

PRESENT: K. A. Shiflett, Chairman
J. D. Tilghman, Vice-Chairman
S. N. Bridge
T.H. Byerly
J. W. Curd
W. F. Hite
J. Shomo
D. L. Cobb, Director of Community Development and
Secretary
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County
Planning Commission held on Tuesday, April
13, 2004, 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 two master plans, a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, three rezonings, and the upcoming items on the BZA agenda. They also heard a presentation by Patrick J. Coffield, County Administrator, on the Capital Improvements Plan. Having previously viewed the Valley, B.C., L.L.C. and the County of Augusta sites, the Planning Commission traveled to the following site which will be considered by the Commission at their regular meeting:

1. Martin F. Lightsey – Comprehensive Plan Amendment and Rezoning

Chairman

Secretary

PRESENT: K. A. Shiflett, Chairman
J. D. Tilghman, Vice-Chairman
T. H. Byerly
S. N. Bridge
J. W. Curd
W. F. Hite
J. Shomo
D. L. Cobb, Director of Community Development and
Secretary
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner

VIRGINIA: At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County
Planning Commission held on Tuesday, April
13, 2004, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Meeting
Room, Augusta County Government Center,
Verona, Virginia.

* * * * *

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Ms. Shiflett stated as there were seven (7) members present, there was a quorum.

* * * * *

MINUTES

Mr. Shomo made a motion to approve the minutes of the Called and Regular meeting held on March 9, 2004, and the Called worksession on March 15, 2004. Mr. Bridge seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

Martin F. Lightsey – Comprehensive Plan Amendment

A request to change the Comprehensive Plan designation from Rural Conservation Area and Potential Community Development Area to Community Development Area on approximately 115.4 acres owned by Martin F. Lightsey located on the east side of Shutterlee Mill Road (Route 742) across from the entrance to Farmington Estates Subdivision in the Pastures District.

Mrs. Earhart explained the amendment. She also stated they received correspondence from the Augusta County Service Authority (ACSA) late today. A report by Emery & Garrett Groundwater, Inc., was done in 1998. It looked at the impacts to the Berry Farm Spring due to the development of a recreation area adjoining the spring. The ACSA also supplied staff with a map that shows the Lightsey property to be in the Falling Spring Run Watershed which is the main recharge area for the Berry Farm Spring. She read a memo from Ken Fanfoni, Director of the Augusta County Service Authority that stated: “without having specific geological data on the project area under consideration, it is difficult to make definite conclusions on the threat of septic systems to the groundwater quality feeding into the Berry Farm Spring. I believe that there are already existing septic systems in the recharge area, but not at the intended density of this new project. It may be a consideration that additional septic tank maintenance should be required for systems in sensitive groundwater recharge areas. This is likely to be an item in our development of our source water protection program. If the County wishes to obtain more specific information on this area, I can contact Emery & Garrett Groundwater, Inc. They may be able to provide additional recommendations, or conduct specific field studies if desired.”

Martin F. Lightsey, 2330 Springhill Rd., Staunton, VA 24401, stated the application pretty much described what he would like to do on the property. He and his family own a little over 400 acres in this vicinity and as he gets older he is interested in converting some of his farmland into something he can retire on. He stated he took some issue with the ACSA letter. He indicated the new project would be low density residential with 15 or 16 lots. He stated this project is lower density than the surrounding area.

Russell Cline, 166 Pleasant View Rd., Staunton, VA 24401, stated he really wasn't in opposition to the amendment. He just wanted to voice his concerns. He indicated his property backs up to this property and his property is zoned Exclusive Agriculture. He has a working poultry farm. He's concerned some of these lots will be close to the fence line, which is where his poultry operation is. He didn't think the subdivision would hurt him, but he thought he may do something to upset the people who moved into the subdivision. He indicated the truck turn-around area was next to the property line. He also stated there would be a lot of day and night noise. There are tractor trailers that come in day and night to bring feed and to deliver and pick up the poultry. He also stated along with normal farming things, odor and dust may also be someone's concern. He

would hate for people to purchase property there and be surprised and unhappy with his farming operation. He indicated there weren't any houses real close to him right now, but that would change if this project were to move forward. He may want to expand his operation one day and he wouldn't want any of his neighbors to be dissatisfied.

Ms. Tilghman asked Mr. Cline if he had any livestock or did he just have poultry.

Mr. Cline indicated he only had poultry. He hadn't had livestock since 1994.

Curtis Fultz, 2298 Stuarts Draft Hwy., Stuarts Draft, VA 24477, stated he lived in Farmington Estates. He also indicated he was not in opposition to the amendment. His only concern was the minimum square footage for the homes in Farmington and Baldwin subdivisions was 2200 – 2300 square feet. He would like to see that as a minimum square footage for this project as well. He thought this would be beneficial to everyone.

There being no one else desiring to speak in favor of, or in opposition to, the amendment, Ms. Shiflett declared the public hearing closed.

Ms. Tilghman stated what they are looking at is amending the Comprehensive Plan. She indicated she had problems with amending the plan at this point. Since it was adopted in 1994 there have not been many requests to amend the plan, but they seem to be getting more requests to do so. This either means the plan is out of date or it could be the plan is getting ready to be reviewed and there is some apprehension on how it will be amended. She stated nothing is written in stone and if there is a need shown, the Comprehensive Plan can be amended, but when we are on the verge of revisiting the whole situation she doesn't like to see the plan changed if it doesn't have to be. The other concern she had is the information from the ACSA has to be taken into account before a decision is made.

Ms. Shiflett stated there is certainly some question as to whether or not water pressure is adequate. She stated with the water pressure, the recharge area, and the Exclusive Agriculture compatibility there were still some unanswered questions. She commented there are still some things that needed to be addressed.

Mrs. Earhart stated she failed to mention that at the time the comments were sent out, the ACSA indicated there was some concern as to whether or not they could provide public water to the property. The applicant's engineer has submitted new information to the ACSA to address that concern but staff has not received a response back from the ACSA. They have not had an opportunity to review that information.

Mr. Curd stated he would be opposed to amending the Comprehensive Plan without substantial public interest components especially this close to the revision of the plan.

Mr. Byerly asked if noting on the plats that a poultry house is close by and others can be built is adequate notification for someone who would be building a dwelling there. He also asked if there were any other options to protect Mr. Cline. He stated he sympathized with Mr. Cline.

Ms. Tilghman made a motion to deny the request to amend the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion.

Mr. Byerly asked what recommending denial of the amendment would do.

Mr. Cobb stated the recommendation of denial would go on to the Board of Supervisors on April 28th for their final decision.

Ms. Shiflett indicated she didn't think they knew enough yet. She stated it would go against her grain to amend something that we're trying to revise as a whole. If it is amended piecemeal then she didn't think they would be doing justice to the plan as a whole.

Mr. Lightsey stated he was strongly encouraged by the staff of the Community Development Department to use public water rather than private wells. That is the reason the Comprehensive Plan amendment came about.

Ms. Shiflett indicated she thought public water was the correct way to go. She indicated timing was the key and there are still outstanding issues.

Mr. Lightsey stated the issue with the 20 psi of water pressure has been addressed adequately and fully. He indicated he couldn't address the Berry Farm project that is two miles away. He asked when the new Comprehensive Plan would be done.

Ms. Shiflett indicated there was no completion date.

Mr. Cobb also stated there was no completion date. He indicated staff had met with Mike Chandler, a planning consultant on conducting an analysis of the current plan. He further indicated realistically they would be looking at 18 months.

Mr. Lightsey stated he thought they should deal with the plan as it is now.

Mr. Byerly indicated he sympathized with Mr. Lightsey and where he was coming from. He would like to see the plan revision done much faster. He explained from the Commission's standpoint, they are caught between a rock and a hard place.

Mr. Shomo asked when more information from the ACSA would be available.

Mr. Cobb indicated unless Mr. Lightsey wanted to pursue getting in touch with Emery & Garrett Groundwater, Inc., to see what they come up with, he didn't think there would be more input from the ACSA.

Ms. Tilghman indicated this is a bad position to be in. She did indicate this was a good place for a Rural Residential development. The Comprehensive Plan is only one part of the equation. There are water issues and an intensive agriculture operation adjacent to this property.

Mr. Byerly stated he regretted there has to be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to get water to a project that the Commission would normally absolutely vote for.

Mrs. Earhart explained the State Code requires that public improvements be made in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. In order to provide public water to this tract it does have to appear in a Community Development Area and this is a State Code requirement. She also indicated the current designation would allow for wells.

Mr. Bridge asked to hear the motion again.

Ms. Tilghman stated her motion was to recommend denial of the amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to the Board of Supervisors.

The motion carried with a 6 to 1 vote with Mr. Shomo in opposition.

* * * * *

Martin F. Lightsey – Rezoning

A request to rezone from General Agriculture to Rural Residential approximately 115.4 acres owned by Martin F. Lightsey located on the east side of Shutterlee Mill Road (Route 742) across from the entrance to Farmington Estates Subdivision in the Pastures District.

Mrs. Earhart explained the request and stated the following proffers had been submitted:

1. Access from Route 742 to the 115-acre tract will be limited to one commercial entrance/street intersection, with such intersection to align with the existing entrance to Farmington Estates. There will be no individual lot entrances off of Route 742.
2. The minimum square footage for single-family dwellings will be 1800 square feet.
3. No more than 16 lots will be created out of the 115-acre parcel.
4. No manufactured or mobile homes will be allowed on the property. A deed restriction will be placed on the property prohibiting their placement.
5. County water shall be extended to serve all lots.
6. Developer will dedicate up to twenty-five feet (25') of right-of-way to VDOT from the existing centerline of Route 742.
7. The boundary line adjustment associated with the creation of the 115 acre parcel, as depicted on the minor subdivision plat prepared by R.E. Funk and dated December 9, 2003, will be recorded within 45 days of rezoning approval.
8. Developer shall add a note to the final plat of all lots indicating how close a poultry house can be built to the property boundary.

Martin F. Lightsey, 2330 Springhill Rd., Staunton, VA 24401, stated this rezoning request was similar to the previous amendment. He also indicated he would be happy to answer any questions anyone may have.

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

Mr. Byerly asked what type of road would be built in this type of development.

Mr. Cobb indicated it would be a state maintained road.

Mr. Byerly asked if the road would be curb and gutter.

Mr. Cobb indicated it would not have curb and gutter.

Ms. Tilghman stated the water situation is the key issue. We are lacking some information on this one.

Mr. Bridge asked since we don't have all the information could this request be tabled until more information is available and until the Comprehensive Plan is revised.

Ms. Shiflett asked if he wanted it tabled until the Comprehensive Plan is revised or until the Board of Supervisors acts on the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Mr. Bridge made a motion to table the request until the Board of Supervisors acts on the Comprehensive Plan amendment and until more information can be

obtained on the water pressure and the impact of septic systems on the Berry Farm Spring.

Mr. Byerly seconded the motion. He asked, assuming there is water pressure, are our concerns with the water quality at the Berry Farm.

Ms. Shiflett stated if we want more information, we need to ask someone to take care of this, because she didn't think the ACSA was going to take the lead in investigating this.

Mr. Byerly asked what we are asking and who would be responsible for it.

Mr. Cobb indicated he assumed the applicant would be responsible.

Ms. Tilghman asked if Mr. Bridge's motion was dependant on the Board of Supervisors or was it also dependant on this issue as well.

Mr. Bridge indicated it would include the water pressure and the potential impact on the Berry Farm Spring.

Ms. Shiflett asked Mr. Lightsey if he would be willing to get them more information on the impact of the development on the spring.

Mr. Lightsey indicated it sounded awfully expensive and there would not be any guarantees.

Mr. Curd indicated regardless of the water issues, the majority of this property is surrounded by agriculture land, including an intensive agriculture operation, and this would not be compatible.

Mr. Cobb indicated if they were going to table the request to rezone the property, they would need to table it for a specific amount of time. Mr. Cobb stated the Commission needed to explain to the applicant why they were tabling the request and what he needs to do before coming back. It's up to the Planning Commission to decide whether or not they are going to amend the Comprehensive Plan. This would be doing things in reverse order.

Mr. Bridge indicated he wanted his motion to stand because he believed the Berry Farm situation is important enough to at least have some input.

Mr. Byerly stated he would like a geologist to tell them what the impact on the Berry Farm Spring would be.

Mr. Cobb stated the applicant has indicated he does not want to pay for that. He didn't understand why they were going to table the request if no one will pay for a study.

Mr. Byerly stated they could table the request for 30 days until the costs of a geological study could be received.

Mr. Cobb indicated if the Commission was considering tabling the rezoning request they should also consider tabling the Comprehensive Plan amendment instead of recommending denial.

Ms. Tilghman stated amending the Comprehensive Plan wouldn't have anything to do with the water situation.

Mr. Bridge agreed tabling it for 30 days would be appropriate.

The motion carried with a 4 to 3 vote with Ms. Tilghman, Mr. Curd and Ms. Shiflett opposed.

* * * * *

Valley, B.C., L.L.C. – Rezoning

A request to rezone .134 acres from Single Family Residential to Townhouse Residential and .293 acres from Townhouse Residential to Single Family Residential owned by Valley, B.C., L.L.C., located on the north side of Goose Creek Road (Route 640) just east of the intersection of Goose Creek Road (Route 640) and Caldwell Lane (Route 630) in the Wayne District.

Mrs. Earhart explained the request.

Jeff Gentry, Robert E. Funk & Associates, 15 Terry St., Staunton, VA 24401, stated this request is a response to staff's concerns about rear property boundaries being on the other side of the creek.

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

Mr. Byerly stated he thought this request was a reasonable request. He made a motion to recommend approval of the request.

Mr. Shomo seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

County of Augusta – Public Use Overlay

A request to amend and restate the Public Use Overlay proffers on approximately 1.7 acres owned by the County of Augusta located at the end of Government Center Lane in the Augusta County Government Center Complex in Verona in the Beverley Manor District.

Mrs. Earhart explained the request and stated the following proffer had been submitted:

1. Additional permitted uses will be limited to:
 - A. Government Buildings and Properties
 - B. Utility transformer stations, treatment plants, pumping stations, generating stations, public water supply, major transmission lines and towers, telephone exchanges and other utility facilities which require a lot larger or structure taller than permitted under §25-20 of this Chapter.
 - C. Active and passive recreational facilities
 - D. Jails, prisons, and other detention facilities
 - E. Community centers and similar facilities
 - F. Police, rescue squad and fire stations
 - G. Recycling centers and solid waste collection centers
 - H. Carnivals, circuses, fairs, festivals, revivals, animal shows, exhibitions, and similar special events not permitted under § 25-21 of this Chapter.
 - I. Meeting places and offices of civic clubs, fraternities, lodges and other organizations, excepting those the chief activity of which is a service customarily carried on as a business
 - J. Skid car training for law enforcement personnel enrolled in programs conducted by the Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Training Academy (CSCJTA) or for employees of Augusta County, Augusta County Public Schools, Augusta County Sheriff's Office, and Augusta County Service Authority.

Mrs. Earhart explained her husband owned property adjacent to this request and she stated she had filed a conflict of interest statement for the permanent record.

Mr. Cobb indicated some of the training conducted by the Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Training Academy that had been occurring at Eastside Speedway was also going on here at the government center. He stated we needed to make our site legal also.

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

Mr. Hite asked what the hours of operation were. He was concerned with safety.

Mr. Cobb indicated the County Attorney is working with the Central Shenandoah Criminal Justice Training Academy on drawing up a contract. It will be very limited with restricted hours. Although, he indicated the area was not going to be fenced to keep people from walking through the area.

Ms. Tilghman indicated she thought this would be a good place to do this, but with restrictions.

Mr. Byerly made a motion to recommend approval of the request with the proffer as submitted.

Mr. Shomo seconded the motion.

The motion carried on a 5 to 2 vote with Mr. Hite and Ms. Tilghman opposed.

* * * * *

Boyington Place – Master Plan

Boyington Place Subdivision containing 21 lots zoned Single Family Residential (15) and 6 lots zoned Limited Business located on the south side of Jefferson Highway (Route 250) adjacent to the Waynesboro City Limits in the Wayne District.

Mrs. Earhart explained the master plan. She indicated at the time the master plan was submitted there were several things that needed to be done such as the construction plans being approved by the City of Waynesboro, and verification from them that the sewer can be accepted. We do have a copy of the agreement between the two localities and a written letter can be provided to that affect. They have added a note to the plat indicating a conditional letter of map revision for the floodplain needed to be received for the crossing through Pratts Run. They have sent the information to FEMA, but they haven't received the information and the approvals back yet, but they have noted it on the plan. She indicated the remaining concern that staff had is this is part of an existing subdivision that is known as Bridgeport Subdivision and staff does not recommend changing the name.

Ray Burkholder, Balzer & Associates, Inc., 1557 Commerce Rd., Suite 201, Verona, VA, 24482, stated originally there was only about four acres of this piece as part of the master plan for Bridgeport development. Those four (4) acres have been incorporated into the rest of this development. The Limited Business wasn't part of the original development and the business portion wants its own identity.

Mr. Shomo asked where the access for Bridgeport was now.

Mr. Burkholder indicated it all came around Aero Drive, so they are providing a second ingress/egress.

Ms. Tilghman asked if the commercial was in the front.

Mr. Burkholder indicated it was.

Ms. Tilghman asked if the main concern was with the name of the business property or both.

Mr. Burkholder indicated the concern was with both.

Ms. Tilghman indicated she understood his point, but it could become very confusing changing the name. She asked why he thought they needed to change the residential name.

Mr. Burkholder stated they were not changing the name on the residential portion; it was never part of Bridgeport. Only the very back portion was originally part of Bridgeport. There are two reasons for the name change. One being they want the commercial property separate from the residential property. You are going to be entering through the commercial so it would be nice for that flow to continue through the development. He asked Mr. Cobb if the back portion was master planned with those other lots. He also asked if all the residential lots were zoned at the same time.

Mr. Cobb indicated they didn't require master plans until 1995. There may have been a preliminary plan, but nothing official. He indicated all of the residential property was zoned at the same time. He commented Windward Pointe was approved with business zoning along the front and residential in the back. It was approved all under the same name.

Mr. Curd asked if they would be willing to compromise and name the residential portion Bridgeport Subdivision and name the business portion Boyington Place.

Mr. Burkholder stated he thought that was a good compromise. However, the property owners wish to keep the residential separate from Bridgeport as well.

Mr. Curd made a motion to recommend approval contingent upon written approval from the City of Waynesboro on acceptance of the sewer flows and the residential portion be called Bridgeport.

Mr. Bridge stated he understood their reasoning in wanting to change the name.

Ms. Tilghman seconded the motion.

The motion carried on a vote of 5 to 2 with Mr. Shomo and Mr. Bridge opposed.

* * * * *

Ruby Estates – Master Plan

Ruby Estates Subdivision containing 8 lots zoned General Business; 105 lots zoned Townhouse Residential; 76 lots zoned Single Family Residential and 5 lots zoned Rural Residential located east of the intersection of Route 640 and Route 285 in the Wayne District.

Mrs. Earhart explained the master plan. She stated at the time the plan was submitted there were some outstanding issues. At this point, the County does want to reserve the right not to accept easements on intermittent stream channels. She stated the master plan met the technical requirements of the Ordinance.

Ms. Tilghman made a motion to recommend approval of the master plan.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

Capital Improvements Plan

Mr. Cobb stated the Commission heard the presentation of the plan in worksession and if no one had any questions or comments; they needed to make a recommendation on the plan.

Mr. Bridge made a motion to recommend approval of the plan.

Mr. Byerly seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

Triangle Drive Extension

Ms. Tilghman made a motion to bring the item from the table.

Ms. Bridge seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Shiflett stated she thought the whole area should be looked at because it's going to impact the uses in that area. She indicated we can't look at the road individually. She stated she thought it would strongly impact the area because of it being an agriculture area.

Mr. Cobb stated it could be done as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. He stated he thought they would be able to have a worksession on it in 60 days.

Mrs. Earhart stated she wanted to make sure she was correct. She asked if they wanted it in 60 days as part of an amendment or did they want to be able to look at it in 60 days.

Ms. Shiflett indicated to have it ready for a worksession.

Ms. Tilghman made a motion to table the request and make it part of the advertised Comprehensive Plan update.

Mr. Bridge seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Matters to be Presented by the Public

Jeff Gentry, Robert E. Funk & Associates, 15 Terry St., Staunton, VA 24401, commented he understood their dilemma in going through the Comprehensive Plan revision and it taking 12 – 18 months to do that. He stated on their side, in the private sector and for the general public, it may helpful if the Commission isn't going to entertain any comprehensive plan amendments that they let people know that. He asked the Commission to give County staff some direction on how they want to proceed and what staff should be telling the public regarding this.

Comments from the Commission

Mr. Byerly asked if the worksession on May 24th was still on. He asked if the time had been set.

Mrs. Earhart explained it would be late afternoon into the evening, with the specific time yet to be determined.

Ms. Shiflett stated the Commission needed to deal with the issue as to whether or not they want to deal with any Comprehensive Plan amendments between now and the time the revisions are advertised. She asked what the Commission wished to do.

Ms. Tilghman stated she agreed with Mr. Gentry. She indicated if we would prefer not to look at them we need to make that known. What this might do is give the Board of Supervisors a shove to expedite the Comprehensive Plan revisions as quickly as possible.

Mr. Byerly stated he would echo Ms. Tilghman's sentiment. The plan changes are unknown and he would hope the revision would move more rapidly.

Ms. Tilghman made a motion to not deal with any more Comprehensive Plan amendments individually and wait on the revision as a whole. She would ask the Board of Supervisors to concur.

Mr. Byerly seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Tilghman made comments regarding the County of Augusta's request for skid car training approval. She stated she didn't think just because it was the government's property that public safety be overlooked. The agreement needs to reflect the safety concerns.

Ms. Shiflett asked since there was a split vote, should one of the Commissioners be present and address the Board of Supervisors on this issue.

Mr. Cobb indicated the Board of Supervisors would ask him to fill them in. At this particular meeting Mrs. Earhart and he will both be gone. He will brief Doug Wolfe on the Commission's concerns.

STAFF REPORTS

A. CODE OF VIRGINIA – SECTION 15.2-2310

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

Z & Z Machine, Inc. – 04-35

Ms. Shiflett made a motion, seconded by Ms. Tilghman, that a large business would be out of character in this area. She indicated it would be more appropriate in business zoning. We need to discourage regular businesses going in agriculture zoning. Motion carried unanimously.

H. Joseph Williams – 04-37

Mr. Bridge made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hite, that a large business would be out of character in this area. He indicated it would be more appropriate in business zoning. We need to discourage regular businesses going in agriculture zoning. Motion carried unanimously.

Margaret E. Bright (Life), Carolyn B. Clements and Donald L. Bright – 04-4 (Variance)

Ms. Tilghman made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bridge, to recommend denial of the variance. Since the ordinance was changed requiring 150' of lot width for each lot in agriculture zoning, there are a lot of properties that can't be subdivided. Motion carried unanimously.

Comprehensive Plan Update

Mrs. Earhart passed out an example of an analysis of planning documents that Mike Chandler recommended the County consider doing. She also distributed a proposal for the housing element submitted by Virginia Tech’s Center for Housing Research. The Board of Supervisors is considering both proposals.

Route 636/640 Update

Mrs. Earhart updated the Commission on the Route 636/640 corridor and provided them with a budget sheet on the project. The recommendations are going forward with the Comprehensive Plan amendment. Staff is also recommending the changes to projected land uses along Route 636, adjacent to the hospital. It has been shown as industrial. It doesn’t appear to be industrial property any longer. Staff is recommending that there be business adjacent to the hospital to the railroad track and then Medium Density Residential and Business to Route 250. The Commission concurred with staff and directed them to proceed with the amendment.

Certified Planning Commissioners Course

Ms. Shiflett and Mr. Curd both stated this course is very beneficial and informative. Ms. Shiflett indicated this course is reminding them how important it is that the Commission let applicants know why they make the decisions they make on a request. She encouraged each member to state why they are voting for or against the motion. This could protect the Commission legally.

* * * * *

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

* * * * *

Chairman

Secretary