

PLANNING COMMISSION
APRIL 19, 2006

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19, 2006, AT 7:30 PM IN THE COUNTY MEETING ROOM.

Those present were: Gary Lowe, Chairman
Jim Davis, Vice-Chairman
Davis Lamb, Member
Graydon Lamb, Member
Mickey Cox, Ex-officio Member
Bart Svoboda, Zoning Administrator
Stephanie Golon, Planner
Kelly Clay, Secretary

Ms. Woodfolk was absent.

Mr. Lowe called the meeting to order. He said that the Agricultural and Forestal District Committee (AFD) had an issue that they needed to discuss tonight. He then recessed the Planning Commission meeting to allow the AFD Committee to come forward and discuss their case.

The AFD meeting was called to discuss Mr. Vincel's request to remove property from the Midway, Agricultural and Forestal District due to a medical hardship. There was discussion among the committee members.

Mr. Larry Snow asked if this could be delayed.

Mr. Svoboda said that this could be delayed. He suggested set a date, maybe the next Planning Commission meeting but not at 7:30 but maybe 6:30 before the Planning Commission meeting. All AFD members were in agreement for May 17, 2006 at 6:30. Mr. Svoboda said that staff would notify Mr. Vincel.

Mr. Svoboda said that a formal motion to defer to the next PC meeting.

Mr. Lowe asked for a motion to defer.

Mr. Davis Lamb made a motion to defer this case to the next PC meeting on 5/17/06

Mr. Graydon Lamb seconded the motion.

A vote was taken.

AYE

Jim Davis
Davis Lamb
Graydon Lamb
Gary Lowe

The PC Committee voted unanimously to defer the AFD case until the next PC meeting scheduled for 5/17/06. This case to be held at 6:30, one hour prior to the PC meeting.

The AFD meeting was then adjourned.

PRELIMINARY PLAT REVIEWS

Mr. Lowe said the next order of business will be the Preliminary Plat review for Barrington Place.

Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Svoboda to give a report.

Mr. Svoboda said this is a preliminary plat for Barrington Place which is located on Ice House Road which is Route 677 in the Stanardsville area. He said this is a by-right subdivision with water and sewer availability. He said there is a letter in the PC member's packet from RSA. He said there are some minor adjustments that need to be made between the Engineer and RSA. Mr. Svoboda said that all lots will be serviced on the internal VDOT road. He said VDOT comments are also included in the PC packets. He said that requirements have been met for preliminary plats. He displayed an overhead drawing of the subdivision layout. He said the applicant is present along with the Engineer. He said this would be on the west side of Ice House and the south side between old Rt. 33 and the new Rt. 33. Mr. Svoboda said this is a cluster subdivision with 25% open space in the back. He said there is a proposal for a pump station.

Mr. Lowe asked if the applicant would like to add anymore information.

Mr. Roger Ray approached the Planning Commission stating that his firm prepared this plan. He said that Mr. Svoboda covered the basics on this proposal. He said that this is a by-right subdivision and they have met all the necessary guidelines. He said the property owner is here as well and the both of them are prepared to answer any questions.

Mr. Lowe opened the hearing to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Jim Davis asked the price range of the homes.

Mr. Ray said that the property owner is here and could answer that question.

Mr. Joel Snow approached the Planning Commission. He said that the price range of the

houses will depend on the selling price of the lots. He said that typically you will find that the lot price is 20-25% of the selling price of the house. He said that the retail pricing of the lots has yet been determined. Mr. Snow that he would like to keep the home pricing in the \$300,000 range. He said that he is looking at approximately a 2 year build out.

Mr. Davis Lamb asked the applicant an estimate of water usage.

Mr. Snow said that a study has not been done at this time. He said that RSA said there is enough EDU's (Equivalent Dwelling Unit).

Mr. Graydon Lamb asked the applicant about VDOT and highway access.

Mr. Roger Ray said that the entrance location on Ice House Road has been approved. He said that his firm has designed a road plan and that those plans were in the hands of VDOT. He said this is a state road within a subdivision.

Mr. Lowe said the road will bonded until it meets VDOT standards so that it will pass inspections.

Mr. Davis Lamb made a motion to approve Preliminary Plat SDV#06-022 subject to the following requirements: VDOT comments and RSA concerns are addressed.

Jim Davis seconded the motion.

AYE

Graydon Lamb
Jim Davis
Davis Lamb
Gary Lowe

The Planning Commission voted to approve Preliminary Plat SDV#06-022.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Lowe read the request: Carroll & Lynette Morris/K & B Properties request a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the designation from Rural to a mix of Business/Retail and Residential on Approximately 327.54 acres located on Spotswood Trail, Dunnes Shop Road, and M & M Road and identified on County Tax Maps as 50-(A)-42A, 42B, 45 and 59-(A)-19, 19A, 21, 25, 26, 27 and 28A. (CPA#06-001).

Mr. Lowe explained the process and then asked for the staff report.

Mr. Svoboda said this is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment, 06-001 for K & B Properties

and it does go along with a discussion that the Board of Supervisors (BOS) and the Planning Commission had 6 months to a year ago regarding moving some growth area from the Ruckersville area up along Rt. 33 on the south side of the Quinque area where there is public water and sewer, bigger roads and better infrastructure. Mr. Svoboda pointed out on an overhead the effected parcels. He said that in discussing with the water consultant, there are some issues regarding future water supply. He said that VDOT has been sent the necessary documents to comment on their thoughts for a development this size and staff has not heard back from them yet. He said VDOT is running 45 days and out for return comments. Mr. Svoboda said that staff analysis is that the infrastructure is there to warrant this move of area from Ruckersville area to the Quinque area. He said that the supply may not be there but we do have in our CIP, water impoundment as part of the 10 year 20 year outlook. He said to concentrate on where we want the growth and as part of the re-zoning as the services come into effect. Mr. Svoboda said that staff does like this application as far as relocating existing growth area's to areas where we have better infrastructure. He said that he believes this is a positive proposal. He said that the future land use map does have vast amounts of residential growth designated for the County. He said that eliminating, modifying or relocating some of that existing residential growth as part of this Comprehensive Plan amendment will help the County to control the growth. He said the commercial component of this project is very attractive and there may be a need to buffer some of the commercial with some residential. He said there are still many unanswered questions about transportation and the future availability of public water and sewer. He said that staff currently does not have a recommendation for this proposal. He said that staff likes this proposal but feels that it needs a little more work and more details ironed out. He said the applicant is here tonight and could maybe answer any questions.

Mr. Dick Johnson with Blackwell Engineering approached the PC. He complimented Mr. Svoboda's presentation as to what their purpose is. He said that being a Comprehensive Plan amendment, before proceeding heavily into engineering they would like to know what the zoning requests would be before getting into the specifics for the residential and commercial area. Mr. Johnson said they recognize the transportation problems. He said that one of their thoughts is to ring a roadway from M & M across the side of the property over to Rt. 33. He said that would relieve some of the traffic at the intersection of Rt. 633 and Rt. 33. He said this is one option they are looking at and VDOT will need to take a serious look at this and see how it would be handled. Mr. Johnson said they are well aware of the water issue in the County. He said they understand the impoundment idea that is currently being looked at. He said they could proffer some wells that could be fed into the tank that is nearby that would provide an additional water source for capacity. He said that specifics would get addressed during the re-zoning phase. He said before they proceed further with the engineering of this project, they need to make sure that this falls in the way that the County wants the land developed. He said they believe this area is perfect for what the Comprehensive Plan purposes state. He said that he will be glad to address any questions.

Mr. Lowe then opened it for public comments. He reminded everyone that the PC is an advisory commission that makes recommendations to the BOS. He said that a final decision will not be made this evening. He said that discussion tonight will be on the Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Ms. Andrea Wilkinson approached the PC. She said that she and her husband live on a farm in Ruckersville. She said that they would like to address the designated growth area. She said that if we amend our future land use map, we should think about dropping the designated growth area. Ms. Wilkinson reviewed her handout/ memo and analysis chart that was handed to each commission member and staff. She said the picture is worse than what she has presented on paper. She said that she would like to see the PC stick to the Comprehensive Plan instead of moving designated growth area.

Ms. Hariett Bowie approached the PC. She said that she is a business owner and resident of the County. She said that she served as the Chair for the Natural Resources Task Force for the Comprehensive Plan. She said that we take water for granted. Ms. Bowie said our current water sources cannot sustain a project of this size as well as its density. She reviewed the March 1st memo from Blackwell Engineering PLC. She said that as an off hand guess with these types of developments; she said we would require a reservoir or two. Ms. Bowie said the shear density of this project – Albemarle County is huge and they have several reservoirs and lots of pumping stations and they currently cannot keep up with their demand. She said considering the initial tax payer investment that we have on our current water infrastructure, she said that she did not think it would be fair for all the citizens of Greene County to sacrifice their long term water asset for a short term speculative based cash gain.

Mr. Carl Schmitt approached the PC. He said he served on the Comprehensive Plan Committee and was Chairman of the Land Use Task Force. He reminded everyone that the Comprehensive Plan took 2 years to produce. He said there were several workshops, multiple hearings and 7 task forces. He said that it took a long time and a lot of public input to come up with what we have. Mr. Schmitt said his point being one should not simply change the Comprehensive Plan because of one specific request for one specific property. He said the Future Land Map is a very important element of the Comprehensive Plan because it indicates where the County desires its growth to go. He said that he feels the right answer here is (talking about process), he said he feels it is totally inappropriate to simply wing it, nickel and dime one property add it to the growth map, then in comes another and another, otherwise the vision of the Comprehensive Plan will not be achieved and it's purpose will be called into question. Mr. Schmitt said that he feels the thing to do is if at a certain midpoint in the Comprehensive Plan, there is a belief that the growth map needs revision and he believes that it does because he thinks it is way too big. He said that he would then suggest the PC seek the BOS agreement to launch into a review of the future growth map, have research performed and have a specific proposal on modifying the growth map not based on one property but based on the County's interest, brought forward having a workshop with the PC. He said have the public's input and if we wish to

have a change, then the homework and research will have been done. He said he would like to recommend that the PC take the longer view here and not rush through a simple thing like this.

Mr. Roy Dye said he would pass his comments other than to endorse the comments made from Andrea Wilkinson.

Mr. Marty Silman approached the PC. He said that he has been a Ruckersville resident all of his life. He said that the Comprehensive Plan was written recently and he feels it is too soon to be making changes to it. He said the State law requires that every 5 years the Comprehensive Plan be reviewed and revised accordingly. Mr. Silman said that he feels we haven't had enough time to see whether the Comprehensive Plan is going to work. He said that he doesn't feel that we are prepared to handle an amendment such as this. He said that he agrees with Mr. Schmitt, that we need to do further research and see how this will impact us. He said that he is opposed to this proposal.

The public hearing was closed and then opened to the PC.

Mr. Graydon Lamb said that he didn't have any questions at this time but had comments he would like to express. He said there are things he likes about this proposal, being that it is a four lane highway and public water and sewer. He said he feels this is an ideal area for commercial property. He said that when we talk about re-doing the growth area, we should consider property that is on a four lane road with water and sewer as opposed to those without good roads and no public water and sewer.

Mr. Jim Davis said his concern was water. He questioned the number of houses and the build-out.

Mr. Dick Johnson confirmed the 2 year build-out. He said they are proposing the commercial area on the front end of Rt. 33

Mr. Jim Davis asked if the existing growth area was slated for anything.

Mr. Svoboda said the most existing area is zoned R-1. He said this proposal is only equivalent to the only biggest subdivision that we have had which is Creekside, not close to what we had in the growth area. He said if we are talking about shifting this and losing some, talking strictly about residential, then you make out Comprehensive Plan wise. He said that we do need to take time to re-visit the Comprehensive Plan to find out if it is working and if we can't make that determination then maybe we give it more time. He said it is moving pretty fast in our current growth area with some being by-right and some re-zoning. Mr. Svoboda said that we may areas that are within our Comprehensive Plan that are residential for growth but are currently zoned A-1. He said the area that we are specifically talking about in the Ruckersville area north of Rt. 33 and east of Rt. 29, the majority of that is currently A-1 property. He said the Comprehensive Plan says to re-zone

that to residential. He said that if we are looking at the growth of the County, then one of the things to consider is leaving that as A-1 and pulling it out of the future growth area and let it develop as agricultural property and then move some, none or all that will fit there. He further discussed this piece of property.

Mr. Jim Davis said that we should not be in a hurry and that the growth is tremendous and too fast. He said if we are going to work on this, then there needs to be a study of this growth area. He said this is attractive and we need to take our time and be very analytical about this change. He said there shouldn't be an expansion of the growth area but a reduction in the end and hopefully a reduction of how many residential units that will be coming to the County.

Mr. Davis Lamb said he would like to comment on the water. He said that he is reading that there is to be a build out of 543,000 gallons per day. He said he agrees with others that we are growing too fast and that we need to stick to the Comprehensive Plan and let it work. He said that we need some open space too.

Mr. Gary Lowe said that he has mixed feelings. He said that he sees plus and minuses and has a lot of questions. He said that he agrees that it is not the appropriate approach to do a piece at a time. He complimented Mr. Morris for bringing this application forward. He said it gives us the opportunity to look at this on a serious note. He said that we need to take a comprehensive look at this. He said that he agrees if we take some of this A-1 that is designated for growth areas and keep it as A-1. He said that will benefit the County. Mr. Lowe said that we have a tough task we have here walking this fine line between managing growth and keeping what is dear to all of us and that being the rural character of the County. He said that he doesn't have enough information here to make a decision to deny or approve.

Mr. Jim Davis said that he agreed with Mr. Lowe's comments.

Mr. Dick Johnson said that originally they submitted a Comprehensive Plan amendment and a re-zoning application. He said that they recognize that this was not going to be resolved easily and that is why they pulled the re-zoning request so that they could consider this in a rational and well thought out manner. He said they also recognize that the water is an issue as well. He said they realize that issues will be addressed when they go through the re-zoning process.

Mr. Lowe said that irregardless what is done with the Comprehensive Plan, it still has to go through the process of re-zoning.

Mr. Jim Davis complimented the group who performed the work on the Comprehensive Plan. He said they did a remarkable job and it is a good Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Graydon Lamb said that he too agrees that a lot of work and time was put into the

Comprehensive Plan. He said that this is something that we need to consider and may be give the Planning Department and the property owner more time to work on this proposal.

Mr. Lowe said that he is looking for a motion.

Mr. Graydon Lamb made a motion to defer based on issues related to transportation, public water and sewer.

Mr. Jim Davis seconded the motion.

A vote was taken.

AYE

Graydon Lamb
Jim Davis
Davis Lamb
Gary Lowe

The PC voted to recommend deferral tonight to allow more studying time of this proposal.

There was discussion about a specific date when to defer to. Mr. Lowe said he would like to re-visit this proposal at next months PC meeting. It was decided that continued discussion on this proposal would be held at next months PC meeting – May 17, 2006.

Mr. Lowe read the request: David & Doris Berry/Little Ledge, LLC request a re-zoning from A-1, Agriculture to PUD, Planned Unit Development on approximately 280.80 acres located on Spotswood Trail, Judges Road, and Ford Avenue and identified on County Tax Maps as 27-(A)-6 and 37B-(3)-B1-B18 and F1-F7. (RZ#06-003)

Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Svoboda for a report.

Mr. Svoboda said this is RZ#06-003 for Little Ledge. He said it is located behind the shopping center in Stanardsville, north of Rt. 33 across from the public schools. He said this is a Planned Unit Development. He reviewed the overhead presentation. He said this currently but subject to modification for a proposal for about 230 single family homes and 70 town homes and a resort center. He said that the applicant has been in touch with the Stanardsville Revitalization Committee in talking with them to make this type of development benefit the town and look at the needs of the town and balance that with this type of development. Mr. Svoboda said the Future Land Use Map recommends recommendations of existing Comprehensive Plan support. He said the proposed re-zoning although there are some concerns that some of the issues are not straightened out like public water and sewer, the infrastructure system in Stanardsville is dated and it is

unknown at this time what it will take to bring that up and whether the hook-ups are available that ties into the Ruckersville system. He said that when the Ruckersville plant comes on line, there will be capacity available at the Stanardsville system, uncertain as to how much. Mr. Svoboda said that on this application, staff has not drawn a conclusion other than being favorable toward it. He said that it is positive and is good for the town of Stanardsville if the water and sewer and transportation issues can be worked out. He said the applicant is here tonight with a presentation to provide further information and answer questions.

Mr. Don Franco with KG Associates approached the PC and said he is here representing Little Ledge, LLC. He reviewed an overhead presentation pointing out the future land use plan saying that it is located in area that is designed for residential development. He said that this project is in a residential area, designated for this type of development and its location is in a location that is different from Ruckersville, being that it is located in Stanardsville. He said it would be in a location to enhance the growth of Stanardsville, positive project from the land use side. He said they are also looking at a tourism center on the property, dedicating 20 acres to it with the intent to help bring tourism in some kind of attraction to the town of Stanardsville being at a level not to pull businesses out of the town of Stanardsville but to bring users to the town. He continued to review the overhead presentation pointing out how the project relates to the town itself. He said that they are not talking about the 200 acres in total but roughly 175 acres of the 280 acres that they are talking about. He said that they are talking roughly about 350 units on the property, the numbers changing a little based on discussion findings with RSA and VDOT as to what the final decision will be and he said it is also affected by what input we are getting from the town as far as the number of users they would like to see in the area. Mr. Franco said in the center of the site, they plan to reserve 20 acres for a hospitality center, meaning this could be anything from a resort to a bed and breakfast use. He said they are also opening out for additional uses since this is a PUD to include maybe senior assistant living or other uses in working with the town and not pulling uses out of the town. He said that they see this as a natural extension of the town. Mr. Franco continued to review the overhead presentation displaying the layout of the project being talked about at this time. He pointed out some connecting points to enhance the grid of the town, extensions down to Rt. 33 for the main entrance as well as out to Ford Avenue and these are connections that can be created now. He said there is also the ability to provide for future connections in the middle of the site and toward the top that they could make provisions on their site that would take the adjacent property owners to complete this connection. He said that they recognize at this point that Staff has identified that traffic, water and sewer as big issues that need to be resolved. He said that their goal tonight was to discuss the land use plan and make sure their vision that they are proposing is consistent with the PC interpretation of the Comprehensive Plan. He said they would happy to proffer VDOT standard roads and entrances and do the improvements necessary to meet the VDOT standards for their development. He said they are dealing with technical engineering issues at this point. He said they are in the process of evaluating a central water system, digging several high yield wells on the property. He then reviewed the overhead presentation, pointing out a water

tower that would be part of the central system. He sees building a system to support this project in having additional capacity in case the County wanted to take it over and connect it to the Stanardsville system, it could begin to address some of the issues associated with the current system. He said they would be connecting to the public sewer system. He said there are still logistics and several options on how this connection could be made. Mr. Franco said they do not have specific details at this time but expect to work them out in the near future. He then discussed the economic impact and how this project works with everything else. He said that they anticipate the homes to be in the range of \$300,000, not sure if they are going to be \$350,000 or higher or lower, it is still in the process. He said the single family and town houses to be relatively neutral regarding the impact to the County. He said if the single family homes bring \$350,000, and the town houses require less services because they would be young couples with no children therefore, not requiring school services. Mr. Franco said if you add in the resort component and you then start to build revenue coming from that use as well as create jobs for this specific area. He said a secondary impact or another benefit would be what the users would bring to the existing services and businesses now in Stanardsville. He said at this point, he will be happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Floyd Snow approached the PC. He said he is an adjacent property owner. He pointed out the left hand corner of the map on the overhead and said that according to Mr. Franco's comment that there are 100 or so acres that will be developed. He said the map he viewed in the Planning Department office shows that the circled area on the map adjoins his property. He said that circle pointed out on the overhead is on his property so his question is where in that area is the property not being developed. He said his main concern is where the property lines are. He expressed concerns regarding Ford Avenue and the traffic flow. He said that he feels this applicant's presentation was incomplete.

Ms. Dixie Hines approached the PC. She said there are two things she would like to address. She said that she is concerned about the water tower location. She said that it may be located on her land. She said she thought there had been a 15 year dispute on this property and that there are about 4 or 5 acres that Mr. David Berry says belong to him. She said that she would like to see him have his property surveyed because she did.

Mr. Carl Schmitt approached the PC. He said that he feels we have a proposal here that is no way perfected and is not sufficient for the PC to review. He said that a re-zoning is your last and only chance for the County to make a deal with the developer. He said there have been no proffers made in this regard. He said that the future growth map does show this area for residential but it didn't intend to show it for this density of residential. Mr. Schmitt said that a PUD is relatively a new district and has only been used twice and both times shows substantial commercial component which this one has maybe in the conference center which could be a good thing. He said we hear everything from a conference center to a bed and breakfast. He said the bed and breakfast is not going to bring much revenue to the County. He said he disagrees with the statement that the homes at \$350,000 are revenue neutral. He said that we are talking about 750 people coming into this

development which is more than the town of Stanardsville. He said this project has major impact. Mr. Schmitt said that the developer seems to be willing to work on this. He said there may some real potential with the tie in to the enhancement of Stanardsville and revitalization. He said the conference center would be an ideal concept for tourism. He said there are some positives but there are still a lot of things not stated, not dealt with and not clear. He said he understands that the water and sewer system in Stanardsville is shot and the only way is to replace it and who is going to pay for that in order to support this development. He said there are a number of important issues that have not been answered that need addressing.

Ms. Hariett Bowie addressed the PC. She expressed concerns with water supply. She said she questions why the heavy density and how many toilets flushed in the conference center. She said that we need to be thinking about a hydro-geological study at this point because it is almost on a mountainous slope.

Ms. Patti Shifflett approached the PC. She questioned what is going to happen to the children who are going to be living in these houses. She said if there is one child per SFH, where are the kids going to go to school. Ms. Shifflett said she worked at the school and there is no room in our schools now. She said this is a big issue that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Marty Silman approached the PC. He said his only issue with this is the re-zoning to PUD. He said it is his understanding that a PUD zoning is to promote smart growth – meaning to him as centralizing and densifying development to add more open space. He said that we have 280 acres to be re-zoned and about 20 acres of open space and to him he said that doesn't really sound like an intent for smart growth and PUD.

Mr. Bill Lumpkin approached the PC. He addressed the Commission giving an emotional plea for the PC as well as the BOS to carefully consider the amount of residential growth being proposed in the County as he believes the proposed growth will have a negative impact on EMS and other services within the County.

The public hearing was closed and opened to the PC.

Mr. Graydon Lamb said the question he has is regarding the existing water and sewer in the town – the condition, cost and what has to be done and his going to pay for it.

Mr. Svoboda said he has spoken with RSA about defining the above. He said that we do not know the shape of the system. He said they did know that it is near capacity, old and will need some improvements.

The applicant said they have gotten pretty much the same answers. He said there are issues with the current system. He said long term when the Ruckersville Plant comes on line they are expecting to have capacity in Stanardsville. He said the distribution or

collection system needs help. He said that RSA hasn't been able to find it and that is the part that they are working with RSA on. He said water has been everybody's concern tonight and part of it has been the trade off of what can they do with their project to enhance the value of that system and correct some of the problems by putting the tank on the property. He did say the tank is on their property and not someone else's. He said the EDU money and the upsizing of the water system would hopefully offset the majority of the improvements required for the sewer system.

Mr. Graydon Lamb asked if the line down to the sewer plant would need to be replaced.

Mr. Franco reviewed the overhead presentation pointing out the pump station in the middle of the site, saying that it pumps up to the plant. He said worse case scenario would be that they would have to improve the infrastructure down to the pump station, upsize the pump station and then get it to the plant. He said they are still unsure how much capacity of the plant will be replaced with Ruckersville's plant coming on line. Mr. Franco said that if they provide their own on site system they should not have an impact on the town's existing water line.

Mr. Graydon Lamb asked if VDOT comments have been received.

Mr. Franco said they are working with VDOT now on the location of the main entrance off of Rt. 33. He said what they have discussed with VDOT is the requirements for a turn and taper lane on Rt. 33. He said that VDOT does not have big concern with the respect to the traffic impact. He said they are working on the design to minimize the amount of grading that takes place. Mr. Franco said there a lot of outstanding questions and issues with this project but they are asking is the density and the proposed uses appropriate.

Mr. Jim Davis expressed his concerns about the water and sewer issues. He asked the applicant if there were proffers associated with this.

Mr. Franco said they would be willing to offer proffers that they are looking for feedback tonight.

Mr. Jim Davis then expressed the concern of the impact on schools. He said that he is concerned with the schools, the road and traffic around the schools and needs to understand these issues a little bit better. He then reviewed what had been discussed at last months meeting regarding the proposal. Mr. Davis said at last months meeting there was discussion about a nice resort and now it has moved to a Bed & Breakfast and an assisted living facility, 300 homes last time and now it is at 350 homes and the price of these homes varied from last month to tonight. He said this project needs more frame work. He expressed concern about fire protection and water flow. He asked the applicant if the water tower is located on their property

Mr. Franco said the tower is on the property. He reviewed the overhead presentation.

There was discussion about open space and overall view of the property using the overhead presentation.

There was discussion about preliminary work done on this proposal. Mr. Svoboda said that the sister agencies haven't had time to respond. There was discussion about time frames and deadlines regarding each individual agencies such as RSA, and VDOT.

There was discussion about why a PUD. Mr. Svoboda said the PUD is not well defined in the Comprehensive Plan. It was discussed that without the PUD there couldn't get the resort. There was discussion about the number of roof tops and them being in the right place. Mr. Franco said this project would be in the right with it being easy to service and close to the schools. Mr. Franco said there is less non-residential than normal for a PUD.

Mr. Davis Lamb asked the applicant the amount of acres and how large the lots were.

Mr. Franco said they are looking at a more urban form of development such as something similar to Forest Lakes.

Mr. Davis Lamb asked if this was going to be a tighter cluster.

Mr. Franco said that is what is being discussed and they have allowed 25% open space. He continued to discuss the open space. He used the overhead presentation to point out the open space.

Mr. Davis asked if this development would draw seniors since there will be senior assistance.

Mr. Franco said they would like to have the resort to come in and be that component that the Comprehensive Plan is looking for. He said they are not sure they can draw that, so they would like to open that to other uses such as a senior assisted living, with trying to still keep the character and benefit the County. He said they would offer to proffer a time to pursue the resort community. He said they have not got a resort on line yet until they find out what the zoning will be.

Mr. Graydon Lamb questioned the open space around the existing ponds.

Mr. Franco said yes they were existing ponds.

Mr. Lowe said he is concerned about the traffic. He asked Mr. Franco if he had seen the memo where VDOT is requesting a traffic study.

Mr. Franco said that VDOT has come back with the recommendation and that VDOT also told them that their main entrance – the turn and taper is what they are looking for.

Mr. Lowe said that he also had concern with Ford Avenue being that is a narrow road. He asked if they were going to try and encourage bicycle and walking paths.

Mr. Franco pointed out on the overhead an area that is about a 6-7 minute walk. He said the goal was to create an extension of the town. He pointed out an area of the development that would be about a 15 minute walk to the town. He said they are planning on building paths and encouraging an extension of a pedestrian system.

Mr. Lowe asked the applicant about the children impact. He said that we need to force commercial development into the town to help revitalize the town. He asked if we were talking about an upscale resort. He said that he feels they would want to upscale the town as well. He asked the applicant what they see as their role playing in the town.

Mr. Franco said that in order for their project to be successful, it's going to be key that the town be successful as well. He said they could enhance the pedestrian system. He said they feel that have a responsibility in helping to fund that activity. He said that they were discussing about matching funds with the town – intent to be a partner with the town to help make everyone successful.

Mr. Lowe said that the goal is to make development pay for itself. He said that we really need to study this and feels it will be great for the town if done correctly. He said there are a lot of questions that need to be answered and he realizes the applicant is working toward them and that there are also problems with other agencies not responding in a timely manner. He said this would be beneficial to the town, county and the tax payer.

Mr. Franco commented on Mr. Lowe's comments saying this is what they are looking for and the help of the PC. He said this helps them in addressing issues such as the water and sewer, too dense or not enough non-residential. He said this is the type of feedback that they need while waiting for the other agencies to address concerns.

Mr. Lowe said that the PC needs more such as fiscal impact study, traffic study, impact on schools and EMS. He said that is what we need to work on.

Mr. Franco said they would be happy to defer with the guidance they received from PC and the public and will come back with answers to the questions presented tonight.

Mr. Lowe said it would be appropriate if the applicant would voluntarily defer at this point.

Mr. Franco confirmed the applicant will defer.

Mr. Lowe read the request: Emmanuel Christian Center/Tracy Bony request a special use permit for a church and youth facility on a 20.00 acre tract which is zones A-1, Agriculture,

located on Spotswood Trail and identified on County Tax Map as 50-(A)-38B. (SUP#06-002)

Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Svoboda for a report.

Mr. Svoboda said this is a special use permit request for a church and a youth facility in A-1 district. He said this is a 20 acre tract located on the south side of Rt. 33. He said is actually located at the end of Stephen's Loop. He said public water is available and there is a letter from RSA in each PC member's packet. He said sewer would have to be designed and there is a letter from the Health Department in each packet. Mr. Svoboda said that road improvements need to be required and there is a letter in each packet from VDOT about turn and taper lanes. He said the Comprehensive Plan does not specifically address churches, so there is a fine line with this application. He said this is a low impact use as far as development is concerned. He said that Staff does recommend approval of this special use permit subject to addressing issues related to the rural character of the land to make sure the site is set up and designed so it fits into the land. He said we need to make sure we address concerns for parking, noise and lighting. He said the PC has the ability to condition the permit rather than the applicant offer proffers. He then reviewed the overhead presentation. He said that we need to make sure everyone understands the meaning of "Youth Center". This is not a ball field but a building where youth go for church activities.

Tracy Tanner Bond approached the PC. She said that she has been a resident of Greene County for 23 years. She said that this particular parcel has 5 division rights. She said that she is the seller of the property and Emmanuel Christian Center is the proposed purchaser. She said that Bishop Michael Jackson is the church's representative. She said the property has been on the market for 4 years. She said the part that was most attractive to her as a mother and a resident is that this does afford a youth center. Ms. Bond also said that if she were an adjacent property owner, lighting would be of concern to her.

Pastor Michael Jackson of the Emmanuel Christian Center approached the PC. He said that no one is talking about the youth of Greene County and no one is addressing the young people. He said he has been here since 1996 and nothing in the County for the youth. He said that the youth are hanging out at area businesses and other locations. He said he would like for them to come to the youth center and work on/with the computers to complete their homework and then go into the gymnasium where they could play ball or be tutored on things to better themselves in life. Pastor Jackson said this is not about his members but about the County. He said he goes down to Coffeewood Correctional Center in Culpeper and there are young girls down there from Greene County. He said that it hurts him to see that these young girls are down there and cannot come home. He said that our youth need a place of safety. He said if the church comes aboard on the property fine but the vision is about and for the youth.

Mr. Gary Lowe opened the hearing to the public.

Mr. David Blankenbaker approached the PC. He said he is here with his wife Kathy. He pointed out his location to the property on the overhead. He said items they had concerns about have been addressed by the applicant. He said they have addressed a letter to the PC addressing concerns on this application. He read a prepared letter addressing their issues on this application. He listed those issues as hours of use, congregation size, lighting, rainwater runoff, vehicular noise, privacy and security. He asked what would be the total plan use of the youth center. He asked if there would be a school, day care center, commercial activities, outdoor recreation, or any other planned uses for the future. He said the buildings and parking lots are not suited for this type of use based mostly on the topography. Mr. Blankenbaker said this would significantly change the rural character of the surrounding properties. He said that they request the special use permit not be approved.

Mr. Tommy Durrer approached the PC. He said he is an adjacent property owner. He pointed out on the overhead presentation his property and where the applicant's property joins up with his. He said he is a life long resident of Greene County and he loves the outdoors and the farm area. He said he has presented a video of the surface water than runs off Rt. 33 starting at Woodridge and it goes down Rt. 33. Mr. Durrer used an overhead presentation to point out this issue. He asked if any of PC members have walked this property that's in question.

Mr. Lowe responded that the PC members have not walked the property.

Mr. Durrer continued his presentation. He said that he is not opposed to having the church but he is concerned about the land and the changes it will have to go through. He said he feels when you begin to disturb the land where the water runs through, there is a lot of water run off. He said he feels the land needs to be protected. He said the land is open and is farm land and he would like to see it kept that way. He said he is not opposed to selling the land into 4 or 5 acres but it will also create large traffic issues that will create a large impact. He said if there is no other location for a youth center, then he will be lenient on his comments.

Ms. Pamela Strombeck approached the PC. She said that she is a life long resident of Greene County. She pointed out the 10 acres that she and her husband own. She said that she is never opposed to see another church added to our community. She said that the youth center is her big concern. She said she has questions as to who the youth center will benefit, will that be church members only or would it be available to her kids who could walk to the youth center. Ms. Strombeck said that she also had noise and lighting concerns. She said that she is concerned about the disruption of the nature of the surroundings. She said that she agrees with Mr. Durrer regarding the water run off concerns. She said at this point she cannot tell the PC whether she is for or against this proposal due to the lack of information. She said that she would like to ask the PC have the applicant supply a plan that includes specifics, what the youth center will involve and if

we open up this zoning and re-zone this property, what issues will be faced down the road. She expressed her concerns as to what may be coming if the present Pastor was to retire and someone else took over. Ms. Strombeck said at this time she can say that she is totally against this due to lack of information.

Mr. Richard Strombeck approached the PC. He pointed out on the overhead his parcel and said that part of it is very agricultural and wooded with two streams running through it. He said that the scenery is very beautiful and he enjoys it very much but fears it will be gone. He said that he seconds his wife's comments on the church added to the community or even the youth center.

The public hearing was closed and opened up to the PC.

There was discussion among the PC members regarding several concerns and issues about this proposal. They expressed concerns with the style, size and height of the building. There was discussion about the hours of operation and time table. Mr. Lowe said the storm water run off was a major issue that needed to be addressed. Mr. Svoboda said he hasn't had the opportunity yet to view Mr. Durrer's tape. The PC also asked Pastor Jackson what the youth center meant to him. Pastor Jackson was also asked what did he see as a youth center.

Pastor Jackson said that at this time no size or style and height of the building had been determined. He said at this time operation times would be on Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday. He said the youth center to him meant a fellowship hall, classrooms and a gymnasium. He said that there are similar facilities in Culpeper and Fredericksburg like the facility he would like to see here. When asked if he would model his facility like those, he said that he would get input from there when setting his facility in place.

There was discussion from the PC if this was going to be a school and how many permits we are discussing this evening.

Mr. Svoboda said this is a special use permit and that if the church is there, it would be a church facility with accessory uses. He said that in A-1 there can be a special use permit for a community center. When PC asked Mr. Svoboda if there was going to be a school there would that change anything. Mr. Svoboda said that does not change anything, that the BOS has found there can be private schools in the A-1 district. Mr. Svoboda said the main purpose here is the community center and church facility and not a school.

When the PC asked Pastor Jackson what the plans would be (time frame) and if the church would be moved to this site.

Pastor Jackson said that he is looking at 2-5 years and the church would be moved to this site.

The PC asked Pastor Jackson if he plans to move his church to this site. He was also asked about the drawing of the facility was to scale and how many buildings on the site.

Pastor Jackson said that the drawing was a temporary scale of the facility designed by members. He said these are not the exact settings. He said there would be 2 buildings on the site but does not know the size of them at this time.

Mr. Lowe said this is a special use permit and that the PC can attach conditions to it. He said on past history on these types of permits, there have been more of a defined site plan with the size of the building, parking, lighting, recreation outdoor use, screening or buffering – these items giving them magnitude of the scope of the project which would help in the PC decision making. He then explained the special use permit process. He did point out also that this would stay zoned A-1.

Mr. Svoboda said that the PC also has the ability to condition the plans.

Mr. Lowe said he understands the neighbors concerns and that more detail from the applicant would help address the issues questioned. He asked Pastor Jackson for clarification who this youth center would serve.

Pastor Jackson said the County of Greene.

Mr. Lowe asked Pastor Jackson about staffing, security and traffic.

Pastor Jackson his staffing would come from members, Deputy Sheriff's from surrounding counties. He said the traffic is a tough question.

Pastor Jackson said he would check into this.

Mr. Lowe asked if Pastor Jackson would like to voluntarily defer.

Mr. Svoboda explained the voluntarily deferral process.

Pastor Jackson said that he would like to voluntarily defer so that he can address concerns that were presented tonight.

Mr. Lowe read the request: Wendell Lamb/ Harold Estes request a special use permit for a bible classroom on a portion of a 23.62 acre tract which is zoned A-1, Agriculture, located on Progress Place and identified on County Tax Maps as 60-(A)-5. (SUP#06-003)
He asked Mr. Svoboda to give a report.

Mr. Svoboda said this is a special use permit for a mobile classroom or tentively a private school. He said it is an existing facility that is located near Ruckersville Elementary School.

He said the result of this application is to update the trailer that is now there and has been there since Ruckersville Elementary School was built. He said that the PC can condition this special use permit. He pointed out on an overhead the existing classroom and also what the new classroom would look like. Mr. Svoboda said this is not a re-zoning and no offers need to be made. He said if you wanted to do a time table and bring it back in 5 years and see how things are going. He said that private schools and mobile classrooms are not specifically mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan. He said this supplies a service that public school does not.

Mr. Wendell Lamb approached the PC. He said that they do the time release at the public school. He explained the time release program. He said that he and his wife have been doing this for 21 years. He said the process is that the students have to have permission from their parents on a card provided from them. He said they have the students once a month for a bible lesson. He said that presently they have about 700 children a month. He said with the growth of the children attending, they need a larger facility to accommodate the attendance.

The hearing was then opened to the public. There being no sign-ups, the hearing was closed to the public.

The hearing was then opened to the PC.

There was discussion with the PC and staff regarding the filing for a special use permit since this was already in existence. Mr. Svoboda said that the life of the permit runs with the land. Mr. Svoboda said that you could put a time line on it for re-evaluation. There was discussion among the PC and staff on time limits and stipulations.

Mr. Graydon Lamb said he is familiar with the CMB ministry and knows the successful tract record that it has.

Mr. Wendell Lamb said there no plans to stop this program. He said as long as health permits, he and his wife will continue. He said that young missionaries could come in and take over the program so that it could be continued. He said they are a national organization. He said they don't envision a permanent building because they are on other peoples land and they could sell if wanted to and they would have to find another location to hold classes.

Mr. Wendell Lamb was asked about septic and water. He said no, because they only have the children in the classroom for about 25 minutes. He said they ask that the children use the restroom before they come. He said this is for no other purpose than for the bible study classroom.

There was discussion among the PC regarding the number of children in the classroom and a review of the special use permit. The PC can put conditions on this special use

permit. Mr. Svoboda said the PC can put conditions on things such as traffic, number of children in the classroom and bring this back to the PC for review. Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Wendell Lamb for input. Mr. Wendell Lamb said that he plans to continue doing what their doing with the ministry but with a larger facility. They continued to discuss VDOT concerns. Mr. Svoboda said that VDOT would unlikely have any concerns due to the fact there is only 1 vehicle going from school to classroom and back to school. There was discussion to assure that EMS vehicles could get in with no problems.

Mr. Jim Davis made a motion to recommend approval of SUP#06-003 subject to approval of the site development plan, VDOT concerns, building code requirements, 5 year staff review and the classroom not to exceed 35 children at one time.

Mr. Davis Lamb seconded the motion.

A vote was taken.

AYE

Graydon Lamb
Jim Davis
Davis Lamb
Gary Lowe

The PC recommends approval of SUP#06-003.

Mr. Lowe read the request: Ordinance Revision to Define and List as a use: "Animal Shelter" (OR#06-001). He asked Mr. Svoboda for staff report.

Mr. Svoboda gave a report using an overhead presentation. He said that this is ordinance revision OR#6-001 is to add the definition of Animal Shelter to our zoning ordinance. He said there is information in each PC packet explaining the current ordinance. He said this would be a combination of a commercial kennel and a veterinary clinic which we do not have in the County now. He said that we need to think about where it should be allowed in the districts. He said that are commercial clinics are allowed in A-1 by special permit and vet clinics are allowed in B-1, B-2 and B-3 by special permit. Mr. Svoboda said that staff doesn't see any need to change that formula. He said if the PC was to add this definition and the use into the ordinance then an animal shelter would be allowed by special use permit in A-1, B-1, B-2 and B-3. He said this would give the PC and the BOS the ability to condition distances from the property line, sound, screening and parking. Mr. Svoboda said that staff's recommendation is that they like the desired language and it does allow for this additional use. He said if it is added in the special use permit category it does give the PC and BOS the ability to say no or/and yes with conditions.

Mr. Lowe asked if the applicant would like to add any additional comments.

Dr. John Hayes approached the PC and said that he is Chairman of the Madison and Greene Humane Society. He said there wasn't a whole lot he would like to add, other than it appears to be an oversight on whoever wrote the zoning laws initially and have added to them over the years. He said the Madison and Greene Humane Society are very interested in building a facility.

The hearing was opened to the public.

Eloise Price, Executor Director of the Madison and Greene Humane Society said that she would like to second all that Dr. Hayes just said.

The public hearing was closed and opened up to the PC for comments/questions.

There was discussion to clarify what was being accomplished. Mr. Lowe said that we are trying to add this use into the ordinance and should be by a special use and not by right. Mr. Svoboda said yes that if you were going to add it because of what the BOS has done in the past with commercial kennel and veterinary clinics by special permit. Mr. Lowe repeated the zoning districts involved – A-1, B-1, B-2 and B-3.

Mr. Lowe asked for a motion.

Mr. Davis Lamb made a motion to approve OR#06-001 with conditions of a special permit and zonings of A-1, B-1, B-2 and B-3.

Mr. Graydon Lamb seconded the motion.

A vote was taken.

AYE

Jim Davis
Davis Lamb
Graydon Lamb
Gary Lowe

The PC recommends approval of OR#06-001.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

There was discussion about Time Based Zoning. Mr. Svoboda said that everyone received a letter from the Chairman of the BOS. He said it basically puts time based on hold while looking at service districts through more detailed comprehensive planning, road provisions

for lot frontages. He said also looking at time based zoning with a percent relative to parcel size which is similar to what has already been discussed and the other with time based zoning with the ability to bank division rights. He said we want to look at all of this before bringing it back as a proposal. Mr. Svoboda said this will take staff some time to gather.

Mr. Svoboda said he would like to bring up deadlines. He said that maybe staff could submit something to the BOS requesting to extend the amount of time an applicant submits to the time of which they need to come to the PC.

There was discussion about the proposal of changing the ordinance. There was discussion as to whether the state regulates this. Mr. Svoboda said the state has a maximum time allowance. He said that we self imposed the 30 day minimum. He said we have a 30 day clock and we saw here tonight that we don't always get agency comments back in time and maybe we could get an extension of 60 or 90 days as an option so that we can get all the information in so that everything is present to submit. Mr. Svoboda said that he has had discussions with a few BOS members about the time frame.

Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Mickey Cox if he would like to comment on this issue.

Mr. Cox said that he felt like tonight nothing was accomplished due to incomplete materials presented to the PC. He said he would like to see the by-right subdivisions be done by the administration. He said there is nothing we can do about it besides taking up time.

Mr. Svoboda said that if the BOS gave permission then staff could handle by-rights.

There was discussion about drafting a memo to the BOS regarding the time table for submittal to the actual public hearing and to modify or revise the subdivision ordinance. Mr. Svoboda said the state code maximum is 90 days. He said we should really try to avoid the maximum just in case of glitches. He said 60 days would be good and a good comfort zone.

Mr. Graydon Lamb suggested starting with 60 days and go from there.

Mr. Svoboda said that we have to advertise, but he has 4 or 5 submittals that he will need to check on needing to make deadlines at this time.

Mr. Lowe asked Mr. Graydon Lamb for a report from the Town of Stanardsville.

Mr. Graydon Lamb announced that Mr. Gary Lowe is a new member on the Town Council. He said that Margaret Hope will be moving to Kentucky. He said the Hazard Litigation was presented and they are going to continue to perform more work on that and work with EMS too.

Mr. Gary Lowe said the EDA has been quite busy with a lot of activity.

Ms. Stephanie Golon reviewed the packets describing there will be updates included in each months packets to keep the PC on what is being submitted and their impact.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of March 15, 2006 were unanimously approved as submitted.

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

There was no other planning matters.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Clay
Secretary

Andrea Wilkinson CPA CFP
Ruckersville, Va 22968
(434) 985-3870 voice; 985-3804 fax
April 19, 2006

To: Planning Commission
Board of Supervisors
Planning Department

America is the land and the people. The land sustains the people. If we don't protect the land, we can't provide for the people. We watch on CNN as countries without sufficient planning to protect water and agricultural resources suffer famine and death. We are importing more of our meat and produce each year. Over the last 100 years, the US population has grown 369%. If it continues at this rate, the population will be over 1 billion in another 100 years. (Virginia has grown even faster.) Your young children or grandchildren will likely be alive to see this. What happens as world population grows, and other countries won't send us their food any more, while our own population grows, demanding more food and water? *The function of government is to provide for the current and future welfare of the citizens.* We need to keep this underlying objective in mind in all our decisions.

1. Growth in Greene County is occurring at what could only be considered an alarming rate. **According to the US Census, since 1970, the US population has grown 41%, while the Greene County population has grown 226%. And that was before the 3,000 new homes already approved in Ruckersville since then.** Such rapid growth has put the County in a financially strapped position, as we pedal furiously trying to add to our infrastructure constantly, while slower growing counties just need to maintain current property and services. A slow down in our growth over the last 5 years has allowed us to "catch up" somewhat, so we can at least meet daily expenses without borrowing. But more rapid growth is on the horizon. The already approved 3,000 homes is a **47% increase in our housing units that could occur immediately** and is likely to occur over the next decade.

In the past few decades, our role as the "cheap housing" for Charlottesville workers partially fueled our growth, and has created a variety of other financial difficulties for the county. Our average housing value (\$111k per last census) was 7% below national average, while our average household income of \$49k was 8% above national average. Plus, we have more than the average percentage of school age children, and less than the average percentage of seniors. This is in the process of being changed. I've attached a spreadsheet analyzing the impact of new housing units that have already reached the preliminary plat approval stage, plus another proposed development on tonight's agenda. The spreadsheet shows that only two types of housing cover their own service costs; the conservation communities, which about break even or a little better, and the age-restricted communities, which provide a big financial plus for the community. All other housing types are a continuing financial drain, especially the multi-family dwellings, with their lower tax revenues.

2. The State requires a Comprehensive Plan with updates every five years to help ensure that counties exercise **responsible, representative leadership with long term vision.** The Comprehensive Plan was the result of a year long process involving thousands of volunteer citizen hours and public meetings. We just adopted it a short while ago. The spirit of the Plan is to comply with the state mandate for local government to protect our natural and historical resources, and the health and welfare of our citizens, with appropriate zoning ordinances. The Plan was adopted only recently, and calls for encouraging niche agriculture and tourism, including a resort area in Stanardsville. We have made progress on this by adding vineyards and horse farms to our county, and more are on the way. Our new con-

conservation communities (Ocotonia Highlands and Guilford Farms) add to this, and more are proposed. This is appropriate development of A-1 land according to our zoning. For A-1 land owners, this is a lucrative and compatible form of development. A 300 acre parcel with about 70 division rights could sell 2 acres lots, and put the remaining 160 acres in conservation easement. Lots like these are being marketed now for \$175k each in our county, and higher amounts very near by. At \$175k, this amounts to over \$12 million for the illustrated property, so we are not making any "poor people" by not approving density zoning where it is not called for in the Comprehensive Plan. On the contrary, we are making "poor people" by raising property taxes to the point that people can no longer afford to pay them. Plus, in the long term this actually reduces the value of the properties for resale as people don't want to sign on to pay the high taxes. And, we need to keep some of our water and sewer taps available for the commercial development we hope to attract once the new homes are in place. If the landowners want to hold on to some of their land, the resale value will be a lot higher in 10 years than it is now – probably double or more. Selling only half the lots in a conservation community now for \$6 million, will most likely allow the landowner the pleasure of selling the other half for \$12 million soon enough.

3. Amending the Future Land Use map now in a manner not in keeping with the spirit of the Comprehensive Plan, would not be responsible nor representative leadership. What we should consider, is to review our proposed growth area, and draw it back to leave undisturbed A-1 land between Ruckersville and Stanardsville to promote tourist access. We already have a way larger designated growth area, percentage wise, than surrounding counties. We need to upgrade the Stanardsville water & sewer, and make a second viable commercial and resort center there as suggested in the Comprehensive Plan, instead of creating an unplanned sprawl all the way along route 33. The Stanardsville area also needs moderate priced housing for County teachers and other employees, where they would not have to add to morning rush hour congestion in the already overcrowded Ruckersville area, and burn more gas getting to Stanardsville to work. 100 years from now, small farming is likely to become much more viable financially than it is now, as farmland becomes more and more scarce. Are we going to let continuing population pressure and lack of planning get us into a third world country position; no food, no water, trying to buy food from overseas? We are doing enough of this now, beef and vegetables both. This is why the state legislature mandated localities to protect these resources. We need to keep this agricultural land available for our future. We may run pleasure horses and grow grapes on our easement properties now, but later we may need them for vegetable farms, beef, and dairy again.

It may be profitable for an individual citizen to change a zoning designation, but the zoning designations are part of an overall plan that protects the welfare of all the people. If a corporate CEO felt it would be profitable to engage in insider trading, would an exemption be granted to permit that? No, because his profits would be at the expense of the public shareholders. The County is not in a position to approve density development outside its current designated growth area, in full knowledge that the citizens would have to reach into already overburdened financial resources to meet the additional infrastructure costs and service requirements. In fact, our designated growth area is already too large by the standards of counties all around us. If we consider amending our future land use map at all, it should be in the opposite direction. **We citizens are counting on the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to represent us, resist pressure, and take the actions necessary to protect our welfare now and for our future generations.**