



**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION AGENDA**

Heritage Conference Room

August 4, 2016

(Immediately following regular meeting)

- 1) **Call to Order** - Chairwoman Theresa Stein
- 2) **Chairwoman's Comments**
- 3) **Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Update Public Outreach and Participation**
- 4) **Discussion of Draft Schedule for Comprehensive Plan Update**
- 5) **Discussion of Current Planning Documents: Demographics and Housing**
- 6) **Adjournment**

If you require any type of reasonable accommodation as a result of physical, sensory or mental disability in order to participate in this meeting OR if you would like an expanded copy of this agenda, please contact Tucker Keller at (540) 338-2304 at least three days in advance of the meeting. Expanded copies of the agenda may not be available the night of the meeting, please request a copy in advance.

USE OF ELECTRONIC DEVICES DURING MEETINGS For the comfort and consideration of others, all cellular phones must be turned off and cannot be used in the Council Chambers. Pagers must be set on silent or vibrate mode. This is requested because of potential interference with our recording devices and the transmittal of our hearing impaired broadcast.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



STAFF REPORT
WORK SESSION ITEM

Item # 3

SUBJECT: Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Update Public Outreach and Participation

DATE OF MEETING: August 4, 2016

STAFF CONTACT: Daniel Galindo, AICP – Senior Planner

SUMMARY:

At the July 28th Work Session, the Planning Commission discussed a draft Outreach Plan and corresponding draft schedule prepared by Staff for the remainder of the Comprehensive Plan Update process. Because much of the Commission's previous discussion debated the adequacy of public outreach and participation in the Update process thus far, information on the comprehensive planning processes of other Virginia communities is presented for comparison with Purcellville's completed and proposed efforts.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PARTICIPATION DISCUSSION:

The adequacy of the Comprehensive Plan Update's public outreach and public participation has been discussed repeatedly since the project began and again at the July 28th Work Session. During Staff's initial research at the beginning of the Update project, there were two common themes regarding best practices for outreach and participation:

1. The public participation process should be documented, and the Comprehensive Plan should include an account of the planning process by which it was created. This demonstrates to current and future users of the Plan how various parties were involved in its creation and potentially aids in understanding its basis.
2. Due to the increased use of technology, the public's expectations for interacting with government have shifted, and different population groups interact with government in different ways. In order to have the best opportunity to reach as wide and as varied an audience as possible, it is important to provide opportunities for both in-person and online involvement in the planning process.

From the very beginning of the Update project, Staff has made every effort to pursue these best practices. Yet, given the occasionally stated preference for a quantitative public participation goal, Staff has searched for a resource that provided guidance on setting such a goal on numerous occasions. Staff has spent dozen of hours conducting online research, reviewing academic and professional planning books, and even contacting planning

professors to ask for assistance on this matter over the previous months. However, Staff has still yet to find a single resource that recommends a specific numerical or percentage goal for the level of public participation nor even a resource that recommends for such a goal be established. The only authoritative recommendation came from our consultant team which noted that participation by 1-3% of a population is common for planning projects; this would equate to 91-273 individuals in Purcellville based on the consultant's estimated 2016 population of 9,120. Alternatively, the highest target ever mentioned by a Planning Commissioner was the goal of equaling the community's participation in Purcellville's local elections (1,533 citizens cast a vote for Mayor in the May 2016 election).

After comments were expressed during the previous work session that the 513 Staff-confirmed (or 586+ Staff-estimated) participants was either an inaccurate calculation or simply not adequate, Staff recalculated the number of participants as conservatively as possible and searched yet again for a reasonable quantitative participation goal. As Staff has repeatedly admitted, the data collected regarding public participation is rough, but this is the result of providing for an open and welcoming public process. We have always prioritized public participation above all else, so workshop attendees have not been blocked from entering if they didn't sign-in nor have they been required to complete the demographic survey in order to participate.

Excluding any estimated participation which would increase the participation numbers to account for these issues, there have been 197 people that have signed-in to one of the six workshops held over the first three rounds of public engagement. Of these, there are 137 unique individuals that have attended. This means only 69.5% of the total sign-ins across all three rounds are unique participants. Not including Staff's estimation for the number of online participants in Round 2 and therefore conservatively assuming that only one person left all 331 dots on the interactive map, there have still been 264 participants in the online exercises. There were also a minimum of 55 people that voted on the scenarios at the Music & Arts Festival. Assuming that calculating 69.5% of those participants would similarly account for duplication of participation, the calculation results in an estimated 358 (137+183+38) unique individuals that have participated in the first three rounds of the Comprehensive Plan Update process, and there are still two rounds of public engagement remaining this year.

Next, given Staff's previous lack of success in researching a quantitative participation goal, we instead researched the planning processes described in the comprehensive plans of the 10 Virginia towns that were closest in population to Purcellville (7,727 residents) in 2010, six municipalities in the greater Northern Virginia area, and Blacksburg. Staff's hope was to at least find data to which Purcellville's participation could be compared. In some cases, Staff also called these jurisdiction seeking any information not contained in the plan though that has provided little additional assistance. The results of Staff's research are shown in the table below. Commissioners should note that if a number of events, meetings, work sessions, surveys, participants, responses, etc. is not shown in the table then none was noted in the plan or its associated documentation.

Municipality	2010 Population	Year Plan Adopted	Engagement Efforts & Participation Noted
Abingdon	8,191	2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus Group Discussions • 1 Public Workshop • 1 Citizen Survey • 3-day Design Workshop
Ashland	7,225	2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 Events – 50+ Participants noted for a workshop; 20+ participants noted for another; None noted for other three • Focus Area Meeting Series
Blacksburg	42,620	2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 Events – 295 participants • 1 Twitter Town Hall – 20 participants • 3 Surveys – 167 responses • Total participation of 482
Culpeper	16,379	2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meetings • 1 Kickoff Meeting • 3 Rounds of Community Facilitation
Farmville	8,216	2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Public Meetings • 8 PC Work Sessions • 1 Joint PC Meeting with County PC • 1 Mailed Survey – 208 responses (11% response rate)
Herndon	23,292	2008	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 Public Meetings • Meeting summaries posted to Town website • PC Work Sessions • PC Public Hearings • TC Work Sessions • 4 TC Public Hearings
Leesburg	42,616	2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PC Work Sessions • PC Public Hearings • TC Work Sessions • 1 Public Input Session • TC Public Hearing
Lovettsville	1,613	Under Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Kickoff Meeting • Appointed 4 Advisory Committees • 1 Committee met with PC each month for 12 months • PC started monthly reviews June, 2016
Pulaski	9,086	2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Public Meetings • 1 Mailed Survey – 240 responses (approx.)
Smithfield	8,089	2009	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approx. 9 PC meetings to review • 1 Mailed Survey – 722 responses (24.1% response rate)

Municipality	2010 Population	Year Plan Adopted	Engagement Efforts & Participation Noted
South Boston	8,142	2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 Public Workshops • 3-day Charrette
Strasburg	6,398	2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Public Forum – PC, TC & 20+ Citizens • 2 Public Forums for draft plan review
Vienna	15,687	2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subcommittees • 1 Survey • 1 Joint Public Hearing
Vinton	8,098	2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 Kickoff Meeting • 1 Focus Group Workshop • 1 Visioning Meeting
Warrenton	9,611	2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Work Sessions • PC Work Sessions • TC Work Sessions • Public Hearings
Winchester	26,203	2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Webpage • Professionally Conducted Survey (random sample; by phone and mail) – 1,019 household responses • 1 Visioning Exercise for Staff and Citizen Academy • 1 Visioning Exercise posted online and distributed at an event • 4 Public Input Sessions – 20-30 citizens per session • 1 Public Feedback Session • Public Hearings
Wytheville	8,211	2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None Noted

Notably, extremely few of the jurisdictions reviewed state the actual number of participants in their planning processes within their comprehensive plans. Of those numbers that are included, only the surveys conducted by Smithfield and Winchester produced participation numbers that are definitively better than the range of 358-586 participants in Purcellville’s process thus far. Of those meetings for which a number of participants is noted, nearly all are in line with Purcellville’s attendance numbers; only Blacksburg had a single meeting that was notably more successful with 122 participants. In fact, Blacksburg is the only jurisdiction which publicly provided thorough documentation of its public participation, but while it has a population of 42,620, there were only 482 total participants during 18 input opportunities. (Note that the 482 includes stated attendance estimates and was not scrubbed of any potential duplicate attendees.) This represents only 1.13% of Blacksburg’s total population, and the Commission should note that this is in line with our consultant’s stated range of 1-3%. Even if Purcellville’s participation range of 358-586 is reduced further

to account for the roughly 30% of input from out-of-town residents, the resulting range of 251-410 would still represent between 2.75% and 4.5% of Purcellville's population.

In addition, it should be noted that many of these communities offered fewer opportunities for public input throughout their entire planning process than Purcellville has through its first three rounds of public engagement. Farmville, Pulaski, Strasburg, Vienna, and Vinton all offered three or less public input opportunities, and it doesn't appear that Warrenton offered any outside of the required public hearings. Only Blacksburg's 18 public input opportunities is obviously higher than the 11 opportunities Purcellville has presented over the past seven months (6 meetings + 3 online exercise rounds + 2 tables at community events). Once the planned opportunities for the two remaining rounds of input and the open house to review the draft plan are completed, Purcellville is likely to have met or exceeded the number of public input opportunities offered by a community over four times larger. Finally, Purcellville's practice of offering the same public input exercises online as are offered at workshops appears to be completely unique among the 17 communities reviewed.

Additional public input will always be welcomed. However, Staff hopes this comparative data demonstrates to the Planning Commission that our public outreach efforts and public participation levels compare favorably to these 17 communities. Based on this research, Staff believes that Purcellville's public engagement process is as good as—and likely better than—those of both comparably sized and comparably located jurisdictions in Virginia.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



STAFF REPORT
WORK SESSION ITEM

Item # 4

SUBJECT: Discussion of Draft Schedule for Comprehensive Plan Update

DATE OF MEETING: August 4, 2016

STAFF CONTACT: Daniel Galindo, AICP – Senior Planner

SUMMARY:

At the July 28th Work Session, the Planning Commission discussed a draft Outreach Plan and corresponding draft schedule prepared by Staff for the remainder of the Comprehensive Plan Update process. The Commission proposed an alternative schedule during this discussion, but after updating the schedule as recommended by the Commission, Staff noted issues that must be addressed. Staff has prepared a compromise schedule resolving these issues to the extent possible.

DRAFT SCHEDULE DISCUSSION:

Staff's Initial Schedule Proposal

At the July 28th Work Session, Staff presented the following plan for Round 4 of the Comprehensive Plan Update's public engagement efforts:

1. A full public presentation in the second week of September during a weeknight evening (likely Wednesday the 7th or Thursday the 8th) that would allow time for the public to ask questions of Staff and respond to questions presented for public input.
2. Follow up the next week with a (likely abbreviated) presentation to Town Council at its meeting on September 13th (Tuesday evening) when public input would be difficult-to-impossible because Council would need to continue its meeting and conduct its regular business.
3. During the same week (third week of September), the public input questions would be posted online and left up for approximately three weeks through the end of September.
4. Following the presentation to Council, Staff would spend the remainder of the month presenting to various community groups and organizations that would have previously indicated an interest in scheduling such a presentation.
5. Throughout September and the preceding months, the Commission would meet for weekly work sessions every Thursday and (if the proposed schedule was maintained) would complete discussions of and make preliminary decisions on the goals and objectives for the various topics to be included in the comprehensive plan.

By wrapping up these efforts around the end of September, this plan would provide a three week window to:

1. Analyze the public input received during Round 4,
2. Prepare a summary document for Round 4,
3. Prepare summaries of the Commission's preliminary decisions on the goals and objectives for each topic to be included in the plan, and
4. Prepare for a public workshop on Saturday, October 22nd where these topics and the Commission's preliminary decisions would be presented to and discussed by the public. (Note that this October workshop was already rescheduled from September 17th due to the Commission's earlier decision to not begin the next outreach efforts until after August).

Planning Commission's Alternative Schedule Proposal

The Planning Commission's alternative plan recommended:

1. A joint event with the Town Council on September 8th (Thursday) where Staff would provide an informational presentation to both bodies when they could then jointly discuss it. This would take the place of one of the Commission's weekly work sessions discussing the plan's various topics.
2. The same presentation to Town Council on September 13th listed in Staff's original plan above.
3. A full public presentation on September 24th (Saturday) with opportunities for public input.
4. A full public presentation during the day on September 26th (Monday) with opportunities for public input.
5. A full public presentation during the evening on September 29th (Thursday) with opportunities for public input. This would take the place of one of the Commission's weekly work sessions discussing the plan's various topics.

When attempting to create a workable schedule for this alternative, Staff noted the following problems and issues to be addressed:

1. By pushing the initial public presentation back to September 24th, the public input questions would not be posted online until the final week in September. If kept up for three weeks as originally proposed by Staff (or even two weeks), there will not be enough time to analyze the data, create a summary document, and incorporate any of the Round 4 input prior to the October 22nd workshop date that the consultants have reserved for Purcellville. This is the situation that our emphasis on prioritizing public involvement over the previous six months has continually placed us in, and longer-tenured Commissioners will recall that we specifically decided to push the start of the fourth round of engagement from July to August in order to provide the necessary time to correct this problem. If summary and analysis of a round of public input can not be completed and presented to the public in some fashion prior to the next round beginning, we are asking the public to attend another meeting without showing them

proof that their input has been captured and thoughtfully considered. It would be unwise to continue to make the same mistake after we just corrected it.

2. By canceling two of the Planning Commission's Thursday work sessions, it will become highly unlikely that the Commission will be able to complete its topical discussions and preliminary decisions prior to the October 22nd workshop unless replacement work sessions are scheduled. Even extending the weekly work sessions in to October would not be helpful. Since the work conducted at these work sessions will be the basis of Round 5's public engagement process, the consultant team and Town Staff need ample time to process this work before presenting it to the public for review and comment. Again, it would be unwise to not provide sufficient time to fully prepare for Round 5's workshops.
3. When the Commission's alternative schedule was conveyed to the Town Manager and Assistant Town Manager, both stated a concern that Town Council would be unwilling to hold a joint event on the 8th due to their Strategic Planning Session being scheduled for approximately 19 hours of work over September 9th and 10th. So, whenever the draft summary documents for Rounds 1-3 were distributed to Town Council via email on July 29th, it was noted that the Commission would like to know if the Council would be interested in holding a joint event on September 8th to hear an initial preliminary presentation to both groups. Thus far, Staff has received no response, so it is currently unclear if Council will commit to this date.
4. While Staff's original proposal only included two "official" Town-sponsored presentations, Staff intended to hold additional presentations out in the community by meeting with community groups and organizations at their own regularly scheduled events. With the Planning Commission adding three additional "official" presentations, it is unclear to Staff whether the Commission intended to recommend that Staff also hold these additional community-sponsored presentations. If so, the Commission should be aware that one or more opportunities for a community-sponsored presentation will be lost for each "official" presentation as these typically require greater preparation on the part of Town Staff.
5. As noted to the Commission in the past and discussed at the July 28th Work Session, the Town has a limited capacity to take on additional work. Staff is already working significant overtime to keep up with all of its responsibilities. Unlike in larger jurisdictions where one or more planners would likely be solely devoted to a project as large as the Comprehensive Plan Update, most of the work on this project is conducted by a single staff member who is also responsible for numerous other projects and tasks. Because of this heavy workload, for the foreseeable future each additional workshop, work session, or other event as well as the preparation necessary for them will require additional overtime hours to be worked by Staff (above and beyond those already being required).

Compromise Schedule

Given the Planning Commission's concerns with Staff's original plan and the problems and issues which would result from implementing the Commission's recommended proposal, a compromise plan is necessary. After checking with Emily Crow about the availability of the consultant team for a workshop in November, discussing Town Staff's time and budgetary constraints with the Town Manager and Assistant Town Manager, and considering all known calendar conflicts, Staff has concluded that the schedule below is the best available option.

There can be a very minor change as noted; otherwise, this is the only schedule option of the many considered that addresses most of the stated concerns (unfortunately, it still provides a tight window to prepare for the Round 5 workshops) while completing all public events prior to Thanksgiving and the beginning of the holiday season. However, because of the significant and increasing demands on Staff's time for this and other projects, the Town Manager has requested that before implementing this schedule I discuss the current results and future plans for the Comprehensive Plan Update with Town Council to make sure we are aligning with Council's expectations and desired outcomes for the project. Since Council will not meet again until September, I will be reaching out to the Mayor and each Councilmember individually in the coming days to set up one-on-one meetings as soon as their schedules allow.

July 31 – August 6

- 8/4 – PC Work Session: discuss demographics and housing

August 7-13

- 8/11 – PC Work Session: discuss parks, recreation and open space

August 14-20

- 8/18 – PC Work Session: discuss parks, recreation and open space

August 21-27

- 8/25 – PC Work Session: discuss community design & historic resources

August 28 – September 3

- 9/1 – PC Work Session: discuss economic development

September 4-10

- 9/8 – PC & Council Joint Event: Informational Presentation (*if Council agrees*)

September 11-17

- 9/13 – Presentation @ Town Council Meeting
 - Probably a more condensed presentation due to time constraints
- 9/15 – PC Work Session: discuss transportation

September 18-24

- 9/22 – PC Work Session: discuss transportation

- 9/24 – Public Presentation
 - Staff presents a summary of Rounds 1-3 (No Consultants)
 - Present a list of next steps
 - Present questions for wall responses similar to Round 1

September 25 – October 1

- Post Rounds 1-3 documents online
- Post public input questions online
- 9/26 – Public Presentation (Day)
- 9/29 – Public Presentation (Night)

October 2-8

- 10/6 – PC Work Session: discuss public services & infrastructure
- Continue online questions

October 9-15

- 10/13 – PC Work Session: discuss land use
- Continue online questions

October 16-22

- 10/16 – Close online questions
- 10/20 – PC Work Session: discuss land use

October 23-29

- Consultant to provide Round 4 report and materials for Round 5 Workshop

October 30 – November 5

- 11/3 – PC Meeting with Emily Crow
- 11/5 – Round 5 Public Input Workshops (AM & PM):
 - Present the expected plan content (essentially in outline form):
 - Draft PC recommendations on guiding principles, goals & policies
 - Draft PC planned land use map
 - Have tables working on topic areas (parks and rec, transportation, etc.).

November 6-12

- Post online engagement method

November 13-19

- Continue online engagement
- 11/19 – *Alternative Date for Round 5 Public Input Workshops (Shifts all items after 11/5 back by two weeks)*

November 20-26

- Continue online engagement

November 27 – December 3

- 12/2 – Close online engagement

December 4-10

December 11-17

- Consultant to provide Round 5 report

Mid-December – January 2017

- Create draft plan

February/March

- Send draft plan to VDOT for review (of up to 90 days)
- Publicly present draft plan
- Hold open house for public review
- Revise draft plan as necessary

April/May

- PC Public Hearing on Draft Plan

June or Later

- TC Public Hearing on Draft Plan