

PRESENT: T. Cole, Chairman  
E. Shipplett, Vice Chariman  
J. Curd  
W. Garvey  
K. Shiflett  
R.L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary

ABSENT: C. Foschini  
K. Leonard

VIRGINIA: At the Worksession Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, March 11, 2014, at 4:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

\* \* \* \* \*

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Cole, Chairman.

**Comprehensive Plan Review – Land Use**

Mrs. Earhart reviewed the Land Use section of the Comprehensive Plan. She referred to the policy regarding Rt. 262 by-pass area and stated if the County is interested in developing the property along Rt. 262, it would need to be decided what type of land uses are needed or wanted, the layout of transportation, and the availability of water and sewer services. The City of Staunton would also need to be consulted to determine what plans, if any, are under way for the portion of Rt. 262 that falls under the City of Staunton jurisdiction, and if the City plans to extend public services.

Mrs. Earhart referred to Policy 6 and asked the Commissioners what the areas that have been suggested as Village Mixed Use, such as Churchville, Augusta Springs, New Hope, Middlebrook, and Greenville, should be named.

Mr. Curd suggested they be named Village Communities.

Mr. Shipplett suggested they be named Village Market Center.

Mr. Cole suggested they be called villages as it has a connotation that is consistent with the areas mentioned above.

The Commissioners agreed with Mr. Cole that these areas be called villages.

Mr. Garvey asked if an area does not have public water and sewer would remain under the Rural Residential zoning.

Mrs. Earhart stated if there were no services available, the concept of a rural community would remain.

Mr. Shipplett questioned if the general public would know what the policy was referring to by using only the word village. There should be a definition to describe what a village is.

Mrs. Earhart stated the Comp Plan would give a clear definition of what constitutes a village.

The Commissioners discussed Goal 1, Objective C, Policy 2: Transitions, and concluded the policy is sufficient as it reads and should remain as is.

The Commissioners discussed Goal 2, Objective B, Policy 2: Conservation Easements and decided that language should be added that would require potential easements to be reviewed by the County when a conservation easement is proposed within one-half mile of a significant public facility, such as the airport.

Mrs. Earhart noted Policy 3: Purchase of Development Rights and Policy 4: Transfer of Development Rights under Goal 2, Objective B will be removed from the Comp Plan.

Mr. Cole stated there is a significant amount of non-county money available in PDR programs and farmers would benefit greatly from having a PDR program in the County. If agricultural development is to be encouraged, it is important for the County to participate in the PDR program.

It was agreed upon by the Commissioners the County should consider the reestablishment of the PDR program by keeping a modified policy in the Comp Plan in order for farmers to take advantage of local and state funding.

There being no further discussion, the Planning Commission traveled to the following sites which will be considered by the Commission:

1. MAVRIC, LLC
2. Kenneth Ray Bradley, Jr.

---

Chairman

---

Secretary