

PLANNING COMMISSION
September 21, 2016

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2016, AT 7:30 PM IN THE COUNTY MEETING ROOM.

Members present: Jay Willer, Chairman
 Victor Schaff, Vice-Chairman
 Frank Morris, Member
 John McCloskey, Member
 William Saunders, III, Member

Staff present: Dale Herring, Ex-Officio Member
 Bart Svoboda, Planning Director
 Stephanie Golon, Planner
 Shawn Leake, Zoning Officer

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & MOMENT OF SILENCE

The Chairman lead everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The Chairman asked each member to state their name for the record to determine a quorum.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Willer stated that Mr. Svoboda would be presenting the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for public hearing.

Mr. Svoboda stated that the CIP has been under review for quite a while and has now reached a draft format that may be easier to read and understand. He added that feedback for revisions, etc. would be appreciated and noted that the school will be meeting with the Board of Supervisors soon and feedback is anticipated from that meeting. He stated that other input is expected from Rapidan Service Authority (RSA) and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). He reviewed several items that were included in the packet. He noted that tonight's meeting was advertised as a public hearing to encourage public attendance and input.

Mr. Morris asked about the request by the EDA to widen a lane. He wondered if

that type of request would fall under a transportation standpoint instead.

Mr. Svoboda explained that Economic Development operates from a day to day function perspective as well as how to attract business which may include items such as road issues, etc.

There was discussion relating to Economic Development focuses as they relate to business needs within the county, such as broadband, road improvements, and how they may encourage the location of new business operations.

Mr. Willer noted that often an agency may include the request in anticipation to get the endorsement from the Board of Supervisors.

The Chairman opened the public hearing.

There were no public comments; therefore, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Willer recognized Brent Wilson for his valuable role and input on the CIP Committee.

Mr. Morris asked if a motion should be made to have Mr. Wilson join the Commission up front to be included in any discussions.

Mr. Willer stated that he did not find it necessary for him to move but added that he could be included in discussions.

Mr. Willer stated that the CIP has been a topic of discussion in the past, noting that currently the document is a Capital Improvements Inventory to be considered for the CIP. He reviewed how categories could be identified and other topics that could be included such as how funding would be achieved, prioritization, etc. He encouraged others to consider how to accomplish these items effectively.

Mr. Willer stated that the CIP forms are included in the packets for each member's review.

Mr. McCloskey asked how items currently listed on the CIP are being addressed.

Mr. Svoboda stated that there is not a process to have a running list of active projects but that the list is used to provide funding when the item is truly needed based on the priority of the need. He noted that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) determines the priority of needs and fulfillment.

Mr. Willer noted that Melissa Meador gained grant funding to install generators which may have waited due to funding.

Mr. Svoboda added that a similar situation happened in order to upgrade the phone system. He added that now these items become maintenance items

instead of CIP items.

Mr. Willer added that there have been more items included in the budget due to having a better sense of county needs.

Mr. Schaff stated that he had some specific ideas. He added that what is currently in hand functions more like a CIP Inventory and that a CIP should be inclusive of items with a specific amount needed and the funding possibilities for planning for a later date. He noted that the schools and the water impoundment are two items that should be listed on a true CIP. He suggested looking at true numbers that can be planned for. He suggested beginning fresh with a true CIP and use this document as a wish list type of document.

There was discussion regarding strategic planning for a true CIP and what information should be included to provide accurate planning numbers and accurate planning dates.

Mr. McCloskey suggested that a true CIP should include studies addressing current and future needs and funding sources.

There was discussion regarding the evaluation process of items to be included on a CIP and what information would be beneficial in that evaluation. There was also discussion as to how the CIP works in conjunction with the county budget process.

Mr. Wilson spoke from his seat voicing agreement with what had been discussed relating to the budget process.

Mr. Willer reviewed the possible schedule of review for the CIP from the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Morris suggested obtaining more details relating to infrastructure to assure that needs are being met with the proposed improvements.

Mr. Willer noted that the request forms should include the appropriate information to obtain the needed details. He added that it would allow for the accurate data to be collected.

There was discussion relating to data collection, categorization, and prioritization and how that process can happen effectively.

Mr. Svoboda reviewed the intent of the legislation relating to the Planning Commission's review of the CIP and the goals of the locality.

There was discussion regarding the water capacity and pressure for fire suppression at the schools. There was further discussion relating to the intent of the CIP and the information provided by each department. It was noted that the Planning Commission's responsibility was to make a recommendation based on

the requested items within the CIP working in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Willer suggested that a recommendation be made with a cover page explaining the Commission's opinion on specific items and their suggestions for prioritization as the items relate to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Schaff stated that the information is provided by the departments along with the sources that were used to obtain the information. He noted that the Commission's function is to organize and review the information and set criteria as to how items are included on the CIP. He added that a cover page may be included to point out some specific items that the Commission may feel strongly about.

Mr. Saunders suggested that the Comprehensive Plan and the CIP be reflective of one another with tangible goals.

There was discussion relating to the prioritization process and the Commission's function. There was also discussion as to which items may or may not be required by state laws.

Mr. McCloskey asked how the process works for departmental submittals.

Mr. Svoboda gave an overview of the process and the deadlines for submittals. He noted that once submittals are received, they are reviewed by staff or committee, noting that some localities have developed a CIP department to track items and their needs and to schedule maintenance or replacement requirements, etc.

There was discussion relating to funding sources and alternatives for items that are requested on the CIP and how to plan for the spending of that money before the need arises. It was noted that it allows the locality to be proactive in planning.

There was discussion relating to the Commission's role in the process to organize the numbers and make a recommendation to the BOS based on the details that are provided by the departments. There was discussion regarding items that are outside of the county budget but that are necessary for the community as a whole and must be decided upon by the BOS.

Mr. Saunders suggested that the department submittal should note the items association with the Comprehensive Plan during the submittal phase and then reviewed by staff or committee.

Mr. McCloskey agreed that the CIP Committee could provide a final oversight in that process.

Mr. Svoboda noted that the departments are asked to review the appropriate

sections of the Comprehensive Plan during the submittal process.

There was discussion regarding the reflection of the Comprehensive Plan in the CIP requests.

Mr. Willer noted that there had been some very good discussion points and offered comments from the audience even after closing the public hearing.

There were no public comments offered.

Mr. Willer stated that the discussion had brought new perspectives and asked Mr. Svoboda for a timeline of how this could proceed.

Mr. Svoboda stated that in taking this discussion into consideration, the CIP would likely come back to the Commission in November so that a recommendation could be made to the BOS in January 2017.

There was discussion as to what revisions would be made and how they would align with the Comprehensive Plan, noting that a target list of items would be compiled. It was determined that some responsibilities would fall to the BOS or the County Administrator and not the Planning Commission.

Mr. Morris asked who the contact would be for Emergency Services.

Mr. Svoboda stated that as far as he was aware, Melissa Meador is the contact for Emergency Services.

There was discussion regarding action for the CIP public hearing.

Mr. Morris made a motion to defer the CIP.

Mr. Schaff seconded the motion.

The vote was taken.

AYE

Mr. Saunders
Mr. McCloskey
Mr. Morris
Mr. Schaff
Mr. Willer

NAY

The motion to defer the CIP carried by a unanimous vote.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Svoboda reviewed a resolution that was submitted to the BOS regarding some proposed upcoming ordinance revisions as listed on the work program.

There was a discussion regarding the priority of the proposed revisions, noting that legal requirements would take precedence and the others would follow as directed by the BOS.

Mr. Svoboda gave an update on upcoming training opportunities.

Mr. Svoboda stated that there are some items anticipated but no pending cases for next month.

There was discussion regarding whether or not there will be a meeting in October.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Schaff made a motion to approve the July 20, 2016 meeting minutes as presented.

Mr. McCloskey seconded the motion.

The minutes for the July 20, 2016 meeting were approved by a 5-0 vote.

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

Mr. Svoboda stated that a copy of the revised by-laws were included in the packet.


Mr. Willer reminded everyone that staff will advise whether or not there will be a meeting in October based on feedback from the Town of Stanardsville relating to their Comprehensive Plan.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Marsha Alley
Secretary



Planning Commission, Chairman

11/16/2016

Date