

June 13, 2013

VIRGINIA: At a Public Hearing on the Proposed Comprehensive Plan Update of the Hanover County Planning Commission in the Board Auditorium of the Hanover County Government Building, Hanover County, Virginia, on Thursday, June 13, 2013 at 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Ms. Claiborne R. Winborne, Chairman
Mr. Larry A. Leadbetter, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Jerry W. Bailey
Mrs. Edmonia P. Iverson
Mr. C. Harold Padgett, Jr.
Mrs. Ashley H. Peace
Mr. Randy A. Whittaker

STAFF

PRESENT: Mr. David P. Maloney
Mr. Dennis A. Walter
Mrs. Sharlee D. Mills
Mrs. Angie Pitts
Mr. John A. Bender
Mr. Lee W. Garman
Mrs. Betty S. Gray

Meeting Called to Order

Madam Chairman, Ms. Winborne called the meeting to order at 7:02 P.M. There were approximately 50 citizens present. In order to make the public hearing go as smoothly as possible she asked that those persons who wished to speak to fill out a card. She advised the purpose of this public hearing was to listen to the citizens comments regarding the proposed Comprehensive Plan update.

Roll Call

All members were present. There were approximately 50 citizens present.

Ms. Winborne advised that the Commission will not be taking any action on the draft plans; however, the Comprehensive Plan will be discussed and a possible action may be taken at their regularly scheduled meeting of June 20, 2013. She reviewed the Rules of Order for a public hearing. She advised that she would be calling the citizens up to speak using the cards that were filled out. She asked for a presentation from staff.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Maloney explained that the draft Comprehensive Plan for Hanover County 2012-2032 is the culmination of work sessions and community meetings that were held to review the 2012 update. With regard to text changes much of the text has been reformatted; the existing population data and growth forecasts has been updated; Community Facility planning based on population growth forecasts has been updated. Changes to the text also include the following two new policy initiatives: 1) Allow individual service connections for public water and sewer beyond the boundaries of the Suburban Service Area (SSA) when properties are adjacent to existing public utility easements; 2) There is a proposed policy change that would limit the maximum achievable residential density under any zoning district to no more than 15 units per acre. As was discussed extensively the current Comprehensive Plan and Ordinances allow consideration for up to 30 units per acre for Mixed-Use developments when located in areas shown primarily for commercial use.

Mr. Maloney advised that the draft Plan maps incorporate changes recommended by the Planning Commission to be advertised. Changes were considered for the General Land Use Plan Map and the primary changes are the consolidation of the single-family residential densities from two categories to one for a density of 1 to 4 units per acre and there is the introduction of a Multi-Use designation as well as the introduction of a Business-Industrial designation. The Plan also contemplates the designation of the specific rural areas of the County to be identified as "Rural Villages" which include Montpelier, Beaverdam and the Courthouse areas. The Plan also includes the Conservation and Suburban Development Plan Map. All areas within the Suburban Service Area are shown to be in phase for utility extension and connections. The Community Facilities Plan Maps have been updated to reflect forecasted trends. Also included is this draft Plan, is the Historic Resources and Heritage Tourism Map.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Maloney said the Major Thoroughfare Plan Map is included which is a significant component. This Plan and the analysis were evaluated by the Virginia Department of Transportation in accordance with State regulation and VDOT has found that our Major Thoroughfare Plan is consistent with the statewide transportation plan.

Mr. Maloney pointed out the outstanding issues to be considered are two alternative land use options which have been proposed for consideration in the vicinity of Cedar Lane and U.S. Route 1. He reviewed the current map and alternative maps 2 and 3. Staff recommended adding a Business-Industrial designation at the intersection of Dunn Road and Mountain Road. This designation would reflect existing business uses in the vicinity. Staff met with a property owner and the Board member from that district and the interest from both of those individuals were to consider the Business-Industrial designation at that node. There are current businesses located within this area of a fairly intensive nature; therefore, staff believes this is an appropriate land use designation. Staff also recommended, for purposes of clarity that a designation for "Park" use in the vicinity of Elm Drive in the Mechanicsville Small Area Plan, be eliminated. This area encompasses private property and is not part of the Community Facilities Plan. An industrial designation would be consistent with the adjoining properties. He reviewed the area on the map.

Mr. Maloney explained there are a couple of changes to the Major Thoroughfare Plan. One of the changes is to eliminate a proposed Minor Collector road in the vicinity of Mechanicsville Turnpike and Lee-Davis Road. Staff had initially proposed eliminating a majority of this connection; however, upon further consideration realized that 3 of the 4 "legs" are viable. The existing Plan shows that circular connection and staff recommended that this portion remain as an existing road network and the southern portion remain as a planned future connector as well.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Maloney advised that staff recommended approval of the resolution recommending the Comprehensive Plan amendment subject to the outstanding land use issues being resolved by the Commission.

Ms. Winborne asked Mr. Maloney to summarize all of the opportunities there have been for public input.

Mr. Maloney explained there have been numerous opportunities for public input. The official meeting to kick off this effort was held June 2012, with a work session which included the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission and the Economic Development Authority. Immediately following that meeting staff held a series of public meetings to get the citizens' input. Those meetings were held at the various High Schools and other public facilities. Later in the fall some preliminary land use concepts were presented to the Commission at several work sessions. Those work sessions did allow for public input and comment on those early proposals. Following the drafting of the initial map changes, a series of workshops were held throughout the community, 6 workshops in all, last February and March, and the work done at those workshops culminated in modifications to the Plans, specifically as they relate to density limitations and in redrawing some of the proposed land use changes. The Commission has since held several workshops to review those draft changes and "that brings us up to this evening."

Ms. Winborne added that meetings were also posted on the website, advertised on the school marquees, in the Hanover Review and other community newspapers.

Mr. Maloney said they also utilized social media on Facebook and as drafts and alternatives were developed they were also available on the County's website under the Planning link.

Mr. Padgett asked Mr. Maloney to show the chart with the connectors around Lee-Davis Road again.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Maloney replied that the existing Plan shows a complete loop. The proposed Plan shows the 3 “legs” of the loop.

Ms. Winborne mentioned that the Commission had talked about tweaking the Economic Development section to reflect some information they had gotten regarding descriptions of the County to give a more accurate picture. She advised if it is the consensus of the Commission members she and Mr. Leadbetter could draft some language for the Commission to discuss at their next meeting.

All members were in agreement.

Mr. Whittaker questioned the “Park” designation on Elm Drive and staff’s proposal of changing that area to Industrial.

Mr. Maloney explained he believed at the time the Small Area Plan was developed, there was a recreational area in that vicinity and he was unsure of the genesis of designating that area as “Park” or “Conservation” land. Much of that property is constrained by floodplain and wetlands and one of our initiatives in this Plan is to make sure that land use designations really align well with the policies of the overall Comprehensive Plan. In previous Plans some areas were shown that might be considered for informational purposes but were not classified as a land use per say. It was put on the Plan as public information and public awareness and one of our intended outcomes of this update was to make sure the Plan was clear and essentially eliminate extraneous information from the maps that may otherwise be confusing or lead to conclusions that do not necessarily have a basis under policies of the Plan.

Ms. Winborne thanked the staff on behalf of the Commission and herself. All that extensive process that Mr. Maloney just recounted would not have been possible without the hard work of staff and she wanted him to know how much the Commission appreciates everything staff has done to get to this point.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Maloney thanked Mrs. Winborne for her comments.

Ms. Winborne reminded the audience she would call the citizens to the podium to speak using the sign-up cards.

Mr. Robert Nash thanked the Commission and Planning department for all of their work on the update to the Comprehensive Plan. He said it is not such a small feat to be able to consider and ultimately accommodate such a diverse population with a diverse set of opinions and visions for their property. He supported the two text changes proposed for the Comprehensive Plan allowing individual service and connections beyond the boundaries of the Suburban Service Area (SSA) for properties adjacent to existing public utility easements. He also supported the evaluation of policies and ordinances to ensure that the maximum residential density under any zoning district is 15 units per acre and that the preservation of the rural character of Hanover with the inevitable increase of population is sufficiently addressed by managing growth through the SSA concept. He supported commercial and “managed” residential development and growth as it is vital to the Economic Development goals of the County. He supported the proposed changes to the enterprise business zones as presented by the Planning Department for the areas located in the South Anna District.

Ms. Nancy Young, South Anna District resident, thanked everyone for their work on this update. As a resident on Old Telegraph Road she expressed concern with the future traffic concerns that her neighborhood will be faced with. The proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan to change the zoning on north Old Telegraph Road to Business-Industrial, the proposed map calls for a connector road to be built from Old Telegraph Road to U.S. Route 1 and if the south end of Old Telegraph Road is closed there will be no exit there to U.S. Route 1. She said those that live on the south end of Old Telegraph Road will either have to use Old Keeton Road, which has a very dangerous intersection or go through the future Business Park to use the proposed connector road. She asked for

June 13, 2013

consideration of building a connector road further south on Old Telegraph Road closer to Old Keeton Road. She thought building a connector road from Old Telegraph Road to Lakeridge Parkway could be an option. She asked for consideration of all alternative roads to better meet the needs of all concerned. She thanked Mr. Leadbetter for all of his help on this issue and for responding to e-mails.

Ms. Winborne advised that Mr. Maloney would answer questions at the end of the public hearing.

Mr. Rick Ryan, Cold Harbor District resident, said the concept seems to be that additional affordable workforce housing is needed. He believed there is already a variety of affordable workforce housing vacant; therefore, it was his opinion that there is no need for additional workforce housing development in Hanover. He said the population in Hanover has doubled since 1970 to present and during that interval the growth was organic (market driven). He said as businesses came in the population grew and the businesses were able to absorb the tax burden that residences put on the County services and the County's budget was balanced because of the way Hanover's growth was managed; therefore, what the County has been doing all of these years has worked and he hoped that the new update would not change that which has already worked really well. He asked how the County is going to manage growth without proffers and if this update will change the character of Hanover County.

Mr. Todd Young, a Holly Hill road resident in the South Anna District, expressed concern with the alternative 3 map for Cedar Lane and U.S. Route 1 because it designates the land use along the east side of Holly Hill road as 4 to 8 units per acre. He expressed concern with having people driving through a future development. He said he understood staff to say at the workshops that there are certain protections that will keep the density down along the road, such as setbacks and landscaping. He believes it is very appropriate to use alternative #2 which will leave a strip of 1 to 4 on the east side

June 13, 2013

of Holly Hill. This will ensure that development on the road is more in line with existing residences and still allow development by property owners.

Ms. Lori Schutzbach, South Anna District resident, expressed concern with apartments being built in the Mixed-Use along Cobbs Road. She asked if Cedar Lane and U.S. Route 1 would be extended and if there is going to be a traffic light there. Regarding the SSA area, she stated that she understood it cost Hanover County \$9M to put this in.

Mr. Leadbetter inquired what exactly she was talking about.

Ms. Winborne asked if she was referring to the infrastructure.

Ms. Schutzbach replied yes. She asked if there is anything that states the SSA has to be developed because it was her understanding that the County got the SSA because they told the residents that the water and sewer were being run for Tyson's chicken.

Ms. Winborne reiterated that staff would address everyone's questions at the end of the public hearing.

Ms. Schutzbach asked who is paying to have Cedar Lane widened. She said she was told that VDOT was going to pay for it and then she heard the Richmond MOD was going to pay and now she has heard that the developers are paying for it. She said people buy in Hanover County to have a quiet rural area.

Mrs. Patsy Utley, South Anna District resident, said she had worked with Lee Garman on the phone and she complimented him on the manner in which he answered her questions and took the time to explain things to her. She said it was wonderful dealing with him. Regarding Old Telegraph Road, she said she has written letters and she hoped that something will be done to change the present plans. She believed the entrance into Lakeridge Road would be beneficial to those that live there and to Economic Development. She asked that a road be put on the map that would accommodate all of the

June 13, 2013

Economic Development and another road which could go through Timber Ridge road that would accommodate Old Keeton Road and somewhere in the middle of that she would like to see a dead end of Old Keeton Road. She supported the Holly Hill alternate 2 map. She expressed concern with having apartments around this area due to the possibility of an increase in the crime rate.

She urged more development in the Kings Dominion area because she was surprised that for the infrastructure in that location there is little development. She added that it would be a good location for Economic Development and apartments. She expressed concern that the bridge on Old Telegraph road was going to close.

Mr. Howard Whitlow, South Anna District resident, said he was very happy with the Planning staff and the way the County has managed growth. He said if it was left up to the citizens it would not be orderly. His opinion is that this is a property rights issue because people who have property have a right to develop it within the constraints of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. He said he has been a resident on Holly Hill Road for 42 years and it is a good area for growth, both for commercial and residential. He was in favor of the alternative 3 map, even though it will put development closer to his house he still believes people should be able to develop their property the way they want to. He mentioned that he does own 25 acres there and his house is on 4 acres; however, he would still be in favor of development there because it is a property rights issue. He understood a lot of folks are concerned with the increase of traffic, but the County and State will address those issues. He thanked the Commission and staff for their service and said it is great to have professional planners and Commissioners who will do their duty and be subservient to what is in the best interest of the entire County.

Mr. Jon Beckner, Cedar Lane resident, stated that he appreciates what the Commission does to make Hanover County a better place to live. He spoke in support of the Comprehensive Plan update

June 13, 2013

and requested that the Commission adopt the alternative 3 map. He said in alternative 3 the SSA encourages development in a compact and continuous manner, and also will make Holly Hill Road a definitive density boundary, and will be in good proximity to community facilities for future residents. Also the entire property is within areas off Holly Hill Road and Cedar Lane that is designated in the utility service area. It is convenient and accessible to I-95 and U.S. Route 1 to make an easy commuter distance to downtown Richmond for future residences, and is in a great location to support local shopping, business and dining.

Ms. Elizabeth Greenfield, Director of Government Affairs for the Richmond Association of Realtors, spoke on behalf of the Association. She expressed her support for the proposed amendments on the Comprehensive Plan update. She said their efforts to adequately plan for Hanover's future growth are evident by directing growth to the SSA and recognizing that density and conservation can work collectively. The benefits of concentrating density development areas near transportation corridors and other infrastructure will allow Hanover to continue to preserve its rural character while directing growth in the areas where it can be handled. She thanked the County for encouraging that there be a variety of housing options that can accommodate the needs of all citizens.

Mr. Gibson Wright came forward to speak about the Lewistown Road area west of Lickinghole Creek to U.S. Route 1. He expressed concern with having business-commercial or commercial-industrial for that entire area because there are a lot of residences back there that need some sort of buffering to the commercial development. He felt that the Mixed-Use development might be more appropriate to buffer some of those areas as well as to take advantage of the topography which does not lend itself to industrial development. He did not believe it will be feasible to cross Lickinghole Creek to get to Lakeridge and he proposed that a collector road or thoroughfare road be designated along Lickinghole Creek which would open up that entire land which is very large and take it out to

June 13, 2013

Lewistown road which will be close to the interchange and might assist in securing interest to get development started, as they are virtually landlocked right now.

Mr. James Hill, a Chickahominy District resident, asked the Commission to limit the growth and remove the high density housing from the Plan. He expressed concern with the potential of apartments and condominiums devaluing his house. He said he understood that growth needs to occur in the County to bring in revenue but he also thought Hanover should be kept as rural as possible. He asked that the County encourage developers to build smaller homes in the 1500 square foot range, and single family ownership encourages private property rights.

Ms. Winborne asked if there was anyone else who wished to speak. No one spoke.

Mr. Maloney said there has been quite a bit of discussion regarding the road network in the vicinity of Old Telegraph Road, U.S. Route 1, Old Keeton Road and Lakeridge Parkway. There were some valid concerns expressed at one of the previous meetings about the traffic along Old Keeton Road. Staff had recommended to the Commission that we plan for an east/west connector between Old Telegraph Road and U.S. Route 1. Currently the options are to continue down Old Telegraph Road to its intersection; however, as was pointed out as part of the Atlee Elmont Small Area Plan and a subsequent rezoning, there is a proffered condition to disconnect that intersection. So, in trying to address concerns of the residents about additional traffic down Old Keeton Road we had recommended a connector further to the north. If the proposed Comprehensive Plan is going to show this for Business-Industrial, it is really not a very different land use plan from what the current Comprehensive Plan shows. There are light industrial and commercial uses. Regardless of which alternative either the existing Plan or proposed alternative Plan this is an area where we are targeting the business industry. In order to protect this neighborhood and provide some relief staff believes if there is a connector road between Old Telegraph Road and U.S. Route 1, there would be an opportunity to direct much of the

June 13, 2013

future commercial traffic away from Old Keeton Road and provide an alternative. He stated that he did not hear anyone speak against this option. He said the request was to consider an alternative to connect Old Telegraph Road back to Lakeridge Parkway and said staff is willing to look at that in more detail. He acknowledged that it would be desirable to have a connection somewhere between Old Telegraph Road and Lakeridge Parkway; however, one of the potential challenges with that is that it may increase the likelihood that much of the commercial traffic along Lakeridge Parkway would use that connector and exit out to U.S. Route 1 via Old Keeton Road or the proposed connector. So, wherever that road is to be located it needs to be designed to discourage that commercial traffic.

Mr. Maloney believed what Mr. Wright was referring to on Lewistown Road, which is not on the map, is a concept road running north and south to the west of Lickinghole Road so that all of those properties would have access to Lewistown Road. That is certainly something the Commission can consider but here again one of the purposes of the connector road was not only to serve the properties that front Old Telegraph but also provide another means of ingress and egress to U.S. Route 1 for the properties of the east side of Old Telegraph Road. In concept staff is in agreement and supportive of the citizens but there are a number of details and considerations that have to be taken into account and to make either that north/south connector or the connector between Old Telegraph Road and Lakeridge Parkway.

Mr. Leadbetter inquired what can be done in this Plan so those alternatives will be pursued as business develops in these areas.

Mr. Maloney said one of the common components of a Comprehensive Plan is a series of strategy statements and the Commission may want to add a strategy that the County will undertake a study of a feasible road network that could then be amended into the Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Leadbetter advised he would like to pursue that.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Maloney advised that the staff will prepare a strategy statement to that effect and send it to the Commission for consideration at next month's meeting.

Mr. Maloney, in addressing concerns raised by Mr. Ryan, stated that our current Comprehensive Plan discusses a need for housing to meet the needs of all residents for existing and future residents. He believed there is some misunderstanding within the community based on e-mail correspondence he had received throughout this process that Hanover County in one way or another creating a need for growth when in reality what our Plan is intended to reflect is historic and projected growth trends. There have been many discussions on the growth rate and there is recognition that our County is going to grow. Mr. Ryan made comments that our County should grow organically. Mr. Maloney advised that is how the County has grown as we have grown through a natural growth, births and deaths within the County as well as migration into the County. He advised that this Plan is not supporting any other method of growth. This Plan is not intended to somehow force growth into certain areas that has not already planned for that growth. He hoped he could assure Mr. Ryan and other residents that the intent of this Comprehensive Plan is not to change the overall characteristics of Hanover County. It is not intended to lower the quality of life for the residents of Hanover County but rather create additional opportunities to house new residents.

Mr. Maloney advised that there has been a lot of talk on both sides of property rights issues. There are all sorts of property rights. There are the property rights of the individual land owner who may want to preserve their property in open space and they have a right to do that regardless of where they are located. There are property rights to request development of their property in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and in accordance with the applicable zoning ordinances. Existing property owners have the opportunity to continue to receive the quiet enjoyment of their property. And the reason localities have Comprehensive Plans is to balance those various interest. Residents moving into

June 13, 2013

the County may choose to live in a higher density development. Or they may choose to live in a large single-family estate home and they may choose to live in townhomes.

Mr. Maloney explained that “all this Plan does and seeks to do is continue those choices for property owners. Not to mandate any one lifestyle but to provide choices.” One of the speakers this evening said he believed that 1,500 square foot homes are appropriate; there may be people that want to live in that size home. There may be people who want to live in Hanover in rental housing or in a 5000 square foot home on a 20-acre lot in a rural area. He asked are we going to plan for opportunities to give our citizens the lifestyle that they choose.

Mr. Maloney advised that one of the advantages of Hanover is there are very distinct areas. There is the Suburban Service Area (SSA) which has been in place since 1982. Eighty percent of the County is rural. Therefore, the question is where we accommodate new residents. Speakers have said preserve the rural character; however, at some point in the future we are going to outgrow the SSA. If the rural character is to be preserved what is the answer; push the SSA out so that the County is 70% rural, 30% suburban or is it 50/50. Do we try to preserve this boundary that has been established for the last five years beyond the 30 year horizon. This is really the question that has been before the Commission and the County as part of this update, “what do we want to look like in the future.” He reiterated that this Comprehensive Plan is not a plan for the Planning staff, for the Commission or the Board of Supervisors. It is a Plan for the community. Therefore, one of the issues is how to reconcile these differences in the interest of different property owners and the way we do that is through this process. He reiterated that this Comprehensive Plan is not to force any lifestyle on any individual at any time in the present or the future but rather to provide a broad array of opportunities for future residents and let the market determine how it is going to meet that need.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Maloney stated that several speakers spoke in favor of one of the two alternatives for Cedar Lane. From staff's perspective both alternatives are viable and staff will rely on the wisdom of the Commission to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Regarding Mrs. Schutzbach's question of where the apartments are being located, Mr. Maloney said there is an area highlighted between Cobbs Road and the Town of Ashland west of U. S. Route 1 that is being show for Multi-Use. In accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, Multi-Use is not a plan for apartments. It is a plan to allow a mixture of both residential and commercial uses of which apartments could potentially be a component. However, under this Plan there is nothing in any of the areas shown for Multi-Use that would preclude a community of single-family detached, townhomes, and multi-family, and one of the requirements is for any individual or entity interested in developing to go through the zoning process. This Plan is a guide so when there is a request to rezone land there is some guidance as to what is that right land use decision is in that specific instance. This is not a one size fits all plan. Every zoning case is considered on its own merits.

Mr. Maloney said there were questions raised about managing growth. This Plan is a document to plan and manage our growth. There were questions asked about how the County is going to manage growth without cash proffers. Over the past several years the growth rate has been ½ percent. Resulting from such a low increase in growth there is capacity in our public schools. We know at least for the short term based on growth forecast there will not be a need to plan for new schools. At some point that will change. Those will be policies the Board of Supervisors will have to address at the appropriate time. So, does a lack of a voluntary cash proffer increase the challenge. In some ways it does but it also enhances opportunities. Therefore, rather than debating the merits of cash proffers as it is a matter that has been decided on and we need to acknowledge that there are no cash proffers only road improvement proffers. He said it is important to recognize that the Comprehensive Plan in and of

June 13, 2013

itself never really guided the cash proffer policy. So with or without a cash proffer policy that does not change the principals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Maloney said there was a question about a \$9M investment which he believed what the individual was referring to was the construction of the “Grassy Swamp Pump Station.” And that infrastructure is in place and is intended to provide utility service essentially to the western portion of the County and it is available. We have capacity and hopefully that capacity will be utilized in the not too distant future with commercial and residential development.

Mr. Maloney said some people were concerned that he was going to suggest that Hanover does not have crime. He said of course, we have crime; however, he did not believe there is an overwhelming crime problem. Growth brings crime, shopping centers bring crime, residential development brings crime and it is unfortunate; however, he believes “that is the society we live in.” He said with or without a Comprehensive Plan, or with or without the proposed land use changes at some level Hanover County is going to continue to deal with crime as in the past. He believes there are not too many localities that at one level or another are not dealing with it.

Mr. Maloney stated that everyone is hopeful that this Plan provides the appropriate economic incentive for non-residential development so investors will come into Hanover County and help pay for those services that all the residents rely on. Whether it is schools, public safety and law enforcement protection but the top priority for this and past Board of Supervisors has been to encourage Economic Development. And here again with these land use changes the current plan shows stand-alone areas for high density residential. He explained what they have tried to accomplish with Multi-Use is to let the community know that if more residents are coming in we need the commercial investments to offset the impacts. In looking at this Plan in terms of future economics there are incentives and mechanisms that strengthen that non-residential development which in turn

June 13, 2013

will strengthen the tax base. There will be opportunities to adjust outside the 5-year update and at any point the Commission and Board of Supervisors feel that an adjustment to the Comprehensive Plan is necessary.

Mr. Padgett explained regarding the cash proffer comments that the Board of Supervisors originally put them in place by resolution 20 years ago. At one point they reduced it to \$0 and they passed a transportation proffer. They can change it again by resolution and if the growth indicates a need for that in the future this Board or another Board can do that again. He said another reason for not having a school cash proffer at this time is because of the declining enrollment. However, at some point the school enrollment will turn around and then the cash proffers will have to be re-examined.

Ms. Winborne mentioned that there were 11 speakers who come forward tonight and the Commission has also received numerous e-mails, phone calls and letters from citizens; the Commission as a whole wanted everyone to know how much the Commission has appreciated citizen involvement in this process.

Mr. Leadbetter said that a lot of this infrastructure has been phased into the South Anna District and “it is kind of our time for the increase of the infrastructure which creates a density in the SSA and that is why we are having the issues we are having in South Anna right now.” He thanked those who had been communicating with him in e-mails, telephone conversations and any kind of communication they may have had. He especially thanked Todd Young, Mrs. Utley, Mrs. Young and Mr. Nelson for coming “to the table with helpful solutions.” He felt one of the most positive things that he has experienced in trying to work these issues out is having people that are willing to bring possible solutions to the table. Our decision right now is to take all of this information we have gathered from the citizens and the Planning Department and come to some conclusion on which direction we want to take and which map choices we think will be the best.

June 13, 2013

Mr. Whittaker thanked all the citizens for all of their e-mails and comments to help the Commission in making decisions. He said their voices have been heard and they are working hard on this.

Mr. Bailey asked Mr. Maloney if there were any apartments approved right now in Hanover County other than the ones that were approved a month ago on Atlee Road.

Mr. Maloney replied no there are not. All of the Multi-Family zoning that is in place has been developed with the exception the most recent approved Multi-Family project.

Mr. Bailey said regarding Old Telegraph Road Mr. Maloney had mentioned the potential of that being closed if the property on U.S. Route 1 was developed and there is commercial property both north and south. He asked if both sides have to be developed.

Mr. Maloney replied it was his recollection that the commercial property in question, the smaller parcel on the north side of the intersection was included in that zoning request. Therefore, it was a comprehensive zoning for that entire section of frontage. As part of the proffered conditions for that development in accordance with the existing Atlee Elmont Small Area Plan that intersection would be disconnected from U.S. Route 1 and as part of a thoroughfare improvement, it was negotiated as a proffered condition for that rezoning there was a commitment by the property owner to disconnect that intersection. In order to keep that intersection open there would have to be an amendment to the zoning request.

Mr. Maloney continued by stating there was a question as to where Cedar Lane was going to be relocated. Currently the Major Thoroughfare Plan at U.S. Route 1, Sliding Hill Road, and Cedar Lane currently contemplates that as the property along the frontage of U.S. Route 1 and essentially the trailer park has redeveloped that as part of that redevelopment plan Cedar Lane would be relocated to align with Sliding Hill Road. However, there is an interim project that staff proposes to add to the

June 13, 2013

Thoroughfare Plan which shows the intersection of Cedar Lane being realigned to a point north of the old Hargrove Insurance Agency, and it will create a T intersection and provide greater intersection spacing and sight distance. He believed the plans for this intersection are for it to be signalized. Regarding the funding sources, generally speaking, there are some funds available through the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). He was unsure if general funds are available.

Mr. Mike Flagg, Director of Public Works, explained that project is under design at the current time. The primary source of funding is Federal dollars through the Metropolitan Planning Organization that the County competes for annually. There are some appropriations of proffers and general funds “sitting in the wings” to fill gaps which will be moved to other projects if the other funds are not sufficient. In addition there is also an MPO funded project to overlay and shoulder wedge Cedar Lane to its intersection with Ashland Road that will come as an interim improvement to try to improve that corridor that is currently under design with VDOT.

Mr. Maloney explained that as far as future widening of Cedar Lane, as development proposals are received every effort will be made to identify frontage improvements to Cedar Lane.

Ms. Winborne thanked everyone for coming out. She said all comments will be considered. She asked that citizens continue to e-mail or call them if they had any other concerns, ideas, or questions. She announced that the Commission is scheduled to meet next Thursday for their regularly scheduled meeting beginning at 6:30 P.M., and there will be another work session on the Comprehensive Plan; however, there will be no public input at the work session.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business Madam Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:30 P.M.