

*May 21, 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, May 21, 2015 at 7:00 P.M.

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

**STAFF**

**PRESENT:** Mr. David P. Maloney  
Mr. Dennis A. Walter  
Mrs. Tiffany M. Burton  
Ms. Claudia Cheely

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

Mr. Bailey led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Consideration of Agenda Amendments by Action of the Commission**

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

There were none.

Chairman Leadbetter highlighted the Commissioner's Rules of Order and explained the process for a public hearing.

**Citizens' Time**

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

Chairman Leadbetter 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.

Chairman Leadbetter closed Citizen's Time.

May 21, 2015

**EXPEDITED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

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

There was none, so the Commission proceeded on to the Expedited Agenda.

**Rezoning**

**C-18-00(c) AM. 1-15 BLUE RIDGE CUSTOM HOMES, L.L.C. (WINDING CREEK ESTATES),** Requests an amendment to the proffers approved with rezoning request C-18-00(c), Dorothy Anne Jennings, on GPIN 7811-60-3537, zoned RC(c), Rural Conservation District with conditions, and located in the southwest quadrant of Taylors Overlook Court (State Route 1091) and Wedged Stone Drive (State Route 1090) in the **SOUTH ANNA MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The proposed zoning amendment would amend the cash proffer. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Maloney briefly presented this request to amend the cash proffer for one lot in Winding Creek Estates. Staff recommends approval subject to the submitted proffers.

Chairman Leadbetter 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. Chairman Leadbetter asked if anyone wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to the request. Seeing no one come forward, he closed the public hearing.

Upon a motion by Chairman Leadbetter, seconded by Mr. Whittaker, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF C-18-00(c), AM. 1-15, BLUE RIDGE CUSTOM HOMES, L.L.C. (WINDING CREEK ESTATES), SUBJECT TO THE PROFFERS DATED MARCH 16, 2015:**

1. 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 One Hundred Seventy-One and 00/100 (\$2,171.00) 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.

*May 21, 2015*

2. Exterior foundation of houses shall be of brick or stone construction unless the house is constructed of synthetic stucco, in which case the foundation may be of like material.
3. Minimum house sizes shall be as follows: 2,500 square feet for a one-story building and a one and one-half or two-story building. Minimum floor area shall not include garages or breezeways in any category. Floor area shall be measured along the exterior walls of the structure. All attached garages shall open to the side or rear of the dwelling. No cinder block, cement block, solite block or asbestos shingle shall be permitted for the finished exterior of any structure.
4. Four (4) deciduous trees of 2 inch caliper shall be placed upon each open lot prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy; but credit against this requirement may be taken for any existing trees on the lot which meet the 2 inch caliper requirement. Trees in the rear and side yards may be selectively cut with no removal of trees of 5 inch or greater caliper unless removal is necessary for construction of roads or driveways, establishment of drainfields or drainage, home sites, or when required by the County of Hanover.
5. The property shall be developed in substantial conformity with the conceptual plan titled "Winding Creek Estates," dated October 26, 2000, and revised January 10, 2001, drawn by Goodfellow, Jalbert, Beard, and Associates, Inc. However, Applicant reserves the right to adjust road and lot lines subject to the approval of the Planning Commission in order to effectively design the subdivision, following detailed engineering. No houses shall front on any existing public road.
6. The owner agrees to dedicate twenty-five (25) feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Bethany Church Road (State Route 610) and Taylors Creek Road (State Route 677) to the Property for future road widening when requested by the County, free of cost, and free of encumbrances interfering with the use for road purposes. The amount of land so dedicated shall be included in the acreage total of the Property as such total may be used to determine compliance with any of the requirements of the RC Ordinance.

The vote was as follows:

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

The motion carried.

*May 21, 2015*

**C-5-15(c) SUZANNE L. AND CAMERON L. WOOD**, Request to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District, to AR-6(c), Agricultural Residential District with conditions, on GPIN 8746-52-8458, consisting of approximately 13.32 acres, and located on the north line of Studley Road (State Route 606) approximately 475 feet west of its intersection with Mechanicsville Turnpike (U.S. Route 360) in the **HENRY 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 building lot for a family member for a gross density of one (1) dwelling unit per 6.66 acres. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Maloney briefly presented this request to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District to AR-6(c), Agricultural Residential District with conditions. Staff recommends approval subject to the submitted proffers and conceptual plan.

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

Upon a motion by Mr. Bailey, seconded by Ms. Winborne, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF C-5-15(c), SUZANNE L. AND CAMERON L. WOOD, SUBJECT TO THE SUBMITTED PROFFERS, DATED APRIL 30, 2015, AND CONCEPTUAL PLAN, DATED APRIL 22, 2015:**

1. Conceptual Plan. The property shall be divided in substantial conformity with the conceptual plan attached, titled "Conceptual for Rezoning Review Family Division of Parcel of Land Standing in the names of Cameron L. and Suzanne L. Wood," dated April 22, 2015, and prepared by Edward C. Carr, II.
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. Wetlands Certification. The Owner agrees to submit a wetlands certification for the property to the Hanover County Department of Public Works for its review and approval prior to or concurrent with the submission of an application for a Family Division. The Family Division shall not be approved unless the Department of Public Works approves the wetlands certification.
4. Perenniality Study. The Owner agrees to submit a perenniality study for the property to the Hanover County Department of Public Works for its review and approval prior to or concurrent

May 21, 2015

with the submission of an application for a Family Division. The Family Division shall not be approved unless the Department of Public Works approves the perennality study.

5. Family Division. The Property shall only be divided for family, in accordance with Chapter 25, Article II, Division 5 of the Hanover County Code. The family member to whom the property was sold or given shall hold title to and reside on the newly created lot for at least three (3) years following the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, unless the lot is the subject of an involuntary transfer caused by foreclosure, death, judicial sale, condemnation, or bankruptcy.
6. Reservation of Right-of-Way. The Owner agrees to reserve thirty (30) feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Studley Road (State Route 606) to the property for the future road widening.

The vote was as follows:

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

The motion carried.

## **INDIVIDUAL HEARINGS**

### **Conditional Use Permit**

**CUP-4-15**     **RANDALL EVERETT**, Requests a Conditional Use Permit in accordance with Sections 26-20.13 and 26-20.14 of the Hanover County Zoning Ordinance to permit a recreational facility that includes a race track for the teaching of motocross skills and up to three annual race events, on GPIN 7884-22-5294, consisting of approximately 43.6 acres, zoned A-1, Agricultural District, and located on the east line of Washington Highway (U.S. Route 1) approximately 1,000 feet north of its intersection with Verdon Road (State Route 684) in the **BEAVERDAM MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan for Industrial. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Maloney gave a full presentation of the request for a Conditional Use Permit to permit a motocross race track. The race track will include accessory camping, three race events per year, weekend open track practice days, and individualized weekday instruction. Staff recommends approval subject to the minor modification to clarify condition six on the staff report. The modification states that the

*May 21, 2015*

applicant shall provide sufficient parking to accommodate 250 participants and spectators which equates to 63 all-weather parking spaces.

Chairman Leadbetter stated that the Commission requested a member of the Historical Commission be present to speak at tonight's meeting. He asked Mr. Maloney if the representative was present and ready to speak.

Mr. Maloney stated the representative was present and prepared to speak during the public hearing.

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

Mac Chenault, attorney for the applicant, came forward. He asked the applicant to come forward and speak about the motocross facility.

Randall Everett came forward. He stated he has been in the sport of motocross for 20 years and is professionally licensed in the United States and Europe. Mr. Everett said he has been teaching for eight years on the road with hopes of establishing his own permanent motocross school. He went on to explain that children need a safe environment to learn and ride. He stated that this facility is good for the community and will promote work ethic, commitment, dedication, motorcycle safety and health. Mr. Everett concluded by stating he promises to strive to be a great neighbor.

Mr. Chenault stated this case is within the Comprehensive Plan and is allowed by the County Ordinance. He said it is primarily a motocross training facility with open riding available on weekends. Mr. Chenault said the hours of operation are Monday through Friday 10 am until 6 pm or sunset. On Sundays the facility will open at 11 am. He gave definitions of some of the terms used in the sport of motocross. He stated the applicant has agreed with the staff recommendations, changes and conditions. Mr. Chenault concluded by touching on the controversial issue of noise. He asked the sound engineer for this case to come forward to provide further detail on sound and noise.

*May 21, 2015*

David Poindexter came forward. He gave a synopsis of the software used, calculations for every direction from the property line, environmental fixtures that absorb sound, and the berms. He stated that the sound levels dissipate before they reach the property line within the threshold of 77dB. The County's noise ordinance requires that the decibel levels at the property lines be at level 77 or less.

Chairman Leadbetter asked Mr. Poindexter what the maximum number of sound was at the railroad track property line.

Mr. Poindexter said 70dB.

Chairman Leadbetter asked for the maximum number of sound at the Martin Marietta property line.

Mr. Poindexter said 56.2dB.

Chairman Leadbetter asked what the maximum number of sound was with and without a berm at U. S. Route 1.

Mr. Poindexter said without a berm is 49dB and with the berm it measured 27.3dB.

The Commission asked Mr. Poindexter several questions regarding noise and the tests performed.

Chairman Leadbetter asked Mr. Chenault to come back to the podium for a few questions. He asked Mr. Chenault questions regarding the number of riders and people at the track during training sessions, weekend practice days, and annual races.

Mr. Chenault had the applicant come forward to answer Chairman Leadbetter's questions.

Randall Everett stated the number of riders during the training sessions Monday through Friday would be one to three. The maximum number of people would be six, including parents. On weekends, the maximum amount of riders would be 50. When the weather gets warmer the maximum would be 100. The maximum number of people would range from 130 to 150. Last, the annual race would have a maximum of 20 riders. The race would generate a maximum of 200 people total.

Mr. Chenault ended by saying his client has worked hard with staff and the community to get the project as close to an agreeable state with all who are impacted.

*May 21, 2015*

Chairman Leadbetter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in favor of the application. Due to the high volume of citizens wishing to speak, the Chairman placed a three minute time limit on each speaker and asked the Commissioners to extend the allotted time to 20 minutes.

Steve Salisbury from the American Motorcyclist Association spoke first in favor of this application. He stated that he has been discussing this proposal with the applicant for months. During that time, he has gotten to know his success as a trainer, racing pedigree with the AMA, and business plan for the Hanover facility. He further stated that the AMA believes the applicant has found an ideal site in terms of its accessibility to clients, environmental suitability, and proximity to business that will benefit from the applicants operation. Mr. Salisbury concluded with saying the AMA strongly encourages the Commission to support the proposal.

Hunter Yeager, a nine year old racer stepped forward. He stated that this is his second year training with the applicant. He said he enjoys motocross because he gets to spend time with his family and friends. Hunter said he lives in a small town with no race tracks in the area. This track would be a great place for him and his friends to train he stated.

Laura Johnson spoke next in support of the application. Ms. Johnson owns Hummingbird Wealth Management, a company that has sponsored the applicant's training school for the last four years. She stated that the applicant is focused on making better riders on and better people off the track. Ms. Johnson concluded by stating this sport reinforces good health, promotes a strong work ethic, teaches personal responsibility, reinforces the value of community and supports faith.

Ed Jakovich came forward and said the applicant is one of Virginia's very few professional athletes. He stated that he has had the privilege of riding with the applicant for over five years and will not ride without him being there. He said that he feels this proposal will give people a safe place to ride. It will also give youth something to do and keep them out of trouble he said. Mr. Jakovich stated motocross is an expensive sport and a lot of the money would come to Hanover County. He concluded

*May 21, 2015*

by stating the applicant has been recognized by the AMA as a Pro motocross racer and that speaks volumes for this proposal.

Brian Watson from the Beaverdam district stated he and his family are in total support of this facility. He said motocross is a great family sport and believes it will be great for Doswell. Mr. Watson said it will attract people to the area who will come and spend money which helps Hanover. He concluded this will be a positive facility for the community teaching hard work, courage and discipline to children.

Evan Dewesternyear said he was excited when he learned about this proposal because there is nowhere local for people to ride. He stated he is twenty years old and has wished his parents would come watch him ride. Due to distance, they have not always been able to watch him. Mr. Dewesternyear stated his parents are very comfortable with him going to any motocross track because this sport does not mix with drugs and alcohol.

Shane Hern currently works for a law enforcement agency in the metro Richmond area. He stated that due to his job, he is exposed to the results of the youth having no positive outlets, hobbies and opportunities to express themselves. Mr. Hern said this usually results in negative, unhealthy and often criminal behavior. The facility will be a positive resource for the community that encourages good values, sportsmanship and hard work he stated. Mr. Hern concluded by stating Hanover should take the opportunity to be the home for this facility and the community a safe, organized resource to pursue this sport and its benefits.

Blake Thompson came forward. He stated he has been a resident of Doswell for 15 years and racing for ten years. He said as a local resident, he knows the traffic in the area is out of this world between the Berry Farm, Kings Dominion, the State Fair, and Flipppo Lumber, from Routes 1 and 301. Mr. Thompson concluded stating he could assure the Commission that the track will have a very low impact on traffic in the area. The cars move quickly through the gate he said.

*May 21, 2015*

Ms. Winborne asked the Chairman if the Commission could extend the time for another ten minutes to allow more speakers to speak.

Chairman Leadbetter and the Commissioners were in agreement.

Robert Vaughan spoke next in support of the application. He stated when his son started motocross, the nearest track was in Maryland. There his son was sent to the track with no training or experience. He emphasized how family oriented the sport is. He concluded by stating he hopes this facility will be allowed to come into Hanover to promote a family dynamic and expand the economic base in the Doswell area.

Robert Fletcher stated he supports the application because it makes sense. He said Hanover has all the infrastructure in place for it. He concluded by stating it gives him and his 16 year old son something to enjoy doing together.

Alex Hyman, a Randolph Macon student, lives a few minutes from the proposed track. He stated he is in support of the application because he can attest to it being a family oriented sport.

Eric Rocchiccioli stated as a business owner in Hanover himself, he would like to see the applicant have an opportunity to pursue his dream and start a business in Hanover. He also said as a motocross parent, he knows the difficulty in traveling long distances for the sport. He stated this proposed track would be an excellent opportunity for many geographically.

David Newell stated his son got him started in the sport of motocross. He reinforced the sport being a true family event. Mr. Newell concluded by stating this sport will bring economic growth to Hanover. It will help local gas stations, hotels and restaurants in the area he stated.

Jenny Eyler, a graduate of Randolph Macon, came forward. She stated she is the wife and mother of motocross racers. She said as a mother she would never put her children in something that would expose them to drugs or alcohol. Mrs. Eyler concluded by stating the sport is very family oriented and it is disheartening to know the motocross community is being stereotyped with negativity.

*May 21, 2015*

Amanda Knapp came forward. She stated she was featured on the cover of the AMA magazine last year. Ms. Knapp asked the Planning Commission to challenge the stereotype and consider the fact that the demographics in off road riding are shifting to include women and youth. She also stated that the concept of life-long learning is very valuable. In off road riding there are always lessons to learn and skills to improve upon regardless of how long you have been riding she said. Ms. Knapp concluded by asking the Planning Commission to be progressive in their thinking, move beyond stereotypes, and recognize the applicant as an educator to their sport and someone that can be partnered with to provide opportunities for life-long learner. She said with this concept in mind, Hanover County would reap the reward and be recognized.

Will Liam stated he met the applicant a year ago and had very little experience on a bike. He stated in a short time, the applicant was able to give him the same training he gives to a child on an adult level. He said the applicant can relate to all generations and is in full support of this proposal.

Chairman Leadbetter stated 30 minutes was allotted for those in support of the case. He said he would like to allow the same amount of time for those in opposition.

Donald Pleasants from the Historical Commission came forward to speak in opposition of the application. His greatest concern was the impact the facility would have on the historic properties in the area. Also Mr. Pleasants stated he was concerned about the proposed facility's access point impacting the Whitehall Property which is adjacent to the facility.

Valerie Hall came forward. She stated she lives across the street from the proposed facility and has a son who participated in motocross racing. She said she agrees it is a family sport, however, the noise and fumes from the track concern her. Ms. Hall stated her mother lives with her and has COPD. She is afraid that the fumes will affect her health. She concluded by reminding the Commission that she has been to many tracks with her son and is worried about the noise, dust and racing fumes that she knows are a result of the track.

*May 21, 2015*

Dorothy Heights was next to speak in opposition. Ms. Heights stated she lives about two miles away from the site and she is concerned about the environmental impact the facility will have. She said because this is farm land disturbing the soil will add pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizer to the air pollution created by this project. She said she has concerns that some of the polluted water will reach local streams, the bay, and even local wells. She concluded with questioning what would happen if the applicant expands race dates or sells the facility to another entity that wants to expand the race dates.

Janice Pierce-Rhyne stated she lives 2/10ths of a mile away from the proposed track. She is concerned about the impact the track will have on the land value of her property and the noise it will bring. She concluded by stating it bothers her that she has to fight to live the way she wants to live on her own property.

Debbie Taylor, a resident of Doswell, came forward. She stated she is opposed because of the negative impact the proposal will have on her community. These impacts include noise, increased traffic, and an increase in the water and air pollution. Her greatest concern is the negative impact on property value she stated.

Reagan Armentrout-Waggy stated she lives next to Martin Marietta on a family farm. She said she endures the noise from Kings Dominion and the rock quarry. She stated currently the only time the quarry is not allowed to run is on Saturday nights and Sundays. At any other time she can almost hear the noise over her TV. She said she is very concerned about the added noise the race track will add to the noise she already has to endure. She concluded with being concerned about the increased traffic the track will add.

Emma Lee Mitchell came forward. She stated that between her and her family they have six properties within a mile of this subject property. She said she is opposed for three reasons. The first is because the proposal does not support the economic development goals for Hanover. The second is due to noise. She stated she has experienced the world of motocross with her stepson. She said she knows exactly how noisy the track can be. The last reason is the compatibility to the Doswell community. She

*May 21, 2015*

stated this type of business is not compatible like other businesses in the area. The other business do not affect the quality of life she said. Ms. Mitchell concluded with being greatly concerned with the applicant adding more races once the proposal is approved.

E. Richard Swann, pastor of Jerusalem Baptist Church, came forward. He stated he is speaking on behalf of those who live in the community and are members of the church. Mr. Swann stated his church family of several hundred members is opposed to motocross coming into their back yard. He said they are an active church with meetings of various kinds almost every day or evening. Mr. Swann said Hanover County has qualified this particular community as low to middle income based. A motocross would further disenfranchise the residents as well as significantly decrease the property value even more.

Chairman Leadbetter said no time was left for rebuttal. He then closed the public hearing. Chairman Leadbetter asked Mr. Maloney to address some of the concerns from the citizens.

Mr. Maloney stated in consultation with VDOT, staff does not feel that the amount of traffic emanating from this use is sufficient to warrant a traffic impact analysis. He pointed out that the property is in within the County's suburban service area and is shown for an industrial use. An alternative use for this property such as distribution or warehousing would likely generate significantly more traffic than this proposal. Mr. Maloney then referenced the environmental concerns, particularly those related to disturbance of soil and storm water management. He stated State Code has adopted stringent standards for erosion during the construction process as well as detention of stormwater. This ensures that the amount of stormwater leaving the site post development does not exceed the pre-development rates. The County was also required to adopt enhanced stormwater quality standards. As a result, a very detailed engineering plan will have to be submitted to the County by the applicant demonstrating all the applicable erosion and stormwater controls have been met.

The Commission proceeded to ask Mr. Maloney questions and have discussion in reference to the application.

*May 21, 2015*

Mr. Bailey and Ms. Winborne asked Mr. Chenault how far away was the church from the proposed site.

Mr. Chenault stated it appears that a five mile circle was drawn around the subject property to get the distances. Fork Church is the furthest, Taylorsville next, and Jerusalem is the closest.

Mr. Maloney stated it is at least a mile or more. It is a good distance away from the site.

Mr. Chenault stated he had the exact distances for the churches. The distances are calculated from the intersection of Route 1 and Verdon Road. The exact address of the subject property is not recognized by Google therefore, this intersection is the point of reference. St. Martin Church is 1.2 miles away, Jerusalem Church is 1.5 miles away, Mt. Hope Church is 1.8 miles away, Taylorsville Baptist is 3.1 miles away, and Fork Church is 5.1 miles away.

Mr. Padgett asked if the applicant could come forward for a few questions. He asked if it was the applicant's intent to operate the facility as his full time position. He also asked if the applicant contemplated lights being added to operate in the evening.

Mr. Everett stated yes this would be his full time position. He then said adding lights was never an idea that came up and was not his intention at all.

Chairman Leadbetter asked if the Commission had any other questions or discussion for the applicant. There was none. Chairman Leadbetter then turned the meeting over to Mrs. Iverson for a motion.

Mrs. Iverson said she wanted to thank everyone who brought so much attention to the application from the staff to the applicant and all who have done everything to make this proposal a fit for the community. However, she stated from the many calls, emails and letters she received, it appears to be 10 to 1 in opposition to this request. She stated citizens should have a say in what comes to their community. Mrs. Iverson also stated she has to agree with the majority that this property could offer more jobs and a larger tax base for the County with some other type of business located at this site.

*May 21, 2015*

Mrs. Iverson made a **MOTION TO RECOMMEND DENIAL FOR CUP 4-15,**

**RANDALL EVERETT.**

Mr. Bailey **SECONDED.**

Ms. Winborne stated she thinks it is fair to say reasonable people can look at this same information and come to different conclusions. She also stated she acknowledges the support and interest of all the citizens who are present as well as all who have called and sent letters. However, she said from staff presentation and the information received tonight, she finds that she cannot support Mrs. Iverson's motion.

Mr. Padgett stated everyone has been conditioned by motorcycles on the highway and the few irresponsible ones have probably colored our thoughts of what might take place with this application. He said although it is pretty clear after all the discussion tonight that that will not be the case for this facility. He further stated he has been to the site, has seen what is near it, and does not believe those near it will have a noise problem. He stated this project preserves much of the open space around it and there is nothing there that cannot be undone should the facility not be pursued further in the future. He said he does not see where the traffic will be a problem. If the traffic already on Route 1 and the train on the other side does not cause much of a vibration and noise problem now, he said he does not see where this cause an impact on the historical properties. He also said he cannot see where the property values would be adversely affected by this proposal because people will hardly be able to see it from any angle. He said it is down below the horizon of Route 1. For these reasons, Mr. Padgett said he cannot support the motion.

Mrs. Peace stated based on the staff recommendation and the County's Comprehensive Plan, she would not be able to support the motion.

Mr. Whittaker stated he agreed with his other colleagues and could not support the motion.

Chairman Leadbetter said he is in agreement with the staff report. He stated they all look at the staff report as to whether the application meets the Zoning Ordinance and rules and regulations. He said

*May 21, 2015*

this meets all those without any issues. He further stated it is always a tough decision to decide whether or not it fits into the community. This property is zoned for the use it is being applied for he said. It is zoned for other uses that could without a doubt be a lot noisier and other variations of problems it could provide to the citizens he stated. Chairman Leadbetter stated with those issues being addressed, he would not be able to support Mrs. Iverson's motion.

Chairman Leadbetter called for the vote.

The vote was as follows:

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

The motion did not carry.

Chairman Leadbetter opened the floor for a new motion from the Commissioners.

Ms. Winborne stated the following: "We are here tonight to vote on a land use issue that has come before us. The project in question does fit with the land use plan for the County. The Comprehensive Plan calls for that area to be industrial. Both properties on either side of this property are in fact zoned M-3, Heavy Industrial. There are many uses that could be permitted on that property that would have a significantly different impact on the land than what is being proposed. The view and rural flavor of the land I saw when I went out and visited the property will be substantially the same. While I acknowledge the many citizens who have become involved in this process both for and against and I thank them for their time in doing so, I am sympathetic to the concerns of the community that oppose this project. There is an inherent struggle between property rights and of the land owner and how to balance those against the property rights of the immediate neighbors. In making my decision in this case with intense emotion surrounding it, I have considered whether or not this land use conforms to the Comprehensive Plan and the County's land use map. I agree with the staff report on this point

*May 21, 2015*

that it does. How this land use may impact the neighbors is taken into consideration. This is done by the Planning staff when addressing any impacts on the immediate neighbors through the conditions that are imposed on the applicant. There are 10 such conditions that staff has recommended. Your concerns have been heard. Citizen input is valuable and important, witness the number of citizens here tonight and the number of letters we received. In addition to citizen sentiment for or against a project, we have County regulations and ordinances as well as the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan that we apply to land use cases. Considering all the factors, Mr. Chairman, I **MOVE THAT CUP-4-15, RANDALL EVERETT, BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO CHANGES, AS DESCRIBED IN THE SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES IN THE STAFF REPORT, AND TO THE SUBMITTED SKETCH PLAN, DATED DECEMBER 4, 2014, LAST REVISED MARCH 16, 2015, INCLUDING THE MINOR REVISION THAT MR. MALONEY MENTIONED TO CONDITION #6 STATING THE 63 PARKING SPACES AND TO MODIFY CONDITION #4 WHICH WOULD STIPULATE THE HOURS MONDAY THROUGH SATURDAY 10-6 OR SUNSET, WHICHEVER OCCURS EARLIER, AND SUNDAY BEING STIPULATED AS 11-6 OR SUNSET, WHICHEVER OCCURS EARLIER, AND IN CONDITION #4 TO ELIMINATE THE OUTDOOR LIGHTING POSSIBILITY.**

Mr. Whittaker **SECONDED.**

Mr. Padgett asked if the change in the motion to eliminate the lighting or just to eliminate evening operation beyond the hours mentioned.

Ms. Winborne stated to remove the lighting option.

#### **Staff's Recommended Conditions**

1. The commercial entrance from Washington Highway (U.S. Route 1) shall be located as shown on the sketch plan, and designed and constructed in accordance with VDOT standards and specifications.
2. Any expansion of the use, including structures, features or activities not shown on the sketch plan or approved with this CUP request, shall not be permitted without an amendment to the CUP.

May 21, 2015

3. Prior to site plan approval, the owner shall reserve sixty feet (60') of right-of-way from the centerline of existing Washington Highway (U.S. Route 1) to the property for future road widening should it be determined to be needed at this location. Upon request of the County or VDOT, the owner shall dedicate any right-of-way within this reserved area that is necessary for the road widening to the County or VDOT, free of cost and free of encumbrances restricting the use for roadway purposes.
4. From Monday through Saturday, the hours of operation shall be limited from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. or sunset, whichever occurs earlier, and on Sundays, the hours of operation shall be limited from 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. or sunset, whichever occurs earlier.
5. All vehicles utilizing the track shall comply with the standards of Title 46.2 of the Code of Virginia pertaining to mufflers and exhaust systems.
6. There shall be no more than three (3) race events per calendar year and shall be limited to no more than 250 participants and spectators. At least 63 parking spaces shall be provided to accommodate these events.
7. Overnight camping shall only be allowed in the area designated as "Camp Area" on the approved sketch plan and limited to 30 recreational vehicles; no overnight camping shall commence until appropriate waste disposal for the recreational vehicles has been installed and approved as compliant with all State and local standards, ordinances and regulations.
8. Open fires shall be confined to the "Camp Area" and within a contained unit or pit designed for fire safety.
9. All requirements of the Public Works Department, the Health Department, Public Safety and the Building Inspector's Office shall be met.
10. Development and use of the property shall comply with all federal, State and local statutes, ordinances and regulations.  
Chairman Leadbetter called for the vote.

The vote was as follows:

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

The motion carried 5 to 2.

Chairman Leadbetter thanked all who participated in the public hearing for this case.

*The Commission took a brief recess.*

May 21, 2015

The meeting reconvened at 9:26 P.M. *All members were present.*

Mr. Maloney reminded the Commission should there be a risk of the meeting run past 11:00 P.M., the rules state that the meeting either ends at that time or a motion to suspend the rules must be made.

### **Rezoning**

**C-14-14(c) MARY LYNNE MCDOUGLE, ET AL. (SCOTCHTOWN PARTNERS, L.L.C.),** Requests to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District, to RS(c), Single-Family Residential District with conditions, RM(c), Multi-Family Residential District with conditions and B-3(c), General Business District with conditions, on GPINs 8706-48-8991(part), 8706-58-6162, 8707-51-3243, 8707-51-3841, 8707-61-2365, 8706-58-5695(part), 8706-58-8910(part), 8706-69-3782, 8707-60-1621(part), 8707-60-5237, 8707-61-6614, 8706-58-3434, 8706-59-0093(part), 8706-49-5063(part) and 8707-51-6800, consisting of approximately 103.68 acres, and located at the southwest quadrant of Chamberlayne Road (U.S. Route 301) and New Ashcake Road (State Route 643) in the **CHICKAHOMINY MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT**. The subject property is designated on the General Land Use Plan Map as Multi-Use. The proposed B-3 zoning amendment would permit office and retail uses on 36.68 acres. The proposed RS zoning amendment would permit 115 single family lots on 32.35 acres for a gross density of 3.55 dwelling units per acre; the proposed RM zoning amendment would permit 131 townhouses units on 14.01 acres for a gross density of 9.35 dwelling units per acre; and a proposed RM zoning amendment for 286 apartment units on 20.64 acres for a gross density of 13.86 dwelling units per acre. The overall residential density would be 7.94 dwelling units per acre. (PUBLIC HEARING)

Mr. Maloney gave a full presentation on this case to rezone from A-1, Agricultural District to RS(c), Single-Family Residential District with conditions, RM(c), Multi-Family Residential District with conditions, and B-3(c), General Business District with conditions. The General Land Use Plan designates this rezoning as Multi-Use. The request proposes the following: 36.68 acres of the property being used as office and retail use, 32.35 acres being used for 115 single family lots, 14.01 acres being used for 131 townhome units, and 20.64 acres used for 286 apartment units. Staff recommends deferral to allow the applicant an opportunity to revise and amend the proposal to address the issues raised in the staff report.

Chairman Leadbetter asked if the Commissioners had any questions or discussion.

*May 21, 2015*

Ms. Winborne stated she wanted to thank staff for the thorough report. She said she knows it has taken a lot of time and effort to get to the position of presenting the case to the Planning Commission.

Chairman Leadbetter opened the public hearing. He asked the applicant or applicant's representative to come forward and present the case.

Jim Theobald, attorney for the applicant, came forward to speak. He gave a presentation of the request to rezone reiterating the points Mr. Maloney pointed out during his presentation. He concluded with stating the applicant and his team are prepared to work on addressing the issues and concerns presented in the staff report.

Mr. Padgett asked if the driveways for the townhomes have a one car garage that is the standard width and would the driveways would have enough room for another parked car.

Mr. Theobald said yes to both.

Mr. Padgett then stated that to his knowledge, the proffers the Commission received did not have any access restrictions for trucks and that was something that had been discussed. He asked Mr. Theobald for clarity.

Mr. Theobald stated there were proffers submitted prior to the meeting that were not in the staff packet. The proffers limited the hours of delivery to the grocery store to the hours of 7:00 and 9:00 A.M. and again between 5:00 and 7:00 P.M. He stated they are trying to keep tractor trailers off New Ashcake Road. While there may be tractor trailers on this road, Mr. Theobald said they would not be for the applicant's proposed grocery store. He continued by stating the applicant would be more than willing to post signs once it is determined whether the County or VDOT regulates the posting.

Mrs. Peace asked if Mr. Theobald could explain how a resident in one of the adjacent neighborhoods could walk along New Ashcake to get to the retail area safely.

Mr. Theobald stated he was unsure if the resident would walk along New Ashcake Road. If the resident did use New Ashcake, he said he or she would cross Georgie Drive. He stated this is meant to be pedestrian friendly within the community being created with the proposal.

*May 21, 2015*

Mrs. Peace gave an example for the applicant to consider.

Mr. Padgett asked Mr. Theobald if he could go over the traffic pattern, especially for New Ashcake Road.

Mr. Theobald showed various points on one of his PowerPoint slides illustrating the traffic patterns.

The Commission continued to ask Mr. Theobald questions and have discussion about the specifics of this proposal.

Chairman Leadbetter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in favor of the application. Due to the high volume of citizens wishing to speak for this case, the Chairman placed a three minute time limit on each speaker and asked the Commissioners to extend the allotted time to 20 minutes.

Dennis Young came forward to speak in favor of the application. He stated as a resident and local business owner, he fully understands the need for growth. He said this application meets and raises the bar for existing and future development on Route 301. In comparison to the three most recent small projects on the same corridor currently under construction, he stated he feels better about this larger project being proposed. The smaller projects are scattered about with no connectivity he said.

Monica Powers stated she is a 12 year resident as well as a business owner in Hanover County. She said she supports the applicant because it will bring restaurants to the area. She is also in support because it will bring families into the community which in turn supports her business, as well as others. Ms. Powers concluded with the stating it is an attractive community that will bring a lot to Hanover County.

Eddie Simmons is in support of this application because it would provide housing opportunities that are appealing to people wishing to relocate to Hanover County. He said some of these people would include college graduates and people who have graduated from Hanover County Schools wishing to

*May 21, 2015*

move back to the area. Mr. Simmons concluded with stating the interconnecting walking paths presented for this proposal will provide a nice safe option for pedestrians, runners, cyclists and families.

Justin Walker was next to speak. He stated he was excited about the opportunity to have this project in Hanover. He stated on the rare occasion that he and his family get to go out, he has to drive to Henrico or Richmond City. He said having this plan will provide his family and many others the opportunity to keep the money in Hanover County.

Nick Polivka spoke in support of the application. He stated he followed the path of growing up in Hanover, moving to another county for their amenities, then moving back to Hanover for his children to go to school. He stated this project will help with the amenities missing in Hanover that citizens often leave to find.

Glenn Moore on the board of trustees for the Diocesan and Missionary Society of Virginia came forward to speak in support of the application. He stated he was affiliated with the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia that owns the 13 acre parcel adjacent to the proposal. The plan is to build a church on that parcel in the future and he likes the idea of future residents possibly becoming parishioners he said. He also stated the idea of utilities being brought to the area to allow more efficient use of the property for the Diocese is appealing to him.

Jesse Harris, an endodontic in Rutland, was next to speak. He said he is in support of this proposal because it will help his business as well as others in the area.

Troy Fowler reinforced the points mentioned by others before him. He stated this project will help because apartments are limited in Hanover. The commercial and retail aspect will be beneficial and the culinary revolution will help Hanover as well he stated. He concluded with stating this project will keep residents from leaving Hanover.

Roger Bowers said he is in support of this project. He stated that this project supports the Comp Plan and it will help accommodate growth in Hanover.

*May 21, 2015*

Chairman Leadbetter asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak in opposition for the application. Due to the high volume of citizens wishing to speak for this case, the Chairman placed the same three minute time limit on each speaker and asked the Commissioners to extend the allotted time for citizens to speak.

Sherry Hooe came forward to speak in opposition. She said she is against this project because of noise and smell pollution. She also has concerns about the traffic and an increase in crime from the apartment complex. She stated concerns of the low likelihood of success for the retail establishments and the development not blending with the existing area.

Paige Carpenter opposes the application. She expressed major concerns about traffic. She said the map presented by the applicant does not show where Pearson's Corner Elementary School is located. She stated there will be an increase in traffic right where the school is located. She concluded by saying it is a beautiful community being proposed and she would love to see it in Hanover. She said she does not want it in the area they are proposing.

Pattie Bland stated the following: "While it is way past time to sway the owners to do something different with their land, I wish that they, and many others who have already sold or will be selling their land to development, had taken another path. And though placing land in a conservation easement or selling parcels to members of a generation looking for a smaller, sustainable, homesteading life, may not yield big money. I believe these are worthy choices which would keep Hanover a very desirable place to make a life. Further I wish that the County's planning philosophy would embody a more intentional dedication to green space, connectivity, and in general, low impact development. But these are not concepts that appear to be accorded rigorous attention. As planners, citizens and developers know, planning must engage all the stakeholders and look to the future an arduous and worthwhile endeavor. What do we want our community to look like? Which choices will make good environmental and economic sense? How is a healthy balance between the rights of citizens and developers maintained? What are the consequences of short sighted planning? These are questions that should remain at the

*May 21, 2015*

forefront of a community's consciousness. Even though this project conforms in letter to the planning guidelines, I submit that in spirit it does not. This overlarge project threatens to fracture more than to build community cohesiveness. The urban village model is an attractive one in the planning toolbox. But I believe it is better suited for a brownfields retro fit or at least on land that is more contiguous with preexisting development. Contiguous is now becoming a relative term though. Citizens have voiced concerns over the stripping of US 301 and County planners have said that would not happen given the Comprehensive Plan guidelines. Yet considering the for sale signs dotting US 301 to the Courthouse Complex, I think stripping, leapfrogging development is coming. This project is the next domino. More specific to my environmental concerns are the inevitable traffic volume, noise and light pollution, stripping of the few existing trees and buffer vegetation, and removal of topsoil, which I think is the most grievous act to inflict upon the environment. These are issues always at hand in any planning case. They can only be mitigated never satisfactorily resolved. I think some scaling down of this project would be sensible. Good planning takes good time. Please take some time. I respectfully submit these comments as the Chair of the Coalition for Hanover's Future with the additional signatories being our Board of Directors that includes: Patricia Bailey, Caroline Cooke, Douglas Boardman, Reber Dunkel, Jim Ellis, Jim Hunt, Jean St. John, Ann Marie Martin, Russ Pond, Lynn Wingfield, and Martha Wingfield."

Nancy McCusiston came forward. She said her house is the house on the corner of Georgie Drive and Ashcake Road. She stated she does not want to live next door to a shopping center. She also stated she can hear traffic going up and down the road constantly from 4:30 A.M until approximately 10:30 P.M. Currently she said there are no tractor trailers going down this road so she is asking to flip flop the proposal and put the residential development next to her property instead. She concluded by explaining the current traffic problems that occur on US 301 and expressed how she does not want to have a retail area in her back yard.

Maline Shepherd stated she lives next door to Nancy McCusiston which is one house from the corner. She stated the green space directly behind her house buffers the sound of the traffic except during

*May 21, 2015*

peak hours. She said she feels very comfortable letting her son play in the neighborhood right now but adding this development will change increase the number of residents in the area as well as traffic.

Kelly Austin came forward to speak next. She said she lives on Georgie Drive and there are a lot of cars going in and out of that road currently. She is concerned about the challenges the new traffic pattern is going to create. She stated during the restricted time for tractor trailers is the same time school buses come through for the children.

Carolyn Cooke was next to speak. She read a letter that states the following: "To the Hanover County Planning Commission: I write you in opposition to the proposed rezoning requested by Scotchtown Properties, L.L.C. on the land at Route 301 and New Ashcake Road for a multi-use development. I am indeed aware of the designation in the Comprehensive Plan. But in no way is the proposal remotely in keeping with the spirit of growing gracefully in Hanover. The proposed density and massive number of estimated delay vehicle trips is staggering and unfathomably horrible. Let's be honest, the track record with these sorts of developments has been poor with aesthetic eye sores created from projects that once completed, were far worse than they were marketed to be to gain approval. This proposal is no different. It is one thing to put multi-use projects into backfield areas already surrounded by higher density development. It is indeed quite another unacceptable thing to put them on the fringes or in areas of skipped development. This project is poorly conceived for this location, and heaven forbid if approved, would be even worse executed. Please, please, please demand that the developer scale his project back significantly. Its approval would not only bring congestion and asphalt to the current residents of that area, it would also set a horrific precedent for future proposals. Do not let this happen. Do the right thing, send this rezoning request back to the drawing board. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Sincerely, Doug Boardman, Beaverdam District."

Chairman Leadbetter asked for a motion to extend the time for tonight's meeting.

*May 21, 2015*

Ms. Winborne made a **MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO MEET PAST 11:00 P.M. UNTIL THE COMMISSION IS FINISHED WITH THE STATED AGENDA BUT NOT TO EXCEED 11:30 P.M.**

Mr. Whittaker **SECONDED.**

**THE PLANNING COMMISSION VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO MEET PAST 11:00 P.M.**

Chairman Leadbetter said no time was left for rebuttal. He then closed the public hearing. Chairman Leadbetter asked Mr. Maloney to address some of the concerns from the citizens.

Mr. Maloney stated the staff's position is that in concept there are significant merits to this project in regards to compatibility with the Comp Plan, the multi-use designation, as well as the attractive renderings for the project. However, there are a number of issues of concern. He stated in every zoning case, staff has to reconcile two types of issues. First, does the proposal meet the technical requirements of the Zoning Ordinance? If the proposal does not, staff is unable to support it. In this case there needs some clarity in the plans, which was highlighted in the letter the applicant received. The other issue is a policy issue. Two primary issues have been of concern to staff throughout this project. Mr. Maloney stated he estimates 2/3 or even 3/4 of the commercial development is oriented to Route 301. Staff questions the feasibility of not having a full four way movement intersection along the frontage of the project he said. He stated one of the fundamental considerations in making a recommendation on a zoning case reflects whether the proposal is compatible with the surrounding community. The introduction of heavy commercial traffic on Ashcake Road changes the character of the community and traffic patterns along that road Mr. Maloney said. Staff will continue to raise the issue of whether or not a full movement access properly designed and located to accommodate full movement truck traffic along 301. Mr. Maloney said with a lack of willingness to provide a meaningful phasing schedule as contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan from the applicant, staff is unable to support the project.

Chairman Leadbetter asked if the Commissioners had any questions or discussion.

*May 21, 2015*

Mrs. Peace asked the applicant if he could explain the site planning process and how it was decided that Ashcake and 301 was the best location.

Mr. Theobald stated there is an existing traffic light and it is located at the major intersection with the corner. The property on the other side of New Ashcake Road is zoned B-3, which is commercial zoning he said. He said he understands the residents on Georgie drive wanting to flip the retail with the residential but those living in Crown Colony would not want that in their area. He said the applicant tried to transition the uses.

Chairman Leadbetter stated he agrees with Mr. Maloney's comments. He said "one of the things we do with the mixed use development is try to encourage the commercial growth. We seem, on these projects, to always be lagging behind on that aspect. The ratio with residential in the County is exceeding the growth rate we want it to be. So that is a very, very large concern of mine at this point."

Chairman Leadbetter asked if the Commissioners had any other questions or comments. Seeing none he turned the meeting over to Mr. Padgett for a motion.

Mr. Padgett stated it is his intention to recommend deferral for a month as staff recommends. He stated he wanted to give some guidance for the things he would like to see take place in order for the project to successfully move forward. He said phasing is an important part. The Comp Plan calls for phasing on commercial and residential to be proportional. For developers, they have to raise the financing to ensure the phasing is proportional. Currently in the New Ashcake area, there are roughly 1700 to 2000 homes thus the market is already in place. He stated he knows the applicant would like to see a market for the new development but that is a problem that needs to be worked out. He continued to say he believes there needs to be a commitment for more commercial. He said he would like to see at least 80,000 square feet commitment for the commercial. Mr. Padgett stated the applicant is willing to limit the truck traffic on New Ashcake Road. However, he was thinking the allotted hours should be changed. He suggested the hours of 9:30 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. in order to keep the truck traffic manageable on New Ashcake Road. He said it needs to be determined who would enforce the hours for the trucks.

*May 21, 2015*

Another concern Mr. Padgett presented was the full left turn off Route 301. He said he thinks that was proposed to help with the truck traffic. He stated it is not warranted by the traffic study and it is challenging and costly to do. Mr. Padgett said he understands the cash proffers have been agreed to so that should not be an issue. The pedestrian wetland crossing mentioned during Mr. Theobald's presentation was something Mr. Padgett wanted a little clarity on. He stated he would like the applicant to speak with Virginia Dominion Power to see if the crossing could be moved slightly. Mr. Padgett said there was some concern about the schools being crowded but the School District says more students are needed. Redistricting may be possible and looked at by the School Board. He also touched on the limitations of the Route 301 outparcels, the neighborhood business district. Mr. Padgett said he prefers the staff's position on the limitations as opposed to the applicant's position. He said the staff's position should be given very serious consideration.

Upon a motion by Mr. Padgett, seconded by Mr. Whittaker, the Planning Commission voted **UNANIMOUSLY TO RECOMMEND DEFERRAL OF C-14-14(c), MARY LYNNE MCDOUGLE, ET AL. (SCOTCHTOWN PARTNERS, L.L.C.) UNTIL THE JUNE 18, 2015 MEETING.**

The vote was as follows:

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

The motion carried.

Ms. Winborne asked how the proposal be drafted to limit the right of trucks to use a public road.

Mr. Maloney stated the Planning staff does not have authority for that. He stated there would more than likely be a covenant with the businesses that they would be unable to accept deliveries during

*May 21, 2015*

certain hours. The covenant would be enforced by the Homeowners Association. The proffer is to proffer the deed restriction. From there, it is up to the Homeowners Association to enforce he said.

Chairman Leadbetter thanked the citizens for their patience and for participating in tonight's meeting.

**Miscellaneous**

**A. Approval of Minutes**

Upon a motion by Ms. Winborne, seconded by Mr. Whittaker, the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the April 16, 2015, minutes as submitted.

**B. Community Meeting Coordination**

Mr. Maloney proposed to defer this item and add to the administrative agenda next month.

Chairman Leadbetter concurred.

**C. Roads Committee Appointee**

Chairman Leadbetter appointed Mrs. Iverson to serve another term for the Roads Committee.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

There being no further business on the regular agenda, Chairman Leadbetter adjourned the meeting at 11:15 P.M. The next regularly scheduled meeting is June 18, 2015.