

March 19, 2015

VIRGINIA: At a Regular Meeting, of the Hanover County Planning Commission in the Board Auditorium of the Hanover County Government Building, Hanover County, Virginia, on Thursday, March 19, 2015 at 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Ms. Claiborne R. Winborne, Chairman
Mr. Larry A. Leadbetter, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Jerry W. Bailey
Mrs. Edmonia P. Iverson
Mr. C. Harold Padgett, Jr
Mrs. Ashley H. Peace
Mr. Randy A. Whittaker

STAFF

PRESENT: Mr. David P. Maloney
Mr. Lee W. Garman
Mr. Dennis A. Walter
Mrs. Tiffany M. Burton

Chairman Winborne called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. *All members were present.*

She welcomed everyone and invited them to participate. Chairman Winborne highlighted the Commissioner's Rules of Order and explained the process for a public hearing.

Chairman Winborne led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Winborne acknowledged Ryan Kaegi in the audience. Ryan is with the Boy Scouts and is attending the meeting to work on one of his badges.

Consideration of Agenda Amendments by Action of the Commission

Chairman Winborne asked if there were any changes to tonight's agenda

There were none.

Citizens' Time

Citizens' Time is limited to 20 minutes, and each speaker shall be allotted five minutes.

Chairman Winborne opened Citizen's Time, asking if there was anyone there wishing to speak to the Commission on an issue not on the Agenda.

No one addressed the Commission during Citizens' time.

March 19, 2015

Chairman Winborne closed Citizen's Time.

REQUEST FOR DEFERRAL

Chairman Winborne turned the meeting over to Mr. Garman to present the deferral request.

Rezoning

C-18-14(c) DANA A. AND THOMAS E. PREBLE, Request to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District, to AR-6(c), Agricultural Residential District with conditions, on GPIN 7863-14-3339, consisting of approximately 8.9 acres, and located on the west line of Rocketts Mill Road (State Route 685) approximately 425 feet north of its intersection with Little Bridge Drive (private road) in the **BEAVERDAM MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan Map as Agricultural. The proposed zoning amendment would permit the creation of one additional lot for a family member for a gross density of one (1) dwelling unit per 4.45 acres. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Garman briefly presented the request for deferral.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Iverson to defer the case until the next regularly scheduled meeting, seconded by Mr. Padgett, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY FOR THE DEFERRAL OF C-18-14(c), DANA A. AND THOMAS E. PREBLE.**

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Aye
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

EXPEDITED PUBLIC HEARINGS

Chairman Winborne explained the expedited agenda and asked if there was anyone present who wished to speak regarding any of these cases.

No one stepped forward, so the Commission proceeded on to the Expedited Agenda.

March 19, 2015

CUP-1-10 AM. 1-15 BETHLEHEM PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, INC., Requests an amendment to a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Section 26-20.21 of the Hanover County Zoning Ordinance to permit an amendment to the sketch plan on GPINs 8765-28-6454, 8765-28-3157 and 8765-28-2202, consisting of approximately 8.37 acres, zoned A-1, Agricultural District, and located on the north line of Old Church Road (State Route 606) at its intersection with Ironwood Lane (private road) in the **HENRY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan Map as Agricultural. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Garman briefly presented this request to amend the approved sketch plan and conditions to allow a second entrance. Staff recommends approval subject to conditions outlined in the staff report.

Chairman Winborne opened the public hearing and asked if the applicant was present and in agreement with the staff recommendations. The applicant was not present. Because it is an expedited case, the applicant is assumed to be in agreement being that the applicant was not present. She asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the public hearing.

Chairman Winborne then asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission.

Mr. Bailey stated he had the opportunity to speak with Ms. Cappello, the applicant on behalf of the church. He said this is on the western part of the church where the church has their fellowship hall. He said she shared that it has been especially inconvenient for the elderly to go all the way around the building to get to this part of the church. The original request was by VDOT and now VDOT has lifted the restriction on that entrance.

Chairman Winborne then asked for a motion.

Upon a motion by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Mrs. Iverson, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF CUP-1-10, AM. 1-15, BETHLEHEM PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, INC. SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT:**

1. The subject property shall only be used for a church and its associated uses.

March 19, 2015

2. The Phase 1 sanctuary building shall be designed and constructed in substantial conformity with the submitted elevations titled, "Bethlehem Presbyterian Church", prepared by Huff Morris Architects, dated January 4, 2010. Elevations for the Phase 2 sanctuary expansion and the multi-purpose building shall be submitted to the Planning Commission for its review and approval prior to site plan approval for any Phase 2 improvement. All Phase 2 development shall be developed with a unified architectural theme and shall be compatible with the existing structures. The standard of compatibility shall be met through scale, bulk, mass, materials and colors.
3. No expansion of the existing or proposed use, structures or features shall be added to this site without an amendment to this Conditional Use Permit.
4. The Owner shall dedicate thirty feet (30') of right-of-way from the centerline of Old Church Road (State Route 606) to the property for future road widening, free of cost to the County and free of encumbrances upon request of the County or VDOT.
5. All new parking areas shall be designed and landscaped in accordance with Division 4, Parking, Loading and Access Regulations, of the Hanover County Code.
6. Rooftop, building, and ground level heating and air conditioning equipment on any building(s) shall be fully screened from view by any persons on any public right-of-ways or from adjacent residential uses. Any mechanical units placed on the rooftops or walls of buildings will be fully screened by architectural features and materials that are compatible with the building façade architecture and materials. Any ground level units shall be fully screened at a height not less than the equipment being screened, utilizing evergreen landscaping, attached or unattached wing walls or decorative masonry, which must be designed to be architecturally compatible with the building façade architecture and materials.
7. Prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Church, the existing shed at the northern side lot line shall be relocated so it does not encroach into any required yard setbacks.
8. All development and use of the Property shall comply with all federal, state and local statutes, ordinances and regulations.

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Aye
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

March 19, 2015

Rezoning

C-5-06(c) AM. 1-15 **MARIA L. AND JOHN P. HUDNALL, JR. (MASON ESTATES)**, Request an amendment to the proffers approved with rezoning request C-5-06(c), Hendree F. and Paul H. Mason, Jr., on GPIN 8754-26-7625, zoned AR-6(c), Agricultural Residential District with conditions, and located at the terminus of Hendree Lane (private road) approximately 1,300 feet west of intersection with McClellan Road (State Route 628) in the **COLD HARBOR MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The proposed zoning amendment would amend the cash proffer. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Garman briefly presented this request to amend the cash proffer for one lot in the Mason Estates Subdivision. Staff recommends approval subject to the submitted proffers.

Chairman Winborne opened the public hearing and asked if the applicant was present and in agreement with the staff recommendations. From the audience, the applicant acknowledged that he was in agreement. She asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the public hearing.

Chairman Winborne then asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission. There was no discussion; Chairman Winborne then asked for a motion.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Peace, seconded by Mr. Padgett, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF C-5-06(c), AM. 1-15, MARIA L. AND JOHN P. HUDNALL, JR., SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS OUTLINED IN THE STAFF REPORT:**

1. The Property shall be divided in substantial conformity with the conceptual plan entitled "Conceptual Plan of GPIN# 8754-26-9903 Situated West of Quietude Section #1 and East of Blueberry Hill Lane," dated July 5, 2006, revised July 25, 2006, prepared by Downing Surveys, Inc. The Property shall be divided into three lots.
2. The Property Owner, for himself, his successors and assigns, agrees to pay Hanover County prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Property, the amount of Two Thousand Three Hundred Six and 00/100 (\$2,306.00) per single family unit built on the Property. The funds shall be used for the purpose of completing off-site road improvements relating to the development allowed by the rezoning and included in the Business and Residential Development Road Improvements Transportation Policy, adopted March 13, 2013. In the event funds are paid and are not used for such improvements, the County shall return the funds paid to the Owner or his successors in title.

March 19, 2015

3. Access to the lots to be subdivided from the Property shall be provided by a private road to be constructed within the bounds of a shared 50-foot access easement as shown on the Plan. There shall be no other access for the Property to State Route 628 other than this access. The road shall be paved and maintained by the Property Owner or its successor in title.
4. No cinder block, cement block or asbestos shingles shall be permitted for the finished exterior of any structure.
5. All houses shall have brick, stone, stucco or dryvit type finished foundations.
6. Each house shall have the following minimum finished floor areas, exclusive of covered porches, covered stoops, breezeways, garages, basements, and cellars, as follows:

1 Story	-	2,000 Square Feet
1½ Story	-	2,200 Square Feet
2 Story	-	2,400 Square Feet

Floor area shall be measured along the exterior walls of the structure.

7. Within the area of the building envelope as shown on the Conceptual Plan, existing trees of five-inch (5") or greater on the Property shall not be removed, with the exception of dead or diseased trees or parts thereof; provided, however, this shall not prevent the removal of trees necessary for the construction of improvements, driveways, drainfields or drainage facilities or swimming pools. Outside the building envelope, existing trees of five-inch (5") or greater on the Property shall not be removed, with the exception of dead or diseased trees or parts thereof.
8. The Property Owner shall provide a drilled deep well upon each lot. Should production from the deep well prove inadequate for requisite household use with respect to either quantity or quality, a shallow well may be used.
9. Electric utility lines which provide service to the lots shall be run underground.
10. Should a grave or cemetery be discovered at any point in the development of the subject Property that cannot remain in its current location and must be relocated, the Property Owner shall remove and relocate the human remains from the cemetery through the permit procedure administered by the Virginia Department of Human Resources. The Property Owner shall be responsible for all costs and expenses associated with the cemetery removal or relocation.
11. All residential dwellings and ancillary outbuildings constructed on lots subdivided from the Property shall be located within the area of the building envelope for each lot as shown on the Conceptual Plan. This restriction, however, shall not prohibit the location of buildings outside of the building envelope, provided such buildings are used solely to board or provide shelter for livestock or store equipment, tools, supplies or other goods or materials used for agricultural operations conducted on such lot.

March 19, 2015

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Aye
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

C-1-15(c) CALVIN L. STANLEY, Requests to rezone from B-3, General Business District to AR-6 (c), Agricultural Residential District with conditions on GPIN 7826-68-8756, consisting of approximately 4.07 acres, and located on the east line of Beaver Dam Road (State Route 715) approximately 325 feet south of its intersection with Union Church Road (State Route 678) in the **BEAVERDAM MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan Map as Rural Village and Agricultural. The proposed zoning amendment would permit the creation of two (2) building lots for a gross density of one (1) dwelling unit per 2.04 acres. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Garman briefly presented this request to rezone from B-3 to AR-6(c). Staff recommends approval subject to the submitted proffers and conceptual plan.

Chairman Winborne opened the public hearing and asked if the applicant was present and in agreement with the staff recommendations. From the audience, the applicant acknowledged that he was in agreement. She asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the public hearing.

Chairman Winborne then asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission. There was no discussion; Chairman Winborne then asked for a motion.

Upon a motion by Mrs. Iverson, seconded by Mr. Leadbetter, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF C-1-15(c), CALVIN STANLEY, SUBJECT TO THE SUBMITTED PROFFERS, DATED FEBRUARY 23, 2015, CONCEPTUAL PLAN, DATED DECEMBER 31, 2014, AND REVISED FEBRUARY 23, 2015:**

1. Conceptual Plan. The Property shall be divided in substantial conformity with the conceptual plan attached, titled "Plat Showing a Proposed Division of Land Containing 4.069 Acres for

March 19, 2015

Rezoning,” dated December 31, 2014, prepared by ASA Surveying & Surveying & Mapping, and revised by Calvin Stanley on February 23, 2015.

2. Tree Preservation. Existing trees of 5 inch caliper or greater on the Property shall not be removed with the exception of dead or diseased trees or parts thereof. This shall not prevent the removal of trees necessary for the construction of improvements, driveways, drainfields, or drainage facilities.
3. Contribution for Road Improvements. The Owner, for himself, his successors and assigns, agrees to pay Hanover County prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Property, the amount of Two Thousand Three Hundred Six and 00/100 (\$2,306.00) per single family unit built on the Property. The funds shall be used for the purpose of completing off-site road improvements relating to the development allowed by the rezoning and included in the Business and Residential Development Road Improvements Transportation Policy, adopted March 13, 2013. In the event funds are paid and are not used for such improvements, the County shall return the funds paid to the Owner or his successors in title.
4. Reservation of Right-of-Way. The Owner agrees to reserve thirty (30) feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Beaverdam Road (State Route 715) and twenty-five (25) feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Union Church Road (State Route 678) to the property for the future road widening.

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Aye
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

- C-3-15(c)** **WAYNE T. HAZZARD, ET AL.,** Request to rezone from M-1, Limited Industrial District, to M-2(c), Light Industrial District with conditions, on GPIN 7788-05-8451, consisting of approximately 10.85 acres, and located on the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Washington Highway (U.S. Route 1) and Lewistown Road (State Route 783) in the **SOUTH ANNA MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan Map as Business-Industrial. The proposed zoning amendment would permit additional industrial uses. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Garman briefly presented this request to rezone from M-1 to M-2(c). Staff recommends approval subject to the submitted proffers.

March 19, 2015

Mr. Leadbetter recused himself from the discussion and the vote. He left the dais to sit in the audience with the citizens.

Chairman Winborne opened the public hearing and asked if the applicants were present and in agreement with the staff recommendations. From the audience, Cameron Wood, representative for the applicants, acknowledged that the applicants were in agreement. She asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Seeing no one come forward, she closed the public hearing.

Chairman Winborne then asked if there were any questions or discussion from the Commission. There was no discussion.

Upon a motion by Chairman Winborne, seconded by Mr. Padgett, the Planning Commission voted **6 to 0, Mr. Leadbetter recused himself, TO APPROVE C-3-15(c), WAYNE T. HAZZARD, ET AL., SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS DATED FEBRUARY 25, 2015:**

1. Use Restrictions. The following M-2 uses shall not be permitted:
 - a. Coal and wool yards, coke storage and sales; and,
 - b. Poultry packing and slaughtering (wholesale).
2. Dedication of Right-of-Way. The Owner agrees to dedicate 60 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Washington Highway (U.S. Route 1) to the property and 50 feet right-of-way from the centerline of Lewistown Road (State Route 783) to the property for future road widening, free of cost to the County, upon request of the County or VDOT.
3. Signage. All freestanding signage shall be monument style.

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Recused
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

Mr. Leadbetter returned to the dais.

March 19, 2015

INDIVIDUAL HEARINGS

Rezoning

C-17-14(c) CHAMBERLAYNE ROAD ASSOCIATES, L.L.C., Requests to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District and R-1, Single-Family Residential District to RS(c), Single-Family Residential District with conditions and B-2(c), Community Business District with conditions, on GPINs 8706-67-5588 and 8706-67-5140, consisting of approximately 11.7 acres, and located on the east line of Chamberlayne Road (U.S. Route 301) approximately 250 feet north of its intersection with McKenzie Drive (State Route 1239) in the **CHICKAHOMINY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan Map as Commercial and Suburban High (4-8 dwelling units per acre). The proposed zoning amendment would permit various community business uses on 1.6 acres and the creation of 40 single-family lots on 10.1 acres for a gross density of 3.97 units per acre. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Garman presented the request to rezone the 11.7 acres from A-1, Agricultural District and R-1, Single-Family Residential District to 10.08 acres as RS(c), Single-Family Residential District with conditions and 1.55 acres as B-2(c), Community Business District with conditions. He stated this case was deferred from the previous Planning Commission meeting. He said the applicant has submitted additional proffers and an updated conceptual plan based on issues and concerns raised at the February 19, 2015, Planning Commission meeting. An additional proffer was submitted to advertise the historic house to salvage the materials or remove it. The applicant also proffered a 1,400 square foot minimum house size. Mr. Garman said the conceptual plan was updated to show the pedestrian connection to the adjacent commercial building has been relocated to the thoroughfare buffer. There were also notes added to the common areas to state that these areas will remain in their natural state except what is necessary for utility and drainage improvements. Staff recommends approval subject to the revised conceptual plan and proffers that have been submitted.

Chairman Winborne opened the public hearing. She asked if the applicant or the applicant's representative would come forward to present the case.

Bill Axselle came forward to speak on behalf of the applicant and gave a presentation of the issues from the previous meeting that had been revised.

March 19, 2015

Mr. Padgett asked if Mr. Axelle could explain why the use of a second access point of McKenzie Drive is not possible.

Mr. Axelle asked Mr. Dennis Beard, engineer for the applicant, to come forward to explain.

Mr. Dennis Beard with Goodfellow Jalbert Beard and Associates came forward. He stated that Chamberlayne Road Associates does not own the parcel all the way up to McKenzie Drive. Therefore, they do not access to McKenzie Drive. There is an easement off of Timberlake Lane that belongs to the Chamberlayne Road Associates, however, all of the property does not have the right to use it legally. Also additional property would have to be purchased to extend all the way to McKenzie Drive.

Mr. Padgett asked if that piece of the property had been offered for sale.

Mr. Beard said to his knowledge it has not.

Mr. Whittaker asked if planting trees on the backside of Lots 25 or 26 in Crown Colony was still going to be carried through.

Mr. Beard said yes.

Chairman Winborne asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in favor of the application. Seeing no one come forward she asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in opposition.

John Nolley, a resident of Crown Colony, came forward. He said he has been in the neighborhood for 23 years. He stated his concerns about the number of homes, the traffic with only one way in and one way out, the price of the homes being too much for only 1,400 square feet, and traffic congestion for Crown Colony.

Steve Hadra, another resident of Crown Colony came forward. He said it was very interesting that many of the proffers were addressed that came up in the prior meeting. The one that the applicant addressed the most, is the one that is everyone's biggest concern. It is the entrance or exit into the neighborhood. Mr. Hadra stated he was able to speak with Preston Lloyd at the community meeting.

March 19, 2015

He said he was told it was cost prohibited for Chamberlayne LLC to make the improvements to McKenzie Drive. He said it was explained that in order to absorb the cost to make the improvements, the profit margin would not be there with the homes. Mr. Hadra said the bottom line is it is a money making issue. He expressed how he is the one who has to come in and out of the neighborhood every day and will be the one dealing with the traffic congestion. Mr. Hadra said he felt like the residents of Crown Colony would be a little more understanding if the traffic aspect would be considered.

Mr. Norman Thomas, a resident of Royal Glen came forward. He stated that he agreed with the previous citizens regarding traffic issues. He explained how difficult it is to make a left hand turn out of the subdivision currently. He said VDOT did the study on how it is now and mathematically predicted that the traffic will withstand the additional homes. He said until there is a better situation for traffic control, he would appreciate it if the Planning Commission would vote against it.

Chairman Winborne thanked the citizens for coming forward to speak. She then asked Mr. Axselle to come forward for rebuttal.

Mr. Axselle said he appreciates the perspective of the citizens that came forward but he hopes everyone will understand that the plan is consistent to other plans that have been done in similar rezoning situations. He said commercial and office adjacent to the main thoroughfare, homes behind with larger homes a little further behind it, is how the case should be in the sense of how zoning is done throughout Hanover. The townhomes went away due to the density. He stated the plan calls for a certain density per acre and this proposal is slightly below that. It is within the range set by the County to be appropriate. Mr. Axselle said that Mr. Beard explained why it was legally impossible to extend the road to McKenzie Drive. He stated it is not a matter of cost. Mr. Axselle said the concerns of traffic should be viewed in the perspective that VDOT knows what the finished product will look like and have approved the plan. He said with Staff recommending approval and VDOT recommending approval, there should be some comfort about the traffic concerns.

March 19, 2015

Chairman Winborne thanked Mr. Axselle and asked if he could summarize if the traffic study included the new homes.

Mr. Axselle said it includes the new homes.

Chairman Winborne asked if the Commission had any questions for Mr. Axselle. Seeing none she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Padgett stated that the applicant worked hard to address the concerns. The main concern with McKenzie Drive has not been resolved in a way that the residents of Crown Colony nor himself would like. However, the policy requires a second point of access when there is more than 50 homes in a development, and this proposal is less than 50. He said the applicant is at the bottom of the permissible amount for the density. There's water, sewer, and other infrastructure dedicated to the suburban service area. The suburban service area is where we put the density in the County so that we can retain the rural composition of the rest of the County. About 80% of the County is zoned agricultural, 20% is zoned for the suburban service area which requires density. The people of Hanover have said for many years this is the approach they want the Board to take and that is the cost of being in the suburban service area. There will be more traffic and more density. He said the applicant has addressed everything else that they could. Mr. Padgett said hopefully the 301 project across the street will provide a traffic light for that intersection and will make it easier and safer to get out. He stated that they go by the information provided in the traffic study by VDOT and the study meets all the requirements.

Chairman Winborne asked for a motion.

Upon a motion by Mr. Padgett, seconded by Mr. Whittaker, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF C-17-14 (c), CHAMBERLAYNE ROAD ASSOCIATES, L.L.C., SUBJECT TO THE SUBMITTED PROFFERS, DATED MARCH 3, 2015, CONCEPTUAL PLAN DATED SEPTEMBER 2, 2014, AND REVISED MARCH 3, 2015:**

March 19, 2015

PROFFERS APPLICABLE TO B-2 PROPERTY:

1. Conceptual Plan. The B-2 area shall be developed in substantial conformity with the conceptual plan, entitled “TIMBERLAKE COMMONS’ SUBDIVISION & B-2 PROPERTY CONCEPTUAL & PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAN,” dated September 2, 2014, revised March 3, 2015, and prepared by Goodfellow, Jalbert, Beard & Associates, Inc.
2. Architectural Treatment. The exterior wall surfaces (front, rear and sides) of any building on the B-2 Property shall be similar in architectural treatment and materials. The building constructed on the property shall have exposed walls (above finished grade) of face brick, natural stone, glass stucco, drivit, exposed aggregate concrete or an equivalent permanent architecturally finished material. No portion of an exterior wall surface visible from any adjoining property shall contain painted or untreated concrete masonry units, sheet or corrugated aluminum or metal, except that metal and/or aluminum may be incorporated for window and decorative treatments. All elevations shall be approved by the Director of Planning prior to Site Plan approval.
3. HVAC Units. Any mechanical units on the B-2 Property shall be screened, and if on the roof, screened by a parapet wall that is an integral component of the building. Screening shall be designed so as to block such units from view by persons on any public streets immediately adjoining the B-2 Property, or from adjacent residential uses. The method of screening shall be submitted at the time of site plan review.
4. Lighting. The Property Owner shall provide lighting not greater than twenty-five (25) feet in height.
5. Monument Signs. All freestanding signs on the B-2 Property shall be monument type, and shall include materials and design that are compatible with the proposed materials and architectural theme of the proposed structure.
6. Dumpsters. Dumpsters on the B-2 Property shall be screened with an opaque fence or screening wall so as not to be visible by persons on any public streets immediately adjoining the Property, or from adjacent residential uses.
7. Uses. The following B-2 uses shall not be permitted:
 - Convenience store with or without fuel sales
 - Fast food restaurants with drive-through
 - Flea Market
 - Warehouse
 - Wholesale establishments

PROFFERS APPLICABLE TO RS PROPERTY:

8. Cash Proffers. The Property Owner, for itself, and its successors and assigns, agrees to pay Hanover County prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the amount of Two Thousand Three Hundred Six and 00/100 (\$2,306.00) per single family unit built on the RM zoned Property. The funds shall be used for the purpose of completing off-site road improvements relating to the development allowed by the rezoning and included in the Business and Residential

March 19, 2015

Development Road Improvements Transportation Policy, adopted March 13, 2013. In the event funds are paid and are not used for such improvements, the County shall return the funds paid to the Owner or his successors in title.

9. Architecture. All houses constructed on the RS-zoned property shall include the following: 1) vinyl shakes, vinyl board and batten, and/or beaded vinyl (or compatible materials), 2) brick or stone foundations with matching column bases, and 3) garage door windows. Rooflines shall incorporate gables and/or dormers. The elevations shall generally conform to the style of architecture depicted on the elevations made part of the Conceptual Plan referenced above.
10. House Size. Minimum house sizes shall be 1,400 square feet. The calculation of minimum floor area shall not include floor area devoted to garages or breezeways in any category. Floor area shall be measured along the exterior walls of the structure.

PROFFERS APPLICABLE TO THE B-2 AND RS PROPERTY:

11. Transportation Improvements. The Property Owner shall construct a northbound right turn lane on Chamberlayne Road (U.S. Route 301) as generally shown on the Conceptual Plan. The turn lane shall be designed and shown on the first set of construction plans submitted for the RS zoned portion of the property and shall be bonded as a subdivision improvement with the first section. In the event a site plan for the B-2 zoned property is submitted prior to subdivision construction plans, the turn lane shall be designed and shown on the first site plan submitted to Hanover County and shall be constructed, inspected, and eligible for acceptance by VDOT prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for any structures for which a Building Permit has been issued. All road improvements shall be designed and constructed in accordance with VDOT standards and specifications.
12. Historic Structure. Prior to application for a demolition permit for the historic structure located on the Property, the Owner shall advertise in a regional newspaper for two successive weeks a free offering of the historic structures for its movement to another site. If there are no respondents, the Owner shall allow any historic materials in the structures to be properly salvaged. Prior to any demolition or removal of materials, the Owner shall allow County staff to enter the structures for the purpose of photographic documentation for placement in the County's historic survey file for House, Route 301, VDHR 42-5250.

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Aye
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

March 19, 2015

C-2-15(c) BALDWIN FAMILY PARTNERSHIP, ET AL., Request to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District, to M-2(c), Light Industrial District with conditions, on GPINs 7789-32-7910, 7789-32-8994, 7789-43-2172, 7789-22-7554, 7789-43-8140, 7789-43-7491 and 7789-42-6349, consisting of approximately 95.93 acres, and located generally on the south line of Ashcake Road (State Route 657) at its intersection with Long Road (State Route 95) in the **ASHLAND MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan Map as Limited Industrial. The proposed zoning amendment would permit speculative industrial uses. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Maloney presented the request to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District to M-2(c), Light Industrial District with conditions. The applicant is requesting to rezone to M-2 in order to better market the property and to keep it in the County's land use taxation program until such time as the property is developed and the use changes. In accordance with the land use taxation program, uses are limited to manufacturing, professional uses, transportation and warehousing, hotels and motels, scientific and technical services, and professional offices. A community meeting was held in February. Some of the issues raised at the meeting include concerns that Ashland Heights Road be used for access, increased buffer adjacent to Ashland Heights Road which would include vegetation to discourage trespassing, and traffic congestion and safety on Ashcake Road by potential use of heavy trucks. To address the concerns raised by staff and at the community meeting, the applicants have proffered transportation improvements and studies, they will provide a phasing plan for the installation of any transportation improvements as needed, and there will be no access to Ashland Heights Road. Mr. Maloney stated in his discussions with the applicant prior to the meeting, staff would be in a position to recommend an additional proffer to provide cross access easements to the property identified as the Harris property. Staff recommends approval to the submitted proffers with the addition of the proffer of the cross access easement.

Chairman Winborne asked for clarity on the phasing plan with regard to the traffic.

Mr. Maloney stated what is being recommended is that the traffic impact analysis may include a plan to phase the improvements in with development. In most cases, 100% of the traffic will not be utilizing the site with the first site plan. He said depending on the scope and magnitude of the traffic

March 19, 2015

impacts, it may be possible to phase them in based on traffic generation rates as site plans for the project come in.

Chairman Winborne stated that does not mean overnight all the traffic improvements will be made. She said it is more than likely a phased sequence of events.

Mr. Maloney said that is correct.

Mr. Whittaker asked if this piece of land being rezoned falls under the program that the Board adopted, where it can be rezoned and just sit.

Mr. Maloney stated as of right now the Board has not formally adopted a policy. Staff has been working with Economic Development and the County Administrator to develop a program to bring well situated properties into the zoning process understanding there are some issues that need to be resolved prior to the actual development of the property. He stated that Staff is using this as an opportunity to utilize the process. As of right now, neither the property owners nor the County has an opportunity to market this property as it is currently zoned. It does not have commercial or industrial zoning attached to it.

Mr. Whittaker thought that the Board had adopted this policy.

Mr. Maloney said in the future, staff will present a formal proposal to the Board and have a more formal economic development strategy.

Mr. Leadbetter said he understands the intent is to give the property a commercial zoning as M-2 but can the applicant also revert back to the A-1 zoning?

Mr. Maloney stated ultimately that is a decision for the Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Winborne opened the public hearing. She asked if the applicant or the applicant's representative would come forward to present the case.

Andy Condlin came forward to speak on behalf of the applicant and gave a presentation of the uses and rezoning.

March 19, 2015

Chairman Winborne thanked Mr. Condlin. She said she had the opportunity to visit the neighborhood. She stated she understands there is supposed to be a fence at the end of the road and a 40 foot buffer. She asked where exactly the fence would be located and are they going to leave the buffer in its current natural state.

Mr. Condlin said the fence will be on the industrial side of the buffer. He also said he will just leave the buffer as is.

Chairman Winborne asked if any of the citizens made a preference as to where the fence should go during the community meeting.

Mr. Condlin stated it did not come up at the meeting, however, one of the neighbors asked him tonight about the location of the fence.

Chairman Winborne asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in favor of the application.

Edwin Gaskin, Director of Economic Development, came forward to speak. Mr. Gaskin stated he is asking the Commission to approve the request because it has been a priority for his department. He said from an economic perspective the request makes sense. Currently all it is doing is growing trees and it can do better. He also stated that the request complies with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Gaskin said it is a Board of Supervisors priority to bring in more commercial acreage. Hanover is a popular site to look at but a difficult place to invest in due to the lack of ready commercial product. Having the 95 acres ready by having it rezoned is a wonderful marketing strategy. He stated by this property staying in the land use taxation program, it comes pre-proffered in terms of allowable uses. Furthermore, this land use program is allowing the property owners to speculatively rezone. Mr. Gaskin stated one of the things they do with property owners is help them market their properties. In the marketing process, there is a need for flexibility. He concluded by stating he is very confident this parcel will be popular but it has to be a data point in someone's database. Until it becomes zoned, it is not in anyone's database.

March 19, 2015

Chairman Winborne asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions. She then asked if anyone else wanted to speak in favor of the application. Seeing no one come forward she asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in opposition.

Wanda Edwards, a property owner on Ashland Heights Road, came forward. She stated the subject property is currently zoned as A-1, Agricultural and Designated Limited Industrial on the General Land Use Map. The owners are asking to have the property rezoned to M-2(c), Light Industrial with conditions. She questioned the difference between limited industrial and the M-2(c) zoning. She stated if there were no advantage to having one over the other, then the case of Wayne T. Hazzard asking for his property to be rezoned to M-2(c), would not have come before the Planning Commission tonight. She also said there is a lot of land already available in the County in areas such as Winding Brook, Atlee Elmont, and more. Mrs. Edwards stated she does not think the neighborhood is against this, their concern is the 40 foot buffer and that this development comes right up to their property. She expressed that they are entitled to the peaceful existence that they have enjoyed for the last 50 years. Another issue she was concerned about is the Harris property that is for sale that would qualify for the same zoning as the Baldwin case. She stated a small piece of the Harris property adjoins her property and the Baldwin property but it is not big enough to develop. She had concerns of the increased traffic that will be on Ashcake Road. She concluded by saying they do not want to be left with unpleasant surroundings, failing septic systems, and unpotable water. She said the Commission should deny rezoning of the property at this time until the applicant can provide a less speculative plan with more details.

Sandy Dalton, a property owner on Ashland Heights Road, also came forward. Her major concern is the little triangle piece of property beside her house. She stated Mr. Harris owns that property and the area is open with no woods. She stated she would like the Commission to take that into consideration because Mr. Harris will get his zoning after the applicants get their approval.

March 19, 2015

Chairman Winborne asked Ms. Dalton for clarity on what she meant by a triangle piece with no growth.

Ms. Dalton asked if the Chairman had been to the neighborhood.

Chairman Winborne said yes.

Ms. Dalton explained it was the area at the end of the road where you turn around. She said there is a green house and the piece of property next to the house is Mr. Harris' property. She felt that would be too much with a 40 foot buffer that is in the open.

Chairman Winborne thanked those that came forward to speak. She then asked if Mr. Condlin would come forward for rebuttal.

Mr. Condlin stated he does not know what will happen with the Harris property because it is not part of their case. It is zoned the same as the residential homes in that area and they probably would have to provide a buffer similar to the one for this case. He said the buffer chosen and put forth in the proffers is the maximum buffer provided for in the code. He stated this is not a typical case, it is speculative and a little unusual to not have a specific plan. The reason for that he said is to provide a product that Hanover can market that is not currently available. Surrounding counties have their own industrial parks and the localities actually own them. From Hanover's perspective, a traffic impact analysis is required and all necessary standards have to be met including those of DEQ, EPA and all the stormwater regulations. He stated with having a traffic impact analysis and meeting the necessary standards, there is certainly enough protection to ensure no harm to the residents in this area. Mr. Condlin said one of the reasons they chose M-2 zoning is because it does allow for professional business offices that are not allowed in M-1. Also some of the larger components of industrial type uses are a little bit more expansive in M-2.

Chairman Winborne asked if the Commissioners had any questions for Mr. Condlin. Seeing none she asked Mr. Maloney to address some of the citizens' concerns.

March 19, 2015

Mr. Maloney explained the difference between M-1 and M-2 zoning. He said the primary difference is the intensity of the uses. The M-2 industrial district does not provide nor permit smoke stack type industries. There will not be any paper mills or things of that nature coming to the area. Some things they can expect to see are any range of manufacturing such as steel fabrication or assembly of boxes, wholesale distribution, variety of retail uses, and any of the lighter industrial uses outlined in the M-1 district. The zoning district does provide for a wide range of uses but not what is considered smoke stack type industry. He said with regard to concerns of potable water and impact on neighboring septic systems, the property will be served by public water and sewer. There will be no draw down of any of the surface water resources for the residents who may have shallow wells and it will not draw from the deeper aquifers for residents with deeper wells. He said there are no impacts related to usage of ground water. As far as septic system failure, there are no septic systems or water withdrawal proposed by this development. This property will have to comply with the County Stormwater Management regulations that are dictated to Hanover by the State. Mr. Maloney said any concerns related to water quality management as well as run off from the property will be very well addressed throughout the development process. Lastly, Mr. Maloney said he believed the triangular piece of property owned by Mr. Harris is part of the Ashland Heights subdivision. With that being said, the staff would not foresee any request to change the zoning given the limited opportunities to develop that property and would not see the staff supporting that request if it were forthcoming in the future.

Chairman Winborne thanked Mr. Maloney. She asked Mr. Maloney if there is industrial activity that might have truck traffic coming through 24 hours a day, is that allowed in Hanover?

Mr. Maloney said as of right now the Zoning Ordinance does not limit hours of operation for any business within the County. He stated there have been instances in the past where the County has negotiated proffers to limit hours of operation.

March 19, 2015

Mr. Leadbetter asked if this is approved, is there another process the applicant will have to go through to address other issues that are not addressed currently.

Mr. Maloney stated there is not an opportunity for the public to formally comment however, any files associated with the process involving land development are public files. Several things will have to happen prior to the actual development of the property if it is rezoned as requested. The first of which is the traffic impact analysis has to be performed for the entire property. Part of the traffic impact analysis states that the applicant will not only provide the recommended improvements, but it also establishes a minimum level of service for the roads and intersections. The applicant will have to provide improvements necessary to achieve that level of service to minimize lane congestion along the public roads. Next, the applicant must go through a detailed site plan review. This is where the engineered documents are submitted and reviewed by the County. The documents will contain the details of the internal transportation network. It will include information such as the location of buildings, specific requirements for the buffers with a landscape plan attached, utility construction plans, road construction plans, grading and stormwater management plans.

Mr. Leadbetter said if this gets approved as is, the road seems to have a lot of challenges. He said there would have to be substantial improvements to Ashcake Road to make any project work in that area. He asked Mr. Maloney if that seems to be part of the plan.

Chairman Winborne asked if Ashcake Road is the primary access to the site or will it be in Northlake?

Mr. Maloney stated he is not sure if that decision has been made. He stated the applicants would like some access to Ashcake Road. He said prior to the Community meeting, the applicant's engineer indicated that as it stands, there is limited frontage available to this property on Ashcake Road. Any location of a driveway would not be feasible because the driveway would not meet the current VDOT site distance requirements. At this point, unless the applicant is able to obtain a cross access from the

March 19, 2015

Harris property and go through the zoning process, the access points will be limited to Design Road and a possible extension of Harley Club Drive in the Northlake development. It is very possible for some time, there will not be any traffic from Ashcake Road arising from this property. This is subject to change if the Harris property is zoned and reciprocal cross access easements are negotiated.

Chairman Winborne asked if Design Road was part of Northlake.

Mr. Maloney said Design Road is north of Northlake. It is a public road but currently it is not in good condition. This property has a 60 foot easement from the end of Design Road to allow access to the property. Staff is recommending a proffer that should Design Road be utilized, it will be upgraded to applicable public road standards.

Mr. Whittaker said suppose a buyer purchases 25 acres of the property and decides to come to the Planning Department to review development, at that time, how would Mrs. Edwards and the public know that was taking place because it is all public information?

Mr. Maloney said Hanover County has a policy of posting a sign on the property stating the site plan has been filed. He stated if at any time a citizen has a question as to the status of any project in the County, he welcomes them to call the Planning Office and they will provide any information on the case.

Mrs. Peace said this type of process is typical in other localities that go through the Comprehensive Plan update process and choose target areas for redevelopment and revitalization, then rezone the properties to be in alignment with the Comprehensive Plan. With Hanover's process, since it is a new concept, how will a policy be shaped moving forward? Will the target be mostly commercial properties or industrial properties in targeted areas? How do you weigh protecting the flood gates from opening?

Mr. Maloney stated there are limited areas within Hanover that are eligible for consideration of industrial zoning. With the limited areas in the County for property owners to seek this type of request,

March 19, 2015

it will prevent the flood gates from opening. Mr. Maloney showed the Hanover General Use Land Map to illustrate the limited industrial areas in the County.

Mrs. Peace asked if this process is really targeted for commercial properties and would it apply to residential properties.

Mr. Maloney stated properties identified on the General Land Use Map primarily for industrial and business industrial. He said it would not apply to residential properties.

Chairman Winborne closed the public hearing.

Chairman Winborne said in overview she has heard this is a first for Hanover County to put together a parcel of land that could have commercial potential. The only way to market this to interested parties is to have the property ready and rezoned. She said on the other hand, she hears from the citizens that they would like to know what is coming and how it will impact their neighborhood. She stated after hearing from the applicants, it seems that they are going to do everything they possibly can to be responsive to citizens and their concerns in Ashland Heights.

Upon a motion by Chairman Winborne, seconded by Mrs. Iverson, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF C-2-15(c), BALDWIN FAMILY PARTNERSHIP, ET AL., SUBJECT TO THE SUBMITTED PROFFERS, DATED MARCH 5, 2015, AND CONCEPTUAL PLAN, TITLED “BALDWIN AND DOWNING-GILMAN PROPERTIES, HANOVER COUNTY, EXHIBIT A”, DATED JANUARY 2, 2015, AND REVISED FEBRUARY 26, 2015, AND INCLUDES THE ADDITIONAL PROFFER TO PROVIDE CROSS ACCESS:**

1. Utilities. Public water and sewer facilities shall be used for the development of the Property.
2. Utility Lines. All utility lines, such as electric, telephone, CATV, or other similar lines shall be installed underground, except (a) for major transmission lines, (b) existing lines that now traverse the Property.
3. Uses. Only the uses within the categories of uses set forth in Section 22-17.1(a) of the Hanover County Code, as may be amended, shall be permitted, which includes the following categories:

March 19, 2015

- A. Manufacturing;
- B. Transportation and warehousing;
- C. Professional, scientific and technical services;
- D. Hotels and motels; and
- E. Professional offices.

Nothing herein shall preclude the Owner from applying for any special exception permits or conditional use permits available pursuant to the Hanover County Zoning Ordinance provided the use is consistent with those uses listed in Section 22-17.1(a) of the Hanover County Code.

4. Architectural Treatment.

- A. Materials used for buildings on the Property shall be brick, stone, precast architectural concrete (including tilt-up panels), split face block, architectural metals, metal and glass curtain wall, metal curtain construction systems, or synthetic stucco or other materials determined to be of comparable quality by the Planning Department at the time of site plan review.
- B. The architectural treatment for any wall facing a public right-of-way shall include architectural details, fenestration, or other features that will create architectural interest and not appear as a blank wall. Wall surfaces of each building (whether front, sides or rear) that are visible from any public right-of-way shall be similar in architectural materials to other walls of the building.
- C. Any mechanical units on the Property shall be screened, and if on the roof, screened by a parapet wall that is an integral component of the building. Screening shall be designed so as to block such units from view by persons on any public streets immediately adjoining the Property, or from adjacent residential uses. The method of screening shall be submitted at the time of site plan review.

5. Transportation Improvements. To provide for an adequate roadway system, the Owner shall be responsible for the road improvements as required below.

- A. Prior to the first site plan approval on the Property, the Owner agrees to undertake a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) in accordance with County policies and applicable Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) regulations. The scope of the TIA shall be mutually reviewed by the Owner, Hanover County, and the Virginia Department of Transportation; however, the Director of Planning shall make the final determination regarding the scoping of the TIA. The TIA shall include trip generation forecasts for project build out. The TIA shall provide recommendations to ensure that traffic operations as a result of the proposed development will be sufficient to maintain a minimum service level “D” across the road network identified in the TIA.
- B. The TIA shall include a master plan depicting the internal circulation, which shall be submitted to the Hanover County Planning Department for its review and

March 19, 2015

approval. The master plan shall include provisions for the following potential points of ingress and egress:

- i. Design Road and its intersection with U.S. Route 1
 - a. Should Design Road be utilized for ingress and egress to the property (other than for access used exclusively for emergency access), it shall be designed and improved to VDOT standards from the property to U.S. Route 1;
 - ii. A future connection to Harley Club Lane; and,
 - iii. The proposed entrance from State Route 657.
- C. The TIA shall include a phasing plan for the installation of improvements. The phasing plan shall be based on projected daily vehicle trips and PM peak hour trips. In no case shall the level of service for the roads evaluated in the TIA fall below LOS D in any phase of development. The Owner agrees to install all recommended road and traffic control improvements as recommended by the TIA. The exact design and dimensions of these improvements shall be determined at the time of site plan approval, and they shall be designed and constructed to VDOT standards and specifications.
- D. There shall be no access permitted from the Property to Ashland Heights Road. Prior to site plan approval for any site plan proposing to access Ashcake Road, the Owner agrees to initiate the process with VDOT for placement of a “No Thru-traffic” warning sign to be located near or at the entrance to Ashland Heights Road from State Route 657. Should the sign be approved by VDOT, the applicant shall be responsible for the cost of the sign and its installation.
- E. The location of all access points into the Property shall be in general conformity with the conceptual plan titled “Baldwin and Downing – Gilman Properties, Hanover County, Exhibit A,” prepared by McKinney and Company, dated January 2, 2015, and most recently revised February 26, 2015, or as recommended and approved during site plan review based on the traffic impact analysis.
- F. Dedication of Right-of-Way. The Owner agrees to dedicate 50 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Ashcake Road (State Route 657) to the property for future road widening, free of cost to the County, upon request of the County or VDOT.
6. Buffer. The required buffer adjacent to Ashland Heights subdivision shall at a minimum be 40 feet in width and it shall be designed in accordance with the standards set forth in Section 26-266 of the Hanover County Zoning Ordinance. In addition, the Buffer shall be supplemented with:
 - A. Landscaping consisting of holly, elaeagnus or other such vegetation to deter pedestrian access; or,
 - B. A six foot high screening fence shall be installed along the length of the Buffer and shall be located on the interior side of the Buffer.

March 19, 2015

7. Historic Resources. Prior to application for a demolition permit for the historic structure located on GPIN 7789-43-8140, 12183 Long Road, the Owner shall advertise in a regional newspaper for two successive weeks a free offering of the historic structures for its movement to another site. If there are no respondents, the Owner shall allow any historic materials in the structures to be properly salvaged. Prior to any demolition or removal of materials, the Owner shall allow County staff to enter the structures for the purpose of photographic documentation for placement in the County's historic survey file for the Thomas House, VDHR # 42-5024.

8. Access. The Owner shall provide a reciprocal cross access easement to GPIN 7789-43-1655 prior to site plan approval, and such easement shall be improved to the common property line at a location approved by the Director of Planning. The easement may stipulate that such access shall be granted only upon the rezoning of the parcel to a commercial or industrial zoning designation.

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Aye
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

Ordinance Amendment

ORDINANCE 15-02 BED AND BREAKFAST AS A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IN THE AR-1 and AR-2 ZONING DISTRICTS

AN ORDINANCE to amend the Hanover County Code, Zoning Ordinance, to modify the district regulations for the AR-1, Agricultural Residential District and the AR-2, Agricultural Residential District to permit the operation of a bed and breakfast in those districts with a special exception and in accordance with the standards set forth in Section 26-300 of the Zoning Ordinance. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Maloney stated this ordinance would modify the regulations for the AR-1, Agricultural Residential District and the AR-2, Agricultural Residential District to permit the operation of a bed and breakfast in those districts with a Special Exception Permit and in accordance with the standards set forth in Section 26-300 of the Zoning Ordinance. The South Anna District Board Supervisor was recently approached by an individual inquiring about the feasibility of using the AR-2 zoning for a bed and breakfast business. The current zoning provisions do not permit bed and breakfast establishments. The

March 19, 2015

AR-1 and AR-2 districts were replaced by the AR-6 district in 1996. Both the district regulations remain in effect for existing properties, however, since the AR-6 replaced the two districts, a property owner no longer has the opportunity to seek rezoning to AR-1 or AR-2. Bed and breakfast establishments are permitted in the A-1 and AR-6 districts with a Special Exception Permit. The proposed Ordinance provides for bed and breakfast establishments in the AR-1 and AR-2 districts to be consistent with the provisions in the A-1 and AR-6 districts.

Chairman Winborne thanked Mr. Maloney and asked the Commissioners if they had any questions for him. Seeing none, Chairman Winborne opened the public hearing. She asked if anyone present wanted to speak in favor of the Ordinance. Seeing no one, she asked if anyone present wanted to speak against the Ordinance. No one came forward. Chairman Winborne closed the public hearing.

Chairman Winborne asked if there were any further questions or discussion from the Commission. There was no discussion. She asked for a motion.

Upon a motion by Mr. Padgett, seconded by Mr. Leadbetter, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF ORDINANCE 15-02, BED AND BREAKFAST AS A SPECIAL EXCEPTION IN THE AR-1 AND AR-2 ZONING DISTRICTS.**

The vote was as follows:

Ms. Winborne	Aye
Mr. Leadbetter	Aye
Mr. Bailey	Aye
Mrs. Iverson	Aye
Mr. Padgett	Aye
Mrs. Peace	Aye
Mr. Whittaker	Aye

The motion carried.

March 19, 2015

Miscellaneous

A. Approval of Minutes

Upon a motion by Mr. Padgett, seconded by Mr. Whittaker, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the February 19, 2015 minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Winborne thanked the press and public for coming to the meeting.

There being no further business on the regular agenda and work session, Chairman Winborne adjourned the meeting at 8:57 P. M. The next regularly scheduled meeting is April 16, 2015.