

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORKSESSION MINUTES
APRIL 3, 2007
4:00 p.m.**

PRESENT: J. Curd, Chairman
S.N. Bridge, Vice-Chairman
W. F. Hite
T. H. Byerly
K. A. Shiflett
J. Shomo
J. D. Tilghman

STAFF: Dale Cobb, Director of Community Development
Becky Earhart, Senior Planner
Jeremy Sharp, Associate Planner
Beatrice B. Cardellicchio-Weber, Administrative Secretary

Mr. Curd called the April 3, 2007 Worksession to order.

Ms. Earhart stated that staff felt the joint public hearing went smoothly and she was surprised by the lack of comments at the meeting. She stated that there were not a lot of comments sent in by mail either. She stated that they should be able to address all of the items on the agenda tonight so that the Commissioners will not have to meet on Thursday, April 5, 2007.

Core Comprehensive Plan Assumptions

Mr. Sharp handed out a memo to the Commissioners and indicated he had also given it to the Board of Supervisors. He stated that the first table was a breakdown of the acreages in the Planning Policy Areas from the 1994 Comprehensive Plan and the latest version of the Draft Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the memo includes an explanation on how to interpret this information. He stated that it is important to understand that there are a smaller number of Policy Areas in the new Plan, meaning it is not possible to compare the maps directly. He stated that the second table shows how the Urban Service Areas are broken down by future land uses within the different communities.

Mr. Sharp stated that when the Steering Committee first started updating the Planning Policy Area Map, they did not look at the 1994 Comprehensive Planning Policy Area map. He stated that they drew the map from scratch. He stated that they completed the map in two stages. He stated that if the parcel had water and sewer within 450 feet, it was placed in the Urban Service Area. He stated that if the parcel had only water or sewer within 450 feet, it was placed in the Community Development Area. He stated that this was all done in GIS.

He stated that this provided a base map which was then refined to make the lines more logical. He stated that the remaining parcels were placed in either the Rural or Agricultural Conservation Areas. He stated that they tried a number of formulas to determine which parcels were to be placed in which area. He stated that these formulas considered factors like parcel size, soils, road access, etc. He stated that the initial version was based largely on soils. He stated that some of the most productive agricultural areas have poor soils, making those areas Rural Conservation Areas rather than Agricultural Conservation Areas. He stated that because of this the Steering Committee ultimately removed soils from the formula. He stated that the Steering Committee decided to use parcel size as the largest factor in the formula. He stated that the bigger parcels were placed in the Agricultural Conservation Areas.

Ms. Shiflett stated the soil information did not translate well, that parcels have multiple types of soils in the same parcel.

Mr. Sharp stated that the Steering Committee looked at forty to sixty map change requests from citizens. He stated that after they looked at these map change requests, some of the boundaries were changed quite a bit. He stated that following the public meetings more changes were made. He stated that a lot of land was removed from the Rural Conservation Areas. He stated that all of the land in the Urban Service and Community Development Areas has a Future Land Use Designation on the Future Land Use Map. He stated that development of the Future Land Use Map was not as technical. He stated that staff used the existing land use and zoning as main factors of the Future Land Use Map and that the map was developed in a Steering Committee worksession rather than by the GIS. He stated that the Future Land Use map was also modified by the map change requests.

Ms. Earhart stated that many of the citizens stated that there is too much red on the maps. She stated that the County needs to make a choice as to what kind of development will occur. She stated that the development can occur with higher densities on public sewer or on alternative septic systems with lower densities. She stated that the Steering Committee struggled with areas along the Route 340 corridor from Waynesboro to Stuarts Draft. She stated that on the 1994 Comprehensive Plan map those areas were already in a development area, a mix of Community Development Area, Potential Urban Service Area, and Potential Community Development Area. She stated that if the Commissioners would like to view any of the requests, let staff know and they can arrange that for Tuesday, April 10, 2007.

Mr. Curd stated that there are no Urban Open Space areas in Fishersville.

Mr. Sharp stated that the Urban Open Space was mapped based on the location of existing conservation easements and other types of permanent open space. He stated that areas anticipated for such uses were not mapped.

Ms. Earhart stated that may be accomplished through the small area plans.

Mr. Sharp stated that the Urban Open Space designation was added at the end of the Steering Committee process as a way to encourage open space preservation in the development areas.

Ms. Tilghman stated that Urban Open Space does not necessarily mean that it is public land.

Mr. Sharp stated that the ones designated on the map are the conservation easements that are perpetual not temporary or park land. He indicated a policy has also been added to allow conservation easements in the development areas. He stated that the applicant still needs to get approval from the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for these easements.

Mapping Requests

Mr. Cobb stated that if the Commissioners are not comfortable making a decision on these requests, staff can arrange for them to be viewed next Tuesday, April 10, 2007.

Mr. Sharp introduced the first map change request, from the Shenandoah Valley Regional Airport Commission.

1. Shenandoah Valley Airport – TM#28-61A, 28-59A, 28-58A, 28-58 (portion), and 28-39
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Urban Service Area
Requesting Future Land Use: Public Use

Mr. Sharp stated that the Airport Commission felt that their property, which is zoned Airport Business, should be in the Urban Service Area. He stated that the Airport Commission argued that the uses that may be required on these properties would not be compatible with the Agricultural Conservation Area. He stated that these parcels were in the Urban Service Area on the January draft maps but were removed by the Steering Committee after the public meetings.

Mr. Hite asked what the reason was behind the Steering Committee changing this property from Urban Service Area to Agricultural Conservation Area.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the committee wanted a cleaner edge to the development area and indicated the airport would still be protected. She stated that the airport does not want to have any residential property near them.

Mr. Sharp stated that the airport believes that their use of the property is not compatible with the description of the Agricultural Conservation Area.

Mr. Hite stated that it makes sense to change the request back to an Urban Service Area – Public Use.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the Commissioners may want to look at map change request number two at the same time because it relates to the airport request.

2. Gary Blosser – TM#28-15, 28-17, and 28-18
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Urban Service Area
Requesting Future Land Use: Industrial

Mr. Sharp explained the request and stated that Mr. Blosser believes that the best protection for the airport is industrial and that he wants all of his land near the airport designated for industrial.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the airport believes the best protection for the airport would be either industrial or agriculture. She stated that they do not want to have residential property near the airport.

Ms. Tilghman stated that residential property would be a threat to the airport.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the Blosser property is near an Agricultural Forestal District.

Mr. Byerly stated that if the Commissioners do not take any action now, then the property owner could file a formal request for a Comprehensive Plan amendment later.

Ms. Earhart stated that the property will come before the Planning Commission as a rezoning because the land is not zoned already. She stated that if the property is in an Agricultural Conservation Area, the chance of a rezoning would be very slim.

Mr. Curd stated that it makes sense to put both of these requests in the Urban Service Area.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the next three map change requests, numbers three, four, and five, will be impacted by this decision as well.

3. Kevin Fletcher (requesting for other property owners) - Land around TM#28-8A
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Urban Service Area
Future Land Use (2/21/07): Mixed Use
Requesting Future Land Use: Low Density Residential

4. Rubush Family – TM#27-151A
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Urban Service Area
Future Land Use (2/21/07): Mixed Use
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area

Rubush Family – TM#27-151C
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Urban Service Area
Future Land Use (2/21/07): Mixed Use
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area

Rubush Family – TM#27-153
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area

Rubush Family – TM#27-143
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area
5. David McCaskey – TM#27-149B and 27-150
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Urban Service Area
Future Land Use (2/21/07): Mixed Use
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area

Ms. Earhart stated that Mixed Use would be the best for request number three since the owner wants to ensure compatibility with his property. She stated that staff, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors would see what the applicant plans on doing. She stated that the Comprehensive Plan does not change the zoning of the property. She stated that it is only a guide as to what is the most appropriate use for the property.

Mr. Sharp stated that the proposed extension of Triangle Drive would be located in the area of requests four and five. He stated that it would be best for these properties to be in the Urban Service Area with a Mixed Use designation so that the location of Triangle Drive could be secured.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the airport is already zoned Airport Business. She stated that if it is kept in an Agricultural Conservation Area, it would be misleading the public. She stated that the airport should be in the Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation as Public Use.

Mr. Byerly, Mr. Bridge, Mr. Hite, and Mr. Curd agreed.

Mr. Curd stated that Mr. Blosser's request should also be placed in the Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation as Industrial.

Ms. Shiflett stated that she disagrees.

Ms. Tilghman stated that she agrees with Mr. Curd. She stated that the Rubush and the McCaskey property should remain the same as it is on the 2/21/07 map.

Ms. Earhart stated that if someone were to build Triangle Drive it would be more cost effective to have property on both sides of the road available for development, if and when the road is built.

Mr. Curd stated map change requests one through five should be in the Urban Service Area.

Ms. Shiflett disagreed. She stated that that numbers two and four should not be put in the Urban Service Area. She stated that they should not put any more land in the Urban Service Area. She stated that they should leave what they have.

Ms. Tilghman stated that Mr. McCaskey should be in the Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation as Mixed Use.

Mr. Bridge stated that he agrees. He stated that request number three should be left in the Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation of Mixed Use.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the Rubush Family requests should be left as they are on the 2/21/07 maps.

Ms. Shiflett stated that she agrees.

Mr. Hite stated that Mr. Blosser's property should be changed to the Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation as Industrial.

Mr. Bridge, Mr. Byerly, and Mr. Curd agreed with the change to the Urban Service Area with Ms. Shiflett being opposed.

6. Shenandoah Valley Railroad requesting for other property owners –
TM#27-93 and 27-113
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Urban Service Area

Mr. Sharp introduced the request and indicated that the Railroad is requesting that property along their lines be kept available for potential rail-related uses. He stated that the area was designated Urban Service Area – Mixed Use on the January draft maps which could permit such uses.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the Steering Committee changed this area to Agricultural Conservation Area so that they would have a break in the Urban Service Area on Route 11.

Ms. Earhart stated that typically if the property is in the Agricultural Conservation Area staff can tell a farmer who is looking to invest in a farm the County has no intention of developing around it. She stated that parcels in the Agricultural Conservation Areas are being protected from development. She stated that this property would be surrounded by development and would not be a good place for a farmer to invest. She stated that in the Urban Service Area, the land can be protected by a conservation easement with the Urban Open Space designation.

Mr. Curd stated that the property should be in the Urban Service Area.

Ms. Shiflett stated that citizens wanted gaps along Route 11 in order to form communities and villages and the Steering Committee responded that way. She stated that they will be criticized for adding more Urban Service Area to the map.

Mr. Byerly stated that the Commissioners need to look at the big picture. He stated that if the infrastructure is there, then it is wise to be in the Urban Service Area.

Mr. Sharp stated that the property owners did not publicly comment on the map as it relates to their property.

Mr. Bridge stated that request number six should be changed to the Urban Service Area west to Route 11.

Mr. Byerly, Mr. Curd, Mr. Shomo, and Mr. Hite agreed with Ms. Shiflett and Ms. Tilghman being opposed.

Mr. Hite stated that staff should draw the line right on Route 11. He stated that the east side of Route 11 should be placed in the Urban Service Area.

7. Stephen Wine requesting for other property owners – TM#27-81
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Urban Service Area
Future Land Use (2/21/07): Medium Density Residential
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Rural Conservation Area

Mr. Sharp introduced the request and explained that Mr. Wine is requesting that his neighbor's property be removed from the Urban Service Area west of the peak of the hill that divides the property. He stated that the entire property is zoned residential.

Ms. Shiflett asked if the property was developed.

Ms. Earhart stated no. She stated that the entire parcel is zoned residential and if it is removed from the Urban Service Area the owner may be able to more

easily develop it because getting sewer service has been the biggest difficulty in developing.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the property should remain in the Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation of Medium Density Residential. She stated that the property owner did not make this request. The Commission agreed.

8. Gore Family – TM#36-92
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Urban Service/Rural Conservation Areas

Requesting Future Land Use: Medium Density Residential

Gore Family – TM#36-84
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Rural Conservation Area

Mr. Sharp introduced the request and explained that it is actually two separate requests, one for a property along Route 11 and another along the Middle River. He stated that the owners indicated a desire to develop the properties and a concern that designating them Agricultural Conservation Area would take away the value of the land. He stated that these properties were removed from the Urban Service Area and Rural Conservation Area by the Steering Committee after the public meetings in order to create another gap between the communities along Route 11 north of Staunton.

Ms. Earhart stated that a split between Urban Service Area and Rural Conservation Area does not cause as much conflict as would a split between Urban Service Area and Agricultural Conservation Area. She stated that if the Urban Service Area is put back to the way it was on the January draft then the Rural Conservation Area should be put back as well.

Ms. Shiflett stated that Rural Conservation Area would still be in conflict with Urban Service Area.

Ms. Earhart stated that with a rezoning the development could be transitioned to the back of the property with Rural Conservation Area. She stated that Agricultural Conservation Area calls for no development at all meaning the development would have to stop at the edge with less consideration for the neighboring agriculture.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the property has water and sewer. She stated that TM#36-92 for the Gore Family should be put back the way it was.

Mr. Curd asked where the Urban Service Area would stop.

Mr. Sharp stated just west of Route 11.

Mr. Shomo stated that the line should go all the way east to Interstate 81. He stated that the remainder of the property should be in the Rural Conservation Area.

Mr. Hite, Mr. Curd, Mr. Bridge, and Ms. Tilghman agreed.

Ms. Earhart stated that there could be a problem accessing TM#36-84.

Ms. Tilghman stated that it should be left in the Agricultural Conservation Area.

The Commission agreed.

9. Solutions Way – TM#68-48
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Rural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Urban Service Area
Requesting Future Land Use: Industrial

Mr. Sharp stated that this parcel can only be accessed from Waynesboro through the adjacent industrial development, which is on the same parcel. He stated that the parcel is landlocked in the County by the South River and the railroad. He stated that the neighboring parcel is also landlocked.

Mr. Hite stated that the river should be the boundary for the Urban Service Area.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the property, as well as the neighboring property along the river should be changed to the Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation of Industrial.

10. Mehdi Moshashae (represented by John Hagen) – TM#67-12
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Urban Service Area
Future Land Use (2/21/07): Medium Density Residential
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Urban Service Area
Future Land Use: Medium Density Residential

Mr. Sharp stated that Mr. Moshashae, who is represented by Mr. Hagen, sent in the comment to say thank you for making the change and that he agrees with the Comprehensive Plan designation as it is now. He stated that the property was added to the Urban Service Area, along with others in the area, after the public meetings based on a request by a property owner interested in developing his property.

11. Guy Eavers – TM#65C(1) 6, 6B, 7, 7B, 8, 8A, 8B, and 8C
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Rural Conservation Area

Mr. Sharp introduced the request and explained that Mr. Eavers has been subdividing these properties and intends to develop them.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the property is surrounded by Agricultural Conservation Area.

Mr. Byerly and Mr. Curd stated that the property should be left in the Agricultural Conservation Area.

The Commission agreed.

12. Guy Eavers – TM#74-146
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Urban Service Area
Future Land Use: Mixed Use

Mr. Sharp stated that this property is under the same ownership as the parcel along Route 654 that is in the Urban Service Area.

Ms. Earhart stated that with Mixed Use, the property owner may be able to accommodate some residential density on this property. She stated the School Board had wanted the Steering Committee to locate property in the Riverheads School District for development. She stated that the terrain may be difficult to work with but the Mixed Use designation would allow for a better design.

Ms. Shiflett stated that there is a historic and conservation easement to the east.

Mr. Curd stated that this map change request makes sense. He stated that request number twelve should be changed to Urban Service Area with a Future Land Use designation of Mixed Use.

13. Guy Eavers, Raymond and Cherry Eavers, and Ronald and Elizabeth Hearn – TM#74-34, 74-35, 74-36, 74-37, 74-86, and 74-86A
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Agricultural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Rural Conservation Area

Mr. Sharp stated that these parcels are surrounded by Urban Service Areas and Community Development Areas on several sides.

Mr. Curd stated that it makes sense to place request number thirteen in the Rural Conservation Area.

Mr. Bridge, Mr. Shomo, and Mr. Hite agreed.

14. Abner Johnston – St. Mary's Area along Route 608

Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Rural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area

Mr. Sharp introduced the request and stated that a group of landowners have commented that the area is subject to significant flooding and should not be available for any further development. He stated that the area is not in the flood plain but that apparently changes to the landscape have caused the flood plain boundaries to change.

Ms. Shiflett stated that the property owners in the area know it better than the Steering Committee does.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the land should be changed to the Agricultural Conservation Area.

Mr. Hite, Mr. Byerly, and Ms. Shiflett agreed.

15. Nancy Sorrells – TM#89-112 and 112B and larger area along Route 608
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Rural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area

Mr. Sharp stated that this request is for the entire area of Rural Conservation Area along Route 608. He stated that Ms. Sorrells indicated that the land is not good for development or large-scale agriculture. He stated that she indicated that further development should be discouraged because groundwater is poor and removal of more of the trees in the area will cause significant erosion.

Ms. Earhart stated that Ms. Sorrells requests that if the Commissioners are inclined not to make large changes in this area they should not change her parcel either.

Mr. Sharp stated that Pine Chapel Road south would be compatible with the Agricultural Conservation Area.

Mr. Shomo stated that water is an issue in that area, so most properties are on cisterns.

Mr. Byerly stated that Pine Chapel Hill down should be placed in the Agricultural Conservation Area.

Mr. Curd and Ms. Shiflett agreed.

16. Eddie Sensabaugh – Greenville School Road Area
Planning Policy Area (2/21/07): Rural Conservation Area
Requesting Planning Policy Area: Agricultural Conservation Area

Mr. Sharp introduced the request and explained that Mr. Sensabaugh explained that the area along Greenville School Road east from the end of the water line from Greenville is being actively farmed and has too much traffic already.

Mr. Shomo stated that he has viewed this request and he does agree with it.

Mr. Cobb stated that the area is well subdivided.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the area is already substantially subdivided, what purpose would there be to have the land in the Agricultural Conservation Area.

Mr. Shomo stated that there is open land on both sides.

Ms. Tilghman stated that there are small lots in the area.

Ms. Shiflett stated that either way there would be no real difference.

Mr. Shomo stated that he would have no problem with the land being in the Agricultural Conservation Area east to the railroad.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the little portion of Rural Conservation Area near Camp 10 should be changed to Community Development Area in order to fill in the gap.

Mr. Curd agreed.

Other Comments

Mr. Sharp stated that staff received other comments on the Comprehensive Plan that did not involve map change requests.

Mr. Sharp stated that Mr. Huppach (#17) was happy with the Plan but thought that there was too much Urban Service Area. He stated that Mr. Huppach focused on the importance of the implementation of the Plan.

Mr. Sharp stated that Mr. Eckman (#18) addressed that there was too much Urban Service Area in the Plan. He stated that Mr. Eckman applauds the addition of the Urban Open Space land use designation and thinks that will make a big difference.

Mr. Bridge stated that the citizens need to understand that all of this land will not be developed right away. He stated that it may not even happen in the next twenty years.

Mr. Sharp stated that Mr. Nelson (#19) encouraged Augusta County to become a Certified Local Government. He stated that there is wording in the Plan that states that the County should explore whether to become a Certified Local Government.

Mr. Sharp stated that comments #20 and #21 encourage the Board of Supervisors to appoint a citizen committee to ensure implementation of the Plan. He stated that the Planning Commission is responsible, per state code, for overseeing the Plan.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the Board of Supervisors implements and approves the ordinances. She stated that the Board of Supervisors answers to the citizens of Augusta County. She stated that if the Board of Supervisors appoints citizens to come up with ordinances, then the citizens do not have anyone to answer to.

Mr. Sharp stated that Mr. and Mrs. Long (#22) asked that the County provide information on how much land will be needed for development and how that relates to the amount available for development in the new Plan. He stated that the Plan did not consider how much land was needed for development because the amount available when considering the location of services was already more than would be needed. He stated that the Plan focuses on encouraging development to take place where there are services.

Mr. Sharp stated that Ms. Godfrey (#23) stated that the Plan is good but there is too much land in the Urban Service Area.

Mr. Sharp stated that Mr. Heatwole (#24) stated that the County needs to implement the items in the Implementation Strategy.

Mr. Cobb stated that the County needs to sell the Plan and educate the citizens on the Plan. He stated that people need to understand what the Plan really is.

Ms. Earhart stated that the Commissioners are the people who can get staff into different areas of the County to educate the public. She encouraged them to offer staff as guest speakers at clubs they belong to.

Mr. Cobb stated that with the GIS, staff can tell citizens things that they could not have five years ago.

Issues Raised at January Meetings

Ms. Earhart stated that this handout is a compilation of the comments heard and recorded at the Draft Plan meetings. She stated that the Steering Committee considered those comments in making changes to the Plan that was ultimately sent to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for public hearing.

Urban Service Area Northwest of Waynesboro

Mr. Curd stated that the area along the northwest border of Waynesboro has been the subject of discussions of late between developers, the County, and the Service Authority on how to provide services. He stated that property owned by Mr. Boutros and Mr. Hewitt, who had both requested to be in the Urban Service Area early in the planning process, is in that area. He stated that in both cases there are residential developments served by Waynesboro water and sewer just inside the City.

Mr. Sharp stated that the Service Authority does not have services in that area so they would either have to extend services from other areas or connect any new development back into the City. He stated there is no agreement with the City regarding such an arrangement and the Service Authority doesn't know how to best connect to County services. He stated that Mr. Coleman had suggested that a policy be added to the Plan that instructs the County to study these issues to determine whether providing services here would be appropriate. He stated it would not be appropriate at this time to make the area an Urban Service Area since there are too many unknowns. He stated that a policy could be included in the Land Use Section, Goal 1, Objective A, Policy 8 that reads:

Development North of Waynesboro. The County and the Service Authority should examine ways in which public water and wastewater services can be extended to the area immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the City of Waynesboro, north of Route 250 and west of Route 254, in order to serve existing and future residential developments in that area.

Mr. Curd stated that with this policy it will enable the County and the Service Authority to study the issues further.

Mr. Bridge stated that the policy should be included in the Plan.

Ms. Tilghman stated that she agrees.

Flood Control Dams/Inundation Zones on Maps

Mr. Sharp handed out a map showing the locations of the flood control dams and the flood inundation zones with the draft Planning Policy Areas. He stated that Mr. Shomo suggested that he would like to discuss this issue. He stated that the locations of the flood control dams are all known but that the inundation zones are not generally well mapped, if at all. He stated that the flood inundation zones of Toms Branch, Inch Branch, and Robinson Hollow have been digitally mapped as part of a study on making improvements to those dams. He stated that a few other zones have been roughly identified while the rest have not been mapped at all.

Mr. Shomo suggested that the Plan include policies regarding development in the flood inundation zones and in the flood pool areas above the dams. He stated that development should not be allowed in these areas for public safety reasons.

Mr. Cobb stated that such policies would be premature at this point. He stated that there are people living in those areas now and there are already safety concerns. He stated that until the areas are fully mapped it would be inappropriate to establish a policy discouraging development. He stated that the County would not be able to tell people where they shouldn't build if the maps aren't complete.

Mr. Bridge stated that when they had 22" of rain a few years ago the dam in Sherando had water over the spillway.

Mr. Shomo stated that the dams should be on the Planning Policy Area Map because when people look at the map, they need to know that they are in a flood control dam inundation zone.

Ms. Earhart stated that they can be mapped on the GIS as a layer after the research is done as to where they all are.

Mr. Cobb stated that it is premature now to place them on the Comprehensive Plan maps. He stated that when citizens come in for a building permit, they can be notified through the building permit process that they are in a flood inundation zone. He stated that the areas need to be mapped first.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the County needs to be sure that they map the correct property if they are in a flood inundation zone. She stated that if a property is for sale and it is in an inundation zone, then a potential buyer may not want to purchase the property. She stated that the value of the land would be decreased. She stated that the County needs to have very precise mapping before taking this step.

Mr. Sharp stated that there are policies in the Plan that encourage the County to continue mapping the inundation zones.

Mr. Cobb stated that the Board of Supervisors would need to proceed with this and get the dams mapped accurately and have those zones placed on the GIS.

Ms. Tilghman stated that the Board of Supervisors can look at doing this with the Implementation Strategy to be sure the areas are accurate.

Ms. Earhart stated that the Implementation Strategy in the Plan recommends that the Board begin the process this year.

Mr. Shomo stated that the flood control dams and inundation zones should be mapped on the GIS as a layer. He stated that the County needs to make the effort to get them mapped.

Mr. Cobb stated that if Mr. Shomo would like the Board of Supervisors to address that issue quickly, he should make a motion at the Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday, April 10, 2007.

Comments on Draft Plan from ACSA

Mr. Sharp stated that staff received comments from the Service Authority after the deadline for comments had passed, so they were not included in the mailing. He stated that they recommended a handful of grammatical and minor factual changes. He stated that many of these suggestions were for the Existing Conditions Analysis, which is only being updated with grammatical changes. He stated that staff is reluctant to make any changes to that document since it was a snapshot of conditions as they were in late-2005 when the document was completed. He stated that he will be making the other changes that were suggested for the remainder of the Plan.

Re-Ordering Natural Resources Goals

Mr. Sharp stated that Headwaters commented that Goal 6 of the Natural Resources Section be moved to Goal 1. He stated that the other elements in the Plan started out more general and then got more specific but that the Natural Resources section started with a more specific goal while Goal 6 was more general. He stated that this would be a logical change.

The Commissioners agreed to make this change.

Mr. Curd asked about a level of service policy. He stated that this was something that the County was interested in seeing in the Plan but he does not see it in the Draft.

Mr. Sharp stated that with the change in consultants last spring level of service, along with some other elements, was removed from the Plan's scope.

Mr. Curd stated that he believes that the County has a good Plan, but that items like level of service still need to be considered.

Ms. Earhart stated that the consultant that will be looking at the ordinances could also consider programs such as level of service.

Mr. Curd stated that the Commissioners should encourage that.

Mr. Sharp stated that he is working on an RFP for ordinance review so that the County can move forward with that implementation item once the Board of Supervisors adopts the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Tilghman stated that she will not be at the meeting on Tuesday, April 10, 2007. She stated that the Plan is a good piece of work. She stated that not everyone agrees with everything in the Plan. She stated that if everyone agreed with everything in the Plan, there would be a big problem. She stated that when they were working on the 1994 Plan, the citizens cared about their neighbors and the next generation. She stated that at the public meetings and hearings this time all she heard was what the County is going to do with their own piece of property, not the neighbors, and not the next generation. She stated that this really bothers her.

Ms. Earhart stated that a student that attended the Buffalo Gap meeting asked what the Comprehensive Plan was going to do so that she can afford to buy a house in the future. She stated that this was one of the best questions she received at the meetings. She stated that with Mixed Use, the County can look at the developments once they come in. She stated that there needs to be affordable housing for everyone.

Mr. Cobb thanked Ms. Tilghman and Ms. Shiflett for their work with the Steering Committee. He also thanked Ms. Earhart and Mr. Sharp for all of their hard work.

There being no further business to come before the Commissioners, the Worksession was adjourned.

Chairman

Secretary