

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**February 16, 2005**

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2005, AT 7:30 pm IN THE COUNTY MEETING ROOM.

Those present were:

- Gary Lowe, Chairman
- Helen Phillips, Vice-Chairperson
- Jim Davis, Member
- Brent Wilson, Member
- Mickey Cox, Ex-officio Member
- Catherine Clossin, Community Development Director
- Bart Svoboda, Zoning Official
- Marsha Alley, Secretary

The chairman called the meeting to order stating that there would be one public hearing for a rezoning request and four public hearings for special use permit requests. He explained that those who wished to speak must sign-up and reviewed the public hearing process for those who had not attended before. He added that the first order of business would be the election of officers.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS:**

The members voted by secret ballot for Chairman and Vice-Chairman. The votes were counted and Gary Lowe was elected Chairman and Brent Wilson was elected Vice-Chairman.

**PUBLIC HEARING: Shelter Development/Frederick & Kathryn Benzinger—Rezoning Request #05-158**

Mr. Lowe read the request: Shelter Development, LLC/Frederick & Kathryn Benzinger request a re-zoning from R-1 to R-2 on approximately 7.0 acres of a 14.70 acre tract located in Ruckersville on Matthew Mill Road identified on County Tax Maps as 66-(A)-20. (RZ#05-158)

Ms. Clossin gave a report and PowerPoint presentation regarding the request. She stated that as a result of a survey, the acreage being rezoned will be approximately 7.5 acres. She added that the rezoning is necessary in order to allow 120 garden apartments to be constructed by a special use permit. She stated that this project is targeted to working individuals with an annual income between \$15,000 and \$38,000. She described the project as having five 3-story buildings with 120 garden apartments, 13 one-bedroom apartments, 86 two-bedroom apartments, and 21 three-bedroom apartments, many of which will be handicapped accessible. She added that the project will be aesthetically pleasing and that the applicant will own and manage the property. She noted that the Office of Emergency Services and the Planning Department recommend having more than one location for ingress/egress and having sprinklers and

fire escapes installed in the buildings. She pointed out that the density would allow 16 units per acre and that the applicant has proffered that “the portion of tax map 66-(A)-20 rezoned R-2 shall not contain any land use with a density greater than four (4) dwelling units per acre unless otherwise approved by special use permit. By special use permit, the R-2 portion of the property may have a density up to the maximum allowed for the R-2 district as set forth in the Greene County Zoning Ordinance.”

Ms. Clossin stated that staff recommends approval of the request with that acceptance of the submitted proffers.

Pete Caramanis addressed the Commission as the attorney for Shelter Development. He introduced Marilyn Duker, President Shelter Development, and several others.

Ms. Duker addressed the Commission stating that Shelter Development is a 28-year old business based in Baltimore, MD. She stated that they have developed over 14,000 units of multi-family housing in the mid-Atlantic region. She added that they are long term owners of the properties and want to be a good neighbor. She stated that there would be an on-site staff of four. She pointed out that they are currently working on projects on Pantops and in Staunton. She noted that they have determined that there is a need for this housing alternative in Greene County. She stated that this would be a high quality apartment community for the working people of Greene. She added that the median household income in Greene County is \$47,000 and that the residents of the community would earn \$18,000-\$38,000 per year. She explained that this is not Section 8 housing and there would be no rent subsidy. She stated that the rent would be \$525-840 per month. She further explained that the rent is kept down by tax credit financing and not through rent subsidy. She stated that low impact development techniques are being explored. She described the community as garden apartments with full kitchens, washer, dryer, and a community center with computers. She noted that they look forward to working in Greene.

Mr. Caramanis stated that the rezoning would allow the option for the special use permit for this development. He added that the proffer would limit the density to 4 rather than 16. He noted that regulations may be placed on the special use permit but the R-2 zoning was needed for multi-family dwellings. He presented a display of a concept plan. He reminded the Commission that a site plan would be reviewed to address entrances, parking, etc. He gave several reasons to support the request such as: alternative housing opportunity, located in the designated growth area, supportive services available. He added that the intended residents must have a favorable reference from a previous landlord, no felony convictions, good credit, and be able to afford the rent. He addressed the traffic and school impact concerns stating that traffic studies are being conducted and the results would be presented to the Board of Supervisors. He added that the impact on the school would be similar to or slightly more than the impact of 32 single-family dwellings on the same parcel. He stated that the developer will be spending \$1.2 million for water and sewer hook-ups and extending

the service. He asked that the Commission recommend approval.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

Carl Schmitt addressed the Commission reviewing a handout that was distributed to each member and included in the file. He suggested taking a look at the big picture, knowing that the county has recently approved five major residential developments recently. He added that the county needs to take a break and absorb what has recently been done and their impacts before taking on something else. He also addressed the impacts on schools, housing, traffic, rescue services, and proffers.

Howard Harris, adjoining property owner, stated that he did not need to address the Commission except to say that he agrees with the concerns brought forth by Mr. Schmitt.

Andrea Wilkinson addressed the Commission stating that she was not sure how this project would fit into the county given the increase in impacts on the schools knowing the present school issues at hand. She suggested planning growth in a manner so that the county would be financially prepared.

Mannie Norford addressed the Commission stating that he was 82 years old and asking for patience while he read a letter that he and his wife had written and distributed to the Commission and included in the file. He also presented a map. He read the letter which addressed safety concerns regarding water flow, traffic concerns, screening, education, water and sewer, amenities, and precedent. He asked that the request be denied.

Sonny Clay addressed the Commission asking if someone on a fixed income such as social security can live in these apartments. He added that it was presented to suggest that if someone living there quit working or went on social security, they would have to leave. He stated that there are some people on fixed incomes who could afford a place such as this. He asked for clarification.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Davis stated that he was disappointed to see that there was no Fiscal Impact Data available. He asked if this parcel would allow 32 single-family homes.

Mr. Caramanis stated that the Zoning Ordinance would allow 32 homes on this R-1 parcel.

Mr. Davis asked Mr. Svoboda if that was typical.

There was discussion on the potential 32 single-family dwellings.

Mr. Svoboda explained that 32 was a good average number depending on how the parcel was developed and the availability of public water and sewer.

Mr. Davis asked if the 911 office had any other comments.

Ms. Clossin stated that the only comments from Emergency Services was the recommendation of having more than one location for ingress/egress and having sprinklers and fire escapes installed.

Mr. Davis asked if there was any traffic data available given that the area is already congested.

Ms. Clossin stated that the traffic study is being conducted presently.

Mr. Davis asked how Shelter determined that there is a need for this type of housing in Greene County.

Ms. Duker stated that a demographic analysis was performed and this area was a targeted market.

Mr. Davis asked if current multi-family apartment developments were taken into consideration.

Ms. Duker stated that they were and that such developments were anticipated to rent at current market rates.

Mr. Davis asked if Shelter Development was a for-profit company.

Ms. Duker stated that it is.

Mr. Davis asked if people on social security could live in the apartments.

Ms. Duker stated that they could. She explained that income verification is performed before the resident moves in and they do not have to leave as income rises.

Ms. Phillips asked what the intentions are for the property zoned B-2.

Mr. Caramanis stated that Shelter will not own the property zoned B-2 but added that it is for sale at this time.

Ms. Phillips asked if there would be access to Route 29 through that lot.

Mr. Caramanis stated that there would be an interior road through the Shelter property

from Matthew Mill Road to the property line for future access to Route 29.

Ms. Phillips asked if there would be only one entrance off of Matthew Mill Road.

Mr. Caramanis stated there would be only one entrance there.

Ms. Phillips asked how many parking spaces would be allotted for 120 apartments.

Mr. Caramanis stated that there would be 240 parking spaces as required.

Ms. Phillips asked what the amount of rent would be.

Mr. Caramanis stated that rent would be as follows:

One-bedroom	\$525
Two-bedroom	\$625/\$740
Three-bedroom	\$720/\$840

Ms. Phillips asked how income would be verified.

Ms. Duker explained that the IRS Code sets guidelines on income verification and rent determination.

Ms. Phillips asked what would prevent Shelter from renting to UVA students.

Ms. Duker stated that the IRS does not permit them to rent to students. She added that this is rigorously enforced.

Ms. Phillips stated that traffic is bad in that area currently and that she could only imagine it being ten times worse.

Ms. Duker stated that a traffic study was being done.

Ms. Phillips pointed out that a traffic study will only determine that there will be more cars.

Ms. Duker stated that they are working with VDOT.

Mr. Caramanis added that VDOT believed that it will be likely to need a right and left turn lane at the site.

Ms. Phillips asked how "family" is defined in terms of renting the apartments.

Ms. Duker stated that the name on the lease is considered the head of household. She added that there is a limit on the number of children and also some bedroom restrictions

regarding the gender of the children. She noted that usually there are not that many children.

Mr. Wilson stated that he shared the same concerns that were mentioned. He added that there was no outpouring of support shown tonight so the demand for this project is also a concern.

Ms. Duker stated that they feel like the demand is there and another marketing study will be performed.

Mr. Wilson asked if local contractors would be used.

Ms. Duker stated that it was possible to use a local general contractor and added that the sub-contractors would definitely be local.

Mr. Wilson asked when build-out would be expected.

Ms. Duker estimated that it would be twelve (12) months.

Mr. Wilson asked Ms. Duker to explain how the financing works.

Ms. Duker explained that the Virginia Housing Development Agency allocates tax credits once a year. She added that they apply for these credits and if they are awarded, Shelter then sells the credits to investors.

Mr. Wilson asked what the range of credits is for the number of apartments.

Ms. Duker stated that it would be determined by dividing \$8 million by 120 apartments.

Mr. Wilson asked what the length of the credit would be.

Ms. Duker stated that the credits are equal over a period of fifteen years for the investor.

Mr. Caramanis added that conditions could be added for the approval.

Mr. Wilson stated that he was bothered by not having the studies available to review.

Mr. Caramanis stated that the issue of fire safety had been discussed at the Site Plan meeting with the county. He added that the water flow had been addressed and that he understood that the flow was to be increased in the next twelve months. He noted that the buildings would also have sprinkler systems installed.

Mr. Wilson stated that access at the roadway was also a concern.

Ms. Duker stated that she understood that to be a serious concern with valid issues. She reminded the Commission that a site plan would also be required.

Mr. Wilson asked why there was a rush on approval.

Ms. Duker stated that the deadline for applying for the tax credit allocation is March 12, 2005.

Mr. Wilson asked Ms. Clossin if the request was deferred, would that preclude the Board of Supervisors meeting and the deadline.

Ms. Clossin stated that it would.

Mr. Lowe asked if the rent would increase.

Ms. Duker estimated that the rent could increase 3% per year indexed for inflation.

Mr. Lowe asked what would happen if Shelter was to go out of business.

Ms. Duker stated that she does not see that happening but if it did, the new owner must follow the same guidelines.

Mr. Lowe asked if the requirements for residents were a federal guideline.

Ms. Duker stated that they are not federal guidelines but company guidelines. She added that they want to have good residents who will pay their rent on time, etc.

Mr. Lowe stated that he shared the concern regarding the impact on the school system.

Mr. Caramanis stated that the figures were compared to other surrounding developments.

Mr. Lowe asked what the intentions were regarding water and sewer.

Ms. Clossin stated that a planned gravity flow line will go directly through the property.

Mr. Lowe asked what other studies were being performed.

Ms. Duker stated that there would be a market analysis and traffic impact study coming.

Mr. Caramanis stated that the applicant could try to provide additional impact studies if needed.

Mr. Lowe asked if the water authority had been contacted regarding the water flow.

Mr. Caramanis stated that he had not spoken with the water authority but had understood that the water flow was to be increased in the next twelve months from a statement made by someone at the county site plan meeting.

Ms. Clossin stated that the February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting was the first of its kind for outside agencies to meet and review upcoming requests.

Mr. Lowe stated that he believes affordable housing is a wonderful concept but added that it must not burden the taxpayers either.

Mr. Wilson asked what would happen to the project if it is deferred tonight and the Board of Supervisors meeting is delayed.

Mr. Caramanis stated that basically the project would go away because the deadline for credit allocation will be missed. He pointed out that the zoning and special use permit must be approved prior to application for tax credits. He added that the site plan does not have to be approved prior to application. He noted that he understood the hesitation but asked that their concerns be noted and forwarded to the Board of Supervisors.

There was discussion on the options that could be taken tonight.

Ms. Phillips made a motion to recommend denial of RZ#05-158 due to the following:

1. All of the input from the citizens at this hearing tonight has been against this rezoning,
2. The information before the Commission is incomplete in respect to traffic, the VDOT study, and public safety issues with respect to fire and police, and
3. There are significant questions with respect to the impact on the local school system.

Mr. Wilson seconded the motion, noting that he would prefer to defer but will second the motion to deny in order to allow the request to move forward to the Board of Supervisors due to the applicant's deadline.

Mr. Lowe stated that he agreed with Mr. Wilson.

The vote was taken.

AYE

Mr. Davis

Ms. Phillips

Mr. Wilson

NAY

Mr. Lowe

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: Shelter Development/Frederick & Kathryn Benzinger—Special Use Permit Request #05-734**

Mr. Lowe read the request: Shelter Development, LLC/Frederick & Kathryn Benzinger request a special use permit for garden apartments on approximately 7.0 acres of a 14.70 acre tract, which is zoned R-1, Residential, pending R-2, Residential, approval, located on Matthew Mill Road and identified on County Tax Maps as 66-(A)-20. (SUP#05-734)

Ms. Clossin stated that the previous report and PowerPoint presentation for the rezoning also applies to this request. She noted that she had no additional comments.

There were no additional comments from the applicant.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

Mannie Norford addressed the Commission. He thanked the members for their patience in allowing him to review the letter he distributed to them. He added that allowing this project would be a disservice to those who live there. He suggested having the State Fire Marshall comment of the required water flow for a project of this nature.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

The Commission had no further discussion given that all of the information was presented and discussed during the rezoning public hearing.

Mr. Wilson made a motion to recommend denial of SUP#05-734.

Ms. Phillips seconded the motion.

The vote was taken.

AYE

Mr. Wilson  
Mr. Davis  
Ms. Phillips  
Mr. Lowe

NAY

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: Bruce Shifflett—Special Use Permit Request #05-733**

Mr. Lowe read the request: Bruce Shifflett requests an amendment to Special Use Permit #02-714 to include a maintenance shop and a home business on a 122.88 acre tract, which is zoned A-1, Agriculture, and C-1, Conservation, located on Mountain Laurel Pass and identified on County Tax Maps as 18-(A)-11. (SUP#05-733)

Ms. Clossin gave a report and a PowerPoint presentation regarding the request. She stated that Mr. Shifflett is requesting to have a maintenance shop and a home business at his Lydia Mountain Lodge. She noted that it will allow him to perform maintenance onsite as a function of running the lodge and will allow him a shop for his construction business.

Ms. Clossin stated that staff recommends approval of the request subject to the criteria outlined in Section 22-62 defining “home business”.

Bruce Shifflett addressed the Commission. He stated that he realized the oversight of not having the maintenance shop included in the previous special use permit. He noted that he had not realized the impact of what maintenance would be needed there. He added that it would be an asset to have his business there as well. He described the maintenance responsibilities such as trash removal, storage, firewood, road scraping, and bush-hogging. He added that he plans to build a residence there in the future and would like to have the detached garage now as the maintenance shop for the lodge.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

Roy Dye addressed the Commission as a nearby property owner. He added that he had no strong opposition to the request but wondered what might be coming down the road and what the shop construction would entail. He added that the Thomas' had sent in a letter voicing their opposition to the request.

Ivan Henao addressed the Commission as a nearby property owner on Saddleback Road. He asked if there would be more noise, noting that it is a rural, quiet area. He also asked if there would be lighting at night. He stated that he believes that Mr. Shifflett appreciates the quality of the area and wondered if that would change. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to speak.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Wilson asked if the maintenance shop would be for the cabin facility.

Mr. Shifflett stated that it would.

Mr. Wilson asked what size the shop would be.

Mr. Shifflett described the shop as a single-level with a steep roof which would allow for upstairs storage similar to a Cape Cod design. He added that it would be similar to the cabins with cabin corners and should not be visible from the cabins or lodge.

Mr. Wilson asked where the home business is presently located.

Mr. Shifflett stated that his office is in Wildwood Valley and he stores some equipment on Route F981. He added that he has some equipment on the mountain as he is still constructing cabins there. He noted that he believes by doing much of the maintenance work at the lodge himself traffic is less impacted.

Mr. Wilson stated that he had a good point.

Mr. Shifflett stated that he plans on moving his office into the new shop. He added that the lodge needs its own shop but he would like to keep everything in one place. He noted that the lodge will be about ½ mile from his future residence.

Mr. Lowe asked if both the construction business and the lodge would be operating from this shop.

Mr. Shifflett stated that they would.

Mr. Wilson asked if traffic would be affected.

Mr. Shifflett stated that he creates most of the traffic himself when constructing and maintaining the cabins.

Mr. Wilson asked if a special use permit is required to construct a shop for the use of the lodge.

Mr. Svoboda stated that it is required.

Ms. Phillips asked how much traffic is generated by the construction business.

Mr. Shifflett stated that he makes about three trips per week to the storage area and is in the office daily.

Ms. Phillips asked if noise would increase.

Mr. Shifflett stated that noise should not be any worse than it is now during construction.

Ms. Phillips asked if lighting would increase.

Mr. Shifflett stated that there would be lights inside the shop for any work that needs to be done after hours.

Mr. Davis asked if the construction business would leave its current locations and move to the new shop.

Mr. Shifflett stated that is the plan. He added that he could store extra building materials and equipment there.

Mr. Davis asked if there is any intent to run construction equipment back and forth to this property.

Mr. Shifflett stated that there is no intention of that. He added that there will be times when he has tractors, etc. there for road maintenance, etc.

Mr. Davis asked what size the garage will be.

Mr. Shifflett stated that it will be 40' x 28'.

Mr. Lowe asked if there would be a need to expand the shop in the future.

Mr. Shifflett stated that he believed that this size would be more than adequate. He pointed out that if he was to sell the lodge, the new owner may want to have a maintenance shop on site.

Mr. Lowe asked if the potential new owner would have to request a special use permit.

Mr. Svoboda stated that they would.

Mr. Lowe asked what type of construction the shop would be.

Mr. Shifflett stated that it would have siding but have cabin corners to blend with the cabins. He added that it would have a rear walk-out basement and possibly garage doors.

Mr. Lowe asked what the status is on the cabin construction.

Mr. Shifflett stated that he is currently working on Cabin #6.

Mr. Lowe asked what the time frame would be for the lodge.

Mr. Shifflett stated that he is still watching the market and demand. He stated that the cabins are doing better than expected and there have been a few requests for a larger

facility but he must be able to justify construction. He added that he has permits for nine cabins.

Mr. Lowe asked if there would be any outside storage.

Mr. Shifflett stated that firewood would likely be kept outside under a tarp and possibly some 2 x 4's.

Mr. Lowe asked if there would be any outside lighting.

Mr. Shifflett stated that there would be two floodlights on each end.

Mr. Lowe asked if traffic would be kept to a minimum.

Mr. Shifflett stated that it would. He reminded the Commission that he handles all of the maintenance himself without hiring outside agencies such as trash pick-up, etc. which keeps traffic down.

Mr. Lowe asked if the special use permit must be amended to add a shed or additions to structures, etc.

Mr. Svoboda explained that anything related to the home business or the lodge must be addressed by the special use permit process. He noted that anything for personal use would not.

Mr. Shifflett stated that he would like to separate about 15 acres in the future for his personal residence.

Mr. Wilson asked if the floodlights would be on continuously or motion activated.

Mr. Shifflett stated that they will probably operate by the switch only. He added that they would likely only be on for a couple hours at night when he was there working.

There was discussion on the request.

Mr. Davis made a motion to recommend approval of SUP#05-733 subject to the criteria outlined in Section 22-62 defining "home business" and to the following conditions:

1. The shop would not be larger than 40' x 28',
2. The shop will not be taller than 1 ½ stories with a basement, and
3. The construction will be similar to the log cabin construction.

Ms. Phillips seconded the motion.

The vote was taken.

AYE

Mr. Wilson  
Mr. Davis  
Ms. Phillips  
Mr. Lowe

NAY

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: Mt. Olivet United Church of Christ—Special Use Permit Request #04-732**

Mr. Lowe read the request: Mt. Olivet United Church of Christ requests a special use permit for an addition to the existing church on a 1.00 acre tract, which is zoned R-1, located at 978 Mt. Olivet Road and identified on County Tax Maps as 46-(A)-49. (SUP#04-732)

Ms. Clossin gave a report and PowerPoint presentation regarding the request. She stated that the church would like to construct a 28' x 48' addition for classrooms and a fellowship hall. She added that the Health Department stated that the addition will not interfere with the current septic field but added that the addition will be within 50' of the well so it cannot be treated with a chemical termiticide. She added that no other comments were received.

Ms. Clossin stated that Planning staff recommends approval of the request.

Richard Herring addressed the Commission on behalf of the church. He stated that the addition will consist of a fellowship hall with a basement. He added that it will be handicap accessible. He pointed out that if the request is approved, the basement will be used for classrooms and that if the request is denied, the basement will be used for storage.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Lowe asked why this use would not be by-right.

Mr. Svoboda explained that adding the fellowship hall alone would be by-right, but that adding the basement exceeds the 50% non-conforming expansion allowance which is why the special use permit is required. He noted that the request is actually for the use of the basement. He added that the applicant chose to apply for all of the permits up front rather than waiting to see how the basement would be used.

Ms. Phillips made a motion to recommend approval of SUP#04-732.

Mr. Davis seconded the motion.

The vote was taken.

AYE

Mr. Wilson  
Mr. Davis  
Ms. Phillips  
Mr. Lowe

NAY

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**PUBLIC HEARING: David Pullen—Special Use Permit Request #04-731**

Mr. Lowe read the request: David Pullen requests a special use permit for a Home Business (Excavation/Lawn Care) on a 4.36 acre tract, which is zoned A-1, located at 2025 Toms Road and identified on County Tax Maps as 52-(A)-29. (SUP#04-731)

Ms. Clossin gave a report and PowerPoint presentation regarding the request. She stated that the home business is for a lawn care and excavation business. She pointed out that the Health Department stated that the proposed structure for the home business would not interfere with the septic field serving the residence but would interfere with an abandon septic field. She noted that the applicant has no plans to use the abandon field in the future.

Ms. Clossin stated that staff recommends approval of the request subject to the requirements of Section 22-62 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Pullen addressed the Commission. He stated that he has a home business for lawn care and excavation and that he needs that garage in order to store lime, fertilizer, and equipment on his own property.

The chairman opened the public hearing.

There being no public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Wilson asked if these items are being stored off site at this time.

Mr. Pullen stated that he has used a site on Spotswood Trail for the past ten years and two years ago bought his own property. He added that he would like to locate the business to his home.

Mr. Wilson asked if all of the equipment would be stored inside.

Mr. Pullen stated that some items may be outside at times.

Mr. Wilson asked how large the garage will be.

Mr. Pullen stated that it will be 50' x 30'.

Mr. Lowe asked if that would include a lean-to.

Mr. Pullen stated that there would be a 16' x 50' lean-to as well.

Ms. Phillips and Mr. Davis had no additional comments.

Mr. Lowe asked if there would be outside storage of equipment.

Mr. Pullen stated that there would be.

Mr. Lowe asked how large the parking area would be.

Mr. Pullen stated that it would be 75' from the old road to the front of the building and 125'-150' long. He added that it will be gravel.

Mr. Lowe asked what the construction of the garage would be and if it would be similar to the house.

Mr. Pullen stated that the garage will be cinderblock but added that he could paint it to match the house.

Mr. Davis asked if the special use permit would have a time limit.

Mr. Svoboda stated that the special use permit and any conditions would run with the land.

Mr. Wilson made a motion to recommend approval of SUP#04-731 subject to the requirements of Section 22-62 with the following conditions:

1. The structure will not be larger than 50' x 30',
2. The lean-to will not be larger than 16' x 50', and
3. The structure will be painted to match the existing home.

Mr. Davis seconded the motion.

The vote was taken.

AYE

Mr. Davis  
Ms. Phillips  
Mr. Wilson  
Mr. Lowe

NAY

The motion carried by a unanimous vote.

**OLD/NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. Lowe stated that the Board of Supervisors has asked the Commission to direct Planning staff to study the issues regarding "hardships".

Ms. Clossin stated that staff would provide information at the next meeting.

Mr. Lowe informed the members that the draft Capital Improvements Program (CIP) has been made available tonight.

Ms. Clossin stated that it would be a good idea to schedule a workshop for sometime in March to discuss the CIP. She added that she plans to meet with the County Finance Director, Tracy Morris, this week and plans to invite her to the workshop. She reminded the Commission that the CIP is in a rough draft form, noting that it is the first CIP since 1992. She pointed out that she had not received a lot of response from many departments.

Mr. Lowe asked what requests were on the agenda for March.

Mrs. Alley stated that there would be a rezoning, a special use permit, and a preliminary plat review.

Mr. Lowe suggested that the workshop be held at 6:30 pm prior to the regularly scheduled meeting on March 16, 2005.

All members agreed.

Ms. Clossin stated that a new committee meeting is being held on the second Wednesday of each month from 9 am to 11 am to review current requests in the Planning department with outside agencies. She added that Richard Herring will be attending in the future as a representative for the volunteer fire departments.

Mr. Lowe stated that appointments must be made to the Stanardsville Planning Commission and the Economic Development Authority.

Mike Skeens was reappointed to serve on the Stanardsville Planning Commission.

Gary Lowe was reappointed to serve on the Economic Development Authority.

Mr. Lowe informed the Commission that he has been appointed to serve on the Stanardsville Planning Commission as a resident of the Town. He added that research found that there would be no conflict of interest.

Mr. Wilson asked what the largest expenditures were in the CIP.

Ms. Clossin stated that the largest expenditures were the schools and infrastructure.

There was discussion on the CIP.

Mr. Davis asked what the status is for the previously discussed zoning ordinance revisions.

Ms. Clossin stated that the revisions would be coming in a few at a time. She added that the first one will be addressing the "hardship" issue.

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the December 15, 2004 meeting were unanimously approved as submitted.

#### **OTHER PLANNING MATTERS**

There were no other Planning matters.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Marsha Alley*  
Secretary