

November 15, 2006

At a joint meeting of the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission, held at the Court House, thereof, on Wednesday the 15th day of November, 2006; at 4:30 p.m., there were present:

Board of Supervisors

William G. Fore, Jr., Chairman
Howard F. Simpson, Vice-Chairman
Pattie Cooper-Jones
Robert M. Jones
Charles W. McKay
James C. Moore
Lacy B. Ward

Planning Commission

W. W. Porterfield, Chairman
Samuel Coleman, Vice-Chairman
Garland Carmichael
Jack Leatherwood
Thomas M. Pairet
Clem Richards
Mattie P. Wiley

Also present: Sarah Puckett, Assistant County Administrator; Jonathan L. Pickett, Director of Planning and Community Development; and Terry Harrington of MarshWitt Associates.

Chairman Fore called the meeting to order as a reconvened meeting from October 26, 2006. He explained that its purpose was for a work session with the Prince Edward County Planning Commission on the revised Zoning Ordinance being proposed for the County.

In Re: Work Session on the Revised Zoning Ordinance

Dr. W. W. Porterfield, Chairman of the Planning Commission, advised that the Commissioners had wished to meet with the Board to seek guidance on how to proceed with the draft Zoning Ordinance. He noted that much concern had been expressed during the joint public hearing held by the two bodies on September 11, 2006 with regard to the five-acre minimum lot size proposed for the Agricultural Conservation District. The District encompasses an area of the County south of Worsham, east of Bush River, and west of Buffalo Creek.

Dr. Porterfield indicated that the Agricultural Conservation District would permit landowners with over 50 acres to subdivide their property into 1-acre lots, as long as the overall density did not exceed one dwelling per four acres (0.25 dwelling per acre, compared to 0.20 without the bonus) while maintaining at least 40% of the total acreage as open space. He pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan, adopted in

October of 2005, specifically called for several strategies directly related to the proposed lot sizes and were the rationale for the current draft zoning ordinance proposal:

“Develop a future land use map that clearly shows areas of the County near Farmville where residential, commercial, and industrial growth are encouraged, and areas of the County where such growth is discouraged.”

“Enhance the rural character of the County through rural zoning standards that encourage the preservation of agricultural and forestal lands.”

“Amend the County’s zoning and subdivision ordinances to allow for the construction of cluster housing communities and traditional neighborhood developments.”

“Implement the future land use map recommendation by adopting the following zoning ordinance amendments: (1) Evaluate allowable residential density standards in the County’s agricultural areas, and consider a reduction of residential densities to no more than one unit per five acres of land.”

Understanding that the Board of Supervisors may wish to consider a smaller lot size, the Planning Commission offered the following additional proposals for consideration:

- 1) A two-acre minimum lot size within an overall density of one dwelling per five acres,
- 2) A three-acre lot size with clustering bonus.

Dr. Porterfield explained that in the first option the Agricultural Conservation District would allow the sale and building on a two-acre lot within a larger property, as long as the overall density on the original larger property did not exceed one dwelling per five acres. This would provide some of the open-space benefits of clustering for properties over five acres, but would only apply to tracts with over fifty acres. It would also allow the sale of smaller lots, thus lowering the cost while maintaining the overall space requirement.

The second option would allow sale and building on a three-acre lot with no additional density restriction. A clustering bonus would apply to tracts with over fifty acres permitting one-acre lots if at least 40% of the total area were maintained as open space. In this case, the density would be increased from 0.33 dwelling per acre to 0.40 dwelling per acre.

Supervisor Sally W. Gilfillan entered the meeting at this time.

Several Supervisors expressed concern regarding the affordability of building lots. Mr. Harrington explained that the proposals outlined by the Planning Commission would establish an overall density that allowed flexibility in the minimum lot sizes while still preserving open space.

Mr. Pickett addressed concerns expressed during the joint public hearing with regard to parents being able to transfer or bequeath property to their children. He advised that the *Code of Virginia* specifically states that subdivisions are not partitions of family land, and the intent of the proposed zoning ordinance was to create a mechanism that would deter developers from purchasing a large tract and dividing it into small parcels. He also addressed comments made with regard to the language used in the ordinance by advising that its structure was in line with the standards used statewide.

Mr. Ward questioned the process that would take place with regard to the ordinance's adoption. He was advised that the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing. (Mrs. Gilfillan suggested this hearing be advertised as an opportunity for the public to ask questions and receive answers from the Commission.) Depending on the significance of the comments received, the Commission could make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, or opt to make further revisions and hold a second hearing prior to referring the ordinance to the Board for consideration. Once the Supervisors receive the ordinance, the Board will hold a public hearing. Following that hearing, the Board of Supervisors may adopt the ordinance or refer it back to the Planning Commission for further revisions.

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Planning Commission sought direction from the Board with regard to lot sizes. The Commission was instructed to reduce the lot size to 1.5-acre with an overall density of one dwelling per four acres.

There being no further discussion, Mr. McKay moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion carried:

| | | | |
|------|---|------|------|
| Aye: | William G. Fore, Jr. Pattie Cooper-Jones Sally W. Gilfillan Robert M. Jones Charles W. McKay James C. Moore Howard F. Simpson Lacy B. Ward | Nay: | None |
|------|---|------|------|

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.