

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
JUNE 21, 2006**

The Greene County Planning held a work session on Wednesday, June 21, 2006 at 6:30 in the County Meeting Room to discuss the Comprehensive Plan Amendment.

Those present were:

- Gary Lowe, Chairman
- Jim Davis, Vice Chairman
- Davis Lamb, Member
- Graydon Lamb, Member
- Phyllis Woodfolk, Member
- Mickey Cox, Ex-officio Member
- Bart Svoboda, Zoning Administrator
- Stephanie Golon, Planner
- Kelly Clay, Secretary

Mr. Lowe called the work session to order and explained the procedure for tonight. He asked Mr. Svoboda for a staff report.

Mr. Svoboda said this is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, request CPA#06-001. He said we need to broaden our scope to look at our whole growth area, what to take out and what to put in. He reviewed an overhead presentation pointing our growth areas as to what is developed and what is out there to develop.

Ms. Golon said there are copies in the PC packets to follow along with using the overhead presentation.

Mr. Svoboda continued his overhead presentation.

Mr. Lowe said that the criteria we use to be inclusive was location to public water and public sewer and good road access.

Mr. Svoboda confirmed the criteria.

Mr. Lowe said that the other areas deleted lacked one, two or three of the above items.

Mr. Svoboda said that was correct, that most of them lacked all three of the items.

Mr. Lowe said that we are looking at the pros and con's and what-if scenario's. He said at this time, he would like to open the meeting up to the public.

Mr. Marty Silman approached the PC. He said he is against the amendment. He said a lot of hours were spent into the present Comprehensive Plan. He said that he feels the present Comprehensive Plan has not been in place long enough to see whether it is

working or not. He said that he understands it could be amended every 5 years and it has only been in place for 2 years. He said he feels this is not enough time to see if things are working the way they were planned. He said we should give it more time and then we could look back and see where the problems were or are and look into amendments then. Mr. Silman also expressed his thoughts about the growth area.

Carl Schmitt approached the PC. He said he would like to thank the PC on taking a broad look at this issue. He said that we don't have a very good idea of what the growth area should be. He asked what the growth area is supposed to represent. He said that there should be overall objectives as to what one would want to have in the growth area. He said that he sent an e-mail to the Planning Department with a list of items to maybe consider using as a starting point to define growth area. He said a good starting point is to find what land is already zoned for growth. He said also identifying areas where public water and sewer are or expected to be would help define one area of properties that would seem to be appropriate for the growth area. He said another objective would be to identify the areas suited for specific plans of growth such as senior residential or planned unit development. He said also to identify areas you would want to protect. Mr. Schmitt said that another item that should be looked at is what type of pattern you want. He said that he doesn't favor this proposal. He said that he doesn't favor it exactly the way it is. He said when it was mentioned at the last meeting, we are eliminating three areas but most of those areas are already developed. He said we are trading undeveloped land for developed land. He said that one objective is to reduce the growth map. Mr. Schmitt said it is way too large and there is too much land identified as growth. He said that we shouldn't add more undeveloped area to the growth map.

Ms. Andrea Wilkinson approached the PC. She said that she agrees with Carl's comments. She said that one of the basic planning principles with the Comprehensive Plan was to encourage thriving communities in Ruckersville, which was our economic center and Stanardsville where we are trying to attract tourism. She said we were trying to keep an open service corridor to make getting from Ruckersville to Stanardsville an easy access. Ms. Wilkinson said that she feels we need to stick with our plan. She said get Ruckersville up and running and then get Stanardsville up and running and then get between them and have our schools and public services easy accessible. She expressed concerns regarding adding to the growth area.

Mr. Carroll Morris was signed up to speak but chose to pass his comments.

Ms. Hariett Bowie approached the PC. She said that she agrees with all those who have spoken before her but said no one has addressed natural resources issues. She said the choices we make now will have a great influence on the wellness of our County verses the wealth of the County. She said that her main concern is water.

Mr. Lowe closed the comments to the public and opened up to the PC.

Mr. Lowe said Mr. Carroll Morris, the applicant is here tonight.

Mr. Davis Lamb said he would like to comment on the memo about the County not having adequate water supply. He said we talk a lot about water resources but we are not thinking about land resource, open space. He said if we are going to develop all of it at this time in the next 5-10 years, then what is it going to be down the road.

Mr. Lowe said that he would like to make everyone aware that we are talking about the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. He said before anything is re-zoned, it still has to go through the re-zoning process. He said this is a multi-step process.

There was discussion about taking land already developed out. Mr. Lowe said that we are trying to look at roads, water and sewer. He said we could use these three criteria to put property in the growth area but in turn could we use these three criteria to take property out. He said yes they have been developed as far as residential for that zoning, but they could still have an opportunity if they are in the growth area to even be developed but if they don't meet the three criteria then that would be reason for pulling them out.

Mr. Davis Lamb commented on the growth area being twice the size of Charlottesville. He also commented on Mr. Silman's comment regarding the Comprehensive Plan being in place only 2 years and it hasn't even had a 5 year trial period.

There were discussion/questions using the colored graph prepared by Ms. Golon.

Mr. Graydon Lamb said that if some of the areas shown on the graph should come out, then maybe those areas should be looked at on their own as opposed to being tied to something else coming in. He said the ones we are looking at putting in, we need to look at them with the question, and should they be put in and not tied to something coming out. Mr. Lamb discussed the growth area map with Mr. Svoboda pointing out several areas.

Mr. Lowe said that we do have a Comprehensive Plan that we amend every 5 years and it has been in place for 2 years but things do change. He said there are opportunities for change if it makes sense. He said that he feels we need to concentrate our growth area where we have the three ingredients – good roads, water and sewer. He said that the trade off would be in where we are deleting properties. He said that we do have a substantial growth area.

Mr. Jim Davis said that the rationales are sound if you desire to develop at this time but he feels the County is growing too fast. He also expressed concerns with the timing and feels that there may be a timeline. Mr. Davis expressed his concerns about shortage of water and that we look at the Comprehensive Plan in 3 years.

There was discussion about the inventory of land zoned for business. Ms. Golon provided the PC a packet with statistics from the Thomas Jefferson Planning District.

There was discussion about roads, water and sewer availability. There was also discussion about the cost for somebody to run the water and sewer lines. Mr. Svoboda said that the developer would pick up these expenses.

Ms. Golon pointed out a paper that would show proposed zoning and current zoning. She said there were maps that followed as well.

Mr. Davis asked if A-1 is what is mostly being taken out.

Ms. Golon and Mr. Svoboda said yes that is correct.

Mr. Svoboda reviewed the current future residential growth.

Mr. Lowe said he would like to comment on the explosive development that has been taking place. He said that he would like to remind everyone that over the past ten years that the bulk of the development has been residential growth. He said that right now he sees the emphasis being put on commercial development which he said he feels is a good thing for the County as long as it is done correctly and in the right place. Mr. Lowe said that if we could build up the business side and be very mindful of the residential side, then we could start to achieve a balance that will offer a reasonable tax break with services that this County needs and deserves. He said he is leaning in favor of this plan but still doesn't feel there is enough trade-off of raw land out verses raw land in.

Mr. Svoboda reviewed the current zoning of the future growth area.

Mr. Lowe commented on that we really need to focus on the commercial development. He said that we have the roof tops to attract businesses and we have the workforce. He said that the emphasis over the next few years needs to be on trying to balance the tax base with more of the business side and he would like to offer reasonable options. He asked Mr. Svoboda for options at this point.

Mr. Svoboda said that it can always be taken back to a public hearing, vote to pass it on to the BOS, work session and if we want to stick to the original proposal.

Mr. Lowe asked what the PC desire would be so that this could be moved on. He asked Mr. Carroll Morris to step forward and offer his comments.

Mr. Carroll Morris approached the PC and said that he was told that his property is a more applicable place to develop. He said there was no one present that grew up in the County expressing any concerns against his proposal. He said that he feels that the PC is to determine if this proposal makes more sense than what we have.

Mr. Lowe commented that he is glad Mr. Morris has brought this forward to the PC. He said that the PC has to look out for the best of the County and that is why we are going through this exercise to see if in addition to what Mr. Morris has offered, he agrees with in theory, is just that it needs to be refined better and have rationale for proposal of what

we are doing. He asked the PC what their thoughts were with moving on with this proposal.

Mr. Woodfolk said that we need to determine what is best for the County. She commented on whether these lots should be taken out or put in. She said that we need to determine what is logical even if there are no trade-offs.

Mr. Davis Lamb said that maybe we should stick with Mr. Morris' first proposal.

Mr. Jim Davis said that because of the pace of the growth, he just cannot get comfortable. He said that it needs to be clear as to what kind of houses and types of businesses.

Mr. Lowe said that the PC has control over the type of growth.

The PC agreed to bring Mr. Morris' original proposal back to next months PC meeting.

Mr. Lowe said he is in favor of a public hearing. He asked that staff advertise as a public hearing.

The PC agreed to bring this proposal back to the 07/19/2006 meeting as a public hearing.

There being no further discussion, the work session was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Clay