

IGA Document Comments and Review (discussion notes)

By: Jen Wingard

Date: 15-Jul-25

I have done more detailed work in the Word doc that I distilled from the 2012 IGA and the current draft IGA. I represent more than my assigned neighborhood as I have solicited feedback from everyone who wants to talk about it from across town and also from the parcels not yet incorporated by listed in the "map".

Here is a synopsis:

1. Parcels that could be annexed: those landowners want to provide direct input on their needs/wants/etc.
2. The draft IGA gutted much of the history and "beef" of the 2012 document. Put back the necessary language that will help future residents and boards and administrators to understand how we got to where we are today. (On a personal note: in the pharma industry which is highly regulated we are required to have a table at the end of the document that describes the revision changes and why they were made. This is so important to future readers. We should do it.)
Add back history, purpose and intent, town utilities considerations, implementation procedures,
3. There is no rhyme or reason listed why some properties were listed as no development or as rural preservation and are now different. Either explain it or gut it from the new draft and put more generic terms around what may or may not be developed and why. Add more definitions and allowances for things that are less than low/medium/high density (e.g.
4. Remove all references to specific parcels unless they are addressed elsewhere (e.g. Cemex). The current draft DICTATES that these parcels CANNOT be annexed unless the affordability and density requirements are met. (does not even seem legal)
5. Add generic language about attainable housing (and add definitions!) for times when a developer wants to increase density on a property etc.
6. Go back to a 10 year term instead of 20. Sounds like a lawyer or procrastinator wrote that section.