

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, WAS HELD ON THE THIRD DAY OF SEPTEMBER, TWO-THOUSAND AND FOURTEEN, AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101-F MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

1. **ROLL CALL**

Planning Commissioners

Present:

Rich Krapf
Tim O'Connor
Chris Basic
Robin Bledsoe
George Drummond
John Wright, III
Heath Richardson

Staff Present:

Allen J. Murphy, Jr., Director of Development Management
Paul Holt, Planning Director
José Ribeiro, Senior Planner II
Ellen Cook, Senior Planner II

Mr. Rich Krapf called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mr. Krapf opened the public comment.

Mr. Stephen Moreland, 116 Huntercombe, addressed the Commission regarding the Longhill Road Corridor Study, noting that the recommended improvements would greatly enhance safety and quality of life along the corridor.

Mr. Roy Snyder, 514 Spring Trace, representing the Seasons Trace Home Owners Association, addressed the Commission regarding the Longhill Road Corridor Study with focus on the recommendations for the Seasons Trace intersection. Mr. Snyder noted that the Seasons Trace HOA endorses overall plan for the corridor and encourages immediate installation of the recommended traffic signal at the entrance to Seasons Trace.

As no one else wished to speak, Mr. Krapf closed the public comment.

3. **CONSENT AGENDA**

A. Minutes from the August 6, 2014, Planning Commission meeting

B. Development Review Committee

- i. S-0037-2014, New Town, Section 3 & 6, Block 21, Parcels A & C

Mr. Tim O'Connor moved to approve the Consent Agenda.

In a unanimous vote, the Commission approved the Consent Agenda 7-0.

4. **REPORTS TO THE COMMISSION**

A. **Policy Committee**

Mr. O'Connor stated that the Policy Committee did not meet in August and therefore, there is no report. Mr. O'Connor noted that the Policy Committee would also not meet in September.

B. **Regional Issues Committee**

Ms. Robin Bledsoe stated that the Regional Issues Committee did not meet in August.

5. **PUBLIC HEARING CASES**

A. **Case No. SUP-0008-2014, Gilley Enterprises Equipment Storage**

Mr. José Ribeiro, Senior Planner II, provided the Commission with a report on the proposed storage of heavy equipment on a portion of the property owned by the Gilley family known as Gatehouse Farm.

Mr. Krapf opened the floor to questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. John Wright inquired about the reason for relocating the equipment.

Mr. Ribeiro responded that the relocation of the equipment was necessary because the property where the equipment is currently stored no longer belongs to Mr. Gilley due to recent boundary line adjustments on several parcels.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired whether Engineering & Resource Protection and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) have approved the application.

Mr. Ribeiro responded that both agencies have reviewed the application and did not have any comments or require any SUP conditions. Mr. Ribeiro further noted that the agencies would also review the existing conditions on the property at the site plan stage and might require additional improvements at that time.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired whether the potential improvements would impact the neighborhood.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that there should not be any impact on the neighborhood and that staff is comfortable that the SUP conditions would mitigate of any impacts.

Mr. Heath Richardson inquired whether, when the project is submitted for final site plan approval, Engineering & Resource Protection and other County Divisions will review and provide comments before it is submitted to VDOT.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that review for final site plan approval by the various plan review agencies will be simultaneous.

Mr. Wright inquired whether Smokehouse Lane and Gate House Boulevard are maintained by VDOT and what the speed limit on those roads is.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that both roads are public roads. Mr. Ribeiro stated that he would need to confirm the speed limit but that he believes it is 25 mph.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired how much equipment is involved and whether the amount could be increased in the future.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that the equipment shown in the photos attached to the staff report was all inclusive of the current equipment. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the SUP was flexible enough to allow for additional equipment but noted that it was also necessary to establish limits so that this does not become a large commercial operation. Mr. Ribeiro stated that the SUP conditions limit the storage of equipment to a 3,200 square-foot area. Further expansion would require an SUP amendment.

Mr. Chris Basic inquired how the size limits would be enforced.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that most enforcement was through complaints. Mr. Ribeiro noted that the property is under a conservation easement and that staff monitors the easement yearly for compliance with the requirements of the easement.

M. O'Connor inquired whether the 3,200 square-feet is in compliance with the conservation easement.

Mr. Ribeiro confirmed.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether the access to the current storage area was off Gate House Boulevard.

Mr. Ribeiro confirmed.

Mr. O'Connor inquired why the access road from Gate House Boulevard to the new storage site was not also being removed from the AFD.

Mr. Ribeiro responded that there is an existing farm road which connects the site to Gate House Boulevard.

Mr. O'Connor noted that he has concerns that the access road is supporting a commercial operation while also receiving tax benefits from the AFD.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether the three parcels were approved for an additional 136 units.

Mr. Ribeiro noted that initially it was five parcels; however, it became three parcels after the boundary line extinguishments. Mr. Ribeiro confirmed that the 1987 rezoning did allow for up to 136 additional residential units.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether Gate House Boulevard and Smokehouse Lane were intended to support those 136 lots.

Mr. Ribeiro confirmed.

Mr. George Drummond inquired whether the roads were being used daily for the equipment to go from storage to site.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that the equipment usually moved from site to site and was only stored on the subject property when there was no active construction use.

Ms. Bledsoe requested clarification whether there would be a new access to the property at the end of Smokehouse lane.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that there would not be a new access at Smokehouse Lane. Mr. Ribeiro further stated that the existing farm road would connect the storage site with Gate House Boulevard.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired why the parcel address was given as Smokehouse Lane.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that it is because the parcel has legal road frontage on Smokehouse Lane.

Mr. Wright requested confirmation that the excavator and skid loader would only be moved on a trailer.

Mr. Ribeiro confirmed.

Mr. Krapf called for disclosures from the Commissioners related to meetings or conversations with the applicant.

There were none.

Mr. Krapf opened the public hearing.

Mr. Greg Davis, Kaufman & Canoles, PC, addressed the Planning Commission on behalf of the applicant, providing a history of the property and an overview of the extent of the proposed business.

Ms. Cheryl Sonderman, 105 Gate House Boulevard, addressed the Commission regarding concerns over whether the Home Occupation was correctly approved and the impact of the proposed business on the subdivision roads and the general quality of life in the subdivision.

Ms. Helena Dingee, 115 Smokehouse Lane, addressed the Commission on concerns about the size of the equipment being moved and the frequency with which it would be moved.

Mr. John Street, 109 Smokehouse Lane, addressed the Commission on concerns about the potential for impacts on an environmentally sensitive area.

Ms. Camille Rutan, 108 Smokehouse Lane, addressed the Commission on concerns about the impact of business on traffic in the subdivision, particularly the speed of vehicles traveling on narrow roads.

Ms. Sharon Reed, 124 Smokehouse Lane, addressed the Commission with concerns about the location of the equipment storage on the parcel and the potential for Smokehouse Lane to be used for access to the storage site.

As no one else wished to speak, Mr. Krapf closed the public hearing.

Mr. Krapf asked Mr. Davis for clarification regarding whether the entrance to the new site would differ from the existing access to the current site.

Mr. Davis responded that there would be no change to the way the site would be accessed and that there were no plans to access the site from Smokehouse Lane. Mr. Davis stated that the usage patterns would be no different than those that have existed for the last three years.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether the property is actively being farmed.

Mr. Davis confirmed that the property is actively farmed and hunted.

Mr. O'Connor inquired about the crops grown on the farm.

Mr. Davis responded that the crops are corn, winter wheat and soybeans.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether the farm equipment and trailers are stored on site.

Mr. Davis responded that the heavy farm equipment is brought in several times a year for planting and harvesting.

Mr. Krapf opened the floor for discussion by the Commission.

Mr. Basic requested clarification what would happen if the access easement were denied at any time and the access to the site had to be taken from Smokehouse Lane.

Mr. Holt stated that if access needed to be taken from Smokehouse lane in the future, an SUP amendment would be required.

Mr. Richardson noted that the application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Richardson stated that the vehicular traffic would be minimal and that the times of operation are suitable to a residential neighborhood.

Mr. Wright inquired how often staff would be monitoring compliance.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that Planning staff would inspect the property once a year as part of the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program to confirm compliance with the easement requirements and consequently would be able to monitor compliance with the SUP.

Mr. Wright inquired what would occur if the property was found to be violating the terms of the easement.

Mr. Krapf noted that legal action could be taken if necessary.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether proposed SUP condition #3 limiting the amount of traffic was offered by the applicant or imposed by staff.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that it was a staff recommendation.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired whether Mr. Gilley owned any equipment in addition to what is shown in the photographs.

Mr. Ribeiro confirmed that to the best of his knowledge there is no additional equipment.

Mr. Krapf stated that he is comfortable with the assurances provided by the applicant regarding the operation of the existing business with no changes and the conditions crafted by staff to ensure that the business would not negatively impact the adjacent neighborhood.

Mr. Basic stated that he is inclined to support the application since the business has operated for several years and would not be making any changes to its operations.

Mr. O'Connor noted that this was a much less intensive use for the property. Mr. O'Connor stated that he has concerns about limiting the hours of operation.

Mr. Richardson stated that the restrictions on hours of operation seemed to be a self-limitation by the applicant as a concession to the neighbors.

Mr. O'Connor recommended amending the condition to include language to allow occasional hours of operation before or after those specified.

Mr. Krapf noted that there are other SUPs which do limit hours of operation.

Mr. Basic noted that, based on the staff report, theoretically the equipment would generally already be on a job site should it be needed earlier or later than the hours specified.

Mr. Wright stated that he does not see any obvious changes in the business operations and would support the application.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that it seems that the applicant is willing to make a concession to address the adjacent neighbors' concerns and that as long as there are no changes to the business, she would support the application.

Mr. Richardson moved to recommend approval of the application with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Mr. O'Connor requested amending the SUP condition to allow for occasional off-hours work.

Mr. Richardson stated that he would not be opposed to making the amendment; however, it seems that the applicant is comfortable making the concession for limited hours of operation.

Ms. Bledsoe stated that she believes that the hours are fair because of the nature of the neighborhood and would not want to make that change.

Mr. Richardson stated that his motion stands to recommend approval of the application with the conditions as listed in the staff report.

On a roll call vote, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of SUP-0008-2014 with the conditions in the staff report by a vote of 7-0.

6. PLANNING COMMISSION CONSIDERATIONS

A. Longhill Road Corridor Study

Carroll Collins, Transportation Project Manager with Kimley-Horn and Associates, provided an overview of the Longhill Road Corridor Study process. Mr. Collins noted that the study focused public input as well as data collection. Public input opportunities included community workshops, a project symposium, an online survey and stakeholder interviews. Mr. Collins stated that the responses focused on safety, traffic mobility and improved bike-ped accommodations. Mr. Collins stated that citizens also wanted the corridor to be visually appealing and minimize impact to the natural and built environment. Mr. Collins stated that the recommended design was a four-lane typical section for the entire corridor in its entirety. Mr. Collins stated that notable features of the proposed recommendations include a roundabout at Williamsburg Plantation, a signalized crossing where the multipurpose trail shifts to the opposite side of the roadway and a potential realignment of the corridor to the north of the New Zion Baptist Church Cemetery. Mr. Collins stated that a final report has been prepared for Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors consideration.

Ms. Ellen Cook, Senior Planner II, provided an update on the status of the recommendations for access improvements for Season's Trace and Lafayette High School. Ms. Cook stated that additional options were developed with input from School Division staff and an update on the options was presented to the School Board at its August 19, 2014 meeting. Ms. Cook stated that the School Board provided input which has been included in the public input appendix and noted in Chapter 9 of the report. Ms. Cook further stated that due to the complexity of this situation, staff and the consultant have determined that for the purpose of the Longhill Road Corridor

Study, it would be most appropriate for the text to discuss the options but not make a final recommendation on this matter. Ms. Cook stated that staff anticipates additional discussion with the School Division and Board over time as implementation of improvements to Longhill Road proceeds.

Ms. Cook stated that adoption of the Longhill Corridor Study Report would designate it as the official vision for improvement of Longhill Road and set the stage for implementation actions such as seeking funding and considering the report recommendations during review of legislative cases.

Mr. Drummond stated that he is concerned about the section of the corridor in the vicinity of the Montessori School and inquired whether that portion of the corridor would be four lanes.

Mr. Collins confirmed that the recommended design would be four lanes for the entire corridor.

Mr. Collins stated that during the study staff had met with representatives of the Montessori School and also observed the drop-off and pick-up operations. Mr. Collins further stated that there had been discussion about improved full movement access which included relocating the entrance to the west. Mr. Collins also stated that the report included safety recommendations to improve driver awareness of the school zone which include rumble strips and enhanced pavement markings.

Mr. O'Connor inquired about the proposed improvements at Longhill Gate/Warhill Sports Complex.

Mr. Collins responded that the recommendation is for a traditional signalized intersection.

Mr. Krapf stated that he was impressed with the responsiveness to citizen comments and concerns.

Mr. Wright inquired whether the final cost estimates are in current year dollars or future year dollars.

Mr. Collins stated that the estimates are in current year dollars. Mr. Collins further stated that it was also noted in the Report that costs could rise over time.

Ms. Bledsoe noted that she had participated in the Project Advisory Committee and she was pleased that the citizens' voice had been heard and incorporated in the recommendations.

Mr. Krapf stated that the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors and opened the floor for a motion.

Mr. Drummond moved to recommend approval of the Longhill Road Corridor Study.

On a roll call vote, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the Longhill Road Corridor Study by a vote of 7-0.

7. **PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Holt stated that he would like to highlight that there will be a Planning Commission Working Group meeting on September 4, 2014 to discuss the draft text for the Public Facilities and Community Character sections.

8. **COMMISSION DISCUSSION AND REQUESTS**

Mr. Krapf reminded the Commission that Mr. Wright would be the Planning Commission representative at the Board of Supervisors meetings in September.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Wright moved to adjourn to September 4, 2014 at 4 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:27 p.m.


Richard Krapf, Chairman


Paul D. Holt, III, Secretary