

Most Prevalent* Public Comments Received on Topics Raised at 7/21/20 Planning Commission Public Hearing

Venue	Number	Comment	Is the January Draft Plan Responsive to the Comment?	Was the comment highlighted to decisionmakers, and how was it treated?
Public Hearing 7/21/20	36	Too much growth overall; support less growth; personal 25 year vision wants Warrenton small	No	"Overall amount of potential growth" was listed as the top comment in the first (July 2020) comment summary, then <u>omitted from all future comment summaries.</u>
August 2019 workshop	10			
Comp Plan Vision On-line Survey	12			
Public Hearing 7/21/20	4	Support growth levels; personal 25 yr vision for Warrenton is faster growth	Yes	<p>*At the August 2019 workshop, participants were shown this graph (which omits major public costs for increasing sewer, water, and road capacity) immediately before voting:</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 45%;"> <p>A. The 'don't change' base scenario will have adverse impacts on the Town's fiscal health</p> <p>B. The mix of uses and intensity of development matters</p> <p>C. Balancing residential development with commercial growth will be critical from a financial feasibility perspective</p> </div> <div style="width: 45%; text-align: center;"> <p>FISCAL TREND LINE Base Scenario Compared to Concepts</p> </div> </div>
August 2019 workshop	18*			
Comp Plan Vision On-line Survey	3			
Public Hearing 7/21/20	22	Slow down approval process to factor in more growth impacts (12 comments) and to allow more time to read	<p>No to additional impact assessment</p> <p>Yes to more time</p>	"Slow the process" is on top of the public comment list in the 1/26/20 staff memo. "More time" is listed in July & Aug work session slides.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	12	Remove By-Right	Yes	1/26/20 slide presentation said 1 person mentioned this in-person at the hearing. "By-Right" concern listed in 1/26/20 staff memo and August slides. July slides phrased it as concern with "ability to mitigate and control negative impacts of growth."

Venue	Number	Comment	Is the January Draft Plan Responsive to the Comment?	Was the comment highlighted to decisionmakers, and how was it treated?
Public Hearing 7/21/20	11	Remove Western Bypass	No - no update of data or discussion of parkway's rejection by county, and bypass remains in plan	Considered in July & Sept work sessions; kept in plan "because it has always been in the plan" and because Steering Committee didn't recommend removal. July work session deliberations inaccessible. Omitted from comment list in 1/26/20 staff memo. Listed in July & Aug comment summaries.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	10	Address water supply	No - maximum day demand, storage, and reservoir sufficiency not addressed. Added option to remove drought contingency allowance.	Relied on and did not revisit consultant's summary. Adopted Background Document into plan which recommends revisiting drought contingency allowance. Listed in 1/26/20 staff memo. Infrastructure needs listed as comment of concern in July & Aug comment summaries.. July work session deliberations inaccessible.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	8	Traffic Levels from Zoning Changes Unassessed	No	Omitted - Not mentioned in any comment summaries
Public Hearing 7/21/20	6	Against new thru streets in neighborhoods	No	Omitted - Not mentioned in any comment summaries
Public Hearing 7/21/20	6	Adding too much retail; impact on existing businesses and vacancies	No	Omitted - Not mentioned in any comment summaries
Public Hearing 7/21/20	6	Loss of emphasis on industrial/higher paying jobs	No	Omitted - Not mentioned in any comment summaries
Public Hearing 7/21/20	5	5-6 story Buildings too tall for Character Districts; Prefer 2-3 story buildings	No	Omitted - Not mentioned in any comment summaries
Public Survey Hyperlink	61			
March 2019 Workshop	Top pick			
Public Hearing 7/21/20	1	5+ story Buildings supported for Character Districts; tallest buildings presented top pick	Yes	Omitted - Not mentioned in any comment summaries
Public Survey Hyperlink	22			

Venue	Number	Comment	Is the January Draft Plan Responsive to the Comment?	Was the comment highlighted to decisionmakers, and how was it treated?
Public Hearing 7/21/20	5	Sewer projections not fully substantiated/worrisome	No	Relied on and did not revisit consultant's summary. Listed in 1/26/20 staff memo. Infrastructure needs listed as comment of concern in July & Aug comment summaries. July work session deliberations inaccessible.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	5	Remove Southern Bypass	No	Considered in July & Sept work sessions; kept in plan because it had always been there, and because Steering Committee didn't recommend removal. July work session deliberations inaccessible. Omitted from comment list in 1/26/20 staff memo. Listed in July & Aug comment summaries.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	4	Support mixed use in Character districts	Yes, retained	Listed in July & Aug comment summaries.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	3	Fiscal Model flawed - - tax burden of high growth omitted	No	Omitted - Not mentioned in any comment summaries
Public Hearing 7/21/20	3	Economic vitality will result from plan	Yes	Listed in July & Aug comment summaries.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	3	Support diverse housing in the plan	Yes/Neutral - stayed the same, but does not provide adequate affordable housing	Listed in 1/26/20, July & Aug comment summaries.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	3	Omission of Oliver City history and infrastructure needs	Yes to history; No to infrastructure support	Listed in 1/26/20 slides. "Desire for previously included significant neighborhoods" listed in 1/26/20 staff memo. "Protection of existing neighborhoods" listed in July & Aug comment summaries.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	<3**	Supports plan's view of "Market realities"	Yes	Listed in July & Aug comment summaries.
Public Hearing 7/21/20	0? **	"Streamline document"	Yes	Listed in July & Aug comment summaries.

*3 or more people made the same comment at a venue.

**Included because the town has highlighted this concern.

Prepared 2/1/21