

VIRGINIA: AT THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND THE DINWIDDIE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD IN THE MULTI-PURPOSE ROOM OF THE PAMPLIN ADMINISTRATION BUILDING IN DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, ON THE 17TH DAY OF JANUARY 2006 AT 4:05 P.M.

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PRESENT: DORETHA E. MOODY – CHAIR ELECTION DISTRICT #4
MICHAEL W. STONE - VICE CHAIR ELECTION DISTRICT #5
DONALD L. HARAWAY ELECTION DISTRICT #2
HARRISON A. MOODY ELECTION DISTRICT #1

ABSENT: ROBERT L. BOWMAN IV ELECTION DISTRICT #3

PLANNING COMMISSION

PRESENT: DR. MARK E. MOORE, CHAIRMAN
MICHAEL W. STONE
SAMUEL W. HAYES
BUTCH CUNNINGHAM
DANIEL LEE

ADMINISTRATION

PRESENT: KEVIN MASSENGILL, INTERIM COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
ANNE HOWERTON, FINANCE DIRECTOR
SCOTT WRENN, ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
CHIEF DENNIS HALE, PUBLIC SAFETY

OTHERS: LILLIAN STEWART, FORMER PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD MEMBER

=====
The Chairs called their respective Boards to order at 4:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

PRESENT: Mr. Haraway
Mr. Moody
Mr. Stone, Vice Chair
Ms. Moody, Chair

ABSENT: Mr. Bowman

PLANNING COMMISSION

PRESENT: Dr. Moore, Chair
Mr. Stone
Mr. Cunningham
Mr. Lee

ABSENT: Mr. Hayes

Mr. Hayes was not present at the beginning of the meeting, but arrived at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Cobb was present but did not speak as he has a personal interest in the case.

DISCUSSION OF P-05-8 WHIPPONOCK, LLC.

Mr. Massengill, Interim County Administrator, stated the purpose of the meeting was to have an open dialogue between the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission regarding the Planning Commission's decision on P-05-8 Whipponock, LLC. Mr. Massengill stated that Ms. Lillian Stewart was present for this meeting as a former commissioner who had voted approval for the Whipponock case. She was available for any questions.

Mr. Haraway stated that the reason he had asked for the meeting was because he had spoken with two or three Planning Commission members after the vote was taken on this case. He said that when he spoke with them he did not hear a lot of

opposition in their tone of voice. He thought that perhaps there was a happy medium that could be reached in this case. He stated that once this proposed subdivision was fully developed it would have approximately a 3% tax affect on the County. He said this would be an important contribution to the revenue of the County.

Mr. Haraway said there were some things he didn't agree with regarding the proposed subdivision and he would like to see those addressed, for example: he felt a right-hand turn lane was needed going into the subdivision; and that a common area was needed with a boat landing.

He asked also if anyone knew of a waterfront property with five acre lots. He felt that two and half acres was a good size.

He said he knew that the Planning Commission members did their homework, and he was just interested as to the reasons why they had voted against the subdivision.

Mr. Cunningham stated that rather than just a turn lane, the whole road would need to be improved all the way down the road if that many houses were put on it. He said that was especially true with the possibility of a thousand more acres to be developed later. He said that regarding the five acre waterfront property, he might not have a problem with the waterfront properties being two or three acres. However, he said the back lots would need to go to five acres. He said his decision was based on: water availability; sewer; response time impact; differences in the traffic study numbers; and schools.

Dr. Moore said that there was a need and a desire for something of this magnitude to come to the County. He said his comments when the Planning Commission voted on this case were pertaining more to what is right beside it. He said that he thinks they set precedence when they vote on this particular property. He said that he thinks that road has to be put on the six-year road improvement plan. His reasoning for that is not necessarily the 150 homes discussed here; but, there are still 100 homes that can be built in Waterford. At some point the road will have to be addressed. He said the rural conversation area was not addressed. At some point that has to be addressed as this piece of property can't stay in rural conservation. He said that another thing that had hurt the process was the school development process. He said that he thought the Board of Supervisors made an extreme commitment on the fifty-five million dollars. He said the process has been drawn out, and that in itself has hindered the process some. He said that the other thing that hasn't been addressed is that when you talk to Fire and EMS personnel regarding response time of 20 to 25 minutes to get there, that there has to be some forethought into the possibility of another firehouse. He asked how this could be made to work for both the citizens and for the County. He said that a geological study was done at the ninth hour after the Planning Commission had voted. He stated that during the process the goal line has changed each time they had met over a 90-day period of time. He said when the process started there was no proffer on the table and they were told there wouldn't be a proffer. There is a proffer on the table now. He said this was a good opportunity to find some kind of medium ground to make this a win-win for the County, the citizens, and the development.

Mr. Lee stated that the area he looked at was that as the plan goes forward to expand the County, and it appears that the plan is to expand it from north to south. He said it appeared to him that it was a big hop out to this subdivision. He stated that would then create problems that would have to be addressed before the problems are addressed that already exist in the northern end on River Road, and also around the Airport area. He said a clear directive as to where the County is going is needed, and that maybe the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors getting together to understand one another would help bring that about. He stated that he was also concerned about the school situation. He said he was concerned about jumping out so far from our services with this subdivision.

At this time Mr. Massengill asked Ms. Stewart if she would make some comments as her decision.

Ms. Stewart stated that she was the lone voter in favor of the proposal. She said the Highway Department said they would not make any improvements to the road until there was a need for it. She asked the question, when does the County plan for the future rather than the past. She said she didn't know of any subdivision that the Board had previously had on the table that some group didn't oppose.

Mr. Massengill asked Chief Hale to address the response time to this proposed development.

Chief Hale stated that the fire station that would serve the development is approximately eight and a half miles from the development. The issue for response time is not only the distance, but also the isolation of the subdivision off the main corridor. He said the closest ambulance is stationed twelve miles away. They can use Rt. 226 and Rt. 460 as part of their response corridor so their response time is a little better. He said the homes will be in ISO class 10 insurance rating.

Mr. Massengill asked Chief Hale about the accidents recorded in the 911 system along the two corridors. Chief Hale stated that the State Police records are based more on intersection accidents. Safety statistics reflect any accident that has occurred on that road whether it was related to an intersection or not. He said that there have been some significant accidents on Sutherland Road in the very recent past. Over time, both Sutherland Road and Namozine Road prove to be a very busy corridor for accidents.

Dr. Moore asked the question, as a County how do we view the intersection of Namozine Road, Rt. 460, and Clayburn Road? He said that he anticipated that 90% of the traffic from this proposed subdivision would be coming in that direction to that intersection.

There was discussion regarding Sutherland Road and the improvements that were needed.

Mr. Hayes arrived at 4:45 p.m.

Mr. Massengill asked Mr. Hayes his views as to what the road would need as improvement.

Mr. Hayes stated that his perspective on this case, and the reason he voted against it was primarily concerning transportation. He said that this proposed subdivision would definitely impact the road out to Rt. 460 as mentioned. He said the key was how to define what that impact would be. He said that in his opinion a roadway voluntary proffer was needed. Mr. Hayes said he thought the proposed development was a good development. His concern was the transportation. He said he had just come back from Richmond, meeting the folks in the new administration and that was why he was late. He said there is no new money coming in for roads or any other type of transportation. He said either the County will have to pay for it directly, or the developments will have to pay for some combination thereof. He said he would be glad to help in determining how that system should look. He stated that he had talked with Chesterfield, Hanover, Goochland, and some folks in other communities to determine how they are handling it. He said he would be glad to help out any way he could.

Mr. Massengill asked if there was anything that Mr. Hayes thought the applicant could proffer that would lessen the impact on the transportation aspect.

Mr. Hayes said the ideal solution would be one where the County would have a calculated voluntary proffer for roads in the same fashion it was calculated for other improvements that have already been included. He said he would propose that the applicant work with the local VDOT office, and the planners at VDOT, to come up with what that proffer would look like. He said that way a determination could be made as to what the applicant's prorated share should be.

Mr. Massengill asked Mr. Hayes if there was another component to his decision against the proposed subdivision, in addition to the transportation issue.

Mr. Hayes said his concerns were solely around transportation. He said that otherwise he saw a lot of benefits to this project and was impressed with Waterford which is another subdivision this applicant had developed.

Mr. Haraway stated that Dinwiddie County already has a disproportionate share of low income homes. He said the only way the County can improve the services to the citizens of Dinwiddie County is to raise the value of homes in order to receive more tax credit.

Dr. Moore thanked the citizens who attended the meeting for turning out. He said the Planning Commission wants to do what is best for the County.

Mr. Massengill thanked everyone for coming and said he hoped the meeting proved helpful.

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairs adjourned their respective meetings at 5:00 p.m.

Doretha E. Moody, Chair

ATTEST: _____
Kevin Massengill
Interim County Administrator
Clerk to the Board

/wjn