

PRESENT: T. Byerly, Chairman
K. Shiflett, Vice Chairman
J. Curd
T. Cole
K. Leonard
R.L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary

ABSENT: S. Bridge
W. F. Hite

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, August 11, 2009, at 4:00 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 Plan of Development. The Planning Commission traveled to the following site which will be considered by the Commission:

1. Augusta Woods – Plan of Development

* * * * *

Chairman

Secretary

PRESENT: T. Byerly, Chairman
K. Shiflett, Vice Chairman
S. Bridge
T. Cole
J. Curd
K. Leonard
R. L. Earhart, Senior Planner and Secretary

ABSENT: W.F. Hite

VIRGINIA: At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, August 11, 2009, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

* * * * *

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Mr. Byerly stated as there were six (6) members present, there was a quorum.

* * * * *

MINUTES

Mr. Bridge moved to approve the minutes of the regular meeting held on July 14, 2009.

Ms. Shiflett seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

* * * * *

Augusta Woods – Plan of Development

A request to approve a Plan of Development for Augusta Woods Manufactured Home Park located on Jefferson Highway (Route 250) just east of Interstate 81 in the Beverley Manor District. The development will consist of 240 units and recreational areas.

Ms. Earhart described the Plan of Development.

Brasil Hamrick, Hamrick Engineering, Verona, Virginia, stated he is the designer and planner for the development. He introduced Raymond Eavers, owner of the property.

Mr. Hamrick gave the Planning Commission a brief overview of the history of the property. He stated the property was rezoned in 1989. Mr. Hamrick stated the original Plan of Development included 266 home sites and was approved in 1998. He explained in 2000, the site plan was approved with access over the CSX Railroad tracks. Mr. Hamrick explained problems arose with the access to the development across the railroad tracks. He stated they looked at options of building a bridge over the railroad tracks and Route 250, but that did not work out. He stated eventually, an agreement was made with the Frontier Culture Museum for an access road under the interstate to access the park, which is the plan before the Commission tonight. He stated he wants to work with the Planning Commission in order to get approval for this plan tonight.

Ms. Shiflett voiced concern with the children in the park boarding and getting off of the school buses at the end of the cul-de-sac. She asked about the grade of the parking lot to the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Hamrick stated the parking lot is almost level with a grade of 5%.

Ms. Shiflett asked if the parking lot would remain where it is now which is up a large hill.

Mr. Hamrick answered no. He explained there will be some cut and fill done to enlarge the parking lot as well as make it more level.

Ms. Shiflett stated she didn't believe there was enough parking and the estimate of 120 kids was probably low. She questioned if the circulation would prevent parking and backups at the entrance to the parking lot.

Mr. Hamrick stated Bill Schindler has indicated there are no issues with the parking. He stated there are currently forty-eight (48) spaces. He stated he has asked staff to give him a required number of spaces which they have not provided.

Ms. Shiflett stated if Mr. Schindler said that, she disagrees with him as she believes there will be more children and they need close to one hundred (100) spaces and a more efficient circulation pattern. She further stated there will be bottlenecks at the entrance to the parking lot with the design that is currently proposed.

Mr. Hamrick stated they have decided to add a second entrance to the parking lot off of the public road and that will address that concern.

Ms. Shiflett asked about a bike rack and a shelter for the children while they wait for the school buses.

Mr. Leonard stated there was space on the other side of the road and asked if more parking spaces could be added there. He echoed the need for a covered shelter to be added.

Mr. Hamrick stated the parking will work like the school complex at Fort Defiance. He wanted to put the shelter on the other side of the road, but staff did not like that proposal.

Mr. Leonard stated he understands staff's safety concerns with the pavilion on the other side of the road. Ideally, he stated they want the shelter close to the parking lot and on the same side of the road. Mr. Leonard also asked if there could be additional parking.

Mr. Hamrick asked how many more spaces.

Mr. Leonard stated another forty-eight (48) spaces on the other side of the road that could be phased in with the development of the park.

Mr. Hamrick stated one hundred (100) units and forty-eight (48) spaces will be placed in the first phase. Another forty-eight (48) could be added in the second phase if needed. Mr. Hamrick recommended staff could conduct a visual inspection to determine if these spaces are needed.

Mr. Leonard asked Mr. Hamrick for a time frame for the completion of the project.

Mr. Hamrick stated an aggressive approach would be fifty (50) units per year for a total of five (5) years for the first phase. He explained the first phase would be one hundred (100) units, but they could possibly accommodate more based what is already built.

Mr. Cole asked about the location of the pavilion.

Mr. Hamrick asked if the pavilion was really necessary.

Ms. Shiflett stated a shelter is needed for children waiting on the school buses.

Mr. Byerly stated the shelter does not necessarily have to be enclosed.

Mr. Hamrick stated the shelter will be 24' x 24'.

Ms. Shiflett stated the shelter could be longer and not as wide, based on what will fit on the property with the topography and the required setbacks.

Mr. Leonard asked where this pavilion will be located.

Mr. Hamrick answered at the end of the cul-de-sac on the park side of the parking lot.

Mr. Cole questioned the amount of traffic that will be using the road at 8:00 am. He asked if this flow will work.

Mr. Hamrick answered certainly.

Mr. Cole asked for further explanation.

Mr. Hamrick stated during peak hours in the morning, there will be no more than thirty-five (35) vehicles on the road.

Mr. Cole stated he does not agree there will be no more than thirty-five (35) vehicles per hour during the peak hour with people going to school and work. He stated concern with children and the flow of traffic and asked if there is a bypass lane.

Mr. Hamrick answered no.

Mr. Cole stated it will be a bottleneck.

Mr. Byerly also voiced concern with public safety.

Mr. Cole asked if there was any on street parking. He asked where the residents' visitors on the end units will park.

Mr. Hamrick stated visitor parking will be at the entrance. He further stated visitors could walk or be shuttled to the homes. He stated the purpose of the spaces is for control, that if someone wanted more spaces, they could accommodate up to five (5) on a lot that they would have to pay for, but it can be done.

Mr. Cole asked how this will be enforced.

Mr. Hamrick answered that there would be on-site management.

Mr. Byerly asked if this is a method commonly used in a park of this size.

Mr. Hamrick stated they do not want parking scattered throughout the park. He explained they do not want residents living next to the parking lot. He stated rather, they can walk to the recreational areas.

Ms. Shiflett asked if these were all rental spaces.

Mr. Hamrick stated the homes will be privately owned, but the spaces will be rental.

Mr. Leonard stated there are two (2) centrally located recreational areas and he would like to see parking there.

Mr. Hamrick stated the whole point is for people to walk to these areas, but his goal is to satisfy the Planning Commission.

Mr. Leonard stated he wanted to see parking around the recreation area.

Mr. Hamrick stated no one wants to live next to a parking lot.

Ms. Shiflett stated someone will have to.

Mr. Hamrick stated it is highly unlikely that the additional parking lots will be utilized.

Mr. Bridge stated he feels the Planning Commission should take care of the problem before it starts. He stated he feels people are not going to walk to the recreation areas. He explained if the mobile home park was smaller, parking may not be an issue. He stated the larger the park, the more parking will be required, so it is important to solve these issues in the beginning stages of review.

Mr. Hamrick asked the Commission how visitors will get from one of these new parking areas to the homes they are visiting.

Mr. Bridge stated the walk will be shorter if the extra parking is added.

Mr. Leonard stated the landscaping could be placed to make it more aesthetically pleasing and allow it to blend with the park.

Mr. Hamrick stated it is like charging citizens for rescue services. He stated every time something is added, everybody pays.

Mr. Byerly asked if the park manager controls on street parking.

Mr. Hamrick answered yes. He stated it is a necessary task. He explained the development will be a family oriented park, making it difficult for it to become "party central". He stated it has nothing to do with the density, as the park will still be a total of two hundred-forty (240) units. He stated he just feels more parking is not needed.

Ms. Shiflett stated they will have to agree to disagree.

Mr. Hamrick stated he will do whatever it takes to get approval.

Mr. Leonard stated this was a public safety issue. He stated it is necessary for rescue services and law enforcement to pass through.

Ms. Shiflett again expressed support for parking at the recreation areas.

Mr. Bridge stated the extra parking will help the recreational areas to be more utilized.

Mr. Byerly stated he wanted to know how many parking spaces could be added.

Mr. Leonard stated he is not trying to be constraining, he just wanted to know how many spaces will fit.

Mr. Hamrick stated ten (10) to twelve (12) gravel spaces. He asked the Planning Commission to tell him what they prefer.

Mr. Leonard stated ten (10) spaces each at recreation areas 1 and 2. He asked where the sidewalks will be located.

Mr. Hamrick stated the sidewalks will connect the homes to the recreation area.

Mr. Curd asked about the specific recreation amenities.

Mr. Hamrick stated Ron Sites, Director of Parks and Recreation, has approved the facilities which will cost approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Leonard asked if a bike rack at the bus pick up was an option.

Ms. Shiflett stated she too would like to see that.

Mr. Hamrick stated he does not feel that is necessary.

Mr. Leonard stated he would like to have it as an option.

Mr. Curd asked if access over the railroad was an option. In regards to the private road, he asked how this will be controlled.

Mr. Hamrick stated the access is not an option.

Mr. Eavers answered if the road is used, it will be considered trespassing.

Mr. Leonard asked if the road could be blocked.

Mr. Eavers stated that will be done.

Mr. Hamrick stated the Augusta County Service Authority wants access to the road.

Mr. Curd asked if blocking the road should be added to the plan.

Mr. Leonard stated that should be their problem.

Ms. Shiflett moved to approve the Plan of Development as amended to include a second access to the parking lot, a pavilion with bike racks, two (2) ten (10) space parking areas at the recreational areas, and an agreement to build additional parking (up to forty-eight spaces), if utilization or the initial lot indicates on a pro-rata basis that additional parking is needed. If the need for parking would be less than five (5) spaces, additional parking would not be required.

Mr. Bridge seconded the motion.

Mr. Byerly stated this proposal has been on the table for quite some time. He stated he is glad it has reached a point to be approved. He stated he feels there is no better place for this development as it is not highly visible and can be easily serviced by the County. He stated he feels this type of development is better than small manufactured home parks scattered throughout the County. He stated he appreciates the effort that has gone on to get this plan developed. He stated he can support the request.

The motion carried unanimously.

* * * * *

STAFF REPORTS

A. **CODE OF VIRGINIA – SECTION 15.2-2310**

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

09-44 Estate of Daniel K. Croft 1/2 and French Moore 1/2

With this property being located in an Agriculture Conservation Area. Ms. Shiflett moved to recommend to the Board of Zoning Appeals that they consider the public safety of the rockets being launched on the property and concern for the impacts on adjacent properties if the rockets were to veer off course.

Mr. Curd seconded the motion which carried unanimously.

09- 46 Ellen L. Moffett

Mr. Curd stated this property is located in an Urban Service Area and in the middle of a large residential area. He moved to voice concern to the Board of Zoning Appeals about the appropriateness of the area for the proposed use especially as it relates to noise and privacy issues.

Mr. Cole seconded the motion which passed 5-1.

* * * * *

Ms. Earhart updated the Commission on the status on the ordinance revisions. She stated they are continuing with the revisions and asked their preference regarding separate or joint worksessions with the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Cole stated it is not as effective having more people involved as it is harder to get things accomplished.

Mr. Byerly stated he supported having joint worksessions as the Board will make the final decision and he feels members have more influence on the Board when meeting with them in person.

Mr. Leonard agreed to joint worksessions.

Mr. Bridge stated he too supports a joint worksession. He stated it is more effective to discuss in person rather than through memos.

* * * * *

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

* * * * *

Chairman

Secretary