PRESENT: T. Jennings, Chairman

G. Campbell, Vice Chairman

S. Bridge L. Howdyshell K. Leonard J. Curd

J. Wilkinson, Director of Community Development

L. Tate, Planner II

J. Whetzel, Deputy County Administrator

ABSENT:

K. Shiflett

VIRGINIA:

At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, May 14, 2019, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Augusta County Government Center,

Verona, Virginia.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Mr. Jennings stated as there were six (6) members present, there was a quorum.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

MINUTES

Mr. Bridge moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on March 12, 2019.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

PUBLIC HEARINGS

An ordinance to amend Chapter 25. Zoning. Division B. Agriculture Districts. Article VII. General Agriculture (GA) Districts. Section 25-77.4. Lot frontage in general. Exceptions.

Mrs. Tate referenced the ordinance amendment as was distributed in the commissioner's meeting packets. She reminded the commissioners that in 2018 the Planning Commission recommended and the Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance amendment that created another lot frontage exception for the purpose of creating a lot to separate an existing dwelling that was constructed in or before the year 2000, and upon the Planning Commission's recommendation, owned no less than five years, from the original lot without having road frontage. Mrs. Tate stated that the Community Development Department had been asked if such exception applies to mobile and manufactured homes.

Mrs. Tate explained that the provisions of the exception intended to limit such divisions through construction timeframe and ownership timeframe requirements. A mobile home could potentially be moved around on a lot, circumventing the intended limitations. Therefore, this amendment excludes mobile and manufactured homes from the exception as was the original intent.

Because there was no Public to speak in favor of or against the request, Mr. Jennings opened and closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Leonard asked if the lot frontage ordinance had been abused. Mrs. Tate said, "No." She said that they had received a question asking if mobile homes would qualify under the exception language.

Mr. Leonard asked if a mobile home was the same as what is commonly referred to as a "double wide." Mrs. Tate said that this amendment would exclude a "double wide."

Mr. Leonard stated that the current ordinance requires the home be constructed prior to the year 2000. Mrs. Tate reminded the Planning Commission that such provision was intended to prevent the buying of land and constructing of new homes for the purpose of creating additional lots in the County.

Mr. Bridge asked if the reason the manufactured home was also included in the exclusion was because you could move that as well.

Mr. Wilkinson clarified that mobile homes are those built prior to 1976 and everything constructed after then is technically a manufactured home.

Mr. Leonard asked if the exclusion would apply to modular homes.

Mr. Wilkinson said that modular homes would not be excluded, since they are considered the same as a stick built home.

Mr. Bridge questioned if such exclusion was discriminatory against someone living in a manufactured home but he understands the reasoning as it relates to regulations to allow an exception while still controlling lot creation.

Mr. Wilkinson reminded the commissioners that mobile and manufactured homes would still have the ability to utilize the existing family member lot frontage exception.

Mr. Leonard made a motion to recommend approval of the amendment as presented after hearing the explanation and the reasoning to make the intent a little more definitive.

Mr. Campbell seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

An ordinance to amend Chapter 25. Zoning. Division A. In General. Article III. Off-Street Parking. Section 25-35 Number of spaces required.

Mrs. Tate explained that Section 25-35 lists various uses and the number of parking spaces required for each use.

Mrs. Tate read the provision related to a Zoning Administrator waiver for mixed uses, which is proposed for deletion. Mrs. Tate stated that even with removal of the Zoning

Administrator waiver provision, there will continue to be a waiver process before the Board of Supervisors after submittal of a parking study.

Mrs. Tate stated that mixed use buildings could be rather large such as a business on the ground floor and multiple floors of apartments above. Mrs. Tate stated that to her knowledge a Zoning Administrator waiver for parking had never been granted, but all requests have gone to the Board of Supervisors.

Because there was no Public to speak in favor of or against the request, Mr. Jennings opened and closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Howdyshell made a motion to recommend approval of the amendment as was staff's recommendation.

Mr. Leonard seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

NEW BUSINESS

A. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Mrs. Whetzel presented the Capital Improvement Plan as was distributed in the commissioner's meeting packets. She stated that some Planning Commissions actually draft the plan and submit it to the Board of Supervisors but in Augusta County, historically, Administration and Finance have drafted the plan and presented to the Planning Commission for review.

Mrs. Whetzel stated that the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) is an implementation tool of the Comprehensive Plan. She discussed that the CIP is used to identify future capital needs and funding sources, stating that the CIP needs go beyond the funding currently available as the CIP has a five year plus horizon.

She covered the following sections of the plan which are funded by depreciation account: fire apparatus, 911 equipment, IT equipment, vehicle replacements, and building repairs.

She covered various capital projects that vary by budget year and are supported by state, federal or other grant funding. She reviewed the following for this year: rehab of hearthstone dam, DuPont settlement money projects, and Verona sidewalk project.

Mrs. Whetzel discussed debt service as part of the fund and identified the following: water tank in Mill Place Commerce Park and the local match for revenue sharing for completion of Route 636 (Lifecore Drive).

Mrs. Whetzel stated that the Board approved the budget on May 1, 2019 and appropriations to the CIP was \$9 million. Of that \$9 million, \$3.7 million is reoccurring general fund dollars and the remaining is grant revenue related to the projects mentioned previously.

Mr. Leonard asked what projects the DuPont settlement money was funding. Mr. Wilkinson highlighted stream bank restoration projects in Churchville and Dooms.

Mr. Bridge asked why the infrastructure accounts have seen a significant decrease over time. Mrs. Whetzel stated that the 2009 recession was when the funding saw significant decreases.

Mr. Campbell asked if the projects approved by the Board of Supervisors from the infrastructure account were evaluated against the Comprehensive Plan.

Mrs. Whetzel stated that a lot of the projects funded through the infrastructure account are not significant in funding and deal with existing uses or programs. Mr. Wilkinson said that water and sewer projects are sometimes funded through the infrastructure account. Mrs. Tate explained that expansions of public water and sewer do require Comprehensive Plan compliance.

Mr. Jennings asked about the IT related items and the threat of ransomware. Mrs. Whetzel said cybersecurity has certainly risen in importance.

Mr. Bridge asked about road improvement project funding. Mrs. Whetzel reviewed VDOT processes related to revenue sharing with a 50/50 match, rural rustic road funding, and the competitive funding process through Smart Scale.

Mr. Bridge asked if the County funded anything for the schools other than the school facilities. Mrs. Whetzel stated that this year the Board did put money in the schools capital improvements account for school bus replacement.

Mr. Howdyshell made a motion for approval of the CIP after a detailed review of the plan and discussion.

Mr. Bridge seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

B. STUARTS DRAFT SMALL AREA PLAN

Mrs. Tate reviewed a draft of Sections I and II of the Stuarts Draft Small Area Plan as was included in the commissioner's packets. Mrs. Tate reviewed introduction and background information and population and demographics information for the plan. She stated that she would continue bringing sections of the plan to the Planning Commission as drafts are ready for review prior to having a public hearing to recommend adoption of the entire plan.

Mrs. Tate highlighted the public outreach process for the Stuarts Draft Small Area Plan, the relationship of the small area plan to the countywide Comprehensive Plan, the percentage of various Planning Policy Areas within the small area boundary, a discussion of future land uses prior to the recent amendments adopted by the Board based from the small area planning process, current and projected population estimates, and residential building permit data in the small area. She also highlighted the following statistics: median age, gender, percent 65 and older, education data, occupied and vacant housing, owner-occupied, owner-occupied value, and median gross rent, which were all compared to Augusta County and the state of Virginia.

The commissioner had no comments for Mrs. Tate but thanked her for bringing the plan in small sections for their review and acknowledged the hard work spent in drafting the plan sections.

STAFF REPORTS

A. CODE OF VIRGINIA - SECTION 15.2-2310

Mrs. Tate reviewed with the Commissioners the requests coming before the BZA at the June meeting.

The Planning Commission had the following comments:

SUP#19-37 D.M. Conner, Inc. and SUP#19-38 Garnett E. or Virginia Hope Johnson

The Planning Commission would suggest to the Board of Zoning Appeals that they look closely and evaluate the proximity to residential dwellings.

* * * * * * * * * * *

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned.

Chairman

Secretary