

## Summary of Code Outcomes Discussion, Interview Groups

Wednesday, February 18<sup>th</sup>, the Smart Growth Committee discussed the outcomes to be kept in mind when undertaking the Codes Review. In summary, they are derivations of the Smart Growth Principles of EPA et al: (*Committee expansions in italics*)

### Smart Growth (SG) Principles

1. Mix land uses
2. Take advantage of compact building design (*in consideration of the emerging “green” energy designs for development patterns*)
3. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices
4. Create walkable neighborhoods (*revised to incorporate the considerations of “Complete Streets.”*)(*Revised to include an evaluation of obstructions **from the Codes** in integrating the schools into the community*)
5. Foster distinctive, attractive communities *with a strong sense of place*
6. Preserve open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas
7. Strengthen and direct development towards existing communities (*providing balance and completeness in development patterns*)
8. Provide a variety of transportation choices (*functional for the development patterns*)
9. Make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost effective (*revised to ensure science is driving the science based parts of the code*)
10. Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions

An additional “issue” or component of the review and perhaps of the interviews is added by the question, “Is the current code achieving the objectives for which they were adopted?” This is an important question, since most code justification lies in the prevention of circumstances that led to problems of health, safety, and welfare (including community issues of blight). So a counterweight to a Smart Growth proposal will be, “by doing this, do we bring back problems since remedied?”

## ISSUES INTEREST GROUPS

Regarding the “issues interview groups,” the idea is to find those who work with our codes—our own county staff, various components of the “development industry” (which includes public infrastructure like utility, stormwater, and schools, and components of the “benefited public”—for their viewpoints on obstructions to the principles above.

Preliminary Issue Interest Groups for Interviews would be:

1. Architects (including Landscape Architects as a subset)
2. Financiers
3. Utility providers
4. Transportation Providers
5. Community Planning Groups
6. Stormwater Managers, public and private,
7. Fire and EMS
8. Schools
9. The cross organizational associations
10. Attorneys involved in land use or environmental law.
11. Master Developer Firms
12. Property Leasing Managers

For Issue Interest groups that involve a technical expertise staff does not have, SG Committee members (and sympathetic others) will be asked to assist in identifying individuals or associations of such groups above.

Comments Received for Inclusion, verbatim:

In terms of outcomes: We're trying to reduce commutes/carbon/traffic/etc. and enhance community clusters, which mean that people must have jobs within their respective communities. Do codes make it difficult for certain types of (appropriate) businesses/employers to locate near residences (e.g. medical facilities) -- or for residences to locate near certain types of workplaces (e.g. light-manufacturing pods with accessible residential and retail)?

Additionally, I suppose the market is the bigger factor, but are there codes that make it more difficult for people at different income levels to thrive in these communities? For instance, if there are restrictions on how many unrelated people can live in one unit, are they "reasonable"?

Might it be helpful to engage employers/business owners in the interviews? They might have some insights that realtors/leasing agents don't have.

And two other thoughts for interview groups: Parks and Recreation; and Health Department or Social Services (I'm thinking about meeting changing elder needs, for starters.)

Need to target and incorporate industry of various types within our community designs that would provide economic support (JOBS) - (TAXES) – non-service and retail oriented.

Possible additions to 'the list' for your consideration:

Under Item 12. Property Leasing Managers - AGRICULTURE [perhaps small backyard farms? or Buckingham's small horse farms, etc.], UNIVERSITIES [Hodges, FGCU, Edison]

13. Regulators
14. General contractors
15. The regulated