

PLANNING COMMISSION
County of New Kent

MINUTES

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE NEW KENT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON THE 18th DAY OF APRIL IN THE YEAR TWO THOUSAND FIVE OF OUR LORD IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING 6:30 P.M.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Jay Hubbard called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

IN RE: INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Jay Hubbard led the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Attendance:

Jack Chalmers	Present
Thomas Evelyn	Present
Howard Gammon	Present
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Present
Jay Hubbard	Present
Charna Moss	Present
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Present
Tommy Tiller	Present
Patricia Townsend	Present

Also attending:

Rodney Hathaway, Planning Manager
George Homewood, AICP, Director of Community Development
Phyllis Katz, County Attorney
John Budesky, County Administrator
Pam Crosby, Recording Secretary

Chairman Hubbard established that there was a quorum.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Moss stated that she would like to see the names of the commissioners stated in the minutes when a question or comment is made in place of "*The Commission...*"

A motion was made by Ms. Townsend and second by Mr. Gammon, to approve the minutes of the 21 March 2005 – Regular Meeting as presented.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Aye
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 9:0:0

IN RE: CITIZEN COMMENT PERIOD

Chairman Hubbard reminded the citizens that at this time the citizen comments would be heard and are limited to those on planning related issues that are not scheduled for a public hearing later on the agenda. Those wishing to speak should sign up on the sheet at the back of the room prior to the meeting is required. No citizens had signed up and none asked to address the Commission.

IN RE: UNFINISHED BUSINESS

R-05-05, WATER AND SEWER SERVICE AREAS: Consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan to provide for and designate service areas within which public sewer will be available.

George Homewood gave a presentation on the proposed water and sewer service areas, referring to the maps that were distributed to the commission.

Ms. Snyder asked how does the "Farms of New Kent" fit in. Mr. Homewood responded that this question should probably be answered by the Board of Supervisors. The map as presented does not include the "Farms of New Kent" location, if they were to be included then the map would need to be amended and the text amendment that accompanies the map stipulates that if necessary the service area is automatically expanded to include planned unit developments approved by the Board of Supervisors since all PUDs are to be served by public utilities.

Mr. Hubbard stated I was a little disconcerted about the fact that that there isn't anything on the maps stating that we can ever expect sewer in the Lanexa Village. However, at least the commission and staff have thought about it and I like the idea of talking to the neighbors [James City County].

Mr. Hill would like to direct Mr. Homewood to page number 6 known as the Kentland PUD. It looks like to me that it would covers the entire route of Rte 155 between I-64 and Rte 60. This area is predominantly residential and will certainly continue to be residential and with the Kentland PUD out there, there is approximately 2200 units yet to be built. Why would we extend services to the entire Kentland PUD and then beyond? Mr. Homewood responded that a decision was made a while back in approving Colonial Downs in 1995 and again in the Kentland PUD approval in 1997, that all of those lots would be served by public water and sewer, in staff view that is a decision that has already been made and it is no longer up for discussion. All planned unit developments must be served by water and sewer unless some specific exception is made. The rationale for extending service beyond the boundaries of the Kentland PUD is to serve Providence Forge which is a designated village and economic development priority area. Since the distance between the two is relatively little and the development pattern is already set, it was the staff estimate that connecting it made the most sense.

Ms. Snyder asked about the natural gas trunk line that we have throughout the county, when Providence Forge come online will they tap into that as well. Mr. Homewood stated no the natural gas that we have through the county is of such high pressure that we cannot tap into it without having a transformer station installed by VNG. There currently are discussions ongoing between VNG, the property owners in Bottoms Bridge, developer of Patriots Landing and the EDA about going ahead and building the station required to step down the pressure to serve that portion of the County. Once that service becomes available, VNG will likely be very aggressive in marketing natural gas and running it to Providence Forge will turn on when it is cost effective to do so.

Mr. Hubbard noted that under goals for public utilities in the text amendment there is a statement "*Protect the Black Creek and/or other potential water impoundment areas to serve the future water needs of the County, as well as conduct a comprehensive study for the County's long range water supply needs.*" What administrative powers does the county have to do that? Mr. Homewood responded that if we truly want to consider constructing the reservoir, we have to keep the land in that area from being developed in a manner that is not consistent with the future development of the reservoir. That decision will to some extent be made with the decision on the Farms of New Kent. Approval of that development will for all intents and purposes mean that the reservoir idea is being abandoned for all time.

Ms. Snyder asked is there another location where a reservoir can be built. Mr. Homewood responded no. It is possible that there is another branch of Black Creek that could be with a pump over, but all of the analysis that has been done by Newport News was that would not provide enough water to justify the cost.

A motion was made by Mr. Chalmers and seconded by Ms. Townsend to forward application R-05-05 and forward PC-08-05 to the New Kent County Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent

Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARINGS

Rodney Hathaway presented on all seven AFD applications whereupon the public hearings on all were conducted together after all presentations and the Commission acted only after all hearings were completed. However, for the sake of clarity, these minutes append the public comments on a specific application as well as the action taken by the Commission as if the applications had been considered and acted upon sequentially.

Mr. Hill stated that he will be abstaining from voting on the AFD Applications as a standing board member but will be voting when they come to the board. And asked the commissioners to remember that there is a cost involved for anyone in planning to go out and inspect land to ensure that AFD regulations are being upheld by the landowner, but at the same time making the program more burdensome on the landowner than the value obtained for being in the program will defeat the purpose of participation.

AFD-01-05, CREATION OF WAHRANI AFD: Request by Mr. Howard Brady, Jr. to create the Wahrani Agricultural and Forestal District. The proposed AFD district consists of 372.26 acres and is identified on the County tax map as parcels 37-4, 37-6, and 37-7. The AFD Advisory Committee considered this request on 31 March 2005 and voted 6:1, with one member abstaining to forward this application to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Rodney Hathaway gave a presentation on the proposed Creation of Wahrani AFD.

The Commission asked questions.

Mr. Hill referred to a parcel asking if there is any way a boundary line adjustment could be made to include that piece. If it is zoned economic opportunity and it went into an AFD, then he wouldn't be able to do anything with it, right? Mr. Hathaway responded that it is not zoned economic opportunity. Mr. Hill stated that by the comprehensive plan it is economic opportunity and if it goes into an AFD then he can't do anything with it for 10 years. Mr. Hathaway responded that AFD recommends 10 years but it is staff's recommendation that it be for 5 years. It is correct to state that if this property was placed in an AFD the property owner could not develop it for that time.

Ms. Snyder asked is it not possible that if it is placed in an AFD that he can take it out if he wants to and pay back taxes. Mr. Hathaway stated that is correct.

Ms. Moss inquired if it is also a possibility that everything around him could be developed and this would stay the same. Mr. Hathaway it is a possibility that the adjacent property owners could develop.

Mr. Hubbard asked when we get to the resolution page it states that this district will expire in 10 years from the date of approval. Am I wrong when I read this, shouldn't it read 5 years. Mr. Hathaway responded stated that yes it should be 5 years.

Mr. Hathaway stated that we should actually strike the statement "this district shall expire 10 years from the date approval."

Ms. Townsend asked in 5 years will there be another application fee. Mr. Hathaway responded yes there will be another application fee, because when a district comes up for review there are cost associated with that because public hearings are required.

The commission held a public hearing in which one citizen made public comment on the proposed AFD application.

Jim Wallace of Minitree Glen spoke on behalf of Howard Brady, Jr. stating that Mr. Brady had bought the land from the Chesapeake Corporation for the sole purpose of preserving forest land and has no intent to develop or sell. Mr. Brady wants to be able to hunt this property and wants a ten (10) year term before review not a five (5) year term. The additional 5 years should be a given if he is following a management plan. Also, suggest that this would be an administrative review, not a full public review with hearings. Mr. Wallace asks the commission for a favorable recommendation for 10 years with a 5 year review only.

The public hearing portion was closed.

Ms. Townsend asked what about the fees at 5 years reviews. Do we really need a fee? Mr. Hathaway responded that our practice has always been to charge the same fee; however we will look at this and perhaps can have a reduced fee for interim reviews.

Mr. Evelyn asked is there enough time to do these reviews every five years. Mr. Hathaway responded no but we do work with the Department of Forestry, Colonial Soil and Water Conservation District and others.

Ms. Katz stated that we cannot review administratively, the Board of Supervisors must be involved, however public hearings may not be needed. So it is possible to have a 2-tier fee.

Mr. Hubbard asked what is the "normal" term for AFD. Mr. Hathaway responded 4 to 10 years.

Ms. Townsend asked when an AFD comes up for review that does not necessarily mean that the application will expire. Mr. Hathaway responded that when the term comes up for review, staff will make a recommendation or the Board will need to vote whether or not to continue, change or withdraw the district.

A motion was made by Mr. Evelyn and second by Ms. Moss to forward the proposed AFD-01-05, Creation of Wahrani AFD, Resolution PC-10-05 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation, with an amendment of the term to be seven (7) years.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Nay
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 7:1:1.

AFD-02-05, ADDITION TO WAHRANI AFD: Request by Mrs. Patricia T. Rock to add tax map parcel 36-41 consisting of 61.51 acres to the creation of the Wahrani Agricultural and Forestal District. The AFD Advisory Committee considered this request on 31 March 2005 and voted 7:1 to forward this application to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Rodney Hathaway gave a presentation on the proposed Addition to Wahrani AFD.

The Commission asked questions.

Mr. Hill asked what is the term on the application. Mr. Hathaway responded that if the previous application is ultimately approved by the Board of Supervisors then this application would have the same terms.

[Ms. Snyder at this point requested that the commission take a five minute recess; which request was granted and the commission subsequently reconvened]

The commission held a public hearing in which one citizen made public comment on the proposed AFD application.

Pat Rock of Skillman Drive asked for a favorable action on her property and stated that she plans to live on the property and wants the tax relief.

The public hearing portion was closed.

A motion was made by Ms. Townsend and second by Mr. Gammon to forward the proposed AFD-02-05, Addition to Wahrani AFD, Resolution PC-11-05 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

AFD-03-05, ADDITION TO WADDELL AFD: Request by Mr. John N. & Katherine L. Linka to add tax map parcels 20-3-16S, 20-3-15N, 20-3-15S, 20-3-14S, 20-58, and 20-58A consisting of 49.07 acres to the Waddell Agricultural and Forestal District. The Waddell AFD currently consists of three parcels that total 246 acres. The AFD Advisory Committee considered this request on 31 March 2005 and voted 7:1 to forward this application to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Rodney Hathaway gave a presentation on the proposed Addition to Waddell AFD.

The Commission asked questions.

Ms. Snyder asked is the purpose to delay housing. Mr. Hathaway responded yes.

The commission held a public hearing in which one citizen made public comment on the proposed AFD application.

John Linka of Poverty Hall Road stated that they want to preserve land, be able to hunt the land and save the land for his children and grandchildren.

The public hearing portion was closed.

A motion was made by Mr. Chalmers and second by Ms. Townsend to forward the proposed AFD-03-05, Addition to Waddell AFD, Resolution PC-12-05 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye

Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

AFD-04-05, ADDITION TO WINSLOW AFD: Request by Dr. Karen T. Lacy to add tax map parcels 10-50 and 10-50B consisting of 59.4 acres to the Winslow Agricultural and Forestal District. The Winslow AFD currently consists of two properties that total 215.28 acres. The AFD Advisory Committee considered this request on 31 March 2005 and voted 7:1 to forward this application to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation for the addition of tax map parcel 10-50, which consist of 56.06 acres to the Winslow AFD.

Rodney Hathaway gave a presentation on the proposed Addition to Winslow AFD indicating that the AFD Advisory Committee and staff all recommend that parcel 10-50B be excluded from the AFD if approved because of its size and existing use as a residential home site.

The Commission asked questions.

Ms. Snyder asked if this was the same Dr. Lacy as the kennel. Mr. Hathaway responded yes.

Ms. Townsend asked what is the expiration date. Mr. Hathaway responded in 2009.

The commission held a public hearing in which no citizens made public comment on the proposed AFD application.

It was stated that the resolution needed to be amended. Need to amend the resolution header to read the Winslow AFD, the vote of the AFD Board should read 8:0 not 7:1 and add a clause to exclude parcel 10-50B.

A motion was made by Ms. Townsend and second by Ms. Snyder to forward the proposed AFD-04-05, Addition to Winslow AFD, Resolution PC-13-05(R) to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

AFD-05-05, ADDITION TO PAMUNKEY RIVER VALLEY AFD: Request by Mr. James K. & Barbara S. Taylor to add tax map parcels 10-48A, 10-48G, and 10-41A consisting of 65 acres to the Pamunkey River Valley Agricultural and Forestal District. The Pamunkey River Valley AFD currently consists of 22 properties that total 4,650 acres. The AFD Advisory Committee considered this request on 31 March 2005 and voted 8:0 to forward this application to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Rodney Hathaway gave a presentation on the proposed Addition to Wahrani AFD.

The commission held a public hearing in which no citizens made public comment on the proposed AFD application.

A motion was made by Mr. Chalmers and second by Mr. Evelyn to forward the proposed AFD-05-05, Addition to Pamunkey River Valley AFD, Resolution PC-14-05 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

AFD-07-05, ADDITION TO HAMPSTEAD-NORTHBERRY-SHIMOKINS AFD: Request by Mr. George A. & Barbara A. Tate to add tax map parcel 2-49 consisting of 68.52 acres to the Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins Agricultural and Forestal District. The Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins AFD currently consists of 16 properties that total 2,101 acres. The AFD Advisory Committee considered this request on 31 March 2005 and voted 7:0 with one member abstaining to forward this application to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Rodney Hathaway gave a presentation on the proposed Addition to Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins AFD stating that this application would need to be approved in order for AFD-06-05 to qualify.

The Commission asked questions.

Mr. Evelyn stated that the acreage does not add up. Where is the missing 35 acres? Mr. Hathaway responded that the information comes from the Commissioner of Revenue and we would need to ask him. It was noted also that while some of the staff memoranda provide the land use breakdown in percentages, this memo has stated it in acres.

Mr. Hill stated what about little parcels on west side that will be completely surrounded by AFD assuming that both the Tate and Batkins requests are approved. Mr. Hathaway responded that these are 4-acres home sites.

The commission held a public hearing in which one citizen made public comment on the proposed AFD application.

George Tate of Hopewell Road is working with Dennis Gaston on the Forestry Management Plan for both Tate and Batkins and wants to keep it forested and be able to hunt the property.

The public hearing portion was closed.

A motion was made by Ms. Snyder and second by Mr. Chalmers to forward the proposed AFD-07-05, Addition to Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins AFD, Resolution PC-16-05 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

AFD-06-05, ADDITION TO HAMPSTEAD-NORTHBERRY-SHIMOKINS AFD: Request by Mr. Joseph and Diane Batkins to add tax map parcels 2-49C and 2-50C consisting of 104.7 acres to the Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins Agricultural and Forestal District. The Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins AFD currently consists of 16 properties that total 2,101 acres. The AFD Advisory Committee considered this request on 31 March 2005 and voted 7:0 with one member abstaining to forward this application to the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission with a favorable recommendation.

Rodney Hathaway gave a presentation on the proposed Addition to Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins AFD.

The commission held a public hearing in which no citizens made public comment on the proposed AFD application.

A motion was made by Mr. Evelyn and Ms. Snyder to forward the proposed AFD-07-05, Addition to Hampstead-Northberry-Shimokins AFD, Resolution PC-15-05 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

During the consideration of the AFD applications, the Commissioners asked a number of general questions in reference to the AFD process.

Mr. Hill asked what is stronger and AFD or Conservation Easement? Ms. Katz responded that a Conservation Easement is.

Ms. Snyder asked does a Conservation Easement give a better tax break. Mr. Hathaway responded, yes.

Mr. Hill asked what is the term of a Conservation Easement. Mr. Hathaway responded that the term can be negotiated, but many are perpetuity. Ms. Katz stated that if you want the federal and state break then the property would have to be in perpetuity, however you can have an easement in conservation on your property with any term and it will have some impact on local taxes.

Mr. Hill asked what about Conservation Zoning Districts in association with local taxes would it qualify as A-1 property or would the cost be less than A-1. Ms. Katz responded the restrictions under current conservation zoning are so restricted that an evaluation of the fair market value would have to be less than in A-1. AFD's are not conservation, AFD's are for agriculture and forestal areas that are commercially cropped, farmed, timbered, etc. with active maintenance and care.

Mr. Hill asked if AFD land must be contiguous to others. Ms. Katz responded not necessarily, it can be within one mile of core.

Mr. Hill asked can you please define total acres in County that are in AFD's. Mr. Hathaway stated that we can't say right now, but can get the information by our next meeting. Mr. Hill asked to add Conservation Easements to that request.

APPLICATION ZT-01-05, CONDITIONAL ZONING PROVISIONS: Consider an amendment to §98-782 of the Zoning Ordinance of New Kent County to correct an error made during the 2001 re-codification to return this section of the County Code to its pre-2001 condition and restore the County's ability to accept proffers of cash and/or real property. As a "high-growth" locality, New Kent County is eligible under §15.2-2298 to accept proffers of cash and/or property, as was clearly stated in former County Code §9-252. During the re-codification, the code editors mistakenly took those powers away. The proposed revisions will reestablish the County's ability to accept proffers of cash and/or property. This proposed amendment to §98-782 will affect all parcels for which a rezoning or a zoning map change is sought.

George Homewood gave a presentation on the Conditional Zoning Provisions.

The Commission asked questions.

Mr. Gammon asked can the county currently accept proffers. Mr. Homewood responded the board can accept proffers because the state code clearly makes it possible to accept. The problem is two-fold, we have an inconsistency between state code and county codes and we also have an internal inconsistency in that the first subparagraph says cannot accept cash and real estate, but next 3 subparagraphs tell us how to accept cash and real estate. In all cases it is far better to resolve these inconsistencies.

Mr. Hill asked would establishing a cash proffer system in the county require a public hearing, and would it be in the best interest of the county. Mr. Homewood responded a cash proffer system can only be a policy. The board would have to adopt the policy and what type of input the board of supervisors want before adopting the policy is up to you.

Mr. Hill asked how does James City handle cash proffers. Mr. Homewood responded James City has established an advisory committee that consists of planning commissioners, realtors, property owners, etc. to consider how or if to establish a cash proffer system. James City has decided to limit anything they may consider to school impact alone.

Ms. Katz stated that Goochland recently adopted a cash proffer provision with interesting calculations to determine the impact. Ms. Katz went over the resolutions and highlighted the conflicts in the code.

Mr. Hill stated that staff should make a recommendation to the board to create a committee to develop a policy for accepting cash proffers.

Ms. Townsend stated that she would like to sit on that committee.

The commission held a public hearing in which no citizens made public comment on the proposed Conditional Zoning Provisions application.

A motion was made by Ms. Townsend and second by Mr. Chalmers to forward the Application ZT-01-05, Conditional Zoning Provisions, Resolution PC-09-05 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

The members were polled:

Jack Chalmers	Aye
Thomas Evelyn	Aye
Howard Gammon	Aye
Sylvia Godsey	Absent
Mark Hill	Abstain
Jay Hubbard	Aye
Charna Moss	Aye
Edward Pollard	Absent
Sam Snyder	Aye
Tommy Tiller	Aye
Patricia Townsend	Aye

The motion carried, 8:0:1.

IN RE: NEW BUSINESS

None.

IN RE: CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

None.

IN RE: RRPDC REPORT

Mr. Evelyn stated that the last meeting was very short.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

Ms. Snyder asked if we could service the chairs in the board room so that they would cease squeaking with every move by the occupant.

IN RE: STAFF REPORT

PROJECT UPDATES:

Mr. Hathaway stated that the Capital Improvement Program is scheduled to be distributed to the department heads on 02 May 2005. You have before you a draft CIP request form, please review this form and offer any thoughts or comments to Pam Crosby or Rodney Hathaway by 29 April 2005.

Mr. Hathaway reported that The Oaks subdivision has submitted a revised plat; however there are still some major problems that continue. This application may not be ready in time for the May meeting.

Mr. Hathaway reported that the McClure Family application has asked for another 30 day extension.

Mr. Hill asked how many lots does the Oaks subdivision have. Mr. Hathaway responded that the original application had 100 lots that number has increased to 141 lots.

Mr. Hill asked how many lots does the McClure Family subdivision have. Mr. Hathaway responded that the rezoning includes 525 acres and they are proposing a density of 1.8 dwellings per acre.

Mr. Hathaway reported that once the Patriot's Landing construction plan is approved we will receive the final subdivision plant, which will be approved by our department.

Mr. Hathaway reported that staff has not received any applications for DragonsRidge Motor Sports Park. We do know that they are working on it however we have not received anything in our office.

Mr. Hathaway wished Mr. Chalmers well in attending the VAPA Conference next week.

Mr. Gammon asked for an update on the sewer projects. Mr. John Budesky responded that the Board is moving forward with alignment along I-64 and working on obtaining easements. The project is on hold until the small whorled pogonia determination (also swamp pink) is made. We have a number of property owners that have some concerns and we are trying to address those concerns. We are considering reducing the sizes of the easements, considering noise berms to address noise concerns and doing what we can to help.

Mr. Hill stated that we are going from a 12 inch line to a 16 inch line to reduce easement requirements; also asking property owners to provide access to allow the route to be flagged so that everyone will see the impact.

Mr. Hubbard asked will the sewer line be there when Patriot's Landing needs it. Mr. Hill responded that we are about 6 months behind schedule and will do pump and haul if needed to get Patriot's Landing through.

Mr. Hathaway thanked the commissioners for returning the surveys and we will schedule a presentation from the Economic Development Group.

Mr. Hill recommended that a presentation from the Economic Development Group to do a presentation at a work session not a regular meeting.

IN RE: NEXT MEETING

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held on Monday, 16 May 2005 in the Boardroom of the County Administration Building at 6:30.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded by all.

Respectfully submitted:

Pam Crosby
Recording Secretary