

A WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WAS HELD ON THE 11<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD TWO THOUSAND IN THE COURTROOM OF THE OLD COURTHOUSE AT 4:00 P.M.

---

IN RE: ROLL CALL

Julian T. Lipscomb	Present
Rebecca M. Ringley	Present
Dean E. Raynes	Present
W. R. "Ray" Davis Jr.	Present
James H. Burrell	Present

---

IN RE: PRESENTATION - Gary D. Mitchell, Acting Planning Director, gave a follow up presentation on the Route 60 Overlay.

Mr. Emerson told the Board the overlay changes the Board had received did not reflect exactly what the Board had previously discussed. There were also some charges such as the reduction of the buffer area for residential property not questioned by the Board, nor were they questioned by the Richmond Association of Realtors, which Mr. Emerson and Mr. Mitchell were not quite sure as to why they were included in the changes. Mr. Mitchell was handing out a new set of draft documents and Mr. Emerson suggested the Board take the next month to review these new documents and give Mr. Mitchell any changes/comments they may have.

Mr. Mitchell made the following recommendations for the proposed highway overlay district:

- ?? The boundary of the highway corridor along Route 249 would extend from Route 60 to Route 665 (Henpeck Road).
- ?? Replace the 100-foot setback with a minimum of 50-foot along State Route 60 and 249 from the VDOT ultimate right-of-way.
- ?? In those areas presently identified as Village on the West Area Management Plan, the setback would be reduced to 35 feet outside of VDOT's ultimate right-of-way.
- ?? Design standards for monument style signage has been incorporated into the Highway Overlay District regulations.
- ?? Outdoor storage and loading areas and all refuse collection areas are required to be screened from view from the corridor highway. The staff recommends eliminating the screening requirement for outdoor displays of merchandise, when such displays

are located at least 75 feet from VDOT's ultimate right-of-way.

- ?? Language has been added to the ordinance to clarify that the HOD regulations apply only to site plans and preliminary subdivision plans requiring approval in accordance with Division 18 of the Zoning Ordinance and Article IV of the Subdivision Ordinance. The regulations would not apply to family subdivisions and parent tract minor subdivision provided for under Section 9-425 of the Subdivision Ordinance.
- ?? With regard to signage, the ordinance has been changed to add language clarifying that the square footage specified for signs in the HOD is the square footage or size for each side of the sign face.
- ?? Attachment A has been incorporated into Section 9-65.14(E)(3) to specify the minimum landscaping requirements in the buffer area between the 35' parking setback and the road right-of-way. The staff recommends that a minimum three-foot high berm with landscaping be required.
- ?? For purposes of calculating the tree canopy requirements, the staff recommends that the following areas be excluded in calculating the area of the site: 1) areas reserved or dedicated for future street construction or other public improvements, 2) property or areas reserved or dedicated for school sites, playing fields, and other non-wooded recreational areas, and 3) portions of a site which contain existing structures that are not the subject of a pending application.
- ?? The staff recommends the side and rear buffer yard requirement to be 100 feet for commercial and industrial zoned land adjacent to residentially zoned land. Additionally, staff recommends the side and rear buffer yard requirements to be 50 feet for commercial and industrial zoned land adjacent to agriculturally zoned land. This buffer yard could be further reduced by ten feet in width with additional landscaping consisting of two staggered rows of evergreens planted ten feet apart. Since these buffer yard requirements are included in the district regulations and will apply countywide, the staff recommends that the Board consider developing a separate Landscaping, Buffering and Tree Preservation section to the County Code. This landscaping ordinance could be developed in conjunction with the County's update to its Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Ringley questioned the size of the sign face. Mr. Mitchell explained that the sign face was the total of the two sides. Mr. Mitchell also confirmed that a pond, wooded wetland could be included as a tree canopy; there will be exceptions to consider.

Mr. Mitchell showed various pictorials depicting what areas look like with the overlay regulations opposed to areas without the se regulations.

Mrs. Ringley inquired about where the overlay would start and stop. There was discussion among the members about various ways and places to start and stop the overlay district as well as well as instituting a landscape ordinance versus the overlay

plan and the fact that an ordinance would be a countywide application. The Board may not want to make it quite as stringent in some areas as in others and the overlay project would provide this flexibility. The present recommendation of the boundary along Route 249 extends from Route 60 to Route 665. Mr. Emerson stated he thought the Board would want to stop it in the area of the Woods at Five Lakes.

Mr. Emerson also brought up the fact that one thing the Board might consider is re-doing subdivision and zoning at the time the Comprehensive Plan is re-done. The idea of having all these running concurrently might be good. The Board might think about this.

Mr. Emerson suggested the Planning Department make any changes to the draft and bring it back at the October Board meeting for more discussion.

Mr. Emerson reminded the Board that the October meeting would be the meeting with the Constitution Officers.

---

IN RE:                   PRESENTATION: Robert A. Boynton of Boynton, Rothschild, Rowland Architects, PC; J. Lawrence Gallaher, Director of Public Safety presented information regarding a New Kent County Vehicle Maintenance Facility and a New Kent County Fire Station.

Mr. Boynton presented his findings to the Board with regard to a vehicle maintenance facility and fire station for New Kent County. He and Mr. Gallaher had visited the James City County Vehicular Maintenance Facility. The facility does not maintain school buses but does maintain County buses, car fleets and fire equipment. Mr. Emerson stated he and Mrs. Ringley had visited this site and it was very impressive.

Mr. Boynton told the Board the initial decision to be made must be site locations. His firm can begin schematic design of the fire station without a site but cannot begin the schematic design of the vehicular maintenance facility without a site, knowing the current facility associated with the Middle School might be an option. Ruling that option out, they could begin a generic design for any site. Mr. Boynton said his firm can run these projects separately or concurrently.

Mr. Emerson reminded the Board that the management study on fire services indicated we have a critical daytime attrition problem with our ability to provide fire and rescue services. This would cause the need for the fire station to be located closer to the intersection of I-64 and Rt. 155. The planned site is across from the Jasmine Bed and Breakfast on Route 155. This site was given to the County through the planned unit development process for fire and rescue location. That location is an option but there are other locations to review. Mr. Emerson reported he, Mr. Burrell and Mr. Lipscomb had met with some of the School people last week and he has come to the conclusion that utilizing the site of the existing garage probably will not coincide well in time as to where we want to be with that process. He suggested that the Board obtain additional property. He also reminded the Board there are approximately 70 acres on Egypt Road beside the High School but he thought that land would be best served as a school site, not a vehicle

maintenance facility. Mr. Emerson reported he and Steve Campitell (Delmarva Properties) were trading telephone calls but he wanted to ask Mr. Campitell about the possibility of obtaining an additional 10-15 acres from Delmarva further south on Egypt Road. Mr. Boynton stated he was thinking in terms of a 3-bay facility which would require a minimum of 10 acres. The Board needs to plan for the future and not build on a site that will eventually be landlocked. Mr. Boynton's engineering fees cannot be calculated until a site is determined.

Mr. Emerson pointed out we are looking at a metal building with masonry to protect it. He confirmed that is what the Board is expecting and the fact that we should make this as cost effective as possible. Mr. Boynton's prices do not include any equipment of course, i.e., hydraulic lifts, etc. Mr. Davis inquired about the wash bays. Mr. Boynton said his firm could do either indoor or outdoor but his suggestion was outside wash bays. In a metal building it would be hard on the building to have the wash bay inside. James City had an allowance for a wash bay but they were not using it. Mr. Emerson summed up the discussion by saying he understood the Board was looking for a utilitarian building, not necessarily pretty, by a site that tucks it out of view but is convenient and useful. The Board directed Mr. Emerson to go forward with the search for a cost-effective site for the vehicle maintenance facility and Mr. Emerson stated he would know more about the additional site for the fire station in the near future.

Mr. Davis questioned whether down the road when we have paid fire fighters, would the County get the equipment previously bought for the volunteers back. Mr. Gallaher addressed the question by saying the new fire station basically would replace Co. 1. He hoped fire and EMS would be combined. This new station would be the first responders and would serve the whole county during the daytime.

Mr. Emerson again summed the conversation up by confirming the Board wanted Mr. Boynton to move forward on both projects, wanted both facilities to be utilitarian, and the Board wants to move forward now on the vehicle maintenance facility, wait about 30 days on the fire station so Mr. Emerson can come back to the Board regarding the site they have been discussing. The Board also would like the vehicle maintenance facility to be located in the general area of the County buildings.

---

Mrs. Ringley made a motion to go into closed session for discussion of a personnel matter pursuant to § 2.1-344(a)(1) of the Code of Virginia.

Julian T. Lipscomb	Aye
Rebecca M. Ringley	Aye
Dean E. Raynes	Aye
W. R. "Ray" Davis Jr.	Aye
James H. Burrell	Aye

The Board went into closed session at 5:14 p.m.

---

The Board came out of closed session at 5:53 and went directly to the Boardroom for its regular session.