

PRESENT: S.N. Bridge, Chairman  
J. Curd  
T. H. Byerly  
T. Cole  
K. Leonard  
K. A. Shiflett  
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary  
K. Bullerdick, Associate Planner

ABSENT: W.F. Hite

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, November 11, 2008, at 3:45 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, Plan of Development, and preliminary plat. The Planning Commission traveled to the following sites which will be considered by the Commission:

1. Interstate Business Park, LLC – Rezoning
2. CKK, Inc. - Rezoning
3. William Theodore Bear, III – Rezoning

\*\*\*\*\*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary

PRESENT: S.N. Bridge, Chairman  
J. Curd, Vice Chairman  
T. H. Byerly  
T. Cole  
W.F. Hite  
K. Leonard  
K. A. Shiflett  
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary  
K. Bullerdick, Associate Planner

VIRGINIA: At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, November 11, 2008, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

\* \* \* \* \*

**DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM**

Mr. Bridge stated as there were seven (7) members present, there was a quorum.

\* \* \* \* \*

**INTRODUCTION OF A NEW MEMBER**

Mr. Bridge stated he would like to welcome Kyle Leonard to the Planning Commission to serve the unexpired term of Mr. Joseph Shomo. Mr. Leonard will be representing the Riverheads District.

\* \* \* \* \*

**ELECTION OF A VICE CHAIRMAN**

Ms. Shiflett moved to elect James Curd to serve the unexpired term of Vice-Chairman.

Mr. Byerly seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **MINUTES**

Mr. Curd moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on October 14, 2008.

Mr. Byerly seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

### **Interstate Business Park, LLC – Rezoning**

A request to rezone from General Business to General Industrial with proffers approximately 28.288 acres owned by Interstate Business Park, LLC located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Tinkling Springs Road (Rt. 608) and Ramsey Road (Rt. 635) in the Beverley Manor District.

Ms. Bullerdick explained the request. She stated the applicant has submitted the following revised proffers:

1. Development of the parcel shall be in general accord with the Preliminary Plat for Westgate prepared by Terra Concepts, P.C. and dated January 11, 2008, as amended from time to time and approved by the County's Department of Community Development (the "Preliminary Plat").
2. The issuance of the first building permit for the General Industrial zoned property is contingent upon the following: (1) the road improvements to Expo Road, including signalization modifications, (2) the road improvement modifications to Tinkling Spring Road between, and inclusive of, Expo Road and Trader Road, (3) substantial completion of the existing Willow Brook Drive and existing Construction Lane so that the same are open for public use to the intersection of Willow Brook Drive and Construction Lane, and, (4) Willow Brook Drive will terminate at a cul-de-sac and will not make a connection to Ramsey Road. Permits for lots in Westgate (both industrial and business lots) shall be limited to projects that generate a total of no more than 7000 vehicles per day of traffic after the completion of the above listed road improvements. (5) At the point projects exceed 7000 vehicles per day all road improvements to Tinkling Spring Road, Ramsey Road, and Augusta Farm Road will be substantially complete and open for public use as shown on the RTE. 608 sequence of construction plan prepared by Valley Engineering and last revised January 11, 2008.
3. The owner shall install and maintain a 30' planted buffer parallel to Ramsey Road (Rt. 635) along a portion of the Industrial zoned property. The buffer shall contain a staggered double row of Norway spruce trees (6' to 8' tall at the time of planting and planted 15' on center) to the existing tree line along Ramsey Road. A 50' natural buffer shall contain the existing wooded vegetation (600' +/-) along the other section of Ramsey Road. The respective buffers are depicted on Exhibit A.
4. The owner shall dedicate to the County or the Virginia Department of Transportation, for public street purposes, (a) such portions of the parcel as are necessary to construct the Road Improvements in accordance with the Development Agreement,

and (b) additional portions of the parcel parallel and adjacent to Ramsey Road (Rt. 635) within an area 25' from the existing centerline of Ramsey Road (Rt. 635).

Keith Lancaster, 1613 Meadow Brook Heights Road, Charlottesville, stated he is the applicant of the request. He stated the approximate 28 acres being rezoned are located in the rear of the property. Mr. Lancaster explained this land is the same as the multi family request that went before the Planning Commission approximately one year ago. He stated the reason for the industrial zoning is the only interest shown for the property at this time has been for flex office and warehouse space, which he feels will be suitable for the property. Mr. Lancaster stated he also feels they will be able to regulate the businesses with restrictions and covenants in order to place storage yards in the rear of the property which he stated will have little impact on the business zoning in the front of the property. He stated typically industrial zoning will produce a lower traffic count for the site. Mr. Lancaster stated he has met with staff and VDOT and stated road improvements will be done to Expo Road and Tinkling Spring Road up to Trader Road prior to the issuance of any building permits for the property. He stated he feels the industrial zoning will generate interest and development of the property.

Ms. Shiflett stated the proffer regarding Willow Brook Drive has changed from the original submittal. She asked Mr. Lancaster to please explain the reason for this change to not connect Willow Brook Drive to Ramsey Road.

Mr. Lancaster stated a cul-de-sac has been proffered at Willow Brook Drive. He stated with the reduction in traffic count, he feels there will be adequate points of access. Mr. Lancaster stated he does not envision heavy traffic to be created with this industrial zoning because it will likely be warehouse traffic.

Ms. Shiflett commented during discussions of their previous plans, the development was to be more big box style retail, restaurants, office space, etc. She stated by not connecting the industrial development to Ramsey Road, she feels it will be forcing industrial traffic into the business/retail properties.

Mr. Lancaster stated he feels the traffic will not be the typical "industrial" style traffic, but more warehouse style vans, etc. and it will access Tinkling Spring Road.

Ms. Shiflett stated while this may be true, the Commission will have to predict the heaviest traffic uses permitted by the Ordinance as a limit on uses has not been proffered. She stated traffic will not take the longest route, but rather use the internal road to Tinkling Spring Road.

Mr. Lancaster stated yes that may be possible, but he does not see that as an issue.

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

Mr. Hite stated joining Willow Brook Drive to Ramsey Road would make the most sense. He stated the cul-de-sac would not be the best option and for that reason, he stated he cannot support the request.

Mr. Curd stated he agrees with Mr. Hite. He stated he feels Willow Brook Drive should be extended to Ramsey Road with the necessary improvements. He stated he cannot support this request as he feels it is not the best use having industrial traffic traveling through office and business use properties.

Mr. Bridge stated once the business lots are developed, traffic would create a problem. He stated he cannot support the cul-de-sac.

Ms. Shiflett stated if it is not proffered to restrict traffic, the Commission has to consider the highest possible use of the property if it is zoned to industrial. She stated this would allow for tractor trailers, and she feels they will take the shortest route.

Mr. Curd moved to recommend denial of the request.

Ms. Shiflett seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

### **CKK, Inc. – Rezoning**

A request to rezone from General Agriculture to General Business with proffers approximately 3.2 acres owned by CKK, Inc. located on the south side of Jefferson Highway (Rt. 250) just east of the intersection with Payne Landing in the Wayne District.

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

1. Within 90 days of rezoning approval, parcel 67-75 will be combined with parcel 67-74B.
2. Access shall be limited to the existing entrance on to Route 250 at Payne Landing. Access to parcel 67-75B will be provided by way of the existing right of way. Access shall be provided to adjacent parcels 67-76 and 76G.
3. At the time the use of the property changes to a business use and a site plan or preliminary plat is required, the property owner at the time of development will prepare a Traffic Impact Analysis meeting the requirements of VDOT (if the use meets the minimum thresholds for the study) and will install any improvements recommended by the study and reviewed by VDOT in accordance with § 15.2-2222.1 of the Code of Virginia at the developer's expense at a time acceptable to the County.
4. Owner/developer will install a double row of Arborvitae planted 10' on center and 5-6 feet in height at the time of installation along the southeastern property boundary of parcel 67-75. The trees will be planted at the time of development of the site if the

adjacent property is still zoned General Agriculture. The buffer will be maintained until such time as the use or zoning of the adjacent property is changed to business.

Tim Snyder, 22 Indian Ford Lane, Deerfield, stated he is representing Charles Vailes as he was not able to be here tonight. He stated Vailes Brothers would like the adjacent property to be zoned business for future use. He stated there are no immediate plans for the property.

Ms. Shiflett asked Mr. Snyder to show the Commission the exact location of the right of way on the map.

Mr. Snyder stated the right of way follows the property line to serve the homes behind the property subject for rezoning tonight.

Mr. Curd questioned if the recorded easement was located behind the property line. He asked if any parcels will access the middle of this property. Mr. Curd also asked if the applicant would be willing to consider proffering not to disturb the current tree line.

Mr. Snyder stated he does not see that being a problem with the applicant.

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

Linda Sachs, 96 Payne Landing Lane, Fishersville, stated her property is the last parcel on Payne Landing Lane. She stated she owns approximately four acres behind the Vailes Brothers complex. She stated her neighbor, Michael Entsminger, did not receive notification of this hearing. She stated she would like to have met with Mr. Vailes, but he has been out of town. She explained Payne Landing Lane was deeded to her by an exclusive right of way in 1985. She stated this is a 20 foot exclusive right of way and she has had conflict with the Kooglers regarding this right-of-way. She stated she is concerned with having a business directly in front of her house and does not want business traffic using her right of way. She stated she owns a 20 foot right of way, and her neighbor Mr. Entsminger has a 12 foot right of way, totaling a 32 foot easement that should not be used for this business purpose. Ms. Sachs asked if it would be a possibility for Vailes to have another access off of Route 250, because she stated there is already a lot of traffic using her right of way.

Ms. Earhart stated the attempt in the rezoning was to make it very clear that access to parcel 67-75B (Ms. Sachs' property) will be provided by the way of the existing right of way and will not have an impact on her right of way. Ms. Earhart explained the reason why her

neighbor Mr. Entsminger did not receive notification, was because his property does not directly adjoin the parcel in consideration for rezoning. She stated in accordance with State Law, this request was advertised in a newspaper of general circulation.

Mr. Bridge asked Ms. Earhart to explain if the business has the right to use Ms. Sachs' exclusive right of way.

Ms. Earhart stated the proffer limits access to the existing entrance onto Route 250. She stated it is also proffered that access to parcel 67-75B will be provided by way of the existing right of way. Access will be provided to adjacent properties on either side.

Ms. Sachs stated if that were the case, it would only allow a 12 foot right of way for the business.

Ms. Earhart wanted to be clear that Ms. Sachs' right of way is not subject to the rezoning. She explained when the lots are combined internal access on the site will be worked out as part of the applicant's site plan design. Ms. Earhart reiterated that Ms. Sachs' right of way will not be eliminated and is not subject to the rezoning. She also stated that the applicants will need to use the existing entrance based on comments from VDOT.

Ms. Sachs stated the applicants have two entrances off of Route 250. She stated one is beside Payne Landing Lane and the other entrance is located adjacent to Miller Storage Buildings.

Ms. Earhart stated the proffer limits the applicants to the entrance closest to Payne Landing Lane.

Ms. Sachs stated she wanted to make sure the applicants will not plant trees in the middle of, or block, her right of way.

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

Mr. Leonard stated he wanted to be clear on how Ms. Sachs currently accesses her property.

Ms. Earhart stated it is accessed off of Payne Landing Lane, which then turns into a driveway that runs along the property line along the edge of the existing trees.

Ms. Sachs stated concern regarding planting a buffer of trees.

Ms. Earhart stated the trees that are on the Koogler property have been proffered to remain. She explained the trees that are on Ms. Sachs' property will not be impacted. She stated the County has also asked Mr. Koogler to plant additional trees along the property line between Ms. Sachs' and the Koogler's property. Ms. Earhart explained the trees will be planted on the Koogler side of the property.

Ms. Sachs stated she has a lot of trouble in the winter with the large trees.

Ms. Earhart explained the trees will not required to be planted on the property line, as there is a required 25 foot buffer for business property adjacent to property not zoned business.

Ms. Sachs again voiced concern about access to the right of way. She stated the right of way should have been deeded exclusively to her.

Mr. Curd asked Mr. Snyder if there was another way the applicant could access the property without using Payne Landing Lane.

Mr. Snyder stated Vailes Brothers has access across the front of the property. He stated that they do not have to access Payne Landing Lane.

Mr. Curd asked Mr. Snyder if he felt the applicant would be willing to proffer not using Payne Landing Lane for their access.

Mr. Snyder stated he would have to discuss that with Mr. Vailes.

Koogler, stated he does not think it would be a problem, but he feels it would be asking a lot to give up a right of way that was legally paid for and deeded.

Mr. Curd stated he does not think it is a lot to ask of the applicant to access the parcel from another entrance, as the parcel is surrounded by residences and General Agriculture zoning.

Mr. Synder stated he will have to ask Mr. Vailes.

Mr. Koogler explained there is a strip of land that runs the length of the Vailes parcel that is approximately 20 foot wide that Ms. Sachs has access to.



Mr. Leonard asked if this was a deeded right of way.

Mr. Koogler answered yes.

There was discussion in regards to the exact location of the right of way.

Mr. Curd stated it would satisfy the neighbors if the parcels are to be joined, if the business would only access through the front of the parcel off of Route 250.

Mr. Bridge asked if it were possible to have access to the rear of the property off of Route 250.

Mr. Koogler stated yes.

Ms. Earhart stated the exact location and size of the right of way that is being discussed needs to be clarified. She stated she feels it is not possible to make a decision on this rezoning tonight until these items have been clarified.

Mr. Leonard stated his concern is whether or not Ms. Sach's deeded right of way is open and current.

Mr. Byerly stated he appreciates the cooperation of the parties. He moved to recommend the request be tabled for thirty days to allow clarification of the exact location of the right of way for both parties.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion.

Mr. Byerly stated he regrets having to table the request for the sake of the property owner, especially if they wanted a year end closing.

Ms. Earhart stated she is concerned with moving the entrance. She stated she felt that would be a concern of VDOT. She stated she wanted to be sure that the applicant does not proffer something they cannot do. Ms. Earhart also stated she understood it to be a concern of the Planning Commission that access to the parcel that is being rezoned not be off of Payne Landing Lane.

Mr. Leonard stated he does not see it as a concern for the applicant to use the existing entrance off of Route 250 onto Payne Landing Lane for the new business.

Mr. Byerly stated he would like to withdraw his motion. He stated he does not think it is necessary for the applicant to have a separate entrance if the parcels are going to be combined.

Mr. Bridge stated he agrees. He stated he does not see it as an option to not allow the business to use Payne Landing Lane.

Ms. Shiflett asked why you would not allow the business to use Payne Landing Lane.

Mr. Curd stated Vailes Brothers currently uses the entrance directly off of Route 250. He explained if the parcels are going to be combined, he does not see why the pavement could not be extended and have the new business on the parcel in the rear of the property use this entrance also, and not use Payne Landing Lane, which will satisfy the neighbors.

Mr. Bridge asked how the electric business accesses their business at the rear of the property.

Mr. Koogler explained the electric business accesses the rear of the property through the entrance off of Route 250 and then through a gate to their business.

Ms. Sachs stated she is only concerned with the 20 foot right of way that accesses her property. She stated Payne Landing Lane is not the entire 60 foot entrance on Route 250.

Mr. Curd stated VDOT may be assuming that Payne Landing Lane is the entire 60 foot entrance.

Ms. Earhart stated the 20 foot right of way is not part of the rezoning. But, Payne Landing Lane is somewhere between the 20 foot strip and the Vailes property.

Mr. Curd moved to approve the request contingent on the addition of a proffer to retain the existing tree line along the southern property boundary and the entrance to the business property being moved off Payne Landing Lane, if that is possible with the VDOT regulations, in order to mitigate any adverse impacts on the adjacent property owners who also use Payne Landing Lane.

Mr. Byerly seconded the request which carried unanimously.

## **William Theodore Bear, III – Rezoning**

A request to rezone from Single Family Residential to General Business with proffers approximately 0.556 acres owned by William Theodore Bear, III located on the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Green Hill Lane (Rt. 836) and Buffalo Gap Highway (Rt. 42) in Churchville in the Pastures District.

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

1. There will be no direct access off of Buffalo Gap Highway (Route 42).
2. The only permitted use of the property will be a parking lot.
3. Within 12 months of rezoning approval, construction of the parking lot (with at least 25 spaces) will be completed.
4. Within 120 days of rezoning approval, the business zoned portion of the property will be created as a separate lot.

William Theodore Bear, III, 96 Buffalo Gap Highway, Churchville, stated he did not realize the significance of the Health Department's concerns. He stated he was not aware of staff's comments until today.

Mr. Curd asked Mr. Bear why he is not requesting the funeral home property to be rezoned.

Mr. Bear stated there are three reasons why he is not requesting to rezone the funeral home property. They are as follows: (1) He stated he does not own that parcel, as that is owned by his father, (2) He stated the property across the road up for rezoning tonight will provide better access to the funeral home, and (3) The Board of Zoning Appeals has already granted him a variance for this purpose.

Mr. Bridge asked Mr. Bear to explain more specifically why he is not rezoning the funeral home property.

Mr. Bear explained if the property is rezoned it will lose its grandfather rights, which will cause concerns with VDOT, in particular the restrictions on access.

Mr. Bridge asked Mr. Bear to explain the restrictions of access on the overhead.

Mr. Bear explained the location of the building and property lines. He stated there is a secondary parking area to the south of the funeral home. He explained all of these spaces are adjacent to the road with no barriers from the road. He stated Green Hill Lane is

narrow and the parking lot is often used by passing cars, as the other side of the road is a fairly steep ditch with no curbing.

Mr. Bridge stated it was discussed in viewing the parcel, that there may be a possible area for parking so that patrons will not have to cross the road.

Mr. Bear stated the area is actually further away than the parcel under consideration for rezoning tonight and there is also concern with wet weather springs. He stated from a safety aspect, people will not use that area because it is further away and they will actually end up parking along Route 42.

Mr. Byerly stated his concern with approving the request is leaving the house and remaining lot with no septic repair area.

Mr. Bear stated that concern was not confirmed. He stated this was staff's concern, but it was not foreseen. He stated he did not realize staff's concerns until he received the report.

Mr. Byerly asked Mr. Bear if he would consider having the request tabled until the January meeting to allow the concerns of the Health Department to be addressed.

Mr. Bear stated he was not familiar with the procedure and how that will affect the Board of Supervisor's Agenda for November.

Mr. Bridge explained if the request is tabled, it will not show up on the Board of Supervisors' agenda.

Mr. Bear asked if it were tabled, would he then be required to come to the Board of Supervisors' meeting this month.

Mr. Bridge stated he will not have to attend.

Ms. Shiflett stated she sees the Health Department's concerns as a real problem. She explained she would not generally approve of leaving a house with no reserves. She stated there needs to be a resolution between the Health Department and Mr. Bear.

Mr. Bear stated this is not a current problem. He stated he understands the concern as a problem that may occur in the future. He asked if he was correct with that understanding.

Mr. Bridge stated yes this is a concern, as the proposed parking lot is now the repair area, and by paving the lot, there will be no repair area. Mr. Bridge stated it will create a problem.

Ms. Shiflett stated this is not an unusual request the staff is asking of Mr. Bear. She stated all houses are required to have either a repair area or 100% reserve area. She stated how Mr. Bear is to address this concern is something the Planning Commission needs to know, because there does not appear to be enough room for a repair area with the current request.

Mr. Curd stated even if these concerns were addressed, he does not see supporting rezoning 0.5 of an acre to business surrounded by residential zoning, especially when there is plenty of room on the other parcel.

Mr. Byerly stated philosophically he can agree with Mr. Curd, but in this instance he sees the current overflow parking on Route 42 as a safety issue.

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

Mr. Bridge stated he cannot support request with the unaddressed concerns of the Health Department. He stated he feels there are issues that need to be addressed, in particular the reserve area.

Ms. Shiflett moved to table the request until the January meeting.

Mr. Bridge seconded the request. The motion carried on a 5 to 2 vote with Mr. Cole and Mr. Curd opposed.

### **Stuarts Draft Retirement Community, Phase IV- Plan of Development**

A request to approve a Plan of Development for Stuarts Draft Retirement Community, Phase IV. Stuarts Draft Retirement Community is located on the east side of Patton Farm Road (Route 634) approximately 0.2 of a mile north of the intersection of Patton Farm Road (Route 634) and Wayne Avenue (Route 639) in the South River District. The proposed project includes the addition of 8 beds in the residential care facility and 32 new efficiency apartments, as well as recreational amenities.

Ms. Bullerdick explained the request.

Rodney Martin, 563 Hall School Road, Stuarts Draft, stated the plans are to add a new wing to an existing apartment building with 32 efficiency apartments. He stated the

existing building will then be removed as it is out dated. He stated 8 new beds will also be added to the assisted living facility.

Ms. Shiflett thanked Mr. Martin for his work on the development, as he has done what staff has asked and required. She congratulated Mr. Martin and stated it is a beautiful development.

Mr. Byerly asked Mr. Martin if the development had a dementia unit.

Mr. Martin answered yes. He stated there is a cottage that includes 8 units available for residents with dementia.

Mr. Byerly also thanked Mr. Martin for his efforts.

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

Ms. Shiflett moved to approve the request.

Mr. Byerly seconded the request which carried unanimously.

\* \* \* \* \*

## **New Business**

### **River Hills Subdivision**

Located on Route 11 in Greenville adjacent to Riverheads Elementary in the Riverheads District. The plat contains 42 lots zoned Single Family Residential.

Ms. Earhart explained the request. She explained this plat has come before the Planning Commission previously, but it did not meet the required deadlines for recordation. She stated it meets the technical requirements of the ordinance.

Mr. Byerly moved to approve the request.

Mr. Leonard seconded the request which carried unanimously.

### **Appointment of a Nominating Committee**

Mr. Bridge appointed James Curd, Becky Earhart and himself to the nominating committee. They are to report back at the January meeting.

### **Joe Shomo Resolution**

Mr. Cole made a motion to approve a resolution commending Joseph Shomo for his service on the Planning Commission. Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously. Mr. Bridge read the following resolution into the record:

WHEREAS, the County of Augusta in consideration of the long and dedicated service of Joseph Shomo; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Shomo diligently and faithfully served the citizens of Augusta County for over eight years in the capacity of a public servant; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Shomo was appointed to the Augusta County Planning Commission in August 2000 and completed his service in October 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Augusta County Planning Commission is desirous of expressing their appreciation and thanks to Mr. Shomo for his dedicated service on this commission.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Augusta County Planning Commission does hereby publicly thank Mr. Shomo for his service which he has so aptly fulfilled with diligence and concern for the citizens of Augusta County.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution be adopted by the Commission, recorded in its minutes, and a copy forwarded to Mr. Shomo.

### **Inclement Weather Resolution**

Mr. Hite moved to recommend approval of the following resolution. Mr. Bridge read the following resolution into the record:

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 2009.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE AUGUSTA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION:

1. The Planning Commission shall hold regular meetings during calendar year 2009, in the Board Meeting Room at the Augusta County Government Center, on the dates and at the times set forth below:

January 13, 2009	7:00 p.m.
February 10, 2009	7:00 p.m.
March 10, 2009	7:00 p.m.
April 14, 2009	7:00 p.m.
May 12, 2009	7:00 p.m.
June 9, 2009	7:00 p.m.
July 14, 2009	7:00 p.m.
August 11, 2009	7:00 p.m.
September 8, 2009	7:00 p.m.
October 13, 2009	7:00 p.m.
November 10, 2009	7:00 p.m.
December 8, 2009	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.

Ms. Shiflett seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

### **Route 254 Mixed Use Designation**

Ms. Earhart stated in deciding on the designations for the mixed use parcels at the Planning Commission's October meeting inadvertently the West Beverly Street area adjacent to the Route 262 loop was left off. Ms. Earhart explained this area is located in an Urban Service Area. She stated while there are concerns with how the area will be publicly sewerred, it is still located in an area with the expectation that it will have public water and sewer. From a staff perspective, Neighborhood Mixed Use seems consistent with the direction that the Commission was going with the other parcels, being that this parcel is adjacent to a Rural Conservation Area. She stated the Board of Supervisors is expected to be viewing the various sites and the Planning Commission's recommendations on each on November 24, 2008, so if the Planning Commission wants to make a decision on this area, it will be added to the Board's viewing list.

Mr. Curd moved to recommend the West Beverly Street Area, adjacent to the Route 262 loop be designated as Neighborhood Mixed Use on the Countywide Future Land Use Plan.

Mr. Hite seconded the motion which carried unanimously.



\* \* \* \* \*

**MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC**

Jeff Gentry, EGS & Associates, 15 Terry Street, Staunton, stated he would like to see the Planning Commission and staff review the Subdivision Ordinance in regards to the expiration of preliminary plats. He stated twelve months is not sufficient time for recordation of a section of the plat with today's requirements (i.e. submittal of construction plans, review process, etc.) He stated he is asking staff to consider extending the time period preliminary plats would be active.

Mr. Byerly asked Mr. Gentry a reasonable time frame for recording preliminary plats.

Mr. Gentry stated he feels eighteen months with an extension time of twenty-four months would be a sufficient amount of time. He stated the paperwork for today's submittals is phenomenal.

Ms. Earhart stated the consultants are currently reviewing the County's Ordinance and this matter will certainly be considered. She stated it will most likely be late spring before this section will be reviewed.

\* \* \* \* \*

**STAFF REPORTS**

A. CODE OF VIRGINIA – SECTION 15.2-2310

Mr. Bridge asked if there were any comments regarding the upcoming items on the BZA agenda. The Commission took no formal action on the BZA items.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Economic Development Strategic Plan**

Ms. Earhart thanked those from the Planning Commission who took part in the Economic Development Plan meetings. She stated the consultants will be finishing their final report in December. She stated the recommendations are available in Community Development's office and it would also be possible for Dale Cobb to do a formal presentation of these results and recommendations.

Mr. Byerly stated he felt the consultant, John Rhodes, did an excellent job by going to the County's high schools and presenting this information as he felt that was extremely important.

Mr. Bridge stated he felt it was worth noting, that after visiting the high schools, it was discovered that not a single high school student wanted to work in a manufacturing job.

Mr. Hite commented he felt that more economics needs to be taught in the school system.

**Augusta County Ordinance Review Project**

Ms. Earhart updated the Planning Commission on the current status of the Ordinance Review Project. She stated the Board of Supervisors has sent the consultants their recommendations and the consultants are working on those recommendations now. Ms. Earhart stated the ordinance amendments should be completed by the consultants by April. The last module she stated will be erosion and sediment control. Ms. Earhart stated a first module should be sent to staff by mid December and every two months thereafter. The logistics of review on how these amendments will be presented to the Commission and Board is still being worked out.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ms. Earhart stated there will be December Planning Commission meeting to consider the Stoney Run Townhouses Plan of Development.

\* \* \* \* \*

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

\* \* \* \* \*

---

Chairman

---

Secretary