

HANOVER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

DRAFT SUMMARY

Hanover County Administration Building Board Room

September 4, 2013

- I. Call to Order. The Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. All Board Members were present.
 - A. Invocation was given by Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek.
 - B. Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Via.

II. Workshop- Hanover County Comprehensive Plan Amendment 12-01
Chairman Peterson welcomed everyone present and noted that Mr. Hank Lowry, School Board Member and Mr. John Gordon, former Board Member for South Anna were also present.

Guidance was given to the Planning Commission and Staff done during the joint Board of Supervisor 6/13/12 meeting with the Planning Commission and Economic Development Authority. At that meeting the guidance given to the Planning Commission that everybody felt like Hanover County has a reputation for being a rural county and we like our rural atmosphere and we wanted to keep it that way. That direction was given to the Planning Commission and staff at that time with instructions not to expand the suburban service area and to look at the plan as a long term plan remembering that we are looking not at the immediate future 1-5 years from now but to paint a synopsis of what we expect the county to look like for the next generation when we turn it over to them 20-25 years down the road. It is meant to be a general guiding plan, not specific. In order to help maintain keeping those rural areas we also told the planning commission that we did anticipate that we would be looking at a higher density within the suburban service area so as not to put additional pressure on the rural parts of the County. Thanked the Planning Commission and staff for all their hard work and many hours in public meetings. Mr. Peterson advised the board would enter into workshop mode to review the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Via – the made follow up comments related to the welcome mat to Hanover should not be welcome to Hanover only if can afford the median price house of \$230,000. Since that time we have continued to hear concerns about high density housing and growth in Hanover County. There is much information floating around and getting the facts out has been an ongoing effort to counter some mis-information. The comprehensive plan is a plan for the future and read the

quote by Michael Chandler, Statewide Certified Planning Commissioner Trainer, “If you don’t plan for the future your planning for failure.” We need to keep the focus on all of Hanover County and the interest best served for all citizens. Mr. Via supports the diversity of our community and the diversity of housing options.

Five Year Update– Mr. David Maloney, Director of Planning, briefly reviewed what was presented at the public hearing and then the board entered workshop mode on the following:

- ❖ The Board of Supervisors conducted a public hearing on the draft Comprehensive Plan amendment on August 28, 2013
- ❖ During the public hearing, the Board was provided a detailed summary of the proposed changes were presented which include:
 - The addition of three new land use classifications
 - Multi-Use
 - Business – Industrial
 - Rural Village
 - The elimination of the Office-Service land use classification
 - The consolidation of the 1-2 and 2-4 residential land use classifications into a single 1-4 unit per acre designation
- ❖ Other changes include:
 - An update to the community facilities plan to reflect a revised population growth forecast (1.5 percent annual average growth for the 20-year planning horizon)
 - Minor adjustments to the Major Thoroughfare network
 - Minor General Land Use Map modification to accommodate individual requests from property owners
- ❖ Also presented was a comparative summary of changes between the existing and draft

SUMMARY OF PRIMARY CHANGES (These were made available for reference).

	Existing Plan	Proposed Plan
Projected Average Density within the Suburban Service Area	2 Dwelling Units Per Acre	3 Dwelling Units Per Acre
Projected Average Annual Population Growth Forecast	2 Percent	1.5 Percent
Maximum Achievable Density	30 Dwelling Units Per Acre (requires use of Mixed Use zoning within areas designated for Commercial, Business Park, High Density Residential)	15 Dwelling Units Per Acre (requires use of Mixed Use zoning in areas designated as Commercial, Business Park, Multi-Use, or Mixed Use or RM zoning in areas shown for High Density Residential)

Connection to Public Utilities	No connection outside Suburban Service Area boundary	Allow individual service connections beyond the boundaries of the SSA when properties are adjacent to existing public utility easements
Application of the MX Zoning District	All Land Use designations except Industrial	All Land Use designations except Industrial and Suburban General (residential 1-4 du/ac)
	Existing Plan	Proposed Plan
Single Family Residential Designations	Two designations, Suburban Transitional (1-2 du/ac) and Suburban General (2-4 du/ac)	One combined designation Suburban General (1-4 du/ac) which is compatible with RS Zoning District application
New Land Use Designation Multi Use	Planned commercial with residential development requires patchwork of Land Use designations for each zoning district	Allows for more flexible and efficient design with one land use designation
New Land Use Designation Business - Industrial	Various Land Use designations in the vicinity of U.S. Route 1	Allows for more efficient and flexible land development with one land use designation
New Land Use Designation Rural Village	Commercial designation for Beaverdam, Montpelier and Hanover Courthouse	Intended to retain rural village character; allow low intensity commercial and residential uses (new compatible zoning district recommended)

General Land Use Plan 2012 was displayed as recommended by PC 6 20 13

Mr. Peterson asked Maloney to review changes on Multi-Use. Mr. Maloney reviewed that one of the concerns that continually arose during the various community meetings and public

hearings was uncertainty with regard to the purpose and intent of the multi-use land use designation. This does not change what was intended and should clarify.

Multi-Use Land Use

The Multi-Use designated land use is for a master planned community characterized by employment intensive uses including office and business parks, professional offices, ~~shopping centers-retail uses~~, and limited industrial. Although local retail is not intended to be the ~~primary exclusive~~ -non-residential use, it is recognized that ~~limited retail could be considered as an accessory to~~ is an important component to support the overall community. ~~limited~~ Retail may also include service establishments as well as restaurants. The purpose of master planning a multi-use project is to ensure the arrangement of land uses are integrated into an attractive and functional development. Consideration of projects smaller than 20 acres should be discouraged unless ancillary to a larger development, while the assemblage of such parcels should be encouraged to lessen the likelihood of road stripping and inefficient extension of public facilities necessary to support the project.

Residential uses may be incorporated into a multi-use development. It is generally expected that the residential component of such a community would include a variety of housing types, including single family detached, single family attached, and multi-family dwellings. The ratio of residential and business and/or industrial uses should vary between a minimum of 50 percent business or industrial for smaller projects (up to 100 acres) and a minimum of 35 percent non-residential for larger projects (applied to that portion of the property over the initial 100 acres). The maximum density for the multi-family residential component of the project shall be no greater than 15 dwelling units per acre. Density shall be calculated only upon that portion of the project devoted to residential use.

Compatible zoning designations: RS, RM, MX, 0-S, B-0, B-1, B-2, B-3, BP, M-1

Multi-Use Land Use Strategies

- Ensure land uses are harmonious with surrounding uses; residential density and non-residential uses should transition appropriately to adjoining uses
- Ensure provision of an integrated transportation system to accommodate motorized and non-motorized methods of transportation including roads, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, pedestrian paths, and walking trails comprehensively interconnecting all proposed uses within the project and where appropriate, with the surrounding areas
- Ensure provision of adequate and safe vehicular access to thoroughfares
- Promote distinction in commercial building elevations through architectural form and use of durable building materials
- Promote variation in building elevations through diverse but complementary architectural forms, materials, and colors
- Achieve quality neighborhoods by encouraging the use of quality construction materials and techniques

- Ensure provision of contiguous open space designed for passive green space areas and active recreation that is conveniently and centrally located for residential and non-residential uses, and encourage the preservation of cultural resources and environmental features such as wetlands and Resource Protection Areas, scenic view sheds, and existing trees/vegetation
- To the extent practical, environmental and cultural resources should be integrated into the community as an amenity to enhance aesthetics and for the passive enjoyment of residents and employees
- To the extent practical, environmental and cultural resources should be integrated into the community as an amenity to enhance aesthetics and for the passive enjoyment of residents and employees
- Design Mixed-use developments to provide a wide range of housing types with higher densities, to address the changing needs of future residents of the County
- Mixed-use developments should be designed to fit into the fabric of the community while creating a separate "sense of place" for the specific project. Incorporation of these developments into the neighborhood at large should be accomplished through extension of existing roads, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and connections of open spaces
- Project phasing shall be done in a manner that ensures the primary emphasis of this designation is business and professional uses. This shall be done through an appropriate balance of residential and business or professional construction within a master planned development, and establishing the residential development shall not disproportionately precede business or professional development within a project.
- Policies and ordinances should be evaluated to assure that the maximum achievable residential density under any zoning district is 15 units per acre

Copies were distributed to the Audience as well (Exhibit 1 of 3)

Mr. Maloney clarified from the staff perspective and what they have tried to communicate to the public is we do expect multi-use to be a business intensive land use designation. Business intensive first and foremost and these areas that are being proposed for multi-use currently are designated for some type of commercial activity whether it is business park, office service, commercial land uses. A majority of these areas are already designated for business use and then we have introduced an opportunity to add a multitude of residential types into these communities to create a holistic community as an alternative to a straight business park. What this draft plan reflects with or without these changes are the emphasis here is business with residential and a variety of residential to support those businesses.

Mr. Stanley – asked while we are discussing Multi Use Designation – does this include Bass Pro Area. Mr. Maloney advised the multi-use designation under the current draft would not. That area is currently shown as destination commerce and the draft plan maintains that land use designation, for a majority of the Lake Ridge corridor essentially through Winding Brook and North Lake Development we are showing for destination commerce and to the north and North Lake transitioning to lighter industrial uses. Mr. Stanley explain what majority means and is there a chance? Mr. Maloney under this plan the introduction of residential uses he does not believe is contemplated.

Mr. Hazzard can you use MX at all. Mr. Maloney ultimately that would be a decision of the Board as current plan shows the area for destination commerce. When this property was zoned originally it was intended that this area would be a commercial corridor accommodating the

unique retail opportunities and supporting services, hotels, restaurants etc. as well as light industrial uses. There have been discussions with property owners in the area and there is an opportunity for property owners to apply for mixed use zoning. Do not believe the direction of this plan for the Lake Ridge corridor is to emphasize any residential use.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek asked as we discuss different areas of the map, do we have ability to pull up specific areas. Mr. Maloney does have those which received the most attention and individual land use requests.

Mr. Peterson destination commerce – calls compatible zoning districts B-1-B-3; M1- M2 and does not mention MX. Mr. Maloney that is a correct statement. There is a policy statement that says that the BOS may consider MX and staff does not consider this to be a primary use in this corridor. That may be a modification to be made if the Board wishes to maintain that policy statement that gives some use to the MX land use designation.

Mr. Wade no comments at this time.

Mr. Stanley asked Mr. Maloney for the definition multi –use vs. mixed use. Mr. Maloney explained in the context of the comprehensive plan multi-use contemplates a business intensive land use designation. The land use plan in the multi-use designation address the opportunity for a property owner or developer to introduce residential uses – variety of and a variety of densities. Under the multi-use land use classification a property owner would have the opportunity to zone their property for straight business or industrial use and that is perfectly in keeping with multi-use. In addition the property owner can introduce business in industrial zoning as well as a variety of residential zoning. What the multi-use land use designation calls for is that the entire project or community be master planned. The infrastructure, particularly roads any pedestrian paths and so forth, would be master planned as a cohesive community incorporating all those uses understanding a property owner could zone portions to individual zoning districts such as RS, RM, M1, M2 and any of the business districts. It would be master planned. The mixed use references a specific zoning ordinance which contemplates more of a traditional neighborhood, town type of development where there is still that same master plan coordination but where individual uses could be intermingled either vertically or horizontally within the same structure. The classic example is first floor retail or office with second or third floor apartments within a single structure. The mixed use is a zoning designation where multi-use is a land use designation that the implementation could include individual coordinated zoning or zoning in accordance with the MX, mixed use district.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek one of our citizen's posed the question what does multi-use do for us as a tool and Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek advised she discussed this with Mr. Gaskin, Economic Development Director and asked Mr. Maloney for this thoughts on this as well. Mr. Maloney- it accomplishes several objectives and has several advantages. 1) Provides land use flexibility within specified parameters. In one of the comments and directives from this Board and the Planning Commission was to build broader land use flexibility into the plan. In achieving that as it allows for a variety of uses and emphasized that the master planning of cohesive community it creates that flexibility. 2) It helps from an infrastructure standpoint. The cost of extending infrastructure roads, sewers, drainage etc. is not getting less expensive and for those on the Community Development Committee we are dealing with significant storm water management issues etc. Those costs are not getting any cheaper. From an economic standpoint which is a two way road. The economics of Hanover County to provide those services and maintain those

services and the cost of the developer to extend those services when we can consolidate those uses into a generally smaller foot print that is a financially and economically constrained and efficient way to develop land. It also recognizes that increasingly our community is becoming less homogenous. What the 50ish generation idea of growing up in a single family subdivision lot (1/4-1/2) acre subdivision lot is different from those in their early twenties today. There is a trend that as our population ages as interests among the younger generations change that they are seeking a different living environment. They do not want to be held responsible for all the maintenance of the home and want to be able to be mobile. The older generations are more mobile as individuals live longer due to improved health care, the younger generation is more health conscious and it is a lifestyle choice for a significant component of the population and provides significant flexibility for any resident. 80% of the County is designated for rural. A vast amount of the SSA is designated for single family detached dwellings. This provides another choice to promote economic development, save infrastructure costs, concentrate density in strategic locations and it is another tool in the toolbox to maintain all the positives of Hanover County.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek the infrastructure point and is that a function of SSA. Is it an extra tool? Mr. Maloney – yes.

Mr. Stanley – 30-15. 15 still adds up to a lot of units. The last apartment complex approved by the Board - how many units per acre. 8-9 units per acre – Mr. Maloney.

Mr. Davis – appreciate the public input and need the input to represent the people. Two general thoughts have asked a lot of questions of the Planning Commission and other members of the Board. You have a desired outcome and craft that argument to support the desired outcome. It is not ok to craft the facts and have many conversations with those who we agree and don't agree with. It is his responsibility to get the facts straight and know what we are talking about. Addressing the 30-15 while that is a reduction, are there any items in the County at 15. Mr. Maloney apartments at Kings Charter at 15. While that math works if you take the 15 and spread that and I do not want to be disingenuous as folks were asking that question for a particular concern with sprawl. The input came in the latter part of Mr. Davis deliberations were that we did do a major comp plan change in 2007 whether you agree or disagree it needed to be done as it helped with planning and there was a lot of citizen input. From a business standpoint have trouble looking at some of the major changes that we will be making because we don't know if they will be effective or not as we are not in a stable environment. While some things in this plan are not bad, some of them he adamantly opposed. Can't see making drastic changes at this time. Put commercial up front and force developer to have a certain amount of commercial to do residential is no guarantee for success especially with borders of Henrico as they have already built it. Concerns with mixed use and multi-use and the ideas that have come with that. They sound good but one of the arguments we have made during one of the rezoning's and we have talked about it is when it is on the comp plan it is not automatic zoning but it shows the direction the county wants to go. Mr. Davis does not want to lose that argument that if you put it there then you would have an expectation that a reasonable zoning would be approved within that overlay. That could have a propensity to be somewhat disingenuous if you try to do that. Some folks like comp plans and some don't. Hanover as a general rule has used their comp plan fairly well for the type of environment that Hanover wants to have and that is mainly rural with working inside the suburban services area and is the only way you can make it work. Mr. Davis is a believer that the suburban service area does not have to support 80% outside it has to support 100% almost because you have to have the economic engine inside defined areas. Mr. Davis is

not in support of this plan because some of the changes are untimely and some of them are not going to fit in Hanover for a while and don't know how we can reasonably say that some of these things that we have looked at, large drastic changes since 2007 don't seem to make a lot of sense right now. It is not worth gambling at this point, while they could work in the future that is fine, we are not at the future and I have to make decisions with the information I have available at the time that I must make the decision. Those are some of my general thoughts without getting into some of the specific questions that I have talked with other colleagues about.

Mr. Peterson advised that we need Mr. Davis to identify the major changes more specifically. Mr. Davis stated the major one is taking the 30 – 15, some of the changes with mixed use and broadening some of these areas you will not be able to guarantee that if you do a 50/30 ratio with 70% residential or 50/50 that does not guarantee that anything will come. You will put in your higher density and there are places in the county where at some point that will be reasonable because times do change, then to say that you will have 50% commercial, you could kill any project doing that plus you don't know if it going to work right now. The other large issue from a business perspective is the expanse that took place in 2007 which some folks liked and some folks did not was not as insidious as the big hoopla 2007. It was a good big step but when you make big steps you have to see how they are going to play out and is one of the largest concerns that he has. In talking about real estate, the real estate market has been one that has been very, very unstable since 2007 and making some of these changes and then trying to back those out should it not work and is putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. Peterson agree on some items that 50/50 does not sit well. Mr. Davis when you do that it has the impression that I will never do anything that will not support the residential and that is not always the case and we have talked about the other economics of it.

Mr. Peterson stated the idea of putting these tight percentages now looking at 25 years down the road don't see the multi-use as that different as what we already have with the exception of applying those percentages. Is not Rutland a perfect example of multi-use and done with multiple zonings within a master planned area. Mr. Maloney that is correct and Mr. Maloney has had conversations with several board members individually expressing a concern about those ratios and staff have put together analysis of three projects as follows:

	Actual Non-Residential Acres	Actual Residential Acres	100 Ac 50/50 + 35/65		50 Ac 50/50 +35/65	
			Non-Res	Res	Non-Res	Res
Bell Creek	37 % 170 Ac	63% 287 Ac	175Ac	282Ac	167Ac	290Ac
Rutland	35% 64 Ac	65% 121 Ac	80Ac	105Ac	72Ac	113Ac

Creighton Pkwy			Non-Res	Res	Non-Res	Res
Extended /	48%	52%	18.5Ac	18.5Ac	18.5Ac	18.5Ac
Creek side Village	18 Ac	19 Ac				
Cumulative	37%	63%				
	252 Ac	427 Ac				

Assuming you have policy in place as proposed, the first 100 acres 50/50 after that generally a 35/65. Looking at those projects if they had developed that way for Bell Creek you would be at 175 acres non-res and that is five acres off and on target of what is proposed and 282 acres of residential and is almost a perfect match percentage wise of what is being proposed. Rutland is close it is off a little bit but it is 80 acres non res 105 acres res. Creek side because it is less than the 100 acres all together it is 18.5 res and non res. As an alternative these are being shared for informational purposes. If you were to say the 100 acres is too aggressive but we recognize that these areas prior to adoption of this plan if that is where you went were primarily used for businesses. The first 50 acres has to be 50/50 residential, non-commercial and then any acreage after that 50. We are dropping from 100 to 50 turns out to be 167, 290. Again within a few acres identical. Rutland 72/113 and then Creek side does not change it remains 50/50. Understand the concern about encouraging these ratios and admittedly this is three examples. These were three fairly recent random examples that demonstrate the formula is closer to reality than a stretch in terms of creating that residential mix.

Mr. Davis would you still be able to do this if a project like that came up, not spot zoning but to be able to accomplish just like we did in Rutland without changing the comp plan in such a large scale manner. Mr. Maloney depends on what BOS expects from comp plan. Examples: comp plan is long term view to assist in land use decisions and property owner what is supportable for their land if developed. Mr. Maloney advised that in responding to several questions from Mr. Stanley and explaining last week the board has the discretion to amend the plan provided they follow the prescribed process at any point. The real question is at that point are we really validating the plan. If we are going to make land use decisions on a case by case basis without a comprehensive. Mr. Davis advised for the record he did not say we would do that on a case by case basis. Mr. Maloney – understands that and his point is it is the expectation of the board that we make decisions on a case by case basis without a comprehensive view of the long term impacts, the long term goals and are we reacting or are we planning. That is really the fundamental issue at hand. Mr. Davis with the government’s broad brush it can get messy some times and Mr. Maloney agreed. The other thing is that we do have a comprehensive plan now that is a plan that is a guide and is lawfully comprehensive. I never said on a case by case basis we decide yes, no to be arbitrary or capricious. That is not what we are looking at. The planning aspect is we have some general guidelines and we have an effective comprehensive plan and one that works for a while and it is long term but we do review it every five years. I never made any reference or inference to doing it on a case by case basis. In looking at Rutland and the other side of the argument, we can still accomplish certain things without necessarily having to break out the biggest brush we have in the tool box at this particular time. Mr. Maloney advised his only point is if we look at those projects referenced above the underlined land uses supported those projects. It was not in serving for example with Bell Creek. We had a lot of land uses,

light industrial, different residential densities, commercial and very close proximity converging approximately in the area of Rutland. It was that plan that guided that development. We did not go in and take an area predominately shown for commercial development and make a decision that we are going to insert office uses and retail uses and town house uses and single family uses even though the plan shows it for commercial. The plan accommodated all those uses and Mr. Maloney wanted to emphasize that point and with the proposed changes particularly multi-use and referred to the business industrial it does provide flexibility to consider a multitude of zoning applications without looking at the underlying individual land use and is residential ok here, is industrial ok here in making interpretations. It does provide a little clarity and does not counter statements just to provide further information and insight.

Mr. Via advised he had no further comments.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek we keep saying we want Hanover to be open for business and we have established that residential growth does not pay for itself. Most of us agree that we don't want to be a bedroom only community. We know that we need good solid commercial development to relieve the tax burden on the citizens. In considering the changes proposed Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek did speak with Economic Development staff and one of the things discussed was the idea that the multi-use does not have to include residential portion but it does have to include a commercial portion, it could be all business, it could be all commercial. The purple areas on the map are a way to tell those interested in bringing economic development to Hanover as areas that we are open to discuss economic projects in these areas and highlights those areas and open the door and start the conversation. What might be helpful to those concerned that gives a developer cart blanche to do whatever they want – Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek advised she took that comment seriously too and wanted to talk about Hanover's definition of Master Plan and asked Mr. Maloney to review. Mr. Maloney in terms of zoning ordinance – we call it a conceptual plan. Within all the suburban residential districts RS RM and within the RC Conservation district we have a requirement that the applicant provide a conceptual plan which in essence is a master plan, as part of zoning application so that we can better understand the arrangement of roads, infrastructure and open space before taking an action. As part of the business park ordinance we also have a conceptual plan requirement and also have a conceptual plan requirement as part of the MX ordinance. We do not have those requirements for the conventional business and industrial zoning classifications but it has been the long standing practice particularly the more intensive commercial / industrial applications that we get some sort of a conceptual plan that we will negotiate proffers to either require general conformity or substantial conformity depending on what the issues are. Built into our zoning process either by long standing policy or by ordinance we do have requirements to provide conceptual plans which serve this master planning function.

Mr. Hazzard advised he had some plan changes to present. Copies of his comments and presentation were handed out.

Mr. Hazzard - Came forward to the podium. Read comments prepared.

7:50:24 PM Mr. Davis returned to the meeting.

The comprehensive plan is supposed to be a GENERAL plan for the future development of the suburban service area so that the majority of the county stays rural and use the flexibility that a general plan would offer to help promote economic development.

I think the plan that has been passed by the planning commission has gone a long way towards trying to lower density (30-15 DU per acre), but the detail that it creates has caused us to lose some of the flexibility that we need to become competitive in the region. Also terms like Multi-Use and Suburban High are confusing and again take away the flexibility.

People who have lived in the Rt.33/ Hylas area have always considered the area they live in rural, and it is. They were suddenly made part of the suburban service area 6 years ago. Unlike people who move into a suburban service area, the suburban service area was moved in on them. One day the only residential development you can have is 10 acre tracts, or other A-1 allowed zonings, the next we are talking densities of up to 30 DU per acre. The fact that little or no development has occurred during this period has given them a sense of security that has led to the outcry of VOTE NO, and I understand why.

The hard work that the staff and planning commission have done putting this update together should not be overlooked, but sometimes when you are in the middle of working on something as complex as this is you get too deep in the details and make things more complex than intended. With that in mind I would like to offer a few refinements that may make this plan more acceptable to the public and give us the flexibility we need.

In the Rt. 33/ Hylas area I recommend that we eliminate the Multi-Use designation as well as the Suburban High and Suburban transitional. Using the Existing plan as a guide all the area that is Blue on that map should remain Blue (Planned Business). The property East of Rt. 33 that fronts on 33 should also be Blue.

I also suggest we create a new residential classification of 1 DU per acre (green) and everything that is yellow on the existing map, except the land bordering 33, should fall under this category. With this move we have let existing home owners know that they don't have to worry about more than one house per acre being built next to them.

Also people living under the blue umbrella don't have to worry about multifamily without a mixed use development as allowed by our zoning laws. Also our General Land Use requirements will prevent non-compatible development. I can't imagine business moving onto Dude Ranch Road any time soon, so residential development will still be governed by A-1 rules.

The planned density decrease (30 to 15 DU per acre) should be made part of this plan. I also think there should not be any doubling of density anywhere. If it says 4-8 DU per acre it should stay 4-8.

In the Cedar Lane /RT1 area I think the existing Sub. Transitional (1-2) designation should remain and follow the same basic lines spelled out in the existing plan. The other areas on

the existing plan Multi Family (brown), Office Service (pink-white), Limited Industrial (grey), and Commercial (red) should all be Planned Business (blue). This again allows the flexibility that we need and takes away the fear of high density development along Holly Hill rd.

In the Telegraph Rd / Keeton Rd. area I agree with Mrs. Young we need to add a connector road to keep traffic off of Telegraph Rd. I would also extend it East to Lakeridge and limit truck traffic on Telegraph to local delivery only from the connector road south. I would also use the 1DU per acre (green) designation for all areas colored yellow in this area. This too is an older neighborhood that should not have to worry about more than one house per acre which is compatible with the area. There is no question that commercial development will occur starting at the North end of Telegraph road, but I don't see the need for multifamily at the southern end.

The following are general changes I would recommend:

- 1) Leave the Sub. Transitional as 1-2 DU per Acre.
- 2) No doubling of density.
- 3) Make new allowed development in the Commercial, Business Park, designation called Permanently Age Restricted, but only allow a density of 10 DU per acre. If higher density is desired the Multi Use zoning would be required. An age restricted development puts little burden on the community, and I don't think it would be a safety concern for the Sheriff. A stand-alone age Restricted community could start a Medical center or other related commercial development to occur. I think these changes will keep most of the existing plan intact, provide residential density decrease, and give us the flexibility to compete.

I would encourage the Staff and BOS to work together to allow large tracts of land in the Suburban Service Area to be Pre-Zoned without any tax increase for the property owner until it is put into use. One only has to consider the Vitamin Shoppe to realize that having pre-zoned land is an asset that encourages larger users.

If these changes are not acceptable, the only recourse I see is vote no.

Mr. Peterson - question to Mr. Hazzard on the idea of coming up with another land use classification 1 d/u the general land use right now is 1-4 and we are also required to consider what is around it so if 1 were the proper level wouldn't we be able to do that in the 1-4 unit that we already have without having to add another land use designation. Mr. Hazzard advised in the Route 33 Hylas probably ok as we do not have sewer. The problem is with Cedar Lane folks complaining about sewer as it opens it up for more dense area. Mr. Peterson isn't that the instruction we gave the Planning Commission in June to develop a higher density within the SSA. Mr. Hazzard not everywhere and development will start in the major thoroughfares and go forward and can't imagine that someone will go halfway down Cedar Lane and start a business but they will try to do residential development if we make it too easy. Trying not to make it too easy we can revisit as needed. We keep on approving residential communities without commercial to back up if we are shooting for 70/30 mix we can't keep on just approving whether it is apartments or housing subdivisions without having a commercial which some of

this does and is better. What we have there is a better mix. Your question about the one is to make the people 20 years from now not have to worry about somebody beside them putting two houses on an acre and for years they could not have a five acre or six acre tract. In looking at the map the black areas of the map prevent the chance of doing this but why put the fear in the residents there? Mr. Peterson advised he understands but part of what we are trying to do is preserve the rural character of Hanover County and if we get into the SSA and start placing large portions of it as 1 d/u per acre we are going to eat up the land real quick and pretty soon we will have look to expand the footprint into the rural areas if we go to 2 units per acre we have doubled the time before any impact goes on in the rural areas. The problem is the areas that you see on the Route 33/54 map all the black areas on the map is the existing land that has already been developed and it is small areas all around. Areas were pointed out by Mr. Hazzard that will take years for the sewer system with the gravity side to get there to support more than one and it is premature. Another option to make it all blue – business.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek - business next to 1 acre lot would be preferable to two houses? Mr. Hazzard what business will go up Winns Church Road? Mr. Davis confirmed that is correct. Mr. Hazzard advised the business will start on the main thoroughfares anything that is covered under that blue umbrella today.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek – agree that the business is not going to pop out of the middle of nowhere and part of her thought process with Elmont and Holly Hill. No one will throw a mixed use out there until the Route 1 corridor has grown more but you could still have an electrician shop for example. In the SSA some people object to having that next to their homes. Mr. Hazzard response that this goes back to his original point that people that move into the SSA the folks he is talking about in South Anna have had the SSA moved in on top of them. This is a rural community and has been a rural community for a long time and because nothing has happened and probably will not for a while and there is a sense of security which is why you heard all the upset citizen comments related to the purple areas because it was a change. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek asked would it not make sense rather than creating a new zoning district simply to not combine the 1-2 and 2-4? Mr. Hazzard clarified he wants to leave the transitional at 1-2 like it was originally. Mr. Maloney – mx would be a zoning consideration. Mr. Hazzard the same thing that the multi-use allows this still allows to some degree very similar to what we have. Until the sewer comes in this gives more flexibility. This will take it from being a determined Rutland multi-use perceived subdivision. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek advised she is sensitive to that and is her whole point of her conversation with Mr. Gaskin was what are the stumbling blocks and what do you see and what can do with multi-use. The response from Mr. Gaskin was that the multi-use allowed us to have conversations with potential clients. Mr. Hazzard – that is correct in areas near Chickahominy and that is why he is talking about South Anna specifically and multi-use works in other areas but not compatible here. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek– procedural question – what will the process be after workshop tonight. The many calls she received on vote no tonight. Tonight we will make small tweaks as proposed. Mr. Peterson we are starting with what was recommended by the Planning Commission and the Board has the option to make adjustments adding another land use designation would need to go back to PC. Mr. Hazzard take it out. Mr. Peterson changing multi-use if we can get consensus we do that. Mr. Hazzard can we leave the transitional at 1-2 instead of 1-4?

Mr. Rives – the general guidelines are that you have the existing plan as recommended by Planning Commission and board can do anything between keeping same, adopt changes or do something in between. Proposed change 1-2 to 1 is a change that should go back to PC. Mr.

Hazzard – forget it. Mr. Rives explained they would need to have input on that land use designation or the change in the designation or to consider impact on utilities. Mr. Hazzard state the 1-2 probably will suffice but the 3 areas around Meade subdivision recommend it become blue so that subdivision would rather have business around them rather than having. . . Mr. Hazzard taking 1 du off table but retain 1-2 land use which is in the old one as in blue area. Mr. Hazzard where it is yellow now it would be 1-2 instead of 1-4. Mr. Maloney asked Mr. Hazzard clarification about Winns’ Church. Mr. Hazzard the area from Cedar Lane to Winns Church Road those residents do not want to worry about 1-4, 1-2 is better.

Mr. Peterson – lets discuss changes to the map and asked Board members what changes they had and opened for discussions to map.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek – no substantial changes that she received comments on. No map to present. Majority of comments she has received were from outside Chickahominy seeming to have questions about multi-use and adjusting percentages. The remainder of her questions will come about coming to a consensus about adjusting the percentages in multi-use in order to move that forward.

Mr. Via no big changes in Ashland District point is philosophical we have 100,000 folks in Hanover and puts us into an area where we are brothers with Henrico and Chesterfield, City of Richmond and need to realize we are a part of the Richmond Region and realize that facing this comp plan update is really an update and a plan and each time one of these developments becomes a request in an area where Mr. Hazzard was talking about, no problem with that, and at any time we designate as it goes forward in the next 20 year planning cycle we will have opportunity to make changes each development will have to come before the board and approved disapproved on its value. No changes to Ashland District as a lot of Ashland District is already in the SSA and this is something that we can work together on.

Mr. Peterson in Mechanicsville one area that needs to be adjusted. Mr. Peterson advised one of the concerns being heard over the last several months were with the high density of apartments, multi-family type use. Reading through the comprehensive plan there are three land use areas that allow that and they are Multi-Family; Business and Multi-Use. Multi-Family beyond townhouses and Mr. Maloney responded that is correct. Mr. Peterson stated this is an important factor when we look at the entire map that there are certain areas that are designated where multi-family housing could be used. Mr. Peterson in reviewing the map shows I-95 and Bell Creek Road to the right. Bell Creek comes off of Route 360 and goes down and ties into Pole Green Road. The area shown in multi-use here in the map. Mr. Maloney showed the current proposed plan which are all shown for multi-use. Mr. Maloney displayed the map for the Mechanicsville Alternative. Multi use area – Mr. Peterson across from single family development Meadowgate along there and put them there and a multi-use restriction of having to have business on this two lane road where no business could survive does not make sense. Using multi-use is fine but we have to use it discriminately and make sure it is used in the right areas. Suggest in Mechanicsville is that portion along Bell Creed Road on the east side of the creek that runs there and on the west side is where AMF Drive it would be appropriate as it is along 295 and an appropriate area and heavy intensive use and would like to see that changed to see that area changed to yellow – Maloney 1-4. Mr. Peterson stated the same as across the street and is the appropriate way to develop that area, keeping the area on AMF side towards Pole Green which is adjacent to the existing commercial development that is part of Bell Creek and the large area around the interchange which is an appropriate place for economic development. Mr.

Maloney stated the discussion had with Mr. Peterson about keeping the quadrant a portion 4-8 with a small commercial node at the intersection and Mr. Peterson confirmed that as it is a transitional area. The map reflects that as presented.

Mr. Rives in these areas recommend comp plan remain as currently is and the change to multi use not take place. Mr. Peterson just shifting the lines and leaving multi use in place in accordance with this map and difference with this map and the amended version is that he has taken some of the multi-use changed from residential in the existing plan. Mr. Rives in those areas you are keeping it as it is provided in the existing plan. Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Maloney to clarify that. Mr. Maloney – reviewed the area at the intersection is essentially what the current plan shows – small commercial node 4-8. The area shown for multi-use including the area discussed is shown as business park so this is changing to multi-use from business park and the other area is changing from business park to 1-4 units per acre. Mr. Rives the process is to see if the Planning Commission and public had the opportunity to have input on the changes being made and that is what we want to assure is being provided. If you have existing provisions in the plan and the Planning Commission recommends changing them and you decide not to change them that does not have to go back; if they propose changing it from this to this and you don't want to go from 1-4 to 15 du per acre and want it to be 8 du that is within the range that the public has had an opportunity to provide input on. The problem arises when you go outside those boundaries and propose a change that neither the planning commission or public had comment. Like changing a currently yellow are to blue. Mr. Hazzard asked for further clarification and Mr. Rives advised that because the existing area in the plan is yellow and if the Planning Commission and public had no opportunity to comment on whether to make it blue. Mr. Hazzard advised they commented to him and can assure the Meade subdivision would rather have it blue. Mr. Rives advised he is not debating that the question is whether it has been part of the formal process. Mr. Rives advised staff will have to look at proposals and discuss the correct process. A lot of work has gone into the Comprehensive Plan Update, the public has had a lot of opportunity for input and this is a plan that we anticipate being in place for five years and the basis for another 15 years after that. We need to make sure that it is done with the right process. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek asked if Mr. Peterson's recommended changes of going from Business Park to residential instead of multi-use fall into the same category of yellow to blue? Mr. Rives stated if it is a new concept on which the public has not had an opportunity on which to comment then it needs to go back to PC and the public for comment. Mr. Hazzard asked if we can leave it 1-2 instead of 1-4. Mr. Rives advised yes. Mr. Hazzard gave direction to Mr. Maloney to leave the areas yellow but they are 1-2 around Meade subdivision. Mr. Peterson clarified that is because it was 1-2 before. Mr. Rives advised correct.

Mr. Rives could adopt plan and send an element to planning commission for comment. Not the whole plan just the proposal identified as an amendment.

Mr. Stanley stated he has a lot of comments and if he had to vote tonight he would vote to keep existing plan intact with a change of maybe 30-15 and move forward and the community development committee works on items and this should have been worked on all along. Mr. Stanley advised that Mr. Hazzard did a lot of work on this and the citizens he represents would say this is great especially around Meade subdivision as Mr. Stanley has talked to some of those citizens also. The problem is citizen input we can change things but citizen input has always meant vote with the citizen. Mr. Stanley asked Mr. Maloney what this change will have on Beaverdam District and he was advised there will not be much change at all in Beaverdam District but the 1-2 and 1-4 changes maybe there are some to change in Beaverdam. That will be

a lot of work between now and when the board votes and when you say multi-use it will affect all the districts.

Mr. Stanley – noted Mr. Via's comments related to Mr. Mike Chandler and Mr. Stanley has heard Mr. Chandler speak in Denver, Chicago and he uses the Hanover Plan in his instructions throughout the County. Mr. Stanley thinks we have a good plan and we all agree that we have to have a plan and it was changed radically in 2007 by taking such a big area and not sure if we need to change things right now without input. The other thing is and it is so unusual that Mr. Stanley has received no calls from business owners or realtors requesting change. Nothing from Hanover association of businesses and it is unusual that we do not get a lot of emails from those individuals.

Mr. Davis advised that when he talked to citizens about the mapping. When we did the 2007 comp plan and changes made then how many have we utilized from then to now. Some of the large broad changes that were made, how many were implemented and come to fruition. While the footprint was enlarged substantially in the SSA. Not sure that we are at a point now at another localities infill and not sure we are there. When we increased that footprint we have not gotten a feel for what that is going to do at this point yet. So not only is it premature, it is a 20 year plan but it is updated every five years and that is the larger issue we need to look at. While we say this area here or this color could go here what is our basis for saying that would be accurate and how could we realistically plan for that now. Just because someone put a lot of time and effort is not a compelling reason to move something forward. If the plan is not one that you could support. The whole comprehensive plan in 2007 dealt with mapping in his opinion.

Mr. Wade advised he received no comments from anyone.

Mr. Peterson – asked about the other issue Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek was discussing the percentages. Mr. Peterson stated he also has a problem with the 50/50 and realizes and correct if wrong the 35/65 generally speaking within Planning and Economics is considered a good healthy mix of commercial and residential. Mr. Maloney stated roughly 30/70 / 35/65 has generally been considered a healthy mix between residential and commercial. Mr. Maloney advised that going back to the overall general land use plan and for purposes of this discussion it does not matter whether we are talking about the proposed plan or the existing plan. We look at that at a countywide basis even with the introduction of multi-use and those ratios if we look at it from a broad land use perspective he would be surprised if we are approaching that 30/70 – 35/65 mix broadly. If we look at sub areas, areas where we have talked about multi-use and any area that may seem to buy us that calculation unreasonably in favor of commercial but if you look at the examples that were used earlier in the presentation those percentages and ratios pretty well balance out and if we look at it in a county-wide perspective then again it helps to push us county-wide more towards the desirable 35/65 commercial / residential land use mix. Mr. Maloney would be disinclined to review it in isolation of a specific land use category and look at how those ratios play out in the context of the larger county specifically the SSA.

Mr. Peterson stated when we put criteria on what is supposed to be a general plan (50/50 up to 100 acres 30, 70 after that) afraid we are creating a situation where take any one of these multi-purpose areas that you have on the map and all of them are hundreds of acres if put those kind of criteria specific to each project instead of having a larger significant business area with supporting residential can see the potential of this forcing a bunch of small business areas into pods of businesses rather than developing a strong commercial core in these area. Wondering if

we should not have specific percentages but have as part of the comp plan, the comp plan guidelines understanding that as we look at all zoning cases that we strive for that 35/65 balance. That goes to some things we have heard from the public over these last several meetings. Not in favor of a very strict mathematical formula but looking at 35/65 and using that as a guideline as we go forward into development and keeping residential and commercial working together would be much more inclined to have that in the comp plan as one of our guides and not a specific percentage applied to multi-use.

Mr. Hazzard if you have multi-use don't you need mixed use? Mr. Maloney it is one zoning option. Mr. Hazzard what is the ratio. Mr. Maloney under the mixed use zoning district requires a range low end minimum 20% commercial with high end 50% based on the ordinance. Mr. Hazzard stated what he is getting at is there is no need to have it in multi-use because in order to use a mixture of housing and residential in mixed use you have to have that zoning and that zoning allows that variation you are talking about. Mr. Peterson clarified under multi-use you could also not use MX but you could come in and use multi-family. Mr. Maloney clarified you could use RM and say B3.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek we are trying to prevent strip mall and low quality of housing popping up randomly. Mr. Maloney that is what the language strives to avoid in the multi-use category. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek does not mind percentage but others thought the percentages were a little too stringent and would still not help us bring in that economic development we are looking for. Does anyone think that commercial development is a risk in Hanover and thinks no. If we are looking to do everything we can to ensure that we have some commercial development it sounds like our economic development professionals are telling us this multi-use would be an effective tool in that so why not find some percentage that we could all feel comfortable with that would resonate with the business community but would also provide us some flexibility when we start looking at master planned communities as an option. It does not have to be a master planned residential community it would be a master planned business park or something along those lines. Mr. Maloney stated that is correct and the words in the plan no matter what the end result should mean something and should provide reasonably clear guidance to everybody so that a property owner is not left guessing what can I do with my property and it keeps staff from guessing what is appropriate and the board understands what community expectation is at the time of zoning. Forget about a specific ratio the planning staff would strongly support and we can add words but some guideline to assure an appropriate mix whatever is determined and for the sake of discussion we can insert words to substitute the existing words to the effect that multi-use communities should generally contain no less than 35% non-residential and no more than 65% residential. With terms like general we understand the target is anyone here going to argue between 5 acres in the context of the development so the terms like general are specific enough to get a target but we do not have to hit the bulls eye every single time we just need to get close. Mr. Hazzard think general is a good word. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek asked for other board input on this. Mr. Stanley stated when we started talking about commercial and over the years we have been thinking if you are going to bring in all these houses you have to have something to offset it somewhere and not sure if it should be 50%/35% not sure we need that but we need to especially take a look at it. There is one on East Ashland and we have people coming in now they want to do away with the commercial and do more houses and that is not what the citizens were promised and it should stay that way on that case. Mr. Stanley has mixed feelings on this as we do need the commercial component to make it work, a lot of houses and a bookstore will not work. Mr. Maloney regardless of geographic area where you may apply the multi-use. Pole Green, AMF, Bell Creek corridors. It seems like from what Mr. Peterson is saying there is some

support for multi-use concept. That area we are planning but for an MX zoning scenario is all business. One of the objectives in establishing the ratios and we can adjust the ratios. One of the objectives was recognizing the business first philosophy. 50/50 recognizes the business first philosophy and the question is does anything below 50/50 from the commercial recognize that business first philosophy. Mr. Hazzard's concerns about multi-use are known but in reviewing that area 7.5 square miles plus or minus of business park. Business first philosophy. The only way to introduce residential into those areas under this plan is through mixed use, minimum 20% commercial up to 50% commercial. The 50/50 split or 35/65 split fits within that adopted and established criteria recognized within the MX district. That is at the zoning level. Mr. Hazzard - The terms general gives guideline without being specific and accomplishes what we are after 35/65 split as a guide for everybody without being specific. Mr. Maloney reviewed further examples for Bell Creek 38% commercial; 62% residential; Rutland – 43% commercial; 57% residential and Creighton Parkway is 50/50. All cases were well within at a minimum the 35/65 as an absolute percentage. Mr. Peterson how many acres in a square mile – 6/40. Concerned with fixing a rigid percentage because it could end up being a group of 10-12 Rutland's each with a little tiny business center rather than a major business center in the more consolidated business center like Innsbrook. Afraid you will have smaller projects that have their business piece but smaller business, not the strong solid business we would like to have in a major business park. Mr. Maloney advised if the concern is we are going to have small unrelated communities supporting small isolated business centers, the best plan forward is to consider a land use scenario that is stronger towards the business end. In essence a majority of this area you could maintain as Business Park. Mr. Maloney introduced a concept and appreciates Mr. Hazzard's concerns and then returned to a map of Route 33/Hylas Area. Mr. Hazzard expressed concern about the realities of introducing commercial and business along Dude Ranch Road and some of the other minor roads within this area. From pure market standpoint those are legitimate concerns. There is one area Mr. Maloney suggested the Board should consider and that is Cauthorne Road in the southern portion where it abuts Henrico county the opposite side of the border is single family residential. Mr. Hazzard one thing proposed was age restricted stand alone to be allowed in the planned business type park and reason is that is type of residential development that does not put burden on community and could stimulate commercial or medical offices. No crime impacts or school impact. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek stated it will affect Fire/EMS.

8:53:13 PM Mr. Davis left the meeting.

Mr. Hazzard stated that area there is a whole lot of residential area right where you come in to that and on this map you show it as commercial and do not see how you can make it commercial and not move those residents out in that area.

Mr. Maloney asked Mr. Hazzard if he is comfortable with maintaining the residential (age restricted) in that area and Mr. Hazzard advised yes if we can come up with something that allows that as a stand-alone that is as good as commercial. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek we do have potential changes to thoroughfare network are you comfortable keeping the proposed changes to thoroughfare network. Mr. Hazzard yes.

8:55:01 PM Mr. Davis returned.

Mr. Harris would like to ask for clarification for staff to move forward for the next meeting.

Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Rives how suggested change to the maps will need to be handled. Mr. Rives any changes to the maps that would introduce land use concept or change things that the public has not had an opportunity to consider.

Mr. Rives staff could compile ideas with instructions for PC to incorporate into a plan have a hearing on and send back to BOS. Mr. Peterson two map changes and big question on percentages between commercial and residential development as we grow.

Mr. Peterson are there any other issues besides those two we need to address. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek do we have a consensus or proposed wording in multi-use? Mr. Peterson are there any other issues then we have addressed what has to be done if we choose to do something different than the existing and recommended maps. Mr. Peterson would rather see responsibility on board for 35/65 rather than rigid number. Mr. Hazzard generally. Mr. Maloney – generally. The ratio of residential and business and/or industrial uses should generally fall within the range of 35 commercial/industrial and 65 % residential. Mr. Maloney advised this was drafted in context of multi use if you want to incorporate into SSA staff can do that. Mr. Peterson as far as multi use because the business is already 100%. Mr. Maloney keep in the section addressing multi use – consensus from Board members received.

Mr. Harris direction to staff we will make the wording changes on multi-use with general consensus on as draft language now. We will come back with map changes that fall within the book ends for the potential of adoption next Wednesday in addition we will have specific additional suggestions that you might be interested in sending to the Planning Commission off of Pole Green Road where it was blue or purple but now might want to be yellow and something to direct staff to work with Planning Commission to go through a public hearing process and come back to the board and being an example and Mr. Hazzard has some areas to be considered in that same context. Is that the direction for staff and produce product to be adoptable and come back with additional changes for you to send back through process to refine the base map.

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek from fellow board member who were leaning towards a no based on what we were presented from PC are there other things that could be incorporated and or map changes that would bring you to a greater degree of comfort. Mr. Davis – look at ratios. Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek relayed a call she received from a citizen who wanted the board at consensus. What could move you toward confidence. Mr. Davis concern reducing 30-15 and spreading the 15, there is no one thing making changes in course in the middle of a storm is not a great thing, your changing changes. Mr. Stanley will have to take a long look at the map and may want changes too. Mr. Peterson disagree with Mr. Davis as we are not making changes to changes.

III. Announcements

Mrs. Kelly-Wiecek positive feedback on the first day of School and thanked everyone who made school go well this week. Mr. Harris advised that the Superintendent of Schools will update the Board at the next meeting.

IV. Adjournment –

At 9:06:45 PM p.m., the Chairman adjourned the meeting to September 11, 2013 – Hanover County Administration Building – 2:00 p.m.