

PRESENT: W. F. Hite, Chairman
J. Curd, Vice-Chairman
S. N. Bridge
T. H. Byerly
J. Shomo
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary

ABSENT: K. A. Shiflett
J. D. Tilghman
D. L. Cobb, Director of Community Development

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, April 11, 2006, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors' Conference Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Mr. Hite stated as there were five (5) members present, there was a quorum.

MINUTES

Mr. Byerly moved to approve the minutes of the Called and Regular meeting held on March 14, 2006. Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Shields Enterprises, LC – Rezoning

A request to rezone from Single Family Residential to General Business approximately 8 acres owned by Shields Enterprises, LC located in the southwest quadrant of the Interstate 64 and Route 340 interchange at Ladd, in the Wayne District.

Ms. Earhart explained the request. She stated that the applicant has submitted the following proffers:

1. The only permitted use of the property will be for warehouses and mini-warehouses. 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. No outside storage will be allowed on the property, including the storage of RVs, boats, trucks, or cars.
3. A 30' landscape buffer will be installed along the property lines adjacent to residential zoning. As part of site plan approval, a landscape plan for the 30' buffer area will be submitted for approval by the Planning Commission. The landscape plan will indicate which trees will be retained and what trees and shrubs (by species and size) will be planted and where they will be planted. All landscaping will be installed in accordance with the landscape plan and permanently maintained by the property owner.
4. Within the 30' landscape buffer, no trees will be disturbed on the property prior to the approval of the landscape plan by the Planning Commission.
5. A 10' landscape buffer consisting of 6' tall evergreens will be planted 10' apart along the boundary of any property zoned General Business but still used for residential purposes at the time of development of the site.
6. Where storage buildings themselves are not utilized to fence, and thus secure, the site, a minimum of a 6' high, commercial grade chain link fence will be installed. At the primary entrance to the facility a minimum of a 6' high aluminum fence with the appearance of wrought iron will be installed. At the interstate boundary, VDOT fencing will be utilized, provided it remains intact and provides adequate security. Otherwise, additional fencing will be installed to insure security is maintained.
7. Building height shall not exceed one story.
8. No sign shall exceed 25' in height.
9. Should VDOT revise their current plans for the improvement of Exit 94. The developer will dedicate to VDOT up to a 25' wide right-of-way along the lot 10 boundary with I-64.

Bill Watkins, 1035 Fairway Drive, stated that this is the 3rd time the Shields application has been presented to the Planning Commission. He stated that the project is already pretty familiar to the Planning Commission. Mr. Watkins stated that at the previous meetings he presented a slide show on the project. He stated that the City of Waynesboro is no longer taking sewage from that site and any residential developer would have increased expenses finding alternatives for the sewage. He stated that it is not practical to develop the land as medium density residential. He stated that the most practical use for the land would be commercial development. He stated that the mini-storage units would have less traffic and no sewer facilities. He stated that all the

concerns that the Planning Commission has raised, have been responded to with the exception of the building materials concern. He stated that the possibility of having more eye appealing materials used to build the units was looked at. He stated that it was not possible to be competitive with the other mini-storage facilities in the area by increasing the rent to cover the new supplies. He stated that none of the other mini-storage units in Augusta County have “decorative” brick. He stated that the site is not easy to see from the residential locations, and the site is lower than the interstate.

There being no one else wishing to speak in favor of the request, Mr. Hite asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Gordon Parker, 70 Cardinal Lane, stated that he was speaking on behalf of Ms. Schwab and himself. He stated that Ms. Schwab sent a letter to the Planning Commission addressing her concerns with the development.

Ms. Earhart stated that she would read the letter aloud for everyone to hear once Mr. Parker is finished presenting his concerns.

Mr. Parker asked the Planning Commission if there was anything in the plans for a perimeter fence.

Mr. Hite stated that Mr. Shields proffered to have a fence enclosing the buildings. He stated that the way the buildings are positioned, they will act as part of the fence, he stated that fencing will connect the buildings together.

Mr. Parker stated that Mr. Dean and Ms. Schwab and he have discussed this issue and he stated that they all want to have a perimeter fence between the fence that is enclosing the Shields warehouses and the residential neighborhood, to ensure the safety of the neighbors. He stated that the neighbors are concerned for their safety during the construction period of the mini-warehouses.

Mr. Hite stated that he feels as though the fence enclosing the structures will provide enough security for everyone.

Mr. Parker stated that he is also concerned about the light that the development will produce.

Mr. Hite stated that all the proposed lighting for the mini-storage facility will have to comply with the County’s Lighting Ordinance.

Mr. Parker stated that Ms. Schwab will be the most effected by the Shields development. He stated that he is concerned that the 6 foot tall trees will not screen the view of the development from Ms. Schwab’s property. He stated that he feels as though the fences in between the buildings will not provide adequate protection for the surrounding residents. He stated that he is still in favor of keeping the property zoned Residential. He stated that he has worked very hard to keep the development away

from the residential neighborhood and he feels as though this development could cause a real traffic issue.

Ms. Earhart read the letter written by Ms. Schwab, 41 Cardinal Lane, Waynesboro, that was submitted to the Community Development Department as follows:

“Reference: Shields Enterprise, LC request to rezone from Single Family Residential to General Business approximately 8 acres.

Dear Ms. Earhart:

In your above referenced letter there is no mention of another proffer, i.e.:

A security gate in to named property (using card keys to enter): also that a security fence encompass the 8 acres with warehouses inside fence, protecting adjacent residential property owners. There is a concern of drugs- a problem could exist. I would like the Planning Commission members drive around my drive way and view as I do (my home faces Waynesboro) this 8 acre property.

At night the lights from the existing “far away” warehouses, to me, unsightly. These additional warehouses will be much closer – a real eye sore!!!

In reference to “lighting”: “...Wherever possible and situated no lights shine directly toward residences without shielding.” I question effectiveness!!!

Another concern: The landscaping buffer “will provide a visual buffer at maturity.” Some take years!! Will the revised proffer 6 ft. tall evergreens be closely spaced inside chain link fence?

I ask and appreciate the Commission’s consideration also that this property remain zoned “Medium Density Residential”?

A big concern if changed to “Business” in a few years a sale of the property to “whatever”, as we already see happening at the I-64 interchange.

Very Sincerely,
RUBY M. SCHWAB
41 Cardinal Lane
Waynesboro, VA 22980

Telephone (540)942-1689”

Mr. Watkins stated that the pace of development will take about 5 years. He stated that their main concern is safety for their development and the surrounding residential neighborhood. He stated that he does not intend on putting an additional boundary fence around the development that already has a security fence. He stated that an additional fence would be unattractive. He stated that he feels as though a landscape buffer would be more attractive. He stated that he does not feel as though security will be an issue for the development. He stated that the buildings between the fence are more secure than the fence itself. He stated that Mr. Shields has been working with VDOT on the traffic issue. He stated that he feels as though this development will have less of an impact on the traffic than a residential development would. He stated that Ms. Schwab will be looking over the development not into the development. He stated that the development will follow the County's Lighting Ordinance.

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

Mr. Bridge asked if there were areas around the development that were zoned for commercial use, but used as a residential dwelling.

Ms. Earhart stated that there are some areas around the development that are zoned commercial but are used for residential dwellings.

Mr. Bridge stated that he is not sure if this is the best project for the area, but he stated that Mr. Shields has gone above and beyond his duty to make the best proposal he can. He stated that a residential neighborhood would probably see the already existing mini-storage units as an eye-sore.

Mr. Curd stated that he feels as though the applicants are as concerned with the safety of the area as the neighbors are. He stated that this project would have less traffic impact, less fire and rescue impact and no impact on schools or sewers. He stated that all the proffers requested by the Planning Commission have been met. Mr. Curd moved to approve the request with the proffers.

Mr. Bridge seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

NEW BUSINESS

A. Consideration of Capital Improvements Plan and Budget

Mr. Coffield stated that State Law requires the Planning Commission to act on the Capital Improvements Plan in order to accept proffers. Mr. Coffield presented the highlights of the Capital Improvements Plan and the Operating Budget to the Commission. The proposed capital improvement budget for fiscal year 2006-2007 is

\$12,212,000. The entire five year budget for capital projects is \$95,085,000. Mr. Coffield stated that he would be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Byerly made a motion to recommend approval of the Capital Improvements Plan and Budget.

Mr. Shomo seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

STAFF REPORTS

A. CODE OF VIRGINIA – SECTION 15.2-2310

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

SUP 06-26 Paul B. Jerman

Mr. Bridge moved, seconded by Mr. Byerly, to recommend that since this property is located in a Community Development area slated for residential development that no outside storage be allowed on this property associated with the proposed business.

SUP 06-28 Milford M. Leach

Mr. Hite moved, seconded by Mr. Shomo, to recommend denial of the Special Use Permit. This property is located in a small lot subdivision and there doesn't appear to be a hardship to compliance with the Zoning Ordinance to warrant the granting of the Special Use Permit.

SUP 06-29 Philip L., Jr. and Jolene M. Swann

The Planning Commission is concerned about the visibility of this site from Interstate 81. Mr. Bridge moved, seconded by Mr. Byerly, to recommend that if allowed the storage containers must be screened from Interstate 81 view.

VAR 06-4 Daniel or Elvia R. Correa-Villegas

Mr. Curd moved, seconded by Mr. Hite, to encourage the Board of Zoning Appeals to uphold the front setback requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

VAR 06-5 Dana L. Blaine

Mr. Byerly moved, seconded by Mr. Bridge, to recommend denial of the variance. There doesn't appear to be a hardship to compliance with the Zoning Ordinance to warrant the granting of the variance to separate the barn from the house rather it appears to be just convenience.

* * * * *

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

Chairman

Secretary