisions need to take regional issues into concern.

One group of respondents wanted to see a positive (almost protective) relationship with surrounding Counties where local services could be offered to neighboring regions; and where growth could be encouraged within the City of Charlottesville to protect adjacent counties such as Fluvanna and Greene. Others wanted to see regional coordination along the lines of general planning policy and natural resource planning such as with watershed/water supply issues.

## **20 Year Vision for Albemarle County Rural Areas**

### Complete Comments from Community Discussions

#### **RURAL ISSUES – GENERAL**

- County has tools to accomplish rural character.
- Comprehensive Rural Resource Plan
- County ombudsperson for rural area protection
- Good use of development area to protect rural areas (align regulations)
- Review of existing rural development plan/policy vs. what has actually been implemented

#### **CHANGE/GROWTH**

- As is – no more growth!
- No change (little to no change)
- No change
- Exactly the same or more preserved
- Don't assume growth is inevitable
- \*Unchanged
- No new development
- Limit population growth
- Look like they do now – predominately rural
- Growth contained in DA
- same and clearer
- Same thing
- Very little change
- Slow/ halt development, no worse than now
- The way it looks now
- To court growth would be a mistake
- No change
- Slow growth of 'big box' development
- Less/ no strip development (residential)
- Maintain rural character by limiting subdivision
- Local control over growth policy
- Is growth pre-ordained?
- Sustainable population, scenery, water supply, forests - not N. VA
- Growth done wisely
- Maintain rural areas, what makes it special
- Planned Growth somewhere to accommodate families
- truly rural
- RA stays relatively undeveloped. More high-density clusters.
- managed growth
- Like to see community aware that uncontrolled development is as costly or more costly than preservation
- Don't want Albemarle to look like Fairfax
- Contained/ controlled growth
- How to limit population? Recognition that it's an issue

- Scottsville town has room for growth within its boundaries. Would like to see town manage growth area and provide cultural growth.
- Channel growth to city area, not spread out
- Less new! Use old!
- minimized – controlled growth
- Acknowledgement of growth area will occur
- Population policy/ total population cap based on resources

## **ROADS/TRANSPORTATION**

- Transportation solution to efficiently move people and vehicles around
- Country roads
- no new roads in RA
- Maintain road width and character
- Bike paths on major roads
- No significant increase in population paving of gravel roads
- Another major interstate
- Limit road building
- Better public transportation
- Increased traffic calming in rural villages
- No more roads
- Less through truck traffic on small roads
- Bike paths, greenways – property rights, how to create bike paths that interconnect
- Buses?
- Gravel roads?
- Country lanes
- provide circulation (roads)
- Pedestrian/ equestrian trail in RA
- Transportation arteries, not suburban sprawl
- Protect rural roads (cycling, walking)
- Keep roads safe, unpaved roads do not have to be paved, but made safer – small-scale improvements  
ie. Intersection and spot improvements
- Safe roads
- Highway 20 maintain its serenity to Scottsville, develop closer to town
- Rt. 29 maintained as non-interstate- type Rd. Less traffic; through state traffic routed to interstate
- Hate to see Rt. 20 widened – rather it be a scenic byway
- Do not widen Rt. 20, keep scenic
- Linking development areas with transit
- Highways to date with growth
- Allow cross-roads to develop
- Design of roadways, not to pave scenic rural roads
- VDOT runs the policy?

## **INFRASTRUCTURE/SERVICES**

- More strictly limit infrastructure in rural areas
- More thought to infrastructure
- Keep growth on side on town where infrastructure and services are.

- Developers pay for impact (human and environmental)
- Maintain infrastructure with growth
- Develop limited infrastructure to provide for small number (ideally 1500 for town of Scottsville)
- Maintain suitable service boundaries
- Loss over past 20 years, services in growth areas

## **LAND USE**

- Restrict lots to larger sizes (over 21 acres)
- Stronger adherence to master plan
- Permit land use appropriately by location
- Why only utilitarian uses of land?
- If there is no “use” of land then that County is “poor.”
- Infill in Scottsville
- Matching proposed use to site and minimizing impacts
- Shooting, RVs, off-road, extractive, hurts the land
- Balance of land use and opportunity

## **TAXES/INCENTIVES**

- Fair distribution of costs and benefits
- How can land generate tax revenue without destroying the land? Economic models are needed.
- Punitive vs. incentive tactics
- Estate tax effects
- Increase penalties for developing retrospectively
- Key tax structure to type of development, tax users of service higher
- No further restrictive regulations
- Government initiated zoning enforcement
- Improve ‘junky’ areas thru utilizing present codes
- Board of Supervisors and Planning Department make judicious / careful decisions
- A town of about 1500 (Scottsville), increased land, shared real estate taxes with the County or Scottsville should revert back to the County

## **VILLAGES/CLUSTERING**

- Smaller building lot sizes, clustered
- Restrict lots to larger sizes, clustered
- Review clustering regulations
- RPD clusters
- Cluster housing = common well septic
- Cluster development
- Not to see every road has to have a house at the end instead, neighborhoods distinct from farms, discreet areas and concentration of resources
- Villages
- To limit commutes
- Self-sufficiency
- Preserve rural slow traffic patterns

- Crossroad communities
- Not de facto development
- White Hall = a certain type of experience
- Small village atmosphere like Earlysville (small commercial)
- Rural development in villages rather than all over
- Support village stores
- Protection of existing villages (not divided into large acre lots)
- Town of Covesville as a thriving small community

## **HOUSING**

- Better housing for poor, address issue of substandard housing, issue of current substandard housing
- Affordable housing (not trailers)
- Affordable housing other than clumps
- Affordable housing and recognizing existing residents preserving
- Not a County for just the elite.
- Do not want housing developments
- Provision of housing – people of modest income (cluster development)
- Opportunity for range of people (incomes) to live in country

## **BUILDINGS**

- Adapted reuse of buildings
- Renovation of existing structures
- Maintain commercial property, Don't let them decline and become vacant
- Encourage more innovative building (environmental)
- Less clearing of building lots
- Encourage appropriate use of existing buildings
- Re-do commercial buildings

## **BUSINESS/COMMERCIAL**

- Small scale service, employment centers be built
- Accommodate / enable rural economy with no sacrifice to rural character
- Contained commercial
- Restriction on comm. Development at crossroads (like the development on Rt. 29 in Greene north of Cl.)
- Limited commercial development
- Local small business
- Promote work near where you live
- Home occupations: streamline
- Home occupation where compatible ( Class B)
- Keep Scottsville as an economic center
- Limited industrial activities related to agriculture (wineries)
- Commerce in RA basic services (especially for Scottsville for region)

## **PROPERTY RIGHTS**

- Respect property rights
- Protect property owners right to subdivide their own property with limitations based on environmental concerns, not aesthetics
- Protect property owners rights

## **SCHOOLS**

- Local schools
- Schools not overcrowded
- Neighborhood schools
- Continued county emphasis on quality education

## **FARMS**

- Realtor's and regulator's views on development changed so farming is highest and best use, make regs say farming is highest and best use
- Alternative to agriculture:
  - No skeet shooting
  - Bike trails
  - River
  - Pony and horse riding
  - Conservation areas
  - Walking/ hiking paths
  - Home occupations
- Organic incentives
- Avoid water pollution
- Rotational, non-steroidal, non-antibiotic cow practices
- Economically viable use of land
- Cottage industry
- Supports people on land
- Vineyards
- Alternative to traditional farming
- Artisans, woodworkers
- Economic/ preservation
- Rural vs. new urban conflicts
- Smells
- Sprays
- More organic farming
- Preserve traditional barns/ country homes
- Real farms?
- Encourage "cottage" agriculture
- More farming
- Hate to see farm land lost
- More family farms, keep in family and make viable
- Alternative farming and encourage home industries i.e. Grow arushi hemp as an agricultural product, focus on arts and crafts (small enterprise)
- Farm history (homes structures and landscape) preserved

- Like to see viable farms, farms that can support living, more environmentally sensitive farming, viable sustainable farms
- Agricultural land not covered into housing McMansions
- Increased farming and forestry
- Vineyards
- Enough land to make a living off land (keep resource)
- Maintain or increase area of farmland
- More working farms
- Stay open. Family farms stay. Assessments in check.
- Farms stay as farms
- Working farms
- Keep large farms
- Sustainable farms
- Areas still undeveloped – see farmland utilized
- Rehab homes and farms instead of new homes
- More farms
- Maintain and see agricultural endeavors

## **FORESTS**

- More undeveloped open space
- Natural
- Forestal
- Forest preserved
- More mature timber
- Non timbering forest management
- Way to make farm and forestal land viable
- Greenspace, more open, forested areas
- Less logging (more selective); more careful regulation of soil conservation reduction in soil erosion from logging (regs seem to be looser on logging sites)
- Same amount of forested areas as today
- Birds, wildlife, forest
- Maintenance of forest land across generations) include market for good use of land
- Preservation of forests
- Sustainable forestry
- Difference between clear cutting and sustainable forestry
- Tall trees
- Protect forest interior habitat
- Replant forests; water
- Importance of forest on water quality

## **WATER**

- Quality of water not be degraded (groundwater, surface water preserved)
- Riparian buffer ordinance – more effective
- In-stream flow requirements for reservoirs
- Water resources as limit
- Technology to improve septic / water uses
- Septic can ruin groundwater

- Downstream water protection
- Factor in water
- More awareness and protection of groundwater resources
- Protection of surface water
- Available water
- County protect water resources (create ordinances that ask developers to test for adequate water supply)
- Riparian buffers
- Cow fencing
- Waters supply protection
- Water as a limiting factor in growth
- Developments having an adequate provable measured groundwater supply

### **OTHER NATURAL RESOURCES**

- Distinction/ gradation of resources
- County support of resource protection
- Natural resource protection
- Maintain or improve our environmental resources
- Maintain or improve air quality (visibility)
- Awareness of the possibility of environmental changes
- Monitoring and improving air quality
- More native grasses and pastures
- Preservation of wildlife habitat
- Environmental ethic – (intrinsic value instead of \$) appreciating of what we have
- Stars
- Ecotourism
- greater diversity
- Nature conservancy
- More natural areas
- Habitat preservation and consideration in use of land
- Noise and air pollution quality control
- Maintaining biodiversity
- System for sustainability
- Adapt to environmental changes
- Better air quality
- Avoid noise pollution
- Growth limit by land is arbitrary

### **PARKS/OPEN SPACE**

- Limited community facilities for recreation for existing residents – not to encourage growth
- More natural area parks
- park land
- Parks, trails (passive and active)
- Passive recreation on public land
- Athletic fields (more than schools)
- Be proactive to making recreation available/ public and private

- Like to see park close to town
- increased public spaces and recreation
- Active conservation of public land (e.g. tree planting and general habitat improvement)
- Open land
- Comprehensive greenway system
- large “open areas” = non-built
- Share open space
- Open space (not suburb)
- Don’t like open land broken up into unusable pieces
- Common open space (protect open space without using development rights)

### **CONSERVATION/EASEMENTS**

- Stricter easements to protect biodiversity
- Easements
- Virginia Outdoor Foundation
- ACE program
- 100 acres minimum
- PRFA
- More scenic easements / voluntary protection
- Like to see more money in the ACE program
- conservation easements (ACE funding)
- ACE needs more \$\$\$
- More conservation easements
- Conservation easements - build on appropriate land not on wetlands, etc.
- Scottsville should have conservation use of the zoning ordinance ( 1 acre zoning)

### **MOUNTAINS/VIEWSHED**

- Maintain scenic quality (mountain views)
- Mountains undeveloped
- Reasonable mountain regulation
- Property owner control of mountain land
- Mountaintop ordinance
- Tops of mountains; keep development in the valleys
- Undeveloped mountains
- Don’t want to see houses on mountainside
- Viewshed protection
- Viewshed (incl. Agriculture)
- No cell towers or other structures
- Buck Mt Reservoir
- Mountaintop viewshed
- Rural character, open space special protection for mountains, rivers, special places

### **HISTORIC PRESERVATION**

- Historic Preservation ordinance

- Keep historic character/ resources
- Small country stores (Brown's Market, etc.)
- Homes (Esmont, Schuyler)
- This could happen with relaxed zoning
- Survey of existing buildings for historic value and landscape
- Preservation of cultural landscape
- Protection of historical sites (no commercial sites)
- No more loss of historic resources
- Preservation of historic resources
- More historic designations and assistance from the county (barns)
- Adequate protection from development – rural areas, historic resources

#### **UVA**

- Same size for Uva
- University to provide student housing and transportation
- Control UVA expansion

#### **OTHER**

- Increase site distances for driveway permits
- Outlaw billboards
- Power plants, communication towers under more local autonomy
- Evidence that County had done homework researching available limited water resources so not jeopardized by rural development
- Looking to other areas for examples – like San Francisco
  - Ability to buy land
  - Notification and opportunity for involvement
- Access to countryside for RA and DA
- Citizens and complaints should have their identity protected
- Scottsville to be able to sustain itself and draw people

## RA Public Input – “Other Comments” responses

At the end of the small-group discussions, attendees were asked to provide input on other ideas and suggestions that they had. They were especially encouraged to provide ideas or perspectives that they hadn’t been asked about in other questions.

### RA 1:

- **Other Comments**
- Positive versus negative incentives
- Not enough options
- Current policy has not worked
- Running out of water
- Overbuilt
- Results so far are not good
- Zoning needs changes
- Growth is in rural areas anyway
- Preservation
- Clustering
- McMansions
- Less affluent = not many options for affordable housing
- Shared space versus piecemeal
- Downzoning?
- RPD = Cluster on small lots and leave open around it
- Special use permits
- State just took away Albemarle’s autonomy regarding “by right”
- Encourage ‘large lot’ development to maintain agricultural use.
- Education on management techniques
- Consideration given to ‘common good’
- County awareness of impact on individuals
- Balance development limitation on cost of land, housing, etc.
- Maintain existing lot sizes
- Clean air / burning
- Have development opportunity for both cluster and large lot
- Awareness for conditions that apply
- Clustered away from road.
- Clustering with awareness of impact.
- Option for division
- No regulation based on aesthetic
- Public assistance for historic/ older sites
- Incentives to preserve older structures
- Land use tax “manipulated” (not deterrent) 35% of growth under land use, defray cost of future services, Better way?
- Land use may be justified by lack of service
- Evaluate LUT comprehensively
- LUT = “back door ACE” “public’s contribution”
- Easement effort needs more \$ need contiguous easements
- Can LUT be guaranteed into future

- Tax land on production
- Significance of roads. Question of improve, add, delete? Pave
- School redistricting – like it more stable. Not penalized based on where you live.
- Limitations of what the County can do – restricted by budget.
- If you want to be rural, shouldn't ask for services
- Dillon's rule – Counties presumed not to have authority to control land use – good and bad to that.
- Raising parcel size to 40 acres – land is still unusable for agriculture and cost goes up – not equitable
- Option – gain development right if you cluster
- Time release development – prevents speculative subdivision. Also encourage clustering
- For population growth, provide proper utilities to higher density clusters to keep rural character outside
- Concern for new development to impact low flow wells
- Develop tools to permanently protect conservation targets
- Ask whether growth as to occur?
- Require proof of water supply before you can build
- Conservation easements are cost effective
- Regional planning for growth
- Affordable housing
- More flexible housing options
- Encourage vineyards
- Can't have affordable housing without growth
- Coordinate with the city about growth
- Avoid full commercial development on Rt. 29 N
- Bypass will reduce rural integrity of County
- Keep working on thoughtfully managed growth
- Everyone should get equal emergency service
- Large lots, 21 acres, consume land
- Water & Air needs more emphasis (forestry) “Conservation Area”
- Impact on real estate values, need affordable housing (for those working in rural area)

## RA2

- Connect two sides of system RA and DA with appropriate and understood incentives
- ACE is good
- ACE has flaws
- Needs funding (transfer tax)
- Needs to be run more fairly
- Tools to help developer into program as well as farmer
- Improved inter-county cooperation (easier process across boundaries)
- The survey questions do not always specify the issues- like that forestry could be logging and that farming could be cold storage
- Why not add non-commercial recreational lands, county or state park lands
- Safety on roads means not bigger but safer – increased shoulders
- Vistas and views are important
- Public transportation
- Why not address the design of residential division aside from clustering – need more specifics
- The illogic of the rural growth cycle – people move here because it is so rural and this makes it less rural
- Sustainability of resources and businesses

- For question 5, all tools listed are good
- Phasing development is more palatable for developer/ land owner
- How do we provide affordable housing? Could require developers to portion out areas for affordable housing, group likes this idea because it is good for cluster development in RA
- Would not like mobile home parks in rural area
- Agriculture can be too intensive – hog farming

### **RA3**

- Forestry B.M.P.s – parcel size
- Lot size limit
- Cluster
- Cost to public
- Modify development rights (simplify) {downzoning}
- 90 day window for neighbors to comment on plat- not two weeks
- check for threatened species and natural resources on property before development
- exotic invasives – what can we do?
- Write letter to editors saying to magazines that highlight Albemarle “we’re full”
- Keep gravel roads gravel, character
- Insure emergency vehicle access on all roads including driveways
- Roads encourage traffic
- Park and rides – public transportation options
- Development must be linked to resources – water, utilities
- Tax on developers to support ACE program and other carrot programs
- Aesthetic issues of forest resources – viewsheds
- For the goals we’ve been discussing, we need to focus more on “the carrot” than “the stick”
- Be willing to take unaesthetic measures such as clear cutting if it can help industry or ecology later
- Biodiversity
- Not on list –Dillon’s rule – get rid of it
- Wildlife corridors – they should be here in 20 years too
- Concern about forestry practices – have seen it gone badly in other places
- Forestal needs to be carefully defined – issues of industry and ecology
- Small commercial on major roads at certain location in the RA, to support existing “old” structures
- Parks/ rec uses (public or private)
- B & Bs small recreational facilities
- RA not a place for tourism
- Affordability is a big issue
- Policy is nice but not effective, a lot of room for development
- ACE is a wonderful program but money doesn’t go very far
- Voluntary conservation easements are good for preservation
- Participation in A/ F district doesn’t provide much incentive
- Transportation → good policy
- Transportation → some roads are dangerous and need to be improved
- Better mountaintop protection – too restrictive (too broad) ordinance, flexibility in driveway grades
- Drainfields now require taking too many trees down
- Need groundwater regulations – need an authority to enforce groundwater protection for everyone

### **RA4**

- Treat agriculture and forestal differently
- Define objectives for agriculture / forestal (habitat vs. economy)
- Riparian rights/ county controlled aquifer?
- No tax on yard sales
- Loopholes in Land Use Tax (intent of tax vs. application, modify so developers don't abuse intent of tax)
- Large buffer area / transition area from rural to development area – need for neighborhood planning
- Developers be responsible for roads / transportation network
- Larger developers have unfair advantage (they know the loopholes and citizens don't)
- Would like to see rural crossroad communities stay as they are i.e. General stores subsidize general stores so they can compete with chains like Sheetz. Use zoning ordinance to protect Ma and Pa stores.
- Reduce development potential no cluster; no by-right either
- More tax incentive for keeping rural land in agricultural use
- Successful urban development to take pressure from rural areas
- Phasing of growth/ development – non by-right development
- Less by-right subdivisions
- Help to agricultural
- Keep land use tax
- Preserve family farms
- Small B & B – concern with event
- Country stores, limit #
- Services – health and safety needed in a timely manner
- Not sewer and water
- Need to manage supply of groundwater, understand impacts of development on groundwater systems
- Require proof of adequate groundwater before development
- Limited commercial activity in historic structures within villages – alter standards to permit this
- Stronger overall focus on water supply and education on demand side
- Visual design standards
- Focus permitted use in accessory uses that help keep farms intact
- Economic development for agriculture
- Permit farm stays (income + education)
- More rational development process, fewer specifics up front (concept plan vs. site plan)
- Define priority protection areas within the rural areas
- Realize the impact of other localities on Albemarle
- Determine what attracts people here
- Don't want to have stagnation
- Don't ignore growth, provide for clustering development
- Development areas need to have development parameters, E & S, clearing
- Coordinate conservation easements with other identified resources i.e. Historic
- Survey doesn't represent what they want to say. Esp. #5 Need to synthesize Results

## RA Public Input – Written Comments

Attendees were given the opportunity to explain their answers to several questions on the survey form. In addition, many wrote in comments next to questions, even where no comment space was provided. Staff has collected both types of comments here.

### **Part I (20-year Vision)**

- Same as it is now.
- Nothing changed – more incentive for conservation.
- Town of Scottsville: prosperous small town serving rural, farming communities of rural Albemarle, Fluvanna and Buckingham Counties. This means Albemarle County RA in Scottsville Magisterial District should retain strong rural character, unpaved roads, no urban services, large working farms.
- Rolling green hills with beautiful farms and wildlife abundant

### **Part I. a.**

**Imagine that you have lived in Albemarle until today. Tomorrow you move away for twenty years. What would you like to see when you return?**

- I wish v. little development, but prefer incentive not to develop vs. ‘discouragement’ or prohibitive techniques.
- I support compact growth in designated areas, and a clear delineation of urban/rural areas.
- Disagree with some of the ways to implement policy!
- I believe in zero population growth. Until all Albemarle residents and infrastructure is totally green, energy efficient, safe, quite, affordable, why bring more people in?
- Disagree [?] planning efforts to centralize development into smaller areas.
- Current goals have failed to funnel growth into the development areas. Many people move here to enjoy the rural areas and don’t want an ‘urban’ environment.
- I would like to see the county grant fewer waivers and CPAs – we’ve got a CP, let’s use it!
- Rural areas are for farming.
- But it isn’t working, and needs more serious incentives & disincentives.
- But the policy is not realistic given the current growth trends...
- Not sure is working.
- Fair and Consistent when considering landowners’ rights. Also stick to actual ordinances which are in effect at time of application. Special consideration for lifelong residents’ diverse rights. VA is Dillon Rule State.
- It works to maintain the characteristics of the area that make it such a desirable residential locale.
- I believe this policy should be implemented vigorously.
- This county tries to keep the countryside for the elite who do not want growth in the countryside.
- However, judging from the graphs handed out today, it looks like the County needs to be more rigorous in enforcing development restrictions i.e. 77% of new parcels were below the County’s minimum.
- As long as existing cultural and natural resources in ‘designated areas’ aren’t ignored or considered doomed.
- Please avoid draconian restrictions.

- I agree with the policy of directing growth into certain areas, but I believe there should be limits or, at the very least, parameters, established within growth areas to avoid excessive commercialization or overdevelopment.
- Creates the opportunity to maintain a diverse landscape and provides citizens a diverse choice as to where they choose to live.
- I agree with policy but actions and development trends are not consistent with the policy!
- We need to be sure that farmers with land holdings can afford to keep their land.
- People whose financial resources are in their land should not lose their retirement security because of county action.
- The “urban ring” has become ugly, paved “blight” – Keeping the rural area “natural” is a worthy goal but people should have some “clustered” commercial area available for access to goods and services.
- What would I like to see – discourage trash along the highway and unsightly areas. Support should be 1<sup>st</sup> priority county should enforce current zoning rules – especially regarding junk cars in front yards etc. This would beautify the area.
- Current efforts at directing development into growth area are not effective. Rural lands are being gobbled at alarming rates – the train’s already left the station!
- Land use taxation is particularly vital in enabling people to keep rural holdings intact.
- I think resources available in rural areas (i.e. water) have to be reviewed in terms of growth targets for rural areas.
- Once the subdivision lines are drawn on the paper and the County approves it, it is nearly impossible to return the land to agricultural or forestal use.
- Screws up the close-in areas, doesn’t necessarily reduce road use – just shifts the growth problems, doesn’t address them head on.
- Depends on how ‘development’ in RA are defines. I agree with supporting activities consistent with rural character (e.g. family, forestry, open land, etc.)
- Except that is doesn’t seem to be working.
- Excellent educational cultural amenities in Charlottesville carefully planned residential development.
- The term “discourage” seems too lax or vague or even unenforceable.
- Only place for affordable housing. Need to allow Home Occupation B. Common areas no provision unless using development right.
- As explained below, there needs to be mini-Gas to accommodate small development and facilities.
- I feel the growth thus far has not determined the best development right size of acreage in the county to sustain and limit growth for more than the next 20 years.
- But- should Scottsville be a no-growth or a growth area? Perhaps Scottsville should also be designated a growth area.
- Growth with local (Scottsville area) defined neighborhoods – not just along the roads.
- Provided those communities most impacted by the growth channeled into their direction to have meaningful voice in the process, and that those goals are very carefully considered on all levels: agriculturally, economically, and socially.
- The County could go further on the side of discouraging growth in the RA. One area to look at would be by restricting “by-right” roadside division rights.
- Does not go far enough to protect to rural environment.
- Realistically, we will eventually find we do not have landscape resources to support more growth even if sent to rural areas.
- Like death and taxes, growth and development are a way of life. It's how we control the change that matters.

**Part I. b. (see end of report)**

**Part II.**

Keeping in mind your vision for the Rural Areas, individually answer the following questions. The group will discuss these issues, after the questions have been answered. If anyone has other alternative solutions or issues, the facilitator will include them in the summary report to the whole group following the small group discussions.

1. **County Policy:** The County’s growth management goal directs development into designated areas and conserves the balance for rural areas and resource protection. Planning efforts have been to focus on means to discourage development in the Rural Areas and support activities consistent with the character of the Rural Areas.

a) **Do you agree with this policy?** (Circle best answer)

**Yes                      No                      Somewhat**

**Explain Answer** (optional)

- To be more flexible in policies, take into consideration changing needs
- Policy is reasonable; implementation of policy has been poor.
- Keep open space, forests, agriculture and mostly, our watersheds.
- Needs new method of discouraging rural development. The requirement for 21 acres lots consumes land even faster – as demonstrated in areas such as N. Va.
- There must be regulatory reform to facilitate development in the growth area.
- Use positive encouragement to guide growth into acceptable areas.
- Rural areas have been rapidly developing into 20 yard width homes – not creating a rural image.
- Should 40 create agricultural use – Probably not. What would 40 agricultural uses be to increase cost – decrease buyers.
- Absolutely, I would live in town if town was a town and not sprawl. Nucleate the cities and leave the rural areas rural.
- Within Limit.
- The restrictions for growth should not include such language as the “rural nature” of the county or any concerns for aesthetics. The emphasis should be on property owners rights with limitations based on environmental concerns.
- Maintain as large parcels as possible to be available for farming and forestry.
- I would not like to see the “designated growth areas” become overly-congested inner city type neighborhoods.
- Would prefer more restrictive policy re: population growth.
- However, by doing this the county is also driving out the small farmer and making it impossible to remain a small farmer. Land prices have skyrocketed causing the small farmer to sell.
- It has not worked so the policy needs to be changed!
- Find positive incentives!
- I would increase efforts to discourage development – pass a Mountaintop Protection Ordinance, downzone the rural areas even further, fully fund the ACE program each year (and cut elsewhere to balance the County’s budget), etc.
- I’d like to see limitations on development in rural areas that acknowledge the finite nature of vital resources like water, particularly groundwater.
- Discouraging development is too narrow a focus; we need to encourage sensible, creative growth, tucking in homes.

- I don't agree with growth management based on the assumption that growth is inevitable. I do agree with the consistency provision so long as "character" takes account of resources, e.g. water and biodiversity.
- Development should not occur in areas valuable for those resources.
- But in placing these areas around county I think it will be inevitable that rural areas become, at least, partially developed and this encourages it.
- But location must be carefully studied as to water, transportation, etc.
- We have to maintain clearly defines growth areas and discourage (through much tougher zoning) development in the rural areas.

b) **Rank each of the following land uses in that you would like to have in the rural areas:** (one = most preferred)

- \_\_\_ agricultural (farming and agricultural support, such as cold storage buildings)
- \_\_\_ forestal (timber and wood product industries)
- \_\_\_ commercial recreation (recreational opportunities such as biking trails, skeet shooting, camps and conference centers, and off-road recreational vehicle trails)
- \_\_\_ country stores
- \_\_\_ bed and breakfasts
- \_\_\_ special events (such as weddings, parties)
- \_\_\_ offices (medical, insurance, etc.)
- \_\_\_ home occupations (occupations conducted inside the residence or in an accessory building on the same property)
- \_\_\_ small restaurants
- \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

- None of the above, too slanted towards commercial uses – leave the land as natural as possible.
- Recreation – non-invasive, hot-air balloons
- Forestal – depending on harvesting methods.
- Commercial recreation – concerns with noise, pollution, crowds.
- Other – watershed explored and built now.
- Off-road recreational vehicles should be altogether prohibited...sorry! Private vehicles on owners land only.
- Other – creative open land uses, such as Panorama Farms bike trails.
- Other – Garden center.
- Home Occupations – if no large vehicle deliveries
- Kept in some kind of reasonable balance, I would be receptive to all of these activities/ uses.
- Water protection and more reservoirs.
- Other – Owner occupied affordable homes on environmentally sound small lots.
- Forestal – but not just for timber – for wildlife and native plants
- Other - preserves that would maintain biological diversity of native plant and animal species.
- Other- historic resources
- Other- Resource protection #1. All other are uses that need careful placement of management. Parks and protected areas #1.
- Forestal- why product. Why not protection.
- Other- Parkland/ public use areas.

2. **County Policy:** Agricultural and forestal resources have been identified as the most critical County resources and the desired primary land uses in the Rural Areas.

c) **Do you agree with this policy?** (circle best answer)

Yes                      No                      Somewhat

**Explain Answer** (optional)

- This is not an agricultural area, climate and location more desirable for residential.
- With restrictions in use automatically comes preservation of rural areas and open space.
- They keep open space and protect watershed and ecosystem.
- Don't want tree forms with clear cutting – need diverse forests with policies to control fire risk.
- Obviously farming is preferred – But becomes less economically viable over time.
- I agree insofar as ag/for. Resources provide umbrella protection for other uses/ activities. Ultimately, I think there needs to be a balance of multiple uses/ activities.
- Protection and preservation of open space, contiguous forests for wildlife and critical natural resources, i.e. water, should be equal to above.
- Not sure agricultural alone can sustain the farm.
- This is for aesthetic purposes, not for the forest industry.
- Ag use not as common now. Forestal resources are vital to water resources.
- As they also benefit other natural resources protection.
- As long as trees are preserved.
- Forests are fine. Forest industries are another matter. Object to clear cutting for example.
- Now implement it so we can preserve what we have.
- I like your new plan of equality for all 8 areas.
- 'No' for forestry, 'somewhat' for agriculture, but only if sustainable and towards organic.
- Only organic ag and forest restoration. I do not view trees as a 'resource.' They should be left to grow!
- No forestal.
- Current land prices make this use increasingly less likely except for wealthy landowners.
- I don't agree with support of the timber industry as a positive for rural lifestyles.
- Not so simple.
- All equal is better policy in (water supply).
- Scenic beauty & minimum pollution.
- Agriculture – yes, pulpwood farms – no. encourage hardwood and lumber forests.
- Those are the most effective means of making desirable open space sustainable.
- I believe historic and cultural resources should be included as "critical" resources.
- Cows don't go to school.
- We need to have natural areas that are not used for at least conventional economic purposes.
- Water resources also important.
- I don't like timber business.
- Forests are different than ag area and need different incentives.
- This is what everyone likes about the county.
- But again, need to distinguish the commercial aspects of forestry from the scenic/ preservation aspects (or habitat).
- As long as water resources are protected.
- Maintaining habitat for non-humans is equally important (biodiversity needs).
- Except large agribusiness operations.

- Again, it is a matter of scale and character. Clear cutting and agri-business operations are not what makes Albemarle County a good place to live
- They are least intrusive.
- I generally agree but I want to preserve property owners rights to avoid overregulation
- Timber industry should be better regulated; also timbering on private property.
- Small agriculture i.e. that implied by the land use preference above would suggest some modification.
- Both can be (usually are) extremely deleterious, especially for water, sediment, wildlife, as they are industrial uses. That doesn't mean don't have them. It does mean better guidelines and management.
- These are important - but we need to set aside as natural areas open space much of the land also. There should be a balance between the two.
- Too narrow a focus – needs to be more inclusive
- If agriculture includes traditional sporting and equestrian enjoyment than I do. If not, I don't.
- Again- not agricultural broadly speaking, but viable commercial activities (vineyards, horse breeding, etc.)
- I think there are vistas and other resources that are being ruined without Albemarle County input, i.e. Mountains.
- Does not go far enough to protect rural environment.
- Note this is inconsistent with current guiding principles, as forestal industries do not protect most RA resources, despite some entrenched wishful thinking.
- Responsible agricultural and forestal make for a better living environment for all.
- Natural resources (bio-diversity, water, etc.) must be a large part of planning in rural areas.

3. **County Policy:** The County allocates limited funds to the Rural Areas for transportation improvements. Most of the funding is designated for the Development Areas where growth is encouraged.

**Do you agree with this policy?** (Circle best answer)

**Yes**                      **No**                      **Somewhat**

**Explain Answer** (optional)

- Improve bike lanes on major rural roads.
- Better roads bring more traffic. I support only simple maintenance, not “improvement, “of county by-ways.
- Rural areas also needs transportation but of a different nature. Should not be left out.
- More roads lead to more homes.
- If population follows transportation, this is a good policy.
- Tremendous growth area needs: e.g.: Meadowcreek Pkw. Eastern Connector – realistic Western By-pass.
- Keep the gravel roads gravel! If you improve the roads, the cars will come to fill them.
- We pay taxes also.
- Identify danger area and improve.
- More roads only encourage sprawl.
- Country roads reduce sprawl (ideally).
- Unpaved roads are appropriate for rural areas.
- Transportation is necessary.
- Although it discourages growth it also discourages people to stay in the rural areas due to lack of funding for roadways. There needs to be a better balance.

- UVA should be required to bus employees from North Rivanna Park and other outlying areas.
- Development follows roads, roads follow development.
- I agree with David's idea that this plan encourages people to go to designated development area.
- There is some road improvements that could be made in rural areas, but not road widening. What about bike lanes?
- Time to get UVA involved with transportation! North Grounds (Rt. 29).
- Don't fund any transportation projects except bike lanes, clean transportation, monorails, and pedestrian paths. Building roads is a subsidy for developers!
- Growth is increasing outside development areas causing dangerous intersections.
- Rural roads were originally designed as farm-to-market roads, not suburban arteries.
- Widening and paving lowest priority—if people want suburban transportation they should live in suburbia.
- The policy is flawed because it should be allocated on actual growth. Growth is occurring in rural areas.
- We need good roads and bridges in rural areas for all residents of Co.
- If funds provided should encourage greenways & bike paths & public transit.
- Public transport stations in rural village-type areas would be helpful.
- Yes, as long as rural roads can be improved for safety, driving ease, etc.
- Development must pay for infrastructure and schools that serve their properties.
- I think growth should be discouraged.
- Discouraging growth by this means is unproven and I believe misguided. We deserve good roads too!
- In order for GA policy to work, infrastructure dollars must be spent there.
- Well, I don't quite understand what's meant by transportation, things like JAUNT? I don't think you mean roads and bridges.
- As long as roads in rural areas are not unsafe.
- Don't need to pave dirt roads just because the money is there from the state to do so.
- Limited public transportation (such as JAUNT, or a train fro Crozet to C'ville) would be beneficial to get people out of their cars.
- Why is money that is allocated to the rural area being designated instead to Development areas?
- You make a choice to live in the Rural Areas – it is not necessary to provide urban services in the rural areas.
- Transportation is the primary means or venue for experiencing Albemarle County. What the heck is the benefit of a rural vista if it is experiences from a car struck in a traffic jam?
- Country roads should have shoulders or/ and guard rails for safety purposes
- Unpaved roads should remain unpaved unless all property owners give right of way – as in current policy. The paving of little-used rural roads encourages development.
- Better roads bring more development and do not improve traffic flow. This scenario has been played out over and over in all areas of the country – NY Metro, San Francisco, list is endless.
- No more roads in RA!
- Development areas must have public transportation other than auto.
- Money should go to upkeep of existing roads.
- in this area, roads have rarely been built to accommodate future traffic. Refusing to build adequate roads for people who already use them is not providing adequate facilities.
- Residents or rural areas generally commute – better public transportation must be provided to limit car usage and road development.
- They would prohibit the safety issues and improvements that are needed for Rt. 20.
- Pave no roads that are currently paved, widen no roads, straighten no roads. Exception: Improve shoulders on Rt. 20 south!
- Greatly widened and improved roads invite more rural development.
- The quality of our roads is a safety issue for all residents.

- Road improvements should be based on actual growth and not encouraged growth.

a) **With limited transportation funds allocated to the rural areas, rank the type of transportation improvements you would prefer to see implemented in the rural areas.** (one = most preferred)

- \_\_\_ widening of existing paved roads
- \_\_\_ paving of gravel roads
- \_\_\_ widening and paving of gravel roads
- \_\_\_ safety improvements (straightening out dangerous curves, improving sight distance, improving or constructing shoulders and drainage ditches, improving railroad crossings, etc.)
- \_\_\_ offer more alternatives for traffic reduction (JAUNT, park and ride lots)
- \_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_

- Bike paths, buses, ride sharing, no commute zones, green vehicles.
- Decrease speed limits to make it safe for tractors to use roads; maybe equestrian accommodations? (e.g., Moore County, NC).
- Widening of roads for bike lanes only; otherwise, no.
- Reducing speed limits on rural roads.
- Examine a longer list.
- Bridge repair/replacement.
- Experiment with paving materials that permit drainage through surface.
- Require large employers (UVA, etc.) to provide outlying area parking and thru buses to UVA.
- Widening of existing paved roads – for bike lanes only on major routes.
- Paving of gravel roads – only if residents want it.
- Other – wide smooth shoulders allow safer passing, ability to get off road if car disabled.
- Other – Reduction of speed limits and enhanced enforcement.
- are bicycle paths / trails along the roads a possibility-
- Bike lanes, pedestrian accommodations (not necessarily sidewalks, but a safer shoulder) a few “pullout” areas on curvy, single lane roads.
- Bike paths on sides of roads
- 2- add bike paths
- Bike/ walking paths along every country road with speed limits above 35 mph.
- general maintenance, including signage
- Speed checks of all kinds.
- Widening of existing roads – only for shoulders or drainage
- Other – improving shoulders on paved roads where they are narrow – such as Stony Point Rd. But not widening pavement.
- Other- maintain character of existing roads.
- Other – One of the things we don’t realize here in VA is how fortunate we are with good road Systems – having lived in many other areas, mostly large metros, roads are a disaster there.
- Other- bike and running trails
- bike/ walking paths
- Rail? Probably too much money

4. **County Policy:** The location of new public facilities (including police, fire, schools, libraries, water and sewer) should be within the Development Areas. A public facility may be allowed in the Rural Areas only in cases where it is not reasonably possible to locate these facilities in the Development Areas due to physical constraints, the nature of the facility, or services to be provided. Those

residents in the Rural Areas should not anticipate a level of service equal to that in the Development Areas.

**Do you agree with this policy?**

**Yes**

**No**

**Somewhat**

**Explain Answer (optional)**

- As a member of the Long Range Planning Committee for schools, this policy is too rigid in regard to new schools. If you follow this policy the county must purchase land in advance of development.
- Obviously, increased public facilities bring increased development. Better to do without to retain whatever rural character is left.
- I believe satellite coverage should be provided to make response time more reasonable for Police, Fire & Rescue, and EMS. Everyone pays the same tax rate and should receive services adequately. Need Fire District Tax or increase Real Estate Tax.
- I agree with directory growth toward services – but rural residents can't be neglected step children, especially with fire, schools.
- Schools may be an exception.
- Don't put conveniences where you don't want people to live. Nothing wrong with negative reinforcement!
- Unfair.
- New public facilities only encourage more housing in the rural area.
- It is especially important not to extend water and sewer lines. Rural residents must be made to understand that their services are and will be limited!
- Again, although it discourages growth in the rural areas it discourages people to stay in the rural areas.
- The chance you take to be in rural area is that you know you will not have fire and rescue. We pay for that in our insurance premiums.
- Fire and schools need to be within reasonable distances from supported areas.
- Yes! (and I live deep in the rural area).
- Not as many people in Rural Areas to be served. Have to stay in Development Areas.
- Keep this in Development Area—only!
- Why give everything to the urban mob? All these public facilities are a subsidy for new development.
- And no nuisance claims against commercial farm/timber uses, please.
- Encourage volunteer organizations (fire, rescue) in rural communities; also financial support.
- Support existing Fire Stations/ add Rescue Bays in rural areas.
- Reality – budgets are limited.
- Bike lanes, pedestrian paths.
- Discriminatory.
- Need fire protection in rural areas. Increase traffic to get to libraries, etc. will jam roads.
- I think that this policy will help to discourage excessive development.
- I do believe that fire, rescue, and police services should be an exception.
- It's hard to know how it could be otherwise if you're calling it a rural area but we want to be sure services are reasonably available.
- Rural areas should not be denied service due to poor access.
- On the whole, working with incentives and disincentives like this is a good approach.
- Our taxes should provide the same services regardless of where we live.

- \$\$
- Placing public facilities in Development Areas does not mean that rural areas residents are not served; it just means that it is not in their backyard.
- Current facilities need to still be improved etc...cannot expect rural residents to give up fire and police protection.
- Rural residents shouldn't expect same level of service, but should still expect a reasonable level of service.
- If you move to the county, you should not expect city services.
- Taxes should be more proportional to services provided.
- Public service must be provided in rural areas, cluster with schools.
- Minor (i.e., non-Charlottesville) or mini DA such as Crozet, Scottsville, and North Garden should be made into service areas to provide services. The County is already too crowded to be served exclusively out of Charlottesville.
- Resources should be shared on need not numbers.
- Despite the cost, rural residents should not be penalized by lack of facilities and medical, police, and fire.
- This does not adequately provide for Scottsville area.
- Not if: it means critical emergency services will be dangerously distant from those who do live in the rural areas, but otherwise, it makes sense there would be less need for schools, libraries, etc. in a lightly populated area –yes.
- Except parks, a park is an appropriate public facility in RA, i.e.: Walnut Creek, Mint Springs. Expand on there.
- The county has been pretty good about this. One improvement: move Walton Middle School to within corporate limits of Scottsville.
- Need schools, fire, and public protection in all areas.
- Public facilities should be located where the greatest need is.
- One's safety should not be jeopardized because of where they live.
- Any tax supported service should be made available to every tax payer.

**5. Rank the measures that the County could use to control growth in the Rural Areas. (one = most preferred)**

- \_\_\_ Water supply protection (both quality and quantity through environmental protection measures, such as stream buffers or limited development on water supply watersheds)
- \_\_\_ Reduce the number of development rights (from a “theoretical” 5 with a two-acre minimum to something less than 5)
- \_\_\_ Increase the acreage of minimum 21 acre parcels (for example, from 21 acres to 42 acres to provide additional acreage that would provide land for farming, forestry, open space and would reduce fragmentation)
- \_\_\_ Phasing of development (only allow a portion of the development rights to be used during a specified period of time)
- \_\_\_ Acquisition of Conservation Easements (voluntary program to purchase development rights and place land under permanent conservation easement)
- \_\_\_ Land Use Taxation (reduced real estate tax for qualifying agricultural, forestal, open space and horticultural uses)
- \_\_\_ Residential Clustering (houses located on small lots with remaining land under a conservation easement)
- \_\_\_ Conservation Easements (land voluntarily placed under conservation easement – may provide tax benefits)
- \_\_\_ Agricultural/Forestal Districts (land placed in conservation district for between 4 and 10 years)

## Comments:

- Land use taxation is not a disincentive for those who wish to develop land since the tax burden from the change in use is borne by the new owners.
- County needs to offer incentives – with demands for development and sky high value of land – we need all the alternatives that can be mustered against no-ending growth.
- I highly support measures to enable the sharing and active use of open space, in order to increase its value to as many people as possible. Common interest promotes community and self-preservation.
- Land use taxation has been a back door ACE program – without it a lot of rural acreage would or will go up for sale. Can this be permanently granted to “green space?”
- Forty acres is not enough land to farm. Land use taxation should include provisions for recapture of tax should land be non-productive or subdivided. A farm is a farm, not just a deferred subdivision for someone like Dr. Hurt.
- Increasing acreage for parcels increases loss of open space – more nonproductive area. It has the opposite effect from that desired.
- Any reduction of development rights (downzoning) tramples on personal property rights. How can we pay some people for their rights (ACE Program) yet through downzoning take rights away through government fiat with no compensation. It may be legal but it is morally wrong!
- New public facilities only encourage more housing in the rural areas.
- I understand local government can restrict development if doing so serves concerns such as health, safety, and welfare of the existing population. Limited resources like water availability could be involved.
- I would certainly like to see the County pursue all items ranked <1>. To preserve the quality of the rural areas long term, I think that the County will have to consider the items ranked <2>. To not pursue <2> will eventually lead to full build-out, although it may take 100 or more years.
- Keep the land open-space.
- All of these are very important – hard to rank.
- Increasing the lot size from 21 → 42 acres will gobble up the land. It will be too small to farm and too big to mow!! You will make it so only RICH people will be able to afford land in Albemarle County. You will encourage more “McMansions” or “Trophy Houses.” Offer economic incentives on all good points! Please do not allow ‘The’ University to be separate from ‘THE’ City or ‘THE’ County. We are all here, together!
- There are many loopholes that allow developers to destroy Albemarle legally. There is a lot of growth near Earlysville. It’s time to be hard-line and stop accommodating growth. Don’t be afraid of developers. Use the media to drive home the truth about population growth’s inevitable results.
- I think the county is doing a reasonably good job – please stick to the CP and stand firm with developers.
- What else can the County (including extension office) do to link aging farmers with alternatives to selling land for development?
- This list is very unimaginative. Eben Fodor’s book Better not Bigger has a lengthy list – we should be exploring the legality of other options.
- Water supply protection seems to be 1 of the best ways of protecting land and helping build the water supply. In addition it will help wildlife & provide scenery.
- Add more reservoirs. Cooperate regionally on Water Sheds / Water Supplies with surrounding counties. Limit UVA effort to expand into rural areas if possible?
- Best plan is coordinated use of land use controls (limited development rights etc.) tax incentives (tax relief for land kept in ag/forest use, tax benefits for donation of conservation easements) and public acquisition of conservation easements. All these tools must be used.
- ACE program – find as much tax dollars as possible

- How about substituting “discourage,” “influence” or even “direct” for “control” in the heading above. I advocate a concept of more voluntary approach to the issue.
- How feasible are certain measures in relation to others?
- Land Use Taxation – Would like to see changes in this program to reduce the potential for abuses that currently exist.
- Agricultural / Forestal Districts – I’d rather see permanent conservation
- ACE and Conservation Easements – how are these different?
- All but my ranked choices (1-3) seem only to be window dressing or postponing development!
- Attract businesses to urban area so jobs available for support of families with small farms. Improve public transportation options. Close down CSX and have rails to trails.
- Do not encourage development. Encourage land owners to keep their farms / land through incentives. Tax incentives, easements, have an economic coordinator work with these landowners. Sustainable living is the key.
- Clustering solves nothing; the houses and population are still in the rural area.
- These are all worthy programs / approaches. Land Use Taxation not effective – hand-out to developers. Increase roll-back to 15 years.
- Golf courses shouldn’t count as open space.
- The entire RA region needs a higher level of “zoning” – i.e. certain areas, east slope of the Blue Ridge is an important “sponge” or recharge area for water – perhaps should have minimum 50-60 acre zoning whereas NE portion (Rural Historic District) could maintain 21-30 acre. Loudoun County has done this fairly well. SE portion of County seems to have higher bird diversity.
- All are desirable – prioritizing difficult.
- Residential clustering should not be considered. The visual impact may be (less) but it is still a subdivision and will still create traffic on the roads and needs for schools in the RA district.
- Why isn’t there the choice of stopping building permits
- Ag/ Forestal district should be held for much longer than 10 years. Longtime residents should have some recourse when a development upstream from their land threatens to diminish or degrade their water (that they may have been carefully conserving for a long time.)
- Rural areas should have forestations, schools (elementary level especially) police substation and at least a small library
- At whatever means retain open lands and forests and mountains undeveloped
- Generally I favor voluntary restrictions or purchasing conservation easements instead of mandatory restrictions.
- The county should promote policies – and several here are equally good – to keep forestal, mountain land, as well as farms from being developed. Water supply protection with stream buffers is a very good measure – all these work together depending on the local conditions. Large lots may be a bad idea in one place, a good in the other.
- Concern that reducing development rights/ increasing acreage of minimal parcels, phases of development, are too draconian. Some reserve reached with a carrot – i.e. reward conservation easement. That is doing a better job.
- County government needs to make the difficult choice and legislate reasonable land use policies that protect the historic and scenic character of the country.
- These are all very good, but a lot will depend on 1) where these are implemented 2) how they are implemented 3) the duration of the implementation.
- Although I am a developer (and planner) I very much favor conservation of forested lands and wildlife areas (which is why my development is an ecovillage). Trying to keep prices of lots affordable has been very difficult (house on lot for about \$150,000). I offered to put 750 acres into ACE and was rebuffed – this caused me to immediately develop that land to the fullest amount possible. Upping the 21 acre size to 42 would cause the biggest land rush to subdivide this county have ever seen!
- Restrict roadside division rights.

- One needs a comprehensive conservation plan – I hate seeing water supply protection listed as a growth control measure – water must be protected for other reasons and the supply already limits growth. What is the good use of 21 acres?
- Conservation easements most important!
- Actually, I would like to see all the above implemented. Ranking is difficult.

## **Part I-B (Elements of a community vision)**

### ***Level of Development***

- (rural) “to none”
- ‘rural crossed out, ‘agricultural’ added

### ***Character of Development***

- but prefer no development
- but large lot ‘subdivisions’ changed to ‘farms’
- This is too complex an issue for a simple answer. Does it imply the same ultimate build-out? What is the size of ‘large-lot subdivisions’? etc.
- Clustered Subdivisions – if water septic considerations met – no public service extension or package treatment plants.
- Ag- related
- No development – development is development!
- I’d rather not see residential development in the rural areas.
- Combination of 1 & 4
- I wonder how many vacant lots we have currently within the RA district?
- No development if possible
- Clustered subdivisions with protected areas – but very few subdivisions
- Clustered subdivisions with protected areas – minimum # of houses
- All should be allowed to the property owner and buyer – don’t make it difficult or limiting to either one.

### ***Community Connections***

- 4 – But only if this doesn’t mean unregulated development or strip development or large-scale development.
- Connections in rural areas – groceries, post office

### ***Farms***

- 3 – Promote farms that employ sustainable methods, reduce pesticides and fertilizers.
- What scale? Stockyards? Poultry mega farms?
- Working, small.
- But not commercial hog farms, etc.
- Agricultural – it is a matter of scale. I have to assume this means a hog containment operations

### ***Forestry***

- Few – to none; if timbering, then only sustainable and no clear-cutting and not in inappropriate areas, i.e. watersheds, steep slopes, etc.

- 2- Avoid clear-cutting, require replanting if done.
- 3 & 4 – Can be healthy, conservation managed.
- Protect water resources
- Forestry- small, selective timbering
- Sustainable, NOT clear cutting
- Timbering should be done very selectively
- Forestal – what about forest for its own sake?

### ***Natural Areas***

- With stream buffers and mountain protection the RA district would naturally become an abundant element in the RA.
- 9 – Parks
- 3 –County parks with services such as Walnut Creek
- Scenic/ noncommercial recreation (hiking, boating, horse trails, etc.)
- Non commercial recreation areas such as unimproved parkland, wildlife management areas, etc.

### ***Stream Buffers/Habitat Connections***

- Penalties for disturbances, incentives for protection

### ***Visual Character***

- 4 – Only a few houses and those that are there should blend into the landscape and be energy efficient.
- 4 – With a limited number of homes consistent with the environment; e.g., homes to scale.
- 4 – Can't be with 20 acre lots and small lots.
- Hard line buffer to urban area.

### ***Other comments***

- 1 - families
- Country stores, offices, home occupations, small restaurants – only in existing villages.
- Should be a blend of all these - not one.
- Rural area should allow for / accommodate all of these with balance.
- B&B – historic properties – augment farm income; country stores – existing; small restaurants – in historic properties; offices in historic properties
- historic / scenic preservation
- preservation of historic sites
- large scale retail
- Vineyards and small commercial wine producing businesses. Horse related activities.
- Country stores- we have enough, no need to encourage more.
- Parks (public)
- unused (open space) forest, second-growth or wetland
- public parks for low-impact recreation
- 2- Lands conserved for wildlife parks, etc.