

PRESENT: S.N. Bridge, Chairman  
J. Shomo, Vice-Chairman  
T. H. Byerly  
T. Cole  
J. Curd  
W.F. Hite  
K. A. Shiflett  
D.L. Cobb, Director of Community Development  
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary  
K. Bullerdick, Associate Planner

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, October 14, 2008, at 2:30 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Conference Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Planning Commission assembled in the Augusta County Government Center to discuss the rezoning, preliminary plats, and consider land use designations for the Fishersville Small Area Plan and the Countywide Future Land Use Plan. The Planning Commission traveled to various sites under consideration for Mixed Use Land Designations..

\*\*\*\*\*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

PRESENT: S.N. Bridge, Chairman  
J. Shomo, Vice-Chairman  
T. H. Byerly  
T. Cole  
J. Curd  
W.F. Hite  
K. A. Shiflett  
D.L. Cobb, Director of Community Development  
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary

VIRGINIA: At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, October 14, 2008, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

\* \* \* \* \*

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Mr. Bridge stated as there were seven (7) members present, there was a quorum.

\* \* \* \* \*

**MINUTES**

Mr. Byerly moved to approve the revised minutes of the regular meeting held on September 9, 2008 and the minutes of the worksession held on October 2, 2008.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Mary L. Thomas- Rezoning**

A request to rezone from General Business to Single Family Residential less than 0.5 of an acre owned by Mary L. Thomas located on the south side of Church Street (Rt. 1202) just west of the intersection of Church Street (Rt. 1202) and Lee-Jackson Highway (Rt. 11) in Greenville in the Riverheads District.

Ms. Earhart explained the request. She stated part of the property is zoned General Business while the remainder is zoned Single Family Residential. The house was built years ago on the General Business portion of the lot.

Mary Burleson, 227 Fairfield Drive, Staunton, daughter of Mary L. Thomas, stated the home is being sold to the current renters and the mortgage company is requiring the entire parcel be zoned Single Family Residential.

There being no one else desiring to speak, Mr. Bridge declared the public hearing closed.

Ms. Shiflett stated she feels this is a housekeeping issue. She stated part of the property is already zoned residential and being used for a residence. She stated she does not see why this request cannot be approved.

Mr. Curd stated the parcel is on a narrow road that is not appropriate for business use. He moved to recommend approval of the request.

Mr. Byerly seconded the request which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **New Business**

#### **Village on Goose Creek, Phase II**

Located on the south side of Goose Creek Road (Rt. 636) and southwest of the Augusta Medical Center Campus in the Wayne District. The plat contains 188 lots zoned Townhouse Residential.

Ms. Earhart explained the location of the preliminary plat. She stated all of the comments have been addressed and the plat meets the technical requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Curd moved to recommend approval of the preliminary plat as submitted.

Mr. Hite seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

#### **Valley Manor Subdivision**

Located on Cedar Green Road (Rt. 693) between Cedar Green Road and Buttermilk Spring Road (Rt. 703) in the Pastures District. The plat contains 21 lots zoned Single Family Residential.

Ms. Earhart explained the location of the preliminary plat. She stated all of the comments have been addressed and the plat meets the technical requirements of the ordinance. She stated there is public water on the site and alternative sewage disposal

systems have been approved for all 21 lots. She stated that the Planning Commission has also received a copy of the letter from the Health Department that states the sites are located close to the roadways and driveways and on some of the lots there is little room to build a house. If construction of the road disturbs more land than planned, the alternative systems may not be able to be built and the lots would be “unbuildable”.

Mr. Curd voiced concern with the ability to build a house and driveway on some of the lots in the subdivision. With the location of the alternative systems, it does not allow much room for error when developing the sites. He stated affordable housing was the original plan of this subdivision, and he feels it will be difficult to do so with the alternative sewage systems. He stated however he does realize that the plat meets the technical requirements of the Ordinance.

Ms. Shiflett stated she agrees with Mr. Curd. She stated the size of the lots will allow little room for error. She stated the developer of the property will have to be extremely cautious with full disclosure to the builder and property owners about the location of the sewage disposal systems.

Mr. Byerly stated he too shares the same concerns of Mr. Curd and Ms. Shiflett as there are no stakeout requirements during the building permit process. He stated he is concerned with building homes on these lots with the alternative septic systems.

Mr. Bridge stated the plat meets the technical requirements of the Ordinance and staff comments have been addressed.

Ms. Shiflett reluctantly moved to recommend approval of the preliminary plat as it meets the technical requirements of the Ordinance.

Mr. Byerly seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **Old Business**

### **Land Use Designations for Fishersville Small Area Plan and Countywide Future Land Use Plan**

Ms. Earhart explained the proposed definitions as follows:

**Neighborhood Mixed Use** may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre and convenience retail and office uses on up to 20% of the total land area; will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

**Community Mixed Use** may include a variety of residential uses at a density of six to twelve dwelling units per acre and, on up to 40% of the total land area, retail and office

uses and in some, but not all, cases industrial uses. Community Mixed Use will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

**Planned Residential** may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre; will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

**Medium Density Residential** may include detached residential units at a density of between three and four dwelling units per acre; will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

She explained the proposed land use designation for each area currently designated Mixed Use.

Mr. Bridge stated the objective for the Planning Commission is to first decide whether or not they can accept the land use definitions and second decide on recommendations for each Mixed Use parcel.

Mr. Curd stated he prefers having two mixed use designations; Community and Neighborhood Mixed Use. He stated after viewing the sites in the County, he feels it is appropriate to have two categories, as there are some areas he feels industrial uses would not be appropriate, and therefore a Neighborhood Mixed Use Category would better serve those parcels.

Mr. Bridge asked Mr. Curd if he prefers the business and/or office use being up to 15% or 20%

Mr. Curd answered up to 20% business and/or office use.

Ms. Shiflett stated prior to viewing the sites in the County, she felt only one mixed use designation was needed. However, after viewing the sites she feels there are parcels in the County that are not appropriate for business or industrial use. She stated she feels the entire County Plan should have the same designations for land use and not one set for Fishersville and one set for the rest of the County.

Mr. Cole stated based on the amount of land in the County available for industrial use, he does not see a need for industrial uses in Mixed Use Areas. He stated commercial entities will require large amounts of traffic and greater populations in close proximity, and he feels some areas in the County do not need these high levels of traffic and population that will be required.

Mr. Hite stated he feels the County should have two categories. After viewing the sites today, he stated he feels there were some parcels in the County that do not lend themselves to business or industrial use.

Mr. Byerly stated he is convinced the County needs two definitions. He stated by having two definitions, it will clarify the County's expectations to developers as well as giving them more flexibility.

Mr. Bridge stated he too feels by having two definitions, it will allow developers more flexibility as well as set expectations for staff, developers, and landowners. He stated he wanted to clarify that the Planning Commission will be agreeing to make a recommendation of the following definitions to the Board of Supervisors:

**Neighborhood Mixed Use** may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre and convenience retail and office uses on up to 20% of the total land area; will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

**Community Mixed Use** may include a variety of residential uses at a density of six to twelve dwelling units per acre and, on up to 40% of the total land area, retail and office uses and in some, but not all, cases industrial uses. Community Mixed Use will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

**Planned Residential** may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre; will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

**Medium Density Residential** may include detached residential units at a density of between three and four dwelling units per acre; will be found only in the Urban Service Areas.

Ms. Shiflett stated she wanted to emphasize the percentage amounts for business use being up to 40% and 20%. She stated not every parcel will lend itself to the maximum amount of business/industrial use. She stated she hopes good plans will come out of this decision by allowing developers to have more flexibility.

Mr. Bridge asked the Commission if there were any concerns regarding the parcels or sites that were visited.

Mr. Cole stated he would like to revisit the Ironwood/Staunton Country Club development. He stated he would like to suggest looking at Route 11 and Route 262 and dividing it into two separate parts (i.e. 11A and 11B). He stated he feels the area closer to Route 262 should be a more residential area and should be Neighborhood Mixed Use, and the area further back, closer to the industrial park should be Community Mixed Use to allow for expansion of the industrial park.

Mr. Curd stated he agrees with Mr. Cole's concern. He stated he feels Country Club Road cannot accommodate traffic that would be created in a Community Mixed Use land designation. He recommended the possibility of looking at the option of Mill Place traffic not being able to access Country Club Road because of it being a more residential use.

Ms. Earhart stated VDOT has stated there will be no access onto Route 262. She stated the access will have to come from the existing industrial parcels or Country Club Road.

Ms. Shiflett stated she is concerned with Community Mixed Use in the back of the site and questioned having residential traffic have all their access through the industrial park.

Ms. Earhart stated these are only guidelines and suggestions. She stated if and when a rezoning application is accepted for these parcels, then the Planning Commission will use their own judgment.

Mr. Hite stated he does not agree with dividing the area around Country Club Road into two land uses to allow for industrial growth, as he feels existing industrial land should be utilized in the County.

Mr. Bridge asked about designating the entire area Neighborhood Mixed Use.

Mr. Cole stated he liked that idea.

Mr. Curd stated 40% business/industrial use may not be appropriate for the more residential piece of property near the Staunton Country Club.

Mr. Bridge asked if a rezoning request would be possible for certain parcels.

Ms. Earhart stated yes. She stated this decision is to act only as a guideline; that someone could request rezoning certain parcels or areas and not the entire blocks of land that have the mixed use designations.

Mr. Cobb stated it would make more sense to straighten up the property boundary lines and make those parcels industrial.

Ms. Shiflett stated even if the property lines are straightened, there will still be neighborhood residential up against industrial property.

Mr. Bridge stated when applications are received the Commission will have the opportunity to look at the whole picture. Until then, he stated the Commission should decide what would work best for now.

Mr. Hite stated he feels the parcel near Country Club Road should remain Community Mixed Use.

Mr. Shomo stated he agrees.

Ms. Shiflett moved to recommend keeping the area designated in Verona off of Route 262 and Country Club Road Community Mixed Use on the Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Shomo seconded the motion. The motion carried on a 6 to 1, vote with Mr. Cole opposed.

Ms. Shiflett moved to recommend the following land use designations and definitions to be used Countywide to the Board of Supervisors.



## MIXED USE WORKSHEET

	<b>Map</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Planning Commission Recommendation 10/14/08</b>
1.	Weyers Cave	Route 11 North- East- Dharti and Weaver	150	Community Mixed Use
2.	Weyers Cave	Route 11 North- West	7	Business
3.	Weyers Cave	Route 256 North- Houff	200	Community Mixed Use
4.	Weyers Cave	Roller & Blosser	220	Planned Residential
5.	Weyers Cave	Triangle Drive Extended	230	Community Mixed Use
6.	Weyers Cave	Blosser and Cave View	400	Neighborhood Mixed Use
7.	Weyers Cave	Various Owners south of BRCC	220	Community Mixed Use
8.	Route 340 North	East Side/ Gore Family	120	Community Mixed Use

	<b>Map</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Planning Commission Recommendation 10/14/08</b>
9.	Verona	Baker	30	Business
10.	Verona	Staunton- Beverley Road LLC and Moore	160	Business
11.	Verona	Ironwood and Brannon	130	Community Mixed Use
12.	Route 11 South	Dahl	75	Planned Residential
13.	Route 11 South	Various Owners	60	Medium Density Residential
14.	Route 11 South	Glen Burnie/Spring Lakes, Various Owners	65	Planned Residential
15.	Route 11 South	Frontier Drive South- Boyd Homes and others	130	Business and Planned Residential based on existing zoning
16.	Route 11 South	Frontier Drive- Roller and Todd	50	Community Mixed Use
17.	Route 11 South	Eavers Brothers	300	Community Mixed Use

	<b>Map</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Planning Commission Recommendation 10/14/08</b>
18.	Route 11 South	Eavers Brothers/MEG	20	Business
19.	EXPO	Marshall, Henderson, Brement, and Crossroads Baptist Church	350	Planned Residential
20.	Craigsville	By prison	85	Planned Residential
21.	Craigsville	South of Town, Various Owners	260	Community Mixed Use; small portion south of Railroad Avenue- Medium Density Residential
22.	Stuarts Draft	Indian Ridge and Railroad Tracks	85	Planned Residential
23.	Stuarts Draft	Stoney Run and others	75	Planned Residential
24.	Stuarts Draft	Shenandoah Acres	260	Planned Residential
25.	Stuarts Draft	Route 340 North Across from Schools	500	Neighborhood Mixed Use
26.	Stuarts Draft	Stone Valley and Others	550	Neighborhood Mixed Use

	<b>Map</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Planning Commission Recommendation 10/14/08</b>
27.	Stuarts Draft	Route 340 North to Kindig Road	220	Neighborhood Mixed Use
28.	Stuarts Draft	Route 340 North Kindig to Conner	275	Neighborhood Mixed Use
29.	Stuarts Draft	Route 340 North Conner to Ladd	450	Neighborhood Mixed Use
30.	Stuarts Draft	Mt. Vernon to Shalom Road north of Hall School	420	Neighborhood Mixed Use
31.	Stuarts Draft	Hall School and Shalom Road	380	Planned Residential
32.	Stuarts Draft	Shalom to Route 631	160	Neighborhood Mixed Use
33.	Fishersville	Route 250 and Sangers Lane	600	Community Mixed Use
34.	Fishersville	Route 250- Crescent	120	Community Mixed Use
35.	Fishersville	Route 250 south- Hoy and Arehart	150	Community Mixed Use

	<b>Map</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	<b>Acreage</b>	<b>Planning Commission Recommendation 10/14/08</b>
36.	Fishersville	Route 250 and Route 640- Elm Spring, LLC	230	Community Mixed Use
37.	Fishersville	Teaverton	380	Planned Residential
38.	Fishersville	Village Green at the Lake with the airport	100	Neighborhood Mixed Use
39.	Fishersville	Terrell	65	Planned Residential
40.	Fishersville	Ivy Ridge	165	Business, Industrial, and Medium Density Residential to match the zoning

Mr. Hite seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **STAFF REPORTS**

### A. CODE OF VIRGINIA – SECTION 15.2-2310

#### **08-52 Teresa D. Craig**

While the parcel does meet the technical requirements of the Ordinance, the Planning Commission voiced concern about the site not having access from a public road. Ms. Shiflett recommended to the Board of Zoning Appeals that if they approve the request, it will be under one of two conditions, either the applicant provide access off of Ridge Road (Rt. 699) or there be no customers allowed to come to and from the business. Mr. Byerly seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **Ordinance Review Update**

Ms. Earhart stated the consultants will be meeting with the Board of Supervisors at their Staff Briefing on October 20, 2008. Prior to the meeting, the Board members will be providing individual input to the Consultants on the issues and recommendations raised in the Choices Report. The input will be collected and a consensus reached on each item. Revisions to the Ordinances will be drafted based on that consensus. She stated if there were items the Planning Commission wants to be sure are addressed, she suggested that they talk to their Board Members. Ms. Earhart stated within 45 days of the meeting the first module of the revisions will be drafted and county review will begin.

#### **Economic Development Strategy**

Ms. Earhart updated the Commission on the status of the Economic Development Strategic Plan. She encouraged the Commissioners to attend one of the following meetings on the Draft Plan: Monday, October 27, 2008 from 7 - 9 pm at Buffalo High School, Tuesday, October 28, 2008 from 7 – 9 pm at Stuarts Draft High School, and Wednesday, October 29, 2008 from 1 – 3 pm at the Augusta County Government Center.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

---

Chairman

---

Secretary