

**King & Queen County
Planning Commission Minutes
July 25, 2011**

The King & Queen County Planning Commission met on Monday, July 25, 2011, at 7:00 p.m. in the King & Queen County Courts and Administrations Building in the 2nd Floor Conference Room jointly with the Board of Supervisors during the Board of Supervisors regular scheduled workshop meeting. Notification of the meeting was sent to all Planning Commissioners by U.S. Mail and was posted at the Court House public bulletin board 10 days before the meeting.

Planning Commission Members Present:

James "Jimmy" Guess
Milton Watkins
David Campbell
William Herrin

Robert "Bob" Taylor
Hunter Richardson
Wallica Gaines

Also in Attendance:

Thomas J. Swartzwelder, County Attorney
Donna E. Sprouse, Assistant Zoning Administrator
Doris H. Morris, Stevensville Supervisor
James "Jim" Milby, Buena Vista Supervisor
James Lawrence Simpkins, St. Stephens Church Supervisor
Milton "Pete" McDuff, Shanghai Supervisor

Call to Order

Chairman, Robert Taylor, called the meeting to order.

Roll Call/Determination of Quorum

Mr. Campbell took roll call and determined that a quorum was present.

Mr. Taylor then turned the meeting over to Mr. Simpkins, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Simpkins noted that everyone should have received an outline to review and questions or items to consider/review. The following issues/topics were to be discussed...

- New Zoning Classifications and their role
- Development Districts or Corridors or both
- Comprehensive Rezoning
- Conservation Easements/Districts
- Technology Zones
- Low to Moderate Income Housing needs/Apartments
- Public Facilities/Activities/Programs/Utilities

- Infrastructure
- Methodology

Mr. Simpkins asked Mr. Swartzwelder to give them all information pertaining to each one on the list.

New Zoning Classifications

Mr. Swartzwelder explained that the Planning Commission has been working on revising the zoning ordinance and permitted use table for about 2 years. The Planning Commission has recently held a public hearing and has forwarded the proposed text amendments to the Board. Mr. Swartzwelder explained that this text amendment/ordinance change(s) will be a great tool to help with the Comprehensive Plan. The plan can designate the preferred placement of business fitting these new classifications in more detail than the current “anything goes in GB” plan. Mr. Simpkins asked Mr. Swartzwelder how long he thought it would take to get through the text amendments. Mr. Swartzwelder said he would guess about 4 to 6 months. There was not further discussion, Mr. Swartzwelder moved on to the next item.

Development Districts or Corridors

Mr. Swartzwelder commented that presently the Comprehensive Plan labels the first 1,000 feet (deep) of Route 33 and Route 360 as our economic corridors. Which pretty much leave it wide open for any commercial development. He asked if maybe there should be districts created either instead of or in addition to the economic corridors. He explained that the new Comprehensive Plan can break the current corridors into districts using the new zoning classifications as discussed previously within the proposed text amendments. After some discussion, it was the consensus to create districts along with corridors.

Comprehensive Rezoning

Mr. Swartzwelder stated that there had been discussion whether a comprehensive rezoning should take place along the corridors according to the proposed newly created districts. Mr. Swartzwelder reminded everyone that such a rezoning could not be selective if done at all. Mr. Simpkins and Mr. McDuff stated that they could not support comprehensive rezoning. They did not believe in rezoning someone’s property without their consent. After some discussion, it was decided that maybe the county could look at waiving rezoning fees along the corridors once the districts are established. If one wishes to rezone, it would be voluntary and a comprehensive rezoning may not even be necessary at this time.

Conservation Easements/Districts

Mr. Swartzwelder stated that while there is little that the County can do to limit conservation easements, one tool that the County may use is the Comprehensive Plan. He suggested that maybe we could include or designate areas where they are desired and areas that such easements are not wanted. He stated that most state agencies will not grant an easement if it conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan. Creating these areas or districts could limit the ability of private citizens as well in granting conservation easements. Mr. Simpkins stated that he wasn’t sure how he felt about this option. He noted that there are a lot of families with large tracts of land on Route 360 and he didn’t know how he felt about restricting them from placing an easement on their property. Mrs. Sprouse suggested creating such districts in certain areas along the corridors or only 1,000 feet (deep) from Route 33 and Route 360. This would allow those property owners the option of

placing an easement on some or most of their property, outside of the districts. Mrs. Morris asked if Mrs. Sprouse if she had any idea how much of the land that is in conservation easements were done by private property owners. Mrs. Sprouse said that she can look into that and respond to the Board. Hearing no further comments, Mr. Swartzwelder moved on to the next item.

Technology Zones

Mr. Swartzwelder explained that under State law, the County can create technology zones. He added that such zones allows the County to offer tax incentives, infrastructure, etc. to businesses that location within the zone without having to offer the same to businesses locating out of the zone. Mr. Simpkins asked how such zones would be determined. Mr. Swartzwelder stated that it really depends on where the Board would like development. It would be up to the Board. Hearing no other comments, he moved on to the next topic of discussion.

Low to Moderate Income Housing/Apartments

Mr. Swartzwelder stated that there is a need in the County for LMI housing and for apartments for young people and teachers. He asked if the Board wanted to designate areas for these. Should they be on or near the corridors? Mr. McDuff asked if there was a way to discourage them. Mrs. Sprouse stated she was speaking from her own experience, but she found it very difficult after high school and in college to find a place to live that she could afford. It is a problem among many young people because they are not yet established and have no equity to buy, therefore have to rent. She also noted that a while back when she last spoke with Mr. Williams who built the first set of apartments in the County, Mr. Williams has not had any problem getting tenants. Mr. Herrin stated that such developments could potentially burden the schools. Mrs. Gaines noted that she was very upset at some of the comments made. She said that not everyone has the means to buy or move into their own home. Mrs. Gaines noted that we have to provide a place for the citizens in King & Queen to live. Mrs. Sprouse stated that as of today the current Comprehensive Plan wants such development; however she suggested in the revised Comprehensive Plan, there be areas designated as to where such development should take place. She noted that because of the traffic that an apartment complex could bring, she suggested that these areas be located near the Corridors and/or in areas where the roads can support such a development. She noted that usually you do have more noise from an apartment complex than you would a single-family dwelling, therefore another reason to create areas where such development could be placed because of the need. Hearing no other comments, Mr. Swartzwelder moved on to the next item.

Public Facilities/Activities/Programs/Utilities

Mr. Swartzwelder asked the Board if the Commission should evaluate locations for future public facilities, ball fields, etc. There was little to no discussion, a decision was not made at this time.

Infrastructure

Mr. Swartzwelder asked if the Comprehensive Plan should designate or prioritize areas where we desire sewer, water, Internet, road improvements (turn lanes, etc.). The discussion focused on Broadband issues. It was decided that consideration should be made in the plan for the placement of utilities.

Methodology

Mr. Swartzwelder stated that in the past the Planning Commission retained a consultant to assist in the process. He added that this may or may not be necessary of the degree of uses may vary depending on the decisions made regarding the issues as previously discussed. Mr. Swartzwelder stated that the current Plan cost about \$30,000. Mr. Taylor stated that he believes that the

Commission, along with staff, could prepare the skeleton/most of the work and may need assistance in getting the information all together. Mrs. Swartzwelder suggested that maybe we could send out a RFI to see what services are out there as well as contact the Planning District Commission for assistance if needed. It was decided to have the Planning Commission to work with staff at this time and would revisit this topic again if needed.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Taylor stated he would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Watkins to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Campbell. Adjournment was ratified by all present members saying "Aye".

Mr. Robert Taylor, Chairman