

AT A JOINT WORK SESSION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, AND THE PLANNING COMMISSION, HELD ON THE 22ND DAY OF JULY, 2003, AT 4:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

**A. ROLL CALL**

Jay T. Harrison, Sr., Chairman, Berkeley District  
Bruce C. Goodson, Vice Chairman, Roberts District  
John J. McGlennon, Jamestown District  
Michael J. Brown, Powhatan District  
James G. Kennedy, Stonehouse District

Sanford B. Wanner, County Administrator  
Frank M. Morton, III, County Attorney

Mr. Harrison welcomed the Planning Commission to the Joint Meeting and thanked the Commission for all its work on the Draft 2003 Comprehensive Plan update.

**B. BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Brown recommended that in light of the situation with Thomas Nelson Community College (TNCC), that the following language be added to the *Education: Adult and Vocational Education* located on page 31 of the Draft 2003 Comprehensive Plan, "Explore the feasibility of a County provided professional technical workforce center that incorporates current Williamsburg-James City County School system vocational training and future Thomas Nelson Community College technical training as well as private-sector participatory training opportunities."

The Board and staff briefly discussed TNCC's site visit and the potential impact of TNCC's decision on the Land Use portion of the 2003 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Goodson recommended that Errata No. 11, referencing page 25, Item No. 13 of the Draft 2003 Comprehensive Plan specifically mention the BASF property.

The Board and staff discussed the language of Errata No. 19, referencing Item Nos. 19 and 21 on page 67 of the Draft.

Mr. Brown recommended Action No. 21 on page 67 of the Draft be deleted.

Mr. Brown recommended that Errata Action No. 22, referencing Item No. 7B on page 78 of the Draft, have added a clause at the end of the paragraph to read, "...and to adjoining developments where practical and desired by the neighborhoods involved."

The Board and staff discussed the clause amendment and concurred to amend the clause by adding "... and desired."

Mr. Kennedy recommended temporary emergency routes be established in neighborhoods that have limited access and that the routes need not be open to the public unless there is an emergency.

Mr. Brown requested clarification regarding Errata No. 24 referencing Item No. 19 on page 79 of the Draft, regarding the new standards for transportation.

Staff stated that the Comprehensive Plan wants to alleviate traffic impacts to secondary roads by establishing County standards for the type and amount of access to the secondary roads.

Mr. Brown requested to know how the standards would differ from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) standards for access to secondary roads.

Mr. John T. P. Home, Development Manager, stated that County standards would be stricter than VDOT's standards.

Mr. Brown inquired if staff has the expertise to develop the proposed standards.

Mr. Home stated that development of the County standards would require the assistance of an outside consultant.

Mr. Brown requested clarification regarding the population numbers provided on page 107 of the Draft versus the front of the Draft that indicates the population numbers to be a few thousand lower.

Mr. McGlennon stated that the U. S. Census Bureau indicates that the County is the fastest-growing community on the Peninsula and is growing at a rate of about 1,000 new homes per year; and recommended that staff revisit the statistical data utilized in the Draft and incorporate the growth spurt, as the ten-year projection does not seem to meet current data.

Mr. Harrison stated concern regarding the word "straining" in Errata Item No. 3 referring to page 19 of the Draft.

Mr. Wanner recommended that a better word would be "impacting."

Mr. Harrison requested the word "new" be replaced on Errata Item No. 4, referencing page 19 of the Draft, with the word "diverse."

The Board concurred with the replacement of the word "new."

Mr. Harrison stated that he is interested in the redevelopment of the Five Forks area of the County and recommended the area be redesignated in the Land Use portion of the Draft in a manner that would promote commercial development while protecting the existing residents.

Mr. Home stated that page 25 of the Draft addresses redevelopment, that currently the area has a Mixed-Use designation boundary, that staff will further study the proposal for redesignation of Five Forks, and work with the residents of Five Forks.

Mr. Brown recommended the redesignation not be included in the Draft at this time to permit the residents to participate in the redesignation of Five Forks.

The Board and staff discussed adding economic development on page 25 of the Draft.

Mr. Kennedy requested Lightfoot and Mooretown Road be included in the reference for redevelopment on page 25 of the Draft.

The Board and staff discussed the potential for the Mooretown Road/Lightfoot area to become an economic corridor.

Mr. McGlennon requested that the redevelopment of Richmond Road not be overlooked and that the County is looking at the deterioration of affordable housing in the County in the Mooretown Road/Lightfoot area.

Mr. Brown commented on page 112 of the Draft, regarding the *Other Tools Used in Conjunction with the Primary Service Area*, specifically the Adequate Public Schools Facility Policy, inquired if he could get a copy of the written policy and inquired if the reference in the first paragraph, last sentence, refers to all development.

Mr. Home stated that it refers to residential development

Mr. Brown inquired if a differential could be made between residential, commercial, or industrial development that may or may not come with proffers.

Mr. Home stated that incentives to offset impacts apply to industrial development and have not been applied to commercial development, and if keeping with the policy as written, the distinction could be made between residential and industrial development only.

Mr. Brown requested an editorial change to page 112 of the Draft to end the sentence after "...available to County."

Mr. Brown recommended deletion of the second sentence of the second paragraph regarding the Large Retail Establishment Policy on page 113 of the Draft.

The Board and staff discussed the deletion of the sentence and the input from citizens regarding large retail establishments.

Mr. Harrison recommended language for the attention to the design of the aesthetics of large retail establishments.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he could support Mr. Harrison's recommendation and that the paragraph needs to be reworded because the citizens do support large retail establishments.

The Board and staff discussed the economic impacts of businesses located in other jurisdictions, the County's policy language that impacts a business's decision to locate in the County, and the County's residential development.

Mr. McGlennon requested staff review positive language for the County's policy and Comprehensive Plan in regard to retail establishments.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he is concerned that the BASF property may not be able to be developed as an industrial site and would support BASF property becoming affordable housing with an economic redevelopment plan.

The Board discussed the potential for the BASF property and the Industrial Development Authority's recommendation not to change the designation of the site.

Mr. Brown recommended the County consider not hindering the by-right development of landowners and recommended the removal of the parenthetical options on page 115 of the Draft regarding Rural Lands

The Board discussed the examination of the by-right residential rural development.

Mr. Brown requested language regarding the **Treyburn Drive** extension on page 108 of the Draft.

Mr. Home recommended pages 73-76 of the Draft would be an appropriate spot for **Treyburn Drive** extension.

Mr. Brown requested the Board send a letter to the Executive Director of Chambrel and its residents' committee regarding the Public Hearing on August 12 and invite them to comment on the City's proposal for the extension of **Treyburn Drive**.


Mr. Brown recommended the following language be added within pages 73-76 of the Draft, "The **Treyburn Drive** extension from Monticello Avenue to Ironbound Road is planned as a two-lane collector street with center turn lanes, shoulder bike lanes, sidewalks, street lighting, and street trees.

"The **Treyburn Drive** extension project is to be constructed without any cost to James City County. The City of Williamsburg must ensure that the interests of County residents, especially the Chambrel community, are fully protected through such measures as landscaping buffering, entrance relocation, posting of low speed limits, and management of construction activity. The City must also ensure that the needed improvements to the intersection of Ironbound Road and Monticello Avenue are constructed concurrent with, in advance of, construction of the **Treyburn Drive** extension. County approval of development plans for the **Treyburn Drive** extension will be tied to timely progress on construction of the intersection and protection of the interests of the Chambrel community."

The Board requested a letter also be sent to the City of Williamsburg and Chambrel regarding the Public Hearing and inclusion of **Treyburn Drive** in the County's Comprehensive Plan.

**C. RECESS**

At 6:02 p.m., Mr. Harrison and the Board broke for supper until 7 p.m.



Sanford B. Wanner  
Clerk to the Board