

PRESENT: J. D. Tilghman, Chairman
S. N. Bridge
T.H. Byerly
J. Curd
K. A. Shiflett
J. Shomo
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary

ABSENT: W. F. Hite, Vice-Chairman
D. L. Cobb, Director of Community Development

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, May 10, 2005, at 3:30 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, master plans, and the upcoming items on the BZA agenda. The Planning Commission traveled to the following sites which will be considered by the Commission:

1. W & W Developers, Inc. – Rezoning
2. Catherine Click – Rezoning

Chairman

Secretary

PRESENT: J. D. Tilghman, Chairman
S. N. Bridge
T. H. Byerly
J. Curd
K. A. Shiflett
J. Shomo
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary

ABSENT: W. F. Hite, Vice-Chairman
D. L. Cobb, Director of Community Development

VIRGINIA: At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County
Planning Commission held on Tuesday, May
10, 2005, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Meeting
Room, Augusta County Government Center,
Verona, Virginia.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Ms. Tilghman stated as there were six (6) members present, there was a quorum.

MINUTES

Mr. Curd made a motion to approve the minutes of the Called and Regular meeting held on April 12, 2005. Mr. Byerly seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

W. & W. Developers, Inc. – Rezoning

A request to rezone from Limited Industrial to General Industrial approximately 12.4 acres owned by W. & W. Developers, Inc., located on the west side of Indian Mound Road (Rt. 792) just south of the intersection of Indian Mound Road (Rt. 792) and Laurel Hill Road (Rt. 612) and adjacent to Interstate 81 in Verona in the Beverley Manor District.

Mrs. Earhart stated the applicant has submitted three proffers. They are:

1. Permitted uses of the property will be limited to mini-warehouses with an aggregate area not to exceed 77,000 square feet. No activities such as sales, repairs, or servicing of goods from units shall be permitted. In addition, no uses will be allowed by Special Use Permit.
2. There will be no outside storage allowed on the property.
3. The total combined sign area of all signs on the property shall not exceed one-half (0.5) square feet of sign area for each lineal foot of lot frontage.

Mrs. Earhart stated this property was zoned Limited Industrial in November of 1989. She stated this property is in an Urban Service Area slated for industrial development. She stated public water and sewer facilities are currently being extended to this development.

Mr. Steve Wisely stated he is the President of W & W Developers, Inc. He stated David Whetzel, Vice President of W & W Developers, Inc., is also here. He stated this property is currently being developed for mini-warehouses. He stated as this is currently zoned there is a requirement that they have a twenty-foot wide grass buffer. He stated the buffer is a detriment to the operation of the project and they are attempting to remove that requirement. He stated that is why they are applying to have the zoning changed from Limited Industrial to General Industrial. He stated in General Industrial there are no requirements for a buffer. He stated this will be better in terms of access for fire protection and because it will reduce the requirement for them to have long curving driveways. He stated if they were allowed to rezone they would have less pavement. He stated areas to the south are in a floodplain lined with cedar trees and they do not have any plans to develop that area.

Mr. Curd asked if the warehouses would have twenty-four hour access.

Mr. Wisely stated the facility will be closed in with a fence and with automated gates. He stated there is a watchman's quarters on the facility. He stated there may be some instances where someone would come at night to use the facility, but it would be very limited.

Mr. Curd asked what type of fence would be around the mini-warehouses.

Mr. Wisely stated a chain link fence with barbed wire strands on top.

Mr. Curd stated he did not understand why there would be less pavement.

Mr. Wisely stated by not being required to have the buffers they can have traffic access directly to the end of the cul-de-sac without having to build the roadway.

Mr. Curd asked if the sign would be lighted or unlighted.

Mr. Wisely stated there will be a lighted sign on a pole.

There being no one desiring to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, the request Ms. Tilghman declared the public hearing closed.

Ms. Shiflett asked if his project would be impacted by the Lighting Ordinance.

Mrs. Earhart stated it depends on when the site plan is approved. She stated if the site plan had the sign already on it then it would be grandfathered in. She stated if the site plan is approved after July 1st it would have to comply. She stated they would have to resubmit the site plan because it has the interior roads on it. She stated if the new site plan is not approved by July 1st they will have to comply with the new Lighting Ordinance.

Ms. Shiflett asked how much linear feet of lot frontage is there.

Mrs. Earhart stated 1,000 feet of frontage.

Ms. Shiflett stated this would be a major reduction but this still amounts to quite a lot of signage.

Mr. Curd stated the warehouses could be seen from the interstate and with that size of a sign it should be in compliance with the new Lighting Ordinance. He stated there should be a buffer from the interstate. He stated those are his two concerns.

Ms. Shiflett stated she agrees with Mr. Curd. She stated those two things are very important to what the Planning Commission tries to do. She stated they should comply with the new Lighting Ordinance and there should be a buffer from the interstate. She stated this is more of a convenience change than anything else.

Ms. Tilghman asked if Mr. Wisely would be able to adhere to those two additional proffers.

Mr. Wisely stated when approaching this property from the interstate to the south you are less than a tenth of a mile from the property and you cannot see any of this because there is a large hill obscuring the view. He stated at the southwest corner you can see the buildings. He stated the buildings sit forty to fifty feet above the interstate and if you try to put a screen up it would need to be thirty to fifty feet high. He stated trying to put a screen up is impracticable and unattractive.

Ms. Tilghman asked if they are single story buildings.

Mr. Wisely stated one is two-story.

Ms. Tilghman asked where does that sit.

Mr. Wisely indicated on the map the site is at the end of the cul-de-sac.

Mrs. Earhart stated it is under construction.

Mr. Wisely stated it is approximately ten feet high but it will be twenty feet high with a peak roof.

Ms. Tilghman asked what Mr. Wisely's feeling was on the new Lighting Ordinance.

Mr. Wisely stated the lighted sign is currently approved and is on order.

Ms. Tilghman asked if it meets the new ordinance requirements.

Mr. Wisely stated he did not know.

Mr. Shomo stated they are trying to control light pollution. He stated the fixture could be made to comply.

Mr. Wisely stated they are installing lights for security purposes. He stated the lights that are there now face downward. He stated after dark the lights go on and they are not very bright.

Ms. Shiflett asked if the chain link fence would have slats for screening.

Mr. Wisely stated the fence would block the view of the green grass and the trees but it will not block the view of the buildings because they are on a higher elevation.

Ms. Shiflett asked if the fence will be lower than the buildings.

Mr. Wisely stated the fence line is at a lower elevation than the buildings.

Mr. Bridge stated the only thing that will screen the area are trees. He stated a fence is impractical for this location.

Mr. Shomo stated he agrees.

Ms. Shiflett and Mr. Shomo stated they would like to see the Lighting Ordinance complied with for this request.

Mrs. Earhart stated Mr. Wisely does have an existing site plan on file and whether portions of it would be grandfathered in or not, she cannot say. She stated they would need to discuss this matter with the County Attorney.

Ms. Shiflett stated she would recommend approval with compliance to the Lighting Ordinance if the County Attorney deems that possible and with the proffers as stated especially no outside storage.

Mrs. Earhart stated lighting is not a topic that is currently under the proffers and the applicant would have to amend his request to include lighting. She stated the only way to ensure that the Lighting Ordinance would apply is to get a proffer for the request.

Ms. Shiflett withdrew her motion.

Ms. Tilghman asked if the proffer could be amended to include the sign.

Mrs. Earhart stated the applicant could amend proffer #3 to add a lighting component to the sign.

Mr. Shomo stated the request could be tabled until the next meeting.

Mr. Curd stated he would still like to see a screen. He stated he does not necessarily mean a fence. He stated as presented he could not recommend approval.

Mr. Bridge stated based on the concerns, he would recommend denial of the request.

Mr. Shomo stated he hopes that Mr. Wisely and his partner would think about the Planning Commission's concerns.

Ms. Shiflett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Interstate Business Park – Master Plan

Interstate Business Park containing 63 lots zoned General Business located on Route 285 at Expo Road in Fishersville in the Beverley Manor District.

Mrs. Earhart stated this master plan is a revision to one that was approved several years ago. She stated they are adding a right turn only entrance to one lot and made some modifications to the water and sewer plans. She stated the entrance between lots 38 and 39 is currently designed to be a right in and right out. She stated lots 33 and 34 were combined. She stated there is public water and public sewer. She stated it does meet the requirements of the Ordinance; however, staff has some concerns about the right-in/right-out note. She stated they do have enough road frontage to qualify for four entrances. She stated they will still be within the Urban Service Overlay district requirement for no more than one entrance every eight hundred feet.

Mr. Todd Wood of Valley Engineering stated he is representing the owner, Bill Neff.

Ms. Tilghman asked why is the entrance right-in/right-out.

Mr. Wood stated this was a request from VDOT since they were going to eliminate the crossover. Since then, however, VDOT realized the opposing entrance won't be restricted. He stated they are willing to delete the right in/right out note if the County wants them to.

Mr. Curd asked if the entrance to lot 29 would be a right in only.

Mr. Wood stated it would be.

Mr. Curd asked if a right turn lane would be built.

Mr. Wood stated it would be. He stated the plans are subject to VDOT's approval.

Ms. Shiflett stated Mr. Wood is in agreement with removing the note.

Mr. Byerly moved to recommend approval contingent on the removal of the note regarding a right-in/right-out limitation on the entrance between lots 38 and 39.

Ms. Shiflett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ivy Ridge Residential Development – Master Plan

Ivy Ridge Residential Development containing 52 lots zoned Single Family Residential and 1 detention pond lot located on the south side of Ladd Road (Route 631) in the South River District.

Mrs. Earhart stated originally the master plan showed a road configuration that was a loop system but now there is one main road with five cul-de-sacs. She stated there are 52 lots with public water and public sewer. She stated at the time the master plan was submitted there were some things that needed to be corrected. She stated there are outstanding issues regarding fire flow. She stated because they have changed the road system there are changes to the water system. She stated they need to submit new fire flow calculations and have those reviewed and approved by the Service Authority. She stated they are showing two entrances and VDOT’s preferences are to go to one. She stated staff and the developer are still in agreement that there needs to be two entrances.

Mr. Barry Lotts stated they received the notice as of 12:20 p.m. today that they needed a new set of fire flow calculations. He stated the elevations are actually the same so it will not change the fire flow that much.

Ms. Shiflett stated they definitely want to keep the two entrances with more than one hundred homes. Ms. Shiflett moved that the master plan be tabled until the fire flow has been reviewed and approved.

Mr. Curd stated he agrees with Ms. Shiflett.

Mr. Byerly stated he also agrees.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

STAFF REPORTS

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

Ms. Tilghman asked if there were any comments regarding the upcoming items on the BZA agenda. The Commission took the following action:

05-29 Martin and Patricia Gallon

Ms. Shiflett moved that the Planning Commission voice their concern about the number of businesses not related to agriculture being allowed to locate in General Agriculture areas. They recommended the number of classes be limited

depending on the traffic being generated to minimize the impact on the area's road system.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

05-31 Francis Chester-Cestari

Mr. Shomo stated he is concerned with the water quality in Churchville, one of the County's Community Development Areas. They are concerned about who will be charged with monitoring the environmental impacts of the operation (DEQ or EPA, but not the County).

Mr. Curd stated he would question whether a large business sign would be compatible in an area slated for residential development.

Mr. Byerly stated that the sign now appears temporary. If a sign is to be permanently installed, they would recommend that any lighting of the sign, as well as any lighting on the site, be done in compliance with the County's newly adopted lighting ordinance, regardless of when the site plan is approved.

Ms. Shiflett stated she agrees with all of those concerns as well as since this is in a development area, the Planning Commission recommends that the Board of Zoning Appeals retain the permit's two-year time limit to ensure that the operation remains compatible with the community.

Mr. Bridge moved to recommend that any lighting of the sign, as well as any lighting on the site, be done in compliance with the County's newly adopted lighting ordinance, regardless of when the site plan is approved. Since this is in a development area, he recommended that the Board of Zoning Appeals retain the permit's two year time limit to ensure that the operation remains compatible with the community.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

05-32 Robert or Naomi Ingram

Ms. Shiflett would recommend no outside storage be allowed on this property associated with the business and that all business activity be limited to the existing 30' x 60' building.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

B. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE – STEERING COMMITTEE

Mrs. Earhart explained they had the first meeting of the Steering Committee. She stated they will meet on the first Monday of every month. The next meeting

will be June 6th. She stated in July the meeting will take place the second Monday because of the holiday. She stated all of the meetings are open to the public and the meetings will be in the Smith's Transfer Meeting Room West down the hall.

* * * * *

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

* * * * *

Chairman

Secretary