

PRESENT: Augusta County Planning Commission
E. Shipplett, Chairman
S. Bridge, Vice Chairman
J. Curd
K. Leonard
K. Shiflett

PRESENT: Augusta County Board of Supervisors
M. Shull, Chairman
C. Bragg, Vice-Chairman
J. Moore
M. Pattie
T. Pyles
L. Wells
L. Wills

STAFF: P. Coffield, Augusta County Administrator
P. Morgan, Augusta County Attorney
T. Fitzgerald, Director of Community Development
B. Earhart, Senior Planner, Augusta County
D. Wolfe, P.E., County Engineer
J. Whetzel, Director of Finance

ABSENT: T. Cole
C. Foschini

VIRGINIA: At the Joint Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission and the Augusta County Board of Supervisors held on Wednesday, July 22, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

This being the day and time advertised to consider a request to amend the Augusta County Comprehensive Plan 2007-2027 by adopting a 2014/2015 Update to the Plan.

Michael L. Shull, Chairman of the Augusta County Board of Supervisors, called the meeting to order. Mr. Eric Shipplett, Chairman of the Augusta County Planning Commission, called the Planning Commission meeting to order.

* * * * *

Chairman Shull stated that the purpose of this meeting is to discuss the update for the Comp Plan and they will open the public hearing to the citizens so that they can give their comments after Becky Earhart, Senior Planner, gives her presentation.

Mrs. Earhart gave a PowerPoint with the following high-lights:

Comprehensive Plan

- Adopted in 2007 with amendments in 2009 (Fishersville Small Area Plan) and 2011 (Greenville from CDA to USA to allow the extension of public sewer to the village).
- State Code requires that every locality have a Comprehensive Plan and review it at least once every 5 years.
- It provides a guide for County decision makers in terms of land use decisions, but also in terms of where to make investments in public facilities.
- There are hundreds of goals, objectives, and policies in every category imaginable from agriculture to water and sewer.
- Perhaps the area that gets the most attention is the Planning Policy Area/Future Land Use Map. People are most interested in what they can do with their property.

Update Process

- As directed by Board (in 2012) - more Review and Update than Rewrite
- Housing Chapter- to meet State Code
- Transportation Chapter- to meet State Code and HB2 impacts
- Led by the Planning Commission
- Sought input from those more directly involved

Sections Reviewed

Rather than using a citizen committee, staff worked with those that have the most knowledge—Staff, Boards and Commissions that deal with these topics daily and monthly.

Involved:

- Augusta County Service Authority
- School Board Staff
- County Engineer
- Fire Chief, Sheriff, and ECC Director
- Director of Finance
- Directors of Economic Development and Economic Development Authority
- Library Staff, Library Board and Friends of the Library
- Social Services, Office on Youth, Valley Community Services Board
- Extension Service, Headwaters Soil and Water Conservation District
- Ag Industry Board
- Parks and Recreation Staff and Commission
- Virginia Department of Transportation

Sections Reviewed:

- Introduction
- Strategies for Growth
- Goals, Objectives, and Policies for each content area (Agriculture to Utilities)
- Implementation
- Annual Review
- Capital Improvement Plan
- Planning Policy Area and Future Land Use Designation Maps

Augusta County Quick Facts

- Approximately 970 square miles
- Second largest county in terms of land area
- Over 1/3 is federally and state owned
- 2010 population: 73,750
- 15th largest county in terms of population
- Total area population: 118,502
- Unique challenges - This all goes to creating unique challenges for planning the future of the County. One way we address the challenges is through the Comprehensive Plan.
- 2000- 2010 population: 65,615 - 73,750
- 12.4% growth
 - Natural Increase: 1,576
 - Net Migration: 6,559
- Aging population
 - 2010 median age: 42.9
 - 2000 median age: 39.0
- 93.4% White; 4% Black
- 2% Hispanic (146% increase- 1525)

Population and Demographics

- The County's population has grown by more than 12% in that ten year period
- Population shift in 2010: more 40+ population (54.1%) than under 40 population (45.9%) in the County
- 2013 counts estimate Augusta County's population at 74,504
- Limited growth 2010- 2013
 - 754 increase in County
 - 1594 in region - 120,096

The only decline in population over the last 10 years was in the 30-39 age group

Population Projections

The County and region are projected to continue to grow. Although the percentage of growth is projected to slow.

- 2020: 80,655
- 2030: 87,580
- 2040: 94,913 nearly 29% growth since 2010
- Regionally- 145,766 by 2040 23% growth since 2010

Building Permits for Dwellings

- Building Permits spiked in the County – 805 (2004)
- 2013: 244
- 2014: 486 (reflection of 250 multi-family permits)

Active Residential Subdivision Lots

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| • Single Family | 1505 |
| • Attached Residential | 1074 |
| • Rural Residential | 32 |
| • Manufactured Home Park | 190 |
| • Multi-Family (with site plans) | 1491 |
| • Multi-Family (with no site plan) | 2000 |

Vision and Strategies

- Reaffirmed
- Promote a compact, coordinated, orderly, and balanced pattern of development
- Establish distinct areas for urban and rural development, as well as a full range of ag and forestal uses
- Implement planning policies and regulations using a reasonable combination of voluntary and mandatory measures

Existing Planning Policy Planning Map was displayed. Principal Building block of the Comp Plan is the policy area designation. There are 4 different policy areas, plus the government owned land. Policy areas determine where we want growth and where we do not.

1. Urban Service Area (USA) - red: public water and sewer to be utilized, 80% of residential development, most of the future commercial and industrial development
2. Community Development Area (CDA) - brown/orange: public water to be utilized with individual sewage systems, septic or alternative, with the exception of New Hope which will be served by public sewer and wells; 10% of residential; neighborhood commercial development.
3. Rural Conservation Area (RCA) - yellow: less than 5% of residential, no water or

- sewer, new rural residential subdivisions.
4. Ag Conservation Area (ACA) - light green: less than 5% of residential, no water or sewer, a lot here and there for farm families. This is also the area for farming operations to invest and not be encroached upon by a subdivision.
 5. Public lands - dark green (State or Federally owned)
 6. Circles are identified Rural Communities

Agriculture

- Ag Industry Board's mission to identify major challenges and support the development of programs aimed at strengthening the ag economy and preserving ag in the County.
- References to Director of Agriculture Development were changed to the County, AIB, or Extension. (County had an Ag Director, but position was eliminated creating the need to eliminate those references. The tasks assigned to the Ag Director in 2007 shifted to County overall, the AIB, or Extension.)
- Conservation easement language has been modified to reflect possibility of Board approval in USA and CDA (Current Plan supports the placement of conservation easements in RCA and ACA. With this modification, easement holders like Virginia Outdoors Foundation can seek Board approval of an easement in an USA or CDA.)
- Niche markets but recognition of "traditional" ag operations
- Importance of education for all age groups
- Clustering and Preservation tracts (Still want to study opportunities to decrease the number of houses in ag areas. There is concern about the potential for negative impacts of clustering, including the use of the preservation tract which could be a nuisance to the residential development, as well as the ag neighbors, and the County.)

Economy

- Completed the Economic Development Strategy plan reflects the recommendations in that Plan
- Hired two Economic Development Directors and a Marketing Assistant
- Next steps as identified by the Plan, EDA, and staff
 - Organizational Effectiveness
 - Complementary Businesses
 - Ag Tourism
 - Sites
 - Enhance Labor Resources

Education

- Public and Private Education
- Goals more general in nature reflecting role of School Board in directing public education

- Public education goals were revised with assistance of School Board staff
- Life-long learners who have the skills to thrive in the 21st century
- Recognize the important role the library plays in supporting the education of all our students - public, private, and home-schooled.

General Government

- Efficiency in government operations remains the theme of this section.
- Recommends updating Master Plan for the Government Center
- Explore increased use of technology
- Deleted the reference to Fiscal Impact Analysis and Proffer Guidelines and added language recommending the use of innovative funding mechanisms for public facilities and services
- Strategic investments in infrastructure in USAs
- Added goal to promote environmental sustainability and stewardship to reflect on-going county initiatives

Historic Resources

- Largely implemented by private property owners and private organizations
- County's role in preservation will be supportive, rather than direct service delivery

Human Services

- Changes in terminology as recommended by providers
- Increased focus on services provided to youth
- Income and financial literacy for youths, individuals, and families
- Economic Security
- Increased focus on regional efforts to maximize service delivery efficiency and accessibility

Land Use and Development

- Continue distinct areas for targeting growth and preserving agriculture
- Continue to encourage development in the Urban Service Areas and increase emphasis on providing the services that are needed to support that development rather than expecting new growth to pay all costs
- Added a policy for areas where water or sewer are limited. (Basically at rezoning stage, the expectation will be to utilize the remaining capacities without making extensive investments in the expansion of the systems. Once it is used up, you go to private systems - septic or wells with the resulting increase in lot size.)
- Conservation Easement clarification
- Purchase of Development Rights – deleted from Plan

Library

- Major capital improvements have been made since the 2007 plan and the changes in this section reflect the remodeled main library in Fishersville and the library station in Middlebrook. Craigsville branch library moved to the Town Hall building.
- Goal 1 is more facility oriented, Goal 2 is more service and program oriented.
- Emphasis on technology - both for internal operations, as well as providing services to residents

Natural Resources

- Tributary Strategies replaced by Chesapeake Bay TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) and Implementation Plans.
- Stormwater Program MS4 Program changes reflected
- Regional Cooperation, where applicable
- Sourcewater Protection- Coordinate with the ACSA to adopt new areas

Parks and Recreation

- Update to the Parks and Recreation Master Plan Recommended - as a stand-alone chapter of the Comp Plan
- Focus on funding park development and programs
 - Grants
 - Sponsorships and Partnerships
 - Land Acquisition policy
 - Sports Tourism
- More use of schools as community centers
- Added emphasis to programming

Public Safety

- Growth in Fire and Rescue
 - 2007- 44 career staff augmenting volunteers in 8 of 17 stations
 - 2014 - 86 career staff augmenting volunteers in 13 of 17 stations
- Emphasis on the importance of volunteer component of the combination volunteer/career fire/rescue system
- Regularly update Fire/Rescue Master Plan
- Support Continued Accreditation of the Sheriff's Department
- Emergency Communications
- Funding for fire flow improvements
- Tanker Strike Team

Utilities

- Major STP upgrades to Middle River, Fishersville, and Stuarts Draft; Sewer extended to Greenville
- Water tanks in Stuarts Draft and Verona
- Encouraging use of funding options to keep impacts on ratepayers, as well as county citizens, at a minimum
- Sourcewater Protection
- Solid Waste and Recycling
- Expand Broadband

Housing

State Mandates

The Comprehensive Plan shall include the designation of areas and implementation of measures for the construction, rehabilitation, and maintenance of affordable housing, which is sufficient to meet the current and future needs of residents of all levels of income in the locality while considering the current and future needs of the planning district within which the locality is situated.

More detail required by State Code. Note that affordable housing is not locality only and not just our area - Staunton, Waynesboro and Augusta County, but as it relates to the region and specifically in the Code- the Planning District within which Augusta is located- Rockingham/Harrisonburg, Rockbridge/BV/Lexington, Bath, and Highland.

Demographics – 2010

Total Housing Units	31,010	
Occupied Housing Units	28,021	90.4%
Owner-occupied	22,814	81.4%
Renter-occupied	5,207	18.6%
Vacant Units	2,989	9.6%
Homeowner Vacancy		1.9%
Rental Vacancy		4.6%
Owner Household Size		2.53
Renter Household size		2.30

In terms of statistics - More than 90% of our housing stock is occupied, less than 10% is vacant. Of the occupied housing units more than 80% are owner-occupied, but that number is decreasing as we see more and more apartments being built. The average size of an owner occupied household is a little bit larger than the renter household.

Units in Structure

Looking at our housing stock over the last 20 years from Census data, there are more Multi-Family units: 5% in 2000; 8.1% in 2010.

Affordability Index

State Code §15.2-2201 defines affordable housing as “housing that is affordable to households with incomes at or below the area median income, provided that the occupant pays no more than thirty percent of his gross income for gross housing costs, including utilities”. When you add transportation costs into the equation, the percentages that households are paying for housing and related costs go up. Housing plus commuting costs less than 34% are considered to be affordable. At the median, our households are paying 28.7% towards housing and commuting costs, put at 60% of the median, our households are paying 47.8% of their income towards those same costs.

Cost Burdened

Cost burdened is a way to look at housing from an individual’s perspective rather than the one individual who is at the “median” level. If a household is paying over 30% of its housing income for housing it is considered to be “burdened”. Not surprisingly, households with less than \$20,000 in income, regardless of whether they are owning or renting their home are likely to be burdened, although the county’s stats are better than the states.

Goals, Objectives, and Policies

- Emphasis on range of housing densities, types, and prices
 - Adaptive reuse, high value, retiree and elderly, handicapped, universal design
 - Location of developments where services are available- transit, access to shopping, medical care,
 - Ordinance changes should be analyzed in terms of initial costs to developer, as well as the long-term costs to the homebuyer/renter/County
- Regional cooperation

Transportation

Technical assistance was provided by the Planning District Commission and reviewed by VDOT and consistent with the State Plans.

State Code Changes

- System of infrastructure needs and recommendations
- Must include roadways, bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, railways, bridges, waterways, airports, ports, and public transportation facilities
- Connection of transportation infrastructure to affordable and accessible housing and community services
- Map all road and transportation improvements including cost estimates
- Must be consistent with Statewide Transportation Plans

Maps Displayed (and available on-line)

1. Level of service – Darker colors – level of service is deteriorating. Projection:
Most of I-81, Route 11, and I-64 are now in the D, E, and F category. Route 262 and portions of Route 11 are going to be D as well as more sections of Route 340.

Areas in and around Stuarts Draft are beginning to have level of service of D or lower. The Plan requires to note where projects are currently planned such as bridge improvement projects (Route 250) and spot improvements to major intersection projects. Mapping includes a new transportation base map with all facilities such as roads, airport, railroads, details on bike, pedestrian, and transit and commuting patterns

Needs- Level of Service for 2009- last year data was available:

Interstates 81 and 64 and parts of Route 340 are only ones with LOS D and E.

2. By 2035 projected road conditions - Interstate 81 and 64 are failing; Routes 262 and 11 are now Ds along with more sections of Routes 340 and 11. In addition, more County roads are Ds: Routes 608, 256, 612, and Mt. Vernon Road in Stuarts Draft
3. For the subareas of the plan, including the rural areas, projects were identified and mapped. Everything from bridge replacements to intersections, to spot improvements to major road projects.
4. Road projects then had to be prioritized and the top projects had to have cost estimates prepared for them. Some of these projects are already in the 6 Year Plan, but they still had to be included in the Comp Plan. The numbers are not priority numbers, we just went north to south, west to east. From a cost standpoint- everything from a \$220,000 sidewalk project in Stuarts Draft to \$76.6 million to address the I-81 Interchange at Weyers Cave, along with the intersection of Rt. 11 and Rt. 256 are included on the map.

Goals, Objectives, and Policies

- Changes reflect changes in terminology and VDOT's new access management regulations
- Added references to the MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)
- Walkable communities- sidewalks, multi-use paths, bike lanes, share-use paths, or wide shoulders
- Increase transit options
- Most public roads; if private, designed and built and maintained at no cost to County.
- Eliminated Appendix A which had graphic representation of road cross-sections we wanted in various areas ranging from 4 lane divided highway sections to rural roads due to conflict with VDOT regulations.

HB 2 – “New Wrinkle”

- New funding process/formula for some federal and state transportation projects
- Investing limited tax dollars in the right projects that meet the most critical transportation needs in Virginia.
- Not for bridge projects or rehabbing aging pavement, safety improvement and enhancement projects, revenue sharing
- Work in progress
- Evaluated and ranked statewide for funding based on congestion mitigation, economic development, accessibility, safety, environmental quality, and land use and transportation coordination
- Screening Process for HB 2 funding, must address a need in VTrans and be: Corridor of Statewide Significance

- Regional Network
- UDA (Urban Development Area) (Areas in Fishersville, Stuarts Draft, Verona and Weyers Cave and areas outside the City of Staunton would meet the definition of the UDA.)

UDA- §15.2-2223.1

- UDAs are areas that may be appropriate for development at a density on the developable acreage of at least four single-family residences, six townhouses, or 12 apartments, condominium units, or cooperative units per acre, and an authorized floor area ratio of at least 0.4 per acre for commercial development, any proportional combination thereof, or any other combination or arrangement that is adopted by the locality and meets the intent of the code.
- Urban development areas shall incorporate principles of traditional neighborhood design.

From the County’s standpoint, our larger Urban Service Areas that have areas planned for neighborhood or community mixed use meet these criteria, although we don’t call them Urban Development Areas.

UDA Language Added to Plan

Language added to Plan states:

The designated growth areas of Fishersville, Stuarts Draft, Verona, Weyers Cave, and Staunton South and West as discussed herein have been found to meet the intent of the Code of Virginia, section §15.2-2223.1.

Implementation

- Since 2007, many items have been completed, some are in process, some have been studied and rejected, and some haven’t been touched
- 20 Year plan- to be expected
- Measures deleted that have been accomplished
- New measures added

Annual Review

- Designed to be a “scorecard” as to how well the County was doing implementing the Comp Plan
- Time consuming
- Duplication of efforts
 - Annual Reports
 - Budgets
- Draft recommends the deletion of this element

Capital Improvement Plan

This is the “biggest wish list of all”. “This is not the actual plan.”

- Revised Section
- 2014-2018: \$148.8 million

- Schools - \$40.7 million
- Water & Sewer, Sinking Funds, and Economic Development- \$20m each
- 2019-2034: \$364.7 million
 - Sinking Funds: \$69.6
 - Economic Development and Transportation- each \$60m.
- Courts - Costs yet to be determined

Ms. Earhart noted that prior to the time this Updated Plan is adopted, hopefully, the Courts item will be updated.

Planning Policy Areas and Future Land Use Designations

Planning Policy Area Map

Policy Area	Existing Acres	Existing %	Proposed Acres	Proposed %
*USA	40,574	6.6%	39,391	6.4%
*CDA	34,881	5.6%	34,369	5.5%
*RCA	82,948	13.4%	83,087	23.4%
*ACA	246,901	39.8%	248,432	40.1%
Public Land	214,409	34.6%	214,410	34.6%
Total:	619,713		619,689	

*USA (Urban Service Area; CDA (Community Development Area); RCA (Rural Conservation Area; ACA (Agricultural Conservation Area)

As part of the review, staff looked at the Planning Policy Area map and looked at places that needed to be changed. As seen on the chart, some changes have been made. Staff is recommending the Urban Service Areas and Community Development Areas be decreased in size. The difference in total acreage is a function of our GIS system and rounding.

What determines the Policy Area?

- Presence of public water and sewer service
 - Now
 - Future
- Existing Infrastructure-
 - Roads, Schools, Community Facilities
- Zoning
- Existing Land Use Pattern
 - Business
 - Ag, but lots of houses
- Ag/Forestral Districts
- Conservation Easements (In places where easements have been placed on parcels, if they were RCA and are adjacent to ACA, we change those parcels to ACA- since we know they aren't going to develop into a rural residential subdivision.)
- Comments at public meetings (comments tonight will be taken into consideration)

Fishersville – Planning Policy Areas/Future Land Use (Map displayed)

Looking at the Future Land Use Map, for every parcel in the USA (red) and CDA (brown) there is also a specific land use planned for it: business (red), industrial (purple), medium density residential (brown) which is three to four units per acre, planned residential (pink) similar to Teaverton that has developed with its own set of zoning regulations at a density of four to eight units per acre.

Future Land Use Categories

- **Industrial**, where industrial uses of varying scale and scope would be appropriate
- **Business**, where business uses of varying scale and scope would be appropriate
- **Public Use**, which identifies land owned by, or utilized by, a federal, state or local government agency
- **Community Mixed Use**, which may include a variety of residential uses at a density of six to twelve dwelling units per acre and, on up to 40% of the total land area, retail and office uses and in some, but not all cases, industrial uses
- **Neighborhood Mixed Use**, which may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre and convenience retail and office uses on up to 20% of the total land area
- **Village Mixed Use**, which encourages the adaptive reuse of existing structures, as well as infill development, conforming to the existing or historic development pattern in the community; will only be in USAs and CDAs (New Hope, Churchville).
- **Planned Residential**, which may include a variety of residential uses at a density of four to eight dwelling units per acre
- **Multifamily Residential**, which may include residential buildings housing between nine and sixteen dwelling units per acre, as well as manufactured home developments
- **Single-Family Attached Residential**, which may include attached residential units like townhouses and duplexes at a density of between four and eight dwelling units per acre; will be found only in the Urban Service Area
- **Medium Density Residential**, which may include detached residential units at a density of between three and four dwelling units per acre
- **Low Density Residential**, which may include detached residential units at a density of between one-half and one dwelling unit per acre; will be found only in the Community Development Area
- **Urban Open Space**, which identifies land permanently set aside for open space uses such as conservation easements and county recreation areas

Future Land Use Designations

Future Land Use Designation	Proposed Acres	%
Business	5,188	6.7%
Community Mixed Use	3,717	4.8%
Industrial	6,717	8.8%
Low Density Residential	33,327	43.4%
Medium Density Residential	14,611	19.0%
Multi-Family Residential	842	1.1%

Neighborhood Mixed Use	3,401	4.4%
Planned Residential	2,740	3.6%
Public Use	4,167	5.4%
Single Family Attached Residential	815	1.1%
Urban Open Space	1,136	1.5%
Village Mixed Use	155	0.2%
Total:	76,746	100%

Rural Community

Most questions tonight were on Rural Community designation. The term “Rural Community” was used as an overlay for the Policy Area Maps, recognizing that places like Sangersville, Centerville, Springhill, Churchville, and Augusta Springs were traditionally Rural Communities/Rural Villages. That term was used in the 2007 Plan to recognize that there were some villages spread out in Augusta County. It was also used as a future land use designation. In the 2014 Plan, it was decided to clear up the confusion.

- Retained it as a Policy Area Overlay- Rural Communities
- In 2007, was also a Future Land Use designation- confusing
- Placeholder for more work- planning and zoning
- 2014 Draft eliminates Rural Community as a Future Land Use designation and areas were reassigned-
 - Most became Low Density Residential
 - Where there are public facilities- schools, treatment plants, water tanks- the sites are designated public use
 - Some became Village Mixed Use in the core areas of Churchville, Middlebrook, and New Hope with the hope they will redevelop consistent with the existing development pattern, which in most cases is a mix of residential and business uses and in many cases a mix of single family and multi-family dwellings. It did not mean that public sewer was expected in the 2007 plan. If the Service Authority decides to extend public sewer service to an area that does not currently have it, the Comprehensive Plan would need to change that area from Community Development Area to Urban Service Area in order to allow that additional public service to be extended similar to Greenville.

Future Land Use vs. Zoning (Map displayed)

The key thing to remember is the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use designation may be changing for your property, but no zoning is changing. That would take another action, most often it comes at the request of the property owners to change their zoning and it requires a public hearing and notification separate from the Comp Plan change. For example in the Fishersville area the Comp Plan calls for the area outlined in purple to be Planned Residential and yet it is white on the map. That means it is still zoned General Agriculture. There are a lot of zoning colors on this map. Pink is Mixed Use, Green is Single Family Residential, Yellow is Multi-Family Residential, Red is Business, however, 95% of the

County is still zoned General Agriculture.

Mrs. Earhart reiterated that the Comp Plan is a guide. The zoning regulates what can be done on certain property. "We don't rezone everything ahead of time because it messes up land use taxation and conditional zoning. Even if we change the Comprehensive Plan designation for your property, we are not changing any zoning as part of what we are discussing here tonight."

Chairman Shull thanked Ms. Earhart, Staff and the different departments for their input into the Comp Plan Update.

* * *

BOARD COMMENTS:

Mr. Moore stated Sangers Lane citizens had contacted him about the changes. He asked for explanation.

Ms. Earhart said that the transportation component is part of that issue. A road improvement project has been identified to make it a secondary road. In talking with the residents, they would like to see that removed from the Plan. Part of the area closest to Staunton is planned for development, but the area towards Barrenridge Road is in Rural Conservation and Ag Conservation Area. A request in writing has been received and it will be given to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.

Chairman Shull declared the public hearing open.

Chairman Shipplett declared the public hearing open.

Bridget Ragan, of Sangers Lane, mentioned that Sangers Lane runs from where Route 250, intersects with I-81 (where BP and McDonald's are located) and runs back to Barrenridge Road. About 2.5 miles of Sangers Lane is unpaved. She represents the people who live on the unpaved portion of the road who requests that it be removed from the Comp Plan. She addressed their concerns of safety, cost of upgrade, unnecessary expenditures. Citizens with most road frontage do not want the road paved, and do not want the Conservation Easements on the road and participation in Soil and Water Conservation programs to be disturbed.

Rodney Paxton, Mark Breeden, and Pam Breeden spoke in opposition of the proposed change to the Policy area designation change on Sangers Lane to Urban Service Area. They would like to remain in the Community Development Area.

Roosevelt Rowe had recently purchased property in New Hope and learned that no further subdivision could be done for five years. He felt that this period was too long.

There being no other speakers, Chairman Shull and Chairman Shipplett declared the public hearing closed.

Chairman Shull expressed his appreciation for the public interest and participation in

tonight's hearing. Going forward, the Planning Commission will be considering the Update and the input received at its August 11th meeting. If action is taken that night, the Board could consider adoption of the Update at its August 26th meeting.

ADDITIONAL BOARD COMMENTS:

Mr. Wills thanked the public for being present tonight. He also thanked Staff for their excellent job throughout the process. "We have been provided information as it was provided to the Planning Commission throughout the process." He thanked the Planning Commission for its work. "I think it's a very good update and I think we have worked through where the challenges are." In regards to Mr. Rowe's concern, he felt that was a zoning issue.

Mr. Moore stated he does not object to removing Sangers Lane from the Plan.

Mr. Wells stated the meeting has been an educational experience and commended Staff and organizations for their input in the Plan.

Mr. Pyles acknowledged the work of the Planning Commission and noted many accomplishments; libraries; Parks and Recreation (Deerfield, Augusta Springs, Stuarts Draft, Natural Chimneys); Schools (with next two constructions and two closings) will be in good shape. "It doesn't happen by accident. Somebody laid out a plan. They aren't just plans; they're not written in concrete; we can adjust as we get into particular situations, but they are a guidance for us because we took into consideration what the people are looking for." He noted that there is little change in this Plan because there has been very little change in the last five years. "We still work every day to keep making this County better and the Plan and your input helps us do that."

Dr. Pattie stated it was refreshing to see people who didn't want to see the road paved. "Something that I don't have in my community." He thanked the citizens for being present tonight. He also thanked the Planning Commission and Staff for making this process go smoothly for us.

Ms. Bragg thanked the public for its participation. "It is so important as we make our decisions and chart a path for the County in where we are going in the future. Continue to be a part of your local government. It is very important."

Chairman Shull thanked the public. "I hope it eases your mind that there were no big changes and it was public input that drew this up to begin with. We talk about smart growth. That was the reason for the Comprehensive Plan some years ago. It is not set in stone. If we need to look at things to change, we have the ability to do that."

* * * * *

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Mr. Bridge commended Ms. Earhart and Staff for keeping the Planning Commission Informed and stated Staff has come through with flying colors.

Mr. Shipplett echoed what has been said tonight and appreciated the turnout. He adjourned the Planning Commission meeting.

* * * * *

Chairman

Secretary