

PRESENT: W.F. Hite, Chairman
J. Curd, Vice Chairman
K. Leonard
K. Shiflett
E. Shipplett
T.K. Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development
R.L. Earhart, Senior Planner

ABSENT: T. Cole
B. Garvey

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, November 8, 2011, at 4:30 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 rezonings and proposed ordinance amendments. The Planning Commission traveled to the following sites which will be considered by the Commission:

1. Overlook Land Company, LC – Amend and Restate Proffers
2. Barterbrook Investments Co., LLC - Rezoning

* * * * *

Chairman

Secretary

PRESENT: W.F. Hite, Chairman
J. Curd, Vice Chairman
K. Leonard
K. Shiflett
E. Shipplett
T.K. Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development
R.L. Earhart, Senior Planner
K.A.B. Hull, Associate Planner

ABSENT: T. Cole
B. Garvey

VIRGINIA: At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, November 8, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board 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. Curd moved to approve the minutes of the Joint Public Hearing on September 13, 2011 and the Called and Regular Meeting on September 13, 2011 as received.

Mr. Shipplett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

Overlook Land Company, LC – Amend and Restate Proffers

A request to amend and restate proffers on approximately 87 acres owned by Overlook Land Company, LC located on the west side of White Hill Road (Rt. 654) approximately 0.2 of a mile north of the intersection with Stuarts Draft Highway (Rt. 340) in Stuarts Draft in the Riverheads District.

Mrs. Earhart explained the request to amend the proffers. She stated the applicant submitted the following revised proffers:

1. In Phase 2 and all future Phases of Overlook Subdivision, all homes shall have a minimum square footage of at least 1200 square feet. The square footage limit shall be exclusive of porches, garages and unfinished basements.
2. All new streets will be constructed with curb, guttering and sidewalks on at least one side of the street, with the exception of the northern entrance where no new lot will front as shown on the Overlook Conceptual Plat as prepared by Countryside Development Company, LC dated December 17, 2009.
3. Access will be provided to the multi-family zoned portion of this property.
4. No more than 151 single family dwellings will be constructed on the 87 acre tract.
5. Access to this property will be limited to no more than two (2) subdivision street connections. There will be no direct lot access to White Hill Road (Rt. 654).
6. A minimum of 25 acres of open space/common area will be developed; within the common area, the Developer shall construct a play area and picnic shelter.
7. If street lights are installed in this subdivision, they will be installed, operated and maintained at the sole expense of the property owner's association and neither the County nor the Developer shall have any obligation for any costs related to such lights.

Mr. Shipplett stated that he is an employee and investor with Countryside Development, the applicant, and therefore had a conflict of interest with this request. He stated that he had filed a Conflict of Interest form with the County and would not be participating in the discussion or the vote on this request.

Paul Julian, Countryside Service Company, Overlook Land Company, 28 Imperial Drive, Staunton, agent for the request, briefed the Commission on the background of the project. He explained developers had met with Nancy Sorrells who recommended the 15% proffer with regard to minimum home size. He explained since development has started, there has been some difficulty with this requirement. He explained to change the square footage of the homes a deed has to be filed with the Circuit Court and noted this has happened on two occasions. He explained this procedure causes a delay and in today's market, "time is of the essence". He gave an example of a contract on a lot where they are not able to put the house they wanted on the lot due to these restrictions in which a new deed has to be filed with the courthouse "switching out" this lot with another to compensate for the change. He explained while it is possible to make these changes now, there is a delay with filing the documentation with the court and it is an "administrative nightmare". Mr. Julian stated the reason for the request is to allow for more flexibility within the development. He stated if approved, diverse types of housing will be marketed, however, with current economic conditions, 1,400-1,600 square foot homes is the current market. Mr. Julian concluded they have met with Nancy Sorrells who supports this amendment.

Mr. Leonard stated it appears 45% of the lots in the development require a designation. He questioned if the remaining 55% of the development do not require a designation for square footage.

Mr. Julian answered yes. He explained those lots are “non-designated” lots where a customer could build any size home. He stated however development has not “really started” in Phase III of the development. Mr. Julian stated the lots in Phase III have gorgeous views and buyers may be unable to put the size house they desire on those lots without having to go through the administrative process. He noted the market will dictate the size of the homes within the development.

Mr. Leonard asked Mr. Julian if there was more interest in the 45% portion of the designated lots versus the 55% of the non-designated lots within the development.

Mr. Julian replied the purpose is to make it a more “simplistic” process that is more customer friendly. He again provided the example of a client that has a contract on a lot they want to build on, but they are not able to build the type of house they want to build without having to file the required documents at the courthouse.

Mr. Leonard asked if the property owner goes through the procedure with filing the documentation, they can then build the type of house they prefer on that lot.

Mr. Julian answered yes however it would entail delay and the process is “cumbersome and awkward”. He stated he has not seen this type of restriction before in any development and he is “not sure the reasoning” for this type of restriction especially when the developer is going to continue to build the types of houses that he has provided in the examples to the Commission. He stated, “We are not going to go and build 165 more 1,200 square foot homes”.

Mr. Leonard stated, “How are we going to know that”?

Mr. Julian replied, “The market is not going to dictate that”. He stated there are currently four homes under construction, two are 1,200 square feet and two are in the 1,400-1,600 square foot range.

Mr. Hite asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request. There being none, Mr. Hite asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

William Ayres, 1690 White Hill Road, stated he lives across from the apartment complex and was told during the beginning stages of development, he would only see the retaining pond. He stated he is concerned with traffic entering and exiting the development. Mr. Ayres also noted concern with the entrance to the development off of White Hill Road and noted issues with the traffic study. Other concerns he noted were problems with the retaining pond and concern with the 1,200 square foot homes reducing his property values.

Jim Roark, 1732 White Hill Road, Stuarts Draft, voiced concern with the entrance to the development on Route 340. He stated he is concerned with the number of homes in the development and stated the developer is doing a poor job with constructing the homes with regard to trash, etc. He asked that the Planning Commission deny the request and not downgrade the development from what was approved.

Mrs. Earhart stated staff has received a letter addressed to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors from Richard Miller. She read the letter as follows:

“To the Augusta County Planning Commission and Augusta County Board of Supervisors:

This letter is in response to the October 25, 2011 notice we received regarding Overlook Land Company’s request to Amend and Restate proffers on the 87 acres off the White Hill Road (Rt. 654) in Stuarts Draft. While I am one of the least affected landowners, having purchased some buffer land years ago, the statements and opinions enclosed also represent the feelings of several of my neighbors.

I feel this proposed change should be categorically denied. At the initial hearings regarding the originally proposed plan by Overlook, both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors down played any concerns mentioned by adjacent property owners and neighbors stating that this was a great plan and a very reasonable developer and this would be compatible and “fit right in” with the neighborhood. Also you cited the diversity of housing as a strong point. Now we are asked to accept a proposal that allows all housing to be 1,200 square feet if the developer so chooses. This is a considerable down size from the original plan.

Observing the way the start up from this development has gone so far, I have reason to believe that Overlook will do the minimum required without regard to the existing neighbors.

1. These 4-story apartments, although technically built under a separate proposal request are unbelievably close to the Eavers Home and to a very busy White Hill Road, not exactly compatible with the neighborhood.
2. A very limited entrance size, poorly designed turn off lane and a very narrow main drive all indicate that there is lack of consideration for safety or convenience.
3. The start up of this Development pales in comparison to the Stone Valley Development currently being developed in Stuarts Draft, which has similar goals but has actually carried them out. They have a very wide main drive, well-appointed modest houses and the town houses are well away from the existing neighbors and Stuarts Draft Highway.
4. To date I have not heard one positive comment about this development. Many negative comments were made about the 4-story apartment buildings that are right on top of the existing neighbor’s homes and very close to the road. Also

many people have well-intentioned concerns about the poor entrance design and traffic dangers on this busy White Hill Road.

Thus I see no reason to now allow Overlook the option to down size the housing square footage which will most likely be done to the fullest extent, based on their present track record.”

Richard B. Miller
11/01/11

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

Mr. Julian stated for the record that Overlook Land Company is not the developer of the multifamily apartment complex known as Montague Terrace. With regard to the parking issue along Route 340, Mr. Julian noted he has contacted VDOT who has contacted the Virginia State Police and noted the issue will be enforced. With regard to the mosquito problem, Mr. Julian stated that issue can be taken care of with chemicals being placed in the holding pond. With regard to the entrance to the development and traffic concerns, Mr. Julian concluded those issues have been addressed with VDOT.

Mrs. Shiflett stated under the current proffers, the mixture of homes within the development has been successful. She stated if the proffers are amended, there will be no guarantee of a mixture of sizes of homes. She is concerned with amending the minimum home size to 1,200 square feet. While she does understand the current process is cumbersome she stated she has concerns that amending the proffers will not allow for a variety of housing sizes.

Mr. Curd stated agreement with Mrs. Shiflett. He clarified the apartment development was rezoned to Multi-Family Residential in the 1980's and they are being constructed by a different developer than what is before the Commission tonight. He stated the request by Overlook Land is only to amend the proffers. Mr. Curd explained the request is to change one proffer regarding “at least 15% of the homes in this phase must have a minimum square footage of at least 1,400 square feet but less than 1,600 square feet of living space and at least 15% of the homes shall have a minimum square footage of at least 1,600 square feet of living space”. He stated the existing proffer will apply to Phase I of the development as this phase is complete. The request to amend the proffer regarding minimum square footage will apply to Phases II and III. Mr. Curd stated the current market has been more than 1,200 square feet. He stated he understands the applicant's request in making the process of development more “customer friendly” and while it is a market driven industry, there is no guarantee that all the homes built will not be the minimum 1,200 square feet. He moved to recommend denial of the request.

Mr. Leonard seconded the motion that carried on a 4-0 vote with Mr. Shiplett abstaining.

Barterbrook Investment Company, LLC

A request to rezone a total of approximately 86.47 acres from General Agriculture and Multi-Family Residential to Single Family Residential with proffers (approximately 9.36 acres), Attached Residential with proffers (approximately 34.96 acres), Multi-Family Residential with proffers (approximately 25 acres), and Single Family Residential with proffers (approximately 17.13 acres) owned by Barterbrook Investment Co., LLC located on the west side of Barterbrook Road (Rt. 635) approximately one mile south of the intersection with Lee Jackson Highway (Rt. 11) in Staunton in the Beverley Manor District.

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

1. The existing brick/stone structure (possible spring house) shall be retained as depicted on Rezoning Exhibit A prepared by Segars Engineering dated 10/04/2011. The structure and wetlands and areas reserved as open space shall be maintained by an established Property Owners Association or the developer and his successors or assigns and all associated documents submitted and reviewed by the County Attorney.
2. Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) improvements as depicted in the VDOT Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) of Vista Ridge dated 9-23-2011 and prepared by Segars and Associates. All traffic improvements shall be bonded or constructed prior the issuance of the first building permit. The following shall be completed prior to the first Certificate of Occupancy.
 - a. Construct right turn lane(s) along Barterbrook Road at any main road connection(s) from Barterbrook Road to the property. As described in number 8.a.ii on page 60 of the TIA.
 - b. Construct a 4 ½" pavement overlay of SM-9.5 asphalt over the existing pavement width of Barterbrook Road from Frontage Road 217 to the end of the pavement improvements at the intersection of Frontier Road and Barterbrook Road.
 - c. Provide for a 2' paved bike lane/shoulder on each side of Barterbrook Road from Frontage Road 217 to the intersection of Barterbrook Road and Frontier Drive. All traffic improvements shall be bonded or constructed prior the issuance of the first building permit. The following improvement shall be completed prior to the Certificate of Occupancy for the 350th unit.
 - d. Construct a right turn lane on Barterbrook Road at its intersection with Frontier Road (southeast corner only). As described in number 8.a.i on page 60 of the TIA.
3. There shall be no individual lot entrances off of Barterbrook Road (Route 635).

4. Building height shall not exceed 4 story in the Multi-Family zoned portion labeled Land Bay 3 depicted on Rezoning Exhibit A prepared by Segars Engineering dated 10/04/2011.
5. No mobile (or manufactured) homes will be placed on this property.
6. A sidewalk and/or trail system will be provided consistent with VDOT, AASHTO and ADA standards at a minimum of one side of any interior road throughout the development.
7. There shall be no more than 7 units to a structure in the Attached Residential zoned portion labeled Land Bay 2 depicted on the Rezoning Exhibit A prepared by Segars Engineering dated 10/04/2011.
8. Within the Attached Residential zoned parcel there should be varying facades and distances from the road to individual facades within a given set of attached building.
9. All parcels located in the Attached Residential zoned portion labeled Land Bay 2 depicted on the Rezoning Exhibit A prepared by Segars Engineering dated 10/04/2011 shall have individual driveways.
10. Prior to the approval of a building permit for additional units in each consecutive phase the cumulative minimum number of Single Family, Attached Residential, and Multi-Family Residential units in the phase prior will be completed before start of the next phase. A maximum of 400 Multi-Family units and 270 Attached Residential units may be constructed. The following phasing limits shall be in effect for 10 years after approval of the rezoning.

	Phase 1		Phase 2		Phase 3		Phase 4		Total
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	
Single Family	10	20	20	50	30	70	40	85	85
Attached Residential	30	70	50	120	70	200	120	270	270
Multi-Family Residential	100	200	100	200	200	300	200	400	400
									755

David S. Rudiger, President, Boyd Homes Corporation, 544 Newtown Road, Virginia Beach, briefed the Commission on the background of their company. He stated Boyd Homes is a diverse family owned company with developments in Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, and the US Virgin Islands. He addressed staff's concerns. He stated staff was concerned with the phasing requirements being difficult to enforce. Mr. Rudiger explained phasing is based on a proposal from planning with ranges, rather than fixed numbers and will be tied to building permits. Another concern Mr. Rudiger stated from staff was concern regarding the Fire Department's ladder truck limitations of one hundred feet. He responded the apartments in the development are limited to four

stories. Another concern he explained from staff was regarding emergency access which can be resolved during site plan review and he does not object to a proffer requiring adequate fire lanes. He also noted VDOT comments are all being addressed. With regard to the concern for school capacity, Mr. Rudiger responded the 25 acres of property already zoned Multi-Family Residential would allow for up to 700 households. He explained this plan limits the total to 755 and provides phasing to soften the impact. Mr. Rudiger stated multi-family units have a lower impact on schools per unit than single family. Concerning exceeding the Comprehensive Plan density, Mr. Rudiger stated this plan lowers the total units from the Comp Plan. He stated the existing Multi-Family Residential zoning permits 700 units and the remaining 61.47 acres supports 492 units at 8 units per acre. Mr. Rudiger explained rezoning 61.47 acres would result in 1,192 units. He stated the Multi-Family Residential rezoning of the property is included only at the request of staff. He stated Multi-Family Residential density has been proffered at 400 units (-300) and the Attached Residential and Single Family Residential are proffered at 355 units (-137). Other concerns raised by staff Mr. Rudiger explained include the phasing plan being difficult to administer. He replied having an exact balance throughout the project is not feasible and the current market forces will have an influence. Another concern regarding the phasing plan is that it expires after 10 years. He stated at some point successful portions of the project cannot be delayed due to lack of demand for other portions. He noted he does not have an issue with changing the proffer regarding the limits of the single family units. Mr. Rudiger explained staff was concerned with not having a variety of housing styles. He explained it would not make sense to build townhomes on the Multi-Family Residential parcel because the number of units would be reduced. He explained he has offered a proffer that the appearance of dwellings in the Attached Residential zoned portion would be clearly different from those in the Multi-Family Residential zoned portion. He stated individual driveways have been proffered and an example provided in the presentation that includes varying facades and distances from the street. Mr. Rudiger concluded with regard to the old brick structure and common areas/POA it has been proffered that the structure shall be retained and maintained with documents acceptable to the County Attorney and issues can be resolved in that process. He noted giving a firm time for transfer can result in the POA being burdened with expenses before it can afford them and the proffers create clear goals with flexible means.

Mr. Shipplett questioned Mr. Rudiger's comment pertaining to the change in location of the Multi-Family Residential portion of the development as it was a request from staff.

Mr. Rudiger answered yes.

Mr. Shipplett asked Mr. Rudiger for a hard copy of the presentation. He asked if there were any drawings or plats available at this time for review.

Mr. Rudiger replied not at this time. He explained it is a fairly large project and would require a large engineering bill to do the plans. He stated they do not want to incur that cost unless they have the approval first.

Mr. Curd asked if Boyd Homes builds the homes and if they use their own labor or local resources for the development and what percentage of the source is local.

Mr. Rudiger answered Boyd Homes uses local labor sources. He explained a local supervisor would be hired with the project manager being located in Richmond. Subcontractors would then be hired for drywall, etc. He stated the percentage would essentially be 100%.

Mr. Curd asked if the building materials used for construction came from a local supplier.

Mr. Rudiger stated yes they work with local supply houses such as Lowes and Contractor's Yard.

Mr. Curd asked if there was a designated percentage of common area or open space.

Mr. Rudiger stated they do not have the figures at this time.

Mr. Curd asked about plans for recreation within the development.

Mr. Rudiger responded there is adequate property within the development for such plans however the development is market driven and while there are no definite plans at this time, common areas and amenities are intended.

Mr. Curd asked if there were plans for the layout of the internal roads or trail system.

Mr. Rudiger stated developers are working with VDOT regarding the proposed road realignment and connectivity. He stated the development will have two major points of connection and they proffered a trail system that goes through the property.

Mr. Hite questioned if phasing was included as part of the proffers.

Mr. Rudiger answered yes.

Mr. Leonard asked the developer if they were willing to proffer a solution to address Fire and Rescue's concern regarding layout and street design.

Mr. Rudiger stated it is his understanding that will be addressed during the site plan approval process. He stated he feels it is "not necessary to be proffered, but to the extent that it is necessary, we have no objection to Fire and Rescue having input during the site plan approval process".

Mrs. Earhart stated it will be necessary during the process because Fire and Rescue cannot require 360° access to all the buildings.

Mr. Rudiger stated he does not necessarily want 360° access to all buildings and that is “not common”. He stated he does not have objection to Fire and Rescue being a party to the site plan review process, but he does not want to commit as it would render an unattractive site plan that would include a road through the center of every building. He explained the plan is to have green space between the buildings that would provide access, but he does not want to commit to a road between every building.

Mr. Leonard asked a time frame for development.

Mr. Rudiger stated he would like to move forward with engineering plans once approved assuming the design phase would take approximately one year.

Mrs. Shiflett explained as a member of the Comprehensive Plan Committee, the vision for planned residential is to have more mixed housing types. She asked the reason for separating the different zoning types.

Mr. Rudiger answered there are certainly different approaches however this type of development is one that they are more familiar with and has proven to be successful.

Mr. Shipplett asked if it were their intent to develop all three sections.

Mr. Rudiger answered yes.

Mr. Hite asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request.

Houston “Jack” Todd, 1626 Barterbrook Road, Staunton, stated he has reviewed the plans with Mr. Fitzgerald and is aware that in time this area is going to be developed. He stated he has researched Boyd Homes and has spoken with the developer and they have assured him this development will not be “low income” or “tax subsidized”. Mr. Todd further questioned what happens if the development goes bankrupt and asked what happens to the phasing after ten years.

Mr. Hite asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the request.

Herbert Godschalk, 1739 Barterbrook Road, Staunton, stated concern with the impact the number of homes will have on the County’s infrastructure. He stated Barterbrook Road cannot afford the increased traffic. Mr. Godschalk also noted concern with storm runoff from the development into Christians Creek. He asked the Commission to consider a different design with fewer homes.

Christine Macciolo, 1718 Barterbrook Road, Staunton, stated she moved here from Virginia Beach to get away from development. She noted being from Virginia Beach, she is familiar with the developers and stated it does not make sense the number of apartment units they are proposing to build. She stated there are plenty of Multi-Family Residential projects in the area to serve the market and noted 750 units is too much.

William Maury, Karman Hill Farms, LLC expressed several concerns including water runoff from the development and the entrance being located off of a frontage road which he uses to access his farm. He further stated disagreement with the traffic plan results stating the majority of the traffic from the development will be using Frontier Drive. Mr. Maury stated he feels that to be inaccurate as the majority of the traffic from the development will be traveling east to Route 608 to access Augusta Health and Stuarts Draft.

Mrs. Earhart read the following emails that were received by staff:

“I am opposed to the housing project proposed by Barterbrook Investment Co., LLC.

- I question the need for adding 700 plus new homes (1,500 plus more automobiles) to rural roads and the increase in automobile traffic that it will provoke. I question whether the roads can gracefully support it.
- I would much rather support the renovation of the current housing stock in town that seems to need renovation in our community.
- I am opposed to re-zoning land that is designated for agriculture and turning it into another housing development. I think we need more farms.
- I fear that suburban sprawl will have a negative impact on tourism in our area.
- I would question the demographics of the client base the developer plans to market too. Where are the folks going to work? Is there a job market to support this development?
- My personal selfish reason: I moved to Staunton from Philadelphia to get away from urban sprawl and development and chose my property (along Barterbrook Road) because it was an agriculture zoned area and I felt confident that it would remain that way so that I could enjoy country life during my retirement.”

Gil Nova
201 Mc Combs Mill Lane
Staunton, VA 24401

“Dear Becky,

I am opposed to the proposed land development on Barterbrook Rd. This project raises several questions and issues that need to be addressed.

1. Has there been a demonstrated need for such development? Or is this speculation building? Where will these people work?
2. There is significant housing within Staunton needing renovation, rather than destroying green space in favor of more impervious surfaces. We need to support the growth of local agriculture rather than suburban sprawl.
3. What will be the impact on the public school system?
4. Are the utilities set up to cope with this many new homes?

5. There will be significant impact on the roads in place both during construction and after the homes are filled with 2+ cars each.

I have recently bought property off Barterbrook Rd., so feel this potential project will directly impact my life negatively. I want to see Staunton be a vibrant city, but that will happen within the city, not in suburbia. There are plenty of projects that could be addressed for the betterment of the community, rather than lining the pockets of a few. Just because it might be possible to change the zoning from agriculture to residential does not mean it is the right thing to do. Progress does not always look like new housing starts; new jobs are possible without new housing starts.....renewal is good.”

Nancy Stevenson

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

Mr. Rudiger responded, with regard to stormwater, excess stormwater will be required to be stored on site. He explained having Single Family Residential and Multi-Family Residential adjacent to this property is an example of “Smart Growth”. He stated the concept is modest, conservative, and reasonable. Mr. Rudiger stated in today’s market, people are moving into apartments because they are unable to afford single family homes. He stated the vacancy rate for multi-family facilities in this area is low and concluded he is not looking for any type of tax credit or subsidized housing for this development.

Mrs. Shiflett asked with regard to the two possible entrance locations, where is the property’s future entrance at build out.

Mr. Rudiger stated there will be two points of connection and VDOT has several proposals, but it appears it will be in “loop fashion”.

Mrs. Shiflett stated concern with Fire and Rescue’s comments. She explained without the proffer, the issue cannot be addressed at site plan stage. She stated there is only one 100 ft. ladder truck in the entire County and the safety of the citizens in the County cannot be compromised without these comments being addressed. Mrs. Shiflett also asked if there is a minimum square footage requirement for the Single Family or Attached Residential portions of the development.

Mr. Rudiger stated no minimum square footage requirement has been proposed in the Single Family Residential portion of the development. He noted this is the first time it has been mentioned therefore it has not been considered at this time. He explained the plan is for each unit to be sold and under the zoning ordinance, each is required to be on its own individual lot. He stated the apartment units will have sprinkler systems.

Mrs. Shiflett stated she understands the units will be sprinkled, but the issue with the ladder truck remains. With regard to the 700 apartments already approved, Mrs. Shiflett stated they cannot be built because there is no access. She stated the purpose for the

rezoning is to have access to the apartments. She stated concern with Fire Rescue comments not being addressed, the phasing portion of the proffers, she explained they should be something that staff can enforce and asked if there was a concept or sketch plan available for review. She reiterated this is a “huge” project for the County.

Mr. Shipplett asked if a concept plan can be provided.

Mr. Rudiger answered yes but it will not have the technical analysis.

Mr. Shipplett noted this is a large project and stated a sketch plan would be beneficial.

Mr. Rudiger stated a sketch plan will be provided. He stated he envisions it as two 200+ unit apartment project with a loop road.

Mr. Shipplett questioned the location of the apartments and placement of the Single Family Residential portion of the development as a request by staff. He indicated he thought the apartments would be better suited with the rest of the apartments.

Mr. Rudiger responded it was initially believed that location would be the less desirable with it being located near the interstate however he stated, “We are ok with that either way”.

Mr. Curd stated this is the last large undeveloped piece of property in the area and development is inevitable and it is just a matter of time. He stated he shares the same concerns as Mrs. Shiflett. He stated the project is “too dense” with no essential cap on the multifamily portion of the development and not enough single family homes. With regard to the proffer concerning phasing limits being in effect for 10 years after approval of the rezoning, he questioned what would happen when the proffers expire in ten years with the “cap out the window”. He also noted the same concern with Fire Rescue comments not being addressed. Mr. Curd also opined while the pictures of other developments are nice, they are only examples and are no guarantee. Other concerns Mr. Curd stated are the strain the development will have on the school system which is already at capacity as well the County’s other infrastructure. He noted he is not opposed to the development and likes the idea of the developers using local labor and suppliers however there are too many unanswered questions at this time. Mr. Curd moved to table the request for 60 days to allow time for the developer to provide staff with a concept plan of the development and address the concerns of staff including more blending of the units as he stated he is looking for a “community”.

Mrs. Shiflett seconded the motion.

Mr. Shipplett stated he is not opposed to the development but he agrees with Mr. Curd as there are too many unanswered questions at this time and agrees submittal of a concept plan would be beneficial. He also noted the possibility of proffering a minimum square footage on the homes in the Single Family Residential portion of the development.

The motion carried unanimously.

Greenville Urban Service Area

A request to amend the Comprehensive Plan of Augusta County by enlarging the Greenville Urban Service Area in the Riverheads District.

Mrs. Hull explained the request. She stated the request is to change approximately 331 acres from Community Development to Urban Service Area in the Village of Greenville along the Route 11 Corridor. Mrs. Hull further stated the request also includes adding a new category, Village Mixed Use, to the future land uses. She explained the category is defined as, "Providing for the adaptive reuse of existing structures, as well as infill development conforming to the existing or historic development pattern in the community. Expansions of the existing villages should also be supported. The county should explore the feasibility of establishing new zoning districts for use in these communities which will allow a mixture of business and residential uses and support the revitalization of the historic village core". Mrs. Hull explained the reason for the request was sewer being brought to the Greenville area. She stated the Comprehensive Plan states areas with public water and sewer should typically be Urban Service Areas. Mrs. Hull explained existing Future Land Uses include Low Density Residential, Business, Urban Open Space, Public Use, and Floodplain. She stated the Proposed Amended Future Land Uses are to include Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, Business, Neighborhood Mixed Use, Village Mixed Use, Urban Open Space, Public Use, and Floodplain.

Mr. Hite asked if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor or opposition to the request.

Otha Adams, Jr., 3898 Lee Jackson Highway, Staunton, stated he is concerned enlarging the Urban Service Area to encompass his property will increase his property taxes.

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

Mrs. Hull clarified this is not a rezoning but an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and invited Mr. Adams to stay after the meeting was adjourned to discuss whether his property would be affected by this change.

Mrs. Shiflett stated she feels Greenville is delighted to have sewer service in the area and by adopting the district this will "clean up" the Comprehensive Plan. She stated she is in support of the request.

Mr. Leonard agreed with Mrs. Shiflett. He moved to recommend approval of the amendment.

Mrs. Shiflett seconded the motion that carried unanimously.

* * * * *

NEW BUSINESS

Inclement Weather Ordinance

Mr. Leonard moved to recommend approval of the following ordinance.

WHEREAS, § 15.2-2214 of the Code of Virginia (1950), as amended, authorizes the Augusta County Planning Commission to fix a schedule of regular meetings.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission now desires to establish its schedule for regular meetings during calendar year 2012.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE AUGUSTA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. The Planning Commission shall hold regular meetings during calendar year 2012, in the Board Meeting Room at the Augusta County Government Center, on the dates and at the times set forth below:

January 10, 2012	7:00 p.m.
February 14, 2012	7:00 p.m.
March 13, 2012	7:00 p.m.
April 10, 2012	7:00 p.m.
May 8, 2012	7:00 p.m.
June 12, 2012	7:00 p.m.
July 10, 2012	7:00 p.m.
August 14, 2012	7:00 p.m.
September 11, 2012	7:00 p.m.
October 9, 2012	7:00 p.m.
November 13, 2012	7:00 p.m.

2. In the event the Chairman of the Planning Commission, or the Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission, if the Chairman is unable to act, finds and declares that weather or other conditions are such that it is hazardous for members of the Planning Commission to attend a meeting, such meeting shall be continued to the next Tuesday. Such finding and declaration shall be communicated to the members of the Planning Commission and the press as promptly as possible. All hearings and other matters previously advertised shall be conducted at the continued meeting and no further advertisement is required.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be adopted by the Commission and recorded in its minutes.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

Nominating Committee

Mr. Hite appointed Kitra Shiflett, Becky Earhart and himself to the nominating committee.

* * * * *

STAFF REPORTS

A. CODE OF VIRGINIA – SECTION 15.2-2310

Mrs. Earhart reviewed with the Commission the requests coming before the BZA.

Mr. Hite asked if there were any comments regarding the upcoming items on the BZA agenda.

The Planning Commission took no action on the BZA items.

* * * * *

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

* * * * *

Chairman

Secretary