

# COMPREHENSIVE PLAN / ZONING & ORDINANCES AUDIT: REDC--RPA Preservation

Use form to provide key audit information: 1) Review both the 2001 and 2019 Comp Plan to note policy gaps and issues not addressed. 2) Review three ordinance documents (Zoning, FSM, LSDO) to determine existence or levels of enforcement for policies/issues. Use Section (§) references where applicable. 3) Describe Issue and Recommendations. Links to key documents: [2019 Comp Plan](#), [2001 Comp Plan \(RGP\)](#), [CPAM Revisions to the 2001 RGP](#), [Facilities Standards Manual \(FSM\)](#), [Land Subdivision & Development Ordinance \(LSDO\)](#).

1. Comp Plan Policy or Issue Area (2001 & 2019)	2a. Zoning Ordinance § Reference or N/A (Brief text or summary)	2b. Facilities Standards Manual § Reference or N/A (Brief text or summary)	2c. Land Subdivision & Dev. Ordinance § Reference or N/A (Brief text or summary)	3. Issue Description / Recommendations
				<p>Essentially, the REDC ZOR ad-hoc sub-committee is saying that before we can confidently recommend specific revisions to the zoning code, we need additional data and analysis.</p> <p>We need to be able to determine the impact of our recommendations before we can recommend specifics. We propose the following:</p>
				<p>1. Create a staff analysis/matrix for existing conditions across the rural area to determine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) How many developable (and sub-dividable) acres are there as a whole, and by each zoning district?</li> <li>b) How many acres of each category of sensitive environmental assets are there as a whole, and by each zoning district? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o prime soils,</li> <li>o mountainside,</li> <li>o steep slopes,</li> <li>o floodplain,</li> <li>o wetlands,</li> <li>o forest</li> </ul> </li> <li>c) Categorize these assets by sub-watershed for long-term ecosystem sustainability.</li> </ul>
				<p>2. Create a matrix of the different strategies with a cost/benefit analysis for each. This analysis should include examinations of how various methods of prime soils, sensitive resource protection, and overall land conservation effect the stated goals of the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Those stated goals include protection of prime soils, and the continued growth and success of the rural economy. With agriculture being the bedrock of the rural economy and high-quality farmland being critical to the success of agriculture, the protection of USDA Class I/Prime soils must be assured.</p>

<b>1. Comp Plan Policy or Issue Area (2001 &amp; 2019)</b>	<b>2a. Zoning Ordinance</b> § Reference or N/A (Brief text or summary)	<b>2b. Facilities Standards Manual</b> § Reference or N/A (Brief text or summary)	<b>2c. Land Subdivision &amp; Dev. Ordinance</b> § Reference or N/A (Brief text or summary)	<b>3. Issue Description / Recommendations</b>
				3. Take the top two or three strategies and determine how each performs in terms of asset protection based on a set of hypothetical case studies with the goal of maximum protection of the critical assets.
				In addition to the proposed analysis we also agree that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The County should use the USDA definition of prime soils for purposes of the zoning ordinance review.</li> <li>b) Prime soils (per USDA definition) should be mapped as an overlay district.</li> <li>c) Prime soils should be identified on site plans along with other existing conditions.</li> <li>d) Performance standards should be used to preserve these resources.</li> <li>e) Developers should be required to include plans for -- and install -- interconnected trails as a component of their project plan.</li> </ul>