

AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF JAMES CITY, VIRGINIA, HELD ON THE 12TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2006, AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM, 101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, JAMES CITY COUNTY, VIRGINIA.

A. ROLL CALL

Bruce C. Goodson, Chairman, Roberts District
John J. McGlennon, Vice Chairman, Jamestown District
Jay T. Harrison, Sr., Berkeley District
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Powhatan District
M. Anderson Bradshaw, Stonehouse District

Sanford B. Wanner, County Administrator
Leo P. Rogers, County Attorney

*Adopted Sept. 26
as amended*

B. MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. Goodson requested the Board and citizens observe a moment of silence.

C. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Arielle Geiwitz, a rising seventh-grade student at Toano Middle School, led the Board and citizens in the Pledge of Allegiance.

D. PRESENTATIONS

1. Recognition - Environmental Single-Family Award - Affordable Homes, LLC-I

Mr. Goodson presented Mr. Rick Parker, representing Affordable Homes, LLC-I, with a resolution of appreciation and a sign in recognition of the outstanding efforts by Affordable Homes, LLC-I to protect the environment.

2. Tropical Storm Ernesto Update

Chief Tal Luton briefly updated the Board on the impacts of Tropical Storm Ernesto and the effects of the storm. Chief Luton stated preparations began four days prior to the storm with emergency services prepared three days in advance; the Board and executive staff were notified of measures by E-Mail two days in advance; and citizens were notified that shelters were open at 6 a.m. on the day of the storm, 24 hours in advance. Chief Luton continued that Governor Kaine declared a State of Emergency one day before the storm; on the day of the storm the EOC activated at 10 a.m.; shelters were staffed and ready to go; areas monitored; reports were received of flooding and power outages; and there was one request for shelter. Chief Luton stated an estimated \$250,000 of public and private damages were assessed on September 8, 2006. Chief Luton reported that damages were found in pockets with no widespread damage. Chief Luton explained that since Governor Kaine requested a Presidential Declaration of Emergency, the damage would be evaluated by FEMA,

which would allow Federal funds to be distributed. Chief Luton stated due to the James City Service Authority (JCSA) water leak, there was a declaration of a local state of emergency for Tropical Storm Ernesto and the water leak, though they were probably related. Chief Luton reported that 21,000 gallons of water were distributed Friday night and Saturday, and all methods of communications available were utilized to inform citizens of the boil water policy. Chief Luton informed the Board and citizens that the Jolly Pond Convenience Center was accepting debris free of charge until September 16, 2006, and there would be a reevaluation for further action on that date. He stated the current debris totaled 490 tons, with a \$14,000 cost to the County for disposal, small in comparison to Hurricane Isabel.

Mr. McGlennon asked if there was a way that citizens who have observations or suggestions could submit them for consideration.

Chief Luton said citizens would be able to provide feedback on the website.

Mr. McGlennon commented on the water leak being Ernesto-related with a tree coming down on the pipe and the great effort by County staff and citizens in the time of emergency.

Chief Luton stated the Citizens Emergency Response Team (CERT) volunteered and some who received water came back and volunteered as well, with totals of 25-30 employees and volunteers helping serve roughly 500 cars per hour.

Mr. McGlennon stated that Grounds Maintenance employees were helping to unload debris.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the Forest Glen flooding was related to a backed-up storm drain.

Chief Luton stated this was a result of a backed-up storm drain.

Mr. Goodson thanked Chief Luton and asked if the generator at radio station WMBG was operating properly.

Chief Luton said it was.

Mr. McGlennon asked if reverse 911 system of notification would assist in similar emergencies.

Chief Luton stated he would come back with a recommendation for a reverse 911 system, which was budgeted in this year's funds, but in this case phone lines that were out hampered utilizing this kind of system. Chief Luton explained the hosting system utilizes 1,000 phone lines and uploads updates to a database.

E. PUBLIC COMMENTS

1. Mr. Richard Bradshaw, Commissioner of the Revenue, gave an update on real estate tax exemption qualifications for the elderly and disabled. Mr. Bradshaw stated for the current tax year, the County received 457 applications and 412 applicants qualified for exemption, totaling \$432,000.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the increase was due to changed criteria.

Mr. Bradshaw stated the increased dollar amounts of income and assets were part of the increase.

2. Mr. Bryan Oyer, 9025 Barnes Road, commented on the subdivision of property without road access to the lots.

3. Mr. Ed Oyer, 139 Indian Circle, commented on wind generator towers; vehicle access to public properties; his son's letter to the editor; balloon tests for cellular phone towers in the Roberts District; Wolf Contracting; and debris from Tropical Storm Ernesto.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to adopt the items on the consent calendar as amended.

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Harrison, Icenhour, McGlennon, Bradshaw, Goodson (5).
NAY: (0).

1. Minutes -
 - a. June 13, 2006, Regular Meeting
 - b. June 27, 2006, Regular Meeting
 - c. August 8, 2006, Regular Meeting
2. Recognition - Environmental Single-Family Award - Affordable Homes, LLC-I

RESOLUTION

RECOGNITION - ENVIRONMENTAL SINGLE-FAMILY AWARD

WHEREAS, Affordable Homes, LLC-I, is the 2006 Environmental Recognition Award Program second quarter Environmental Single-Family Award recipient at the selected site of 8873 Fenwick Hills Parkway, Lot 82, in Fenwick Hills; and

WHEREAS, Affordable Homes, LLC-I, has demonstrated building practices to minimize environmental impact in James City County; and

WHEREAS, Affordable Homes, LLC-I, has taken the initiative to control erosion, reduce run-off from its site, and go above and beyond normal erosion and sediment control measures.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, does hereby recognize the outstanding dedication of Affordable Homes, LLC-I, for environmental protection in James City County.

2. Mr. Bryan Oyer, 9025 Barnes Road, commented on the subdivision of property without road access to the lots.

3. Mr. Ed Oyer, 139 Indian Circle, commented on wind generator towers; vehicle access to public properties; his son's letter to the editor; balloon tests for cellular phone towers in the Roberts District; Wolf Contracting; and debris from Tropical Storm Ernesto.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to adopt the items on the consent calendar as amended.

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Harrison, Icenhour, McGlennon, Bradshaw, Goodson (5).
NAY: (0).

1. Minutes -
 - a. June 13, 2006, Regular Meeting
 - b. June 27, 2006, Regular Meeting
 - c. August 8, 2006, Regular Meeting
2. Recognition - Environmental Single-Family Award - Affordable Homes, LLC-I

RESOLUTION

RECOGNITION - ENVIRONMENTAL SINGLE-FAMILY AWARD

WHEREAS, Affordable Homes, LLC-I, is the 2006 Environmental Recognition Award Program second quarter Environmental Single-Family Award recipient at the selected site of 8873 Fenwick Hills Parkway, Lot 82, in Fenwick Hills; and

WHEREAS, Affordable Homes, LLC-I, has demonstrated building practices to minimize environmental impact in James City County; and

WHEREAS, Affordable Homes, LLC-I, has taken the initiative to control erosion, reduce run-off from its site, and go above and beyond normal erosion and sediment control measures.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, does hereby recognize the outstanding dedication of Affordable Homes, LLC-I, for environmental protection in James City County.

3. Dedication of Streets - Powhatan Secondary, Phases 7A-B

RESOLUTION

DEDICATION OF STREETS IN POWHATAN SECONDARY OF WILLIAMSBURG,

PHASES 7A-B

WHEREAS, the streets described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3, fully incorporated herein by reference, are shown on plats recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of James City County; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation advised the Board that the streets meet the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Virginia Department of Transportation entered into an agreement on July 1, 1994, for comprehensive stormwater detention which applies to this request for addition.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the streets described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 to the secondary system of State highways, pursuant to §33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia, and the Department's Subdivision Street Requirements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, and any necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

4. Dedication of Street - Louise Lane South Extension

RESOLUTION

DEDICATION OF STREET KNOWN AS LOUISE LANE SOUTH EXTENSION

WHEREAS, the street described on the attached Additions Form AM-4-3, fully incorporated herein by reference, are shown on plats recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of James City County; and

WHEREAS, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation advised the Board that the street meets the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Virginia Department of Transportation entered into an agreement on July 1, 1994, for comprehensive stormwater detention which applies to this request for addition.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the street described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3 to the secondary system of State highways, pursuant to §33.1-229 of the Code of Virginia, and the Department's Subdivision Street Requirements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, and any necessary easements for cuts, fills, and drainage.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

5. Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance Violation - Civil Charge - John Grier Construction

RESOLUTION

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL ORDINANCE VIOLATION -

CIVIL CHARGE – JOHN GRIER CONSTRUCTION

WHEREAS, on or about March 20, 2006, John Grier Construction, Owner, violated or caused a violation of the County's Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance by disturbing land without a permit at 9935 Walnut Creek, Toano, Virginia, designated as Parcel No. (3-14) on James City County Real Estate Tax Map No. (5-2) and hereinafter referred to as (the "Property"); and

WHEREAS, John Grier Construction has abated the violation at the Property; and

WHEREAS, John Grier Construction, has agreed to pay \$1,000 to the County as a civil charge under the County's Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the James City County Board of Supervisors is willing to accept the civil charge in full settlement of the Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance violation, in accordance with Section 8-7(f) of the Code of the County of James City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby authorizes and directs the County Administrator to accept the \$1,000 civil charge from John Grier Construction, Owner, as full settlement of the Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance violation at the Property.

6. Authorization of Two Temporary Overhire Positions - Police Department

RESOLUTION

AUTHORIZATION OF TWO TEMPORARY OVERHIRE POSITIONS

WHEREAS, two officers have given notice of retirement, one effective December 1, 2006, and another effective March 1, 2007; and

WHEREAS, it takes four months for newly hired non-certified personnel to complete the Basic Law Enforcement Course at the Hampton Roads Criminal Justice Academy (November 6, 2006 – March 7, 2007) and an additional eight weeks to complete field training; and

WHEREAS, insufficient staffing in the Police Department adversely affects service delivery and places additional stress on employees already working in dangerous and stressful occupations; and

WHEREAS, some excellent candidates are available from a recent recruitment; and

WHEREAS, funds are available within the existing Police Department FY 2007 budget for the creation of two temporary overhire positions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, does hereby establish two full-time temporary Police Officer I overhire positions that will expire March 1, 2007.

7. Destruction of Paid Personal Property and Real Estate Tax Tickets

RESOLUTION

DESTRUCTION OF PAID PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX TICKETS

WHEREAS, the Code of Virginia, § 58.1-3129, states that the Treasurer may, with the consent of the governing body, destroy all paid tax tickets at any time after five years from the end of the fiscal year during which taxes represented by such tickets were paid, in accordance with the retention regulations pursuant to the Virginia Public Records Act (§ 42.1-76, et seq.); and

WHEREAS, the tax tickets hereby referred to are paid personal property tax records from 1993 and 1994.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby approves the destruction of the paid personal property tax records from 1993 and 1994.

DESTRUCTION OF PAID REAL ESTATE TAX TICKETS

WHEREAS, the Code of Virginia, § 58.1-3129, states that the Treasurer may, with the consent of the governing body, destroy all paid tax tickets at any time after five years from the end of the fiscal year during which taxes represented by such tickets were paid, in accordance with the retention regulations pursuant to the Virginia Public Records Act (§ 42.1-76, et seq.); and

WHEREAS, the tax tickets hereby referred to are paid real estate tax records from 1993 and 1994.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby approves the destruction of the paid real estate tax records from 1993 and 1994.

WHEREAS, it takes four months for newly hired non-certified personnel to complete the Basic Law Enforcement Course at the Hampton Roads Criminal Justice Academy (November 6, 2006 – March 7, 2007) and an additional eight weeks to complete field training; and

WHEREAS, insufficient staffing in the Police Department adversely affects service delivery and places additional stress on employees already working in dangerous and stressful occupations; and

WHEREAS, some excellent candidates are available from a recent recruitment; and

WHEREAS, funds are available within the existing Police Department FY 2007 budget for the creation of two temporary overhire positions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, does hereby establish two full-time temporary Police Officer I overhire positions that will expire March 1, 2007.

7. Destruction of Paid Personal Property and Real Estate Tax Tickets

RESOLUTION

DESTRUCTION OF PAID PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX TICKETS

WHEREAS, the Code of Virginia, § 58.1-3129, states that the Treasurer may, with the consent of the governing body, destroy all paid tax tickets at any time after five years from the end of the fiscal year during which taxes represented by such tickets were paid, in accordance with the retention regulations pursuant to the Virginia Public Records Act (§ 42.1-76, et seq.); and

WHEREAS, the tax tickets hereby referred to are paid personal property tax records from 1993 and 1994.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby approves the destruction of the paid personal property tax records from 1993 and 1994.

DESTRUCTION OF PAID REAL ESTATE TAX TICKETS

WHEREAS, the Code of Virginia, § 58.1-3129, states that the Treasurer may, with the consent of the governing body, destroy all paid tax tickets at any time after five years from the end of the fiscal year during which taxes represented by such tickets were paid, in accordance with the retention regulations pursuant to the Virginia Public Records Act (§ 42.1-76, et seq.); and

WHEREAS, the tax tickets hereby referred to are paid real estate tax records from 1993 and 1994.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby approves the destruction of the paid real estate tax records from 1993 and 1994.

8. Award of Contract - Ambulance Purchase - Fire Department

RESOLUTION

AWARD OF CONTRACT - AMBULANCE PURCHASE - FIRE DEPARTMENT

WHEREAS, funds are available in the FY 2007 Capital Improvements Program budget for purchase of a replacement ambulance; and

WHEREAS, cooperative purchasing action is authorized by Chapter 1, Section 5 of the James City County Purchasing Policy and the Virginia Public Procurement Act and the City of Newport News issued a cooperative purchasing contract to American LaFrance, LLC as a result of a competitive sealed Request for Proposals; and

WHEREAS, Fire Department and Purchasing staff determined the contract specifications met the County's performance requirements for a medium-duty ambulance and negotiated a price of \$185,500 with American LaFrance, LLC for a 2007 Freightliner M2/MedicMaster Type I Medium-Duty Ambulance unit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, authorizes the County Administrator to execute a contract between James City County and American LaFrance, LLC in the amount of \$185,500.

9. Declaration of a Local Emergency - Tropical Storm Ernesto

RESOLUTION

DECLARATION OF A LOCAL EMERGENCY – TROPICAL STORM ERNESTO

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, does hereby find that due to the effects of Tropical Storm Ernesto the County faces dangerous conditions of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant coordinated local government action to mitigate the damage, loss, hardship, or suffering threatened or caused thereby; and

WHEREAS, a condition of extreme peril of life and property necessitated the declaration of the existence of an emergency; and

WHEREAS, due to exigent circumstances, the Board of Supervisors was unable to convene to consent to the declaration of a local emergency.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, pursuant to Section 44-146.21 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, the Declaration of a Local Emergency dated September 7, 2006, by Sanford B. Wanner, Director of Emergency Management for James City County, be, and the same is, confirmed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Director of Emergency Management and the Coordinator of Emergency Management shall exercise those powers, functions, and duties as prescribed by state law and the ordinances, resolutions, and approved plans of James City County in order to mitigate the effects of said emergency.

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Real Property Tax Rate

Mr. John McDonald, Manager of Financial and Management Services, gave an overview of the real property tax rate based on the reassessment. Mr. McDonald explained that in May when the Board adopted the budget for Fiscal Year 2007, the Real Property Tax revenues were calculated with an 18.7 percent increase assumed, and actual numbers were higher, and additional revenue was \$1.46 million. Mr. McDonald stated this budget amendment would reduce the tax rate from 78.5 cents/\$100 to 77 cents/\$100 and contributed the residual \$141,151 to water quality and road improvement projects. Mr. McDonald stated the purpose of real estate assessment was to estimate a reasonable assessment of market value and create equity to other properties; that if someone did not feel his/her assessment met these two requirements, please contact Real Estate Assessments; that the property would be subject to administrative review; and that appeals are to a five-member Board of Equalization.

Mr. Goodson opened the Public Hearing.

1. Mr. Ron Fisher, 3520 Mott Lane, complimented the Board and suggested reducing the quality of life and facilities due to taxes imposed on low- and fixed-income citizens.

2. Mr. Martin Simeck, 122 Water's Edge Drive, stated that for 21 years the Board and Planning Commission favored housing developers rather than businesses and facilities. He commented on the rate increase in late 90s followed by assessment increase; tax rate decreased afterward; and this practice is happening again. Mr. Simeck stated his opposition to the proposal.

3. Mr. R. Streko, 6061 Allegheny Road, stated a reduction of 1.5 cents is not enough. Mr. Streko commented that assessments should be changed and taxes collected at time of sale; commented on quality of life; stated schools do not improve with more money; and suggested increasing tax-exemption income maximum to \$42,000.

4. Mr. Don Kimball, 6151 South Mayfair Circle, stated his opposition to the proposal and commented on the Board not answering questions; stated Fairfax County does tax relief for citizens earning \$90,000 to \$110,000 per year who cannot afford taxes; stated the County cannot produce a formula to define fair market value; and stated money beyond budget should be returned to citizens.

5. Mr. Donnie Martin, 7196 Canal Street, stated Chickahominy Haven flooded from Ernesto and Hurricane Isabel, and few came through from the County; commented on ditches and lack of services; asked for tax relief for long-term citizens of the County; and commented on County vehicles being driven home.

6. Ms. Lee Meadows, 7201 Canal Street, Chickahominy Haven, stated the community was hit hard by Hurricane Isabel and Ernesto, and she is speaking on behalf of her mother; commented on homes being continually flooded; stated the assessments of affordable homes were impacted by larger homes; stated she did not take advantage of the appeal process but will now; stated the Board should advocate for those with low incomes who do not want to be pushed out of the County; and left a CD with Mr. Bradshaw with pictures of Ernesto flooding.

7. Ms. Mary Magoon Delara, 92 Sand Hill Road, stated the Board was commendable to lower tax rates, but a 1.5-cent reduction was not enough; stated affordable housing is taxed out of existence; and suggested alternative measures to make assessments more equitable should be done, such as revised tax relief policies or a cap on assessment increase percentage.

8. Mr. Dave Brinton, 6053 Allegheny Road, Longhill Station, stated he was retired and on a fixed income; and that when he came to the County, taxes were reasonable but now taxes have doubled. Mr. Brinton asked the Board to tax something else other than homeowners.

9. Ms. Josephine Gardner, 731 Autumn Circle, stated houses cannot be sold at the assessed value and will not allow a homeowner to buy another house in the County. Ms. Gardner suggested a cap on assessments, or collecting the taxes when a house is sold.

10. Dr. Robert Herrmann, 6057 Alleghany Road, Longhill Station, stated he could not afford the taxes on his property and could not sell the property at the assessed value.

11. Mr. Ed Oyer, 139 Indian Circle, stated he had previously commented on the real estate tax system; stated his home would not sell for the assessed value because people cannot afford to buy, and that the General Assembly needed to allow counties to develop an indexed system or establish a cap.

12. Mr. Bryan Oyer, 9025 Barnes Road, commented that his property value went up \$70,000 once and now it was up another \$40,000 after he built the home for \$100,000. Mr. Oyer stated the large new homes were not well made but they were driving up his assessment. Mr. Oyer stated he once attempted to appeal his assessment and he received the paperwork the day before it was due. Mr. Oyer commented that property owners were not told what the property was assessed against by the Real Estate Assessments Office. He commented that assessments would not go down as quickly as they rose and this could have been offset if Wal-Mart had located in the County. Mr. Oyer continued that the Board should cut back on many things, including allowing employees to drive County vehicles home because a 1.5-cent reduction was not adequate.

13. Mr. Howard Goldstein, 108 Shinnecock, stated based on assessments that the State dictates, market values are irrational and set by speculation and that the duty of the Board was to normalize this speculation on the behalf of the citizens. Mr. Goldstein stated the Board needed to normalize the growth in the budget, incorporating less than double-digit growth.

14. Mr. George Sperry, 6323 Chinwick Park, stated homes in his development were built in the last ten years and some houses cost \$60,000 more than his house. Mr. Sperry asked how figures are developed and did not get a straight answer. Mr. Sperry asserted the tax system was broken due to abnormal increases.

15. Ms. Margaret Hill, 118 Thompson's Lane, stated her family has lived in the County since 1800 and she will not be able to pass down land due to tax increases; and commented that all middle and lower class would not be able to stay in the County, including working people who had earned the right to live here.

16. Mr. Trevor Walter, 3736 Cherry Walk, stated the Real Estate Assessments Division should disclose how the assessments are made.

Mr. Goodson stated the Board is not allowed by the Code of Virginia to cap the annual assessment.

Mr. Goodson asked Mr. McDonald to comment on the citizens' inquiries.

Mr. McDonald stated that sales produce trends to develop a market value based on property features, generalizations based on square footage, and other characteristics used to define assessment; and then over the next 12 months, the State department would audit the assessment and analyze how closely the County had come to actual market value. Mr. McDonald explained that the most recent evaluation reported the County assessments in the mid-80th percentile, which meant the assessments have not kept up with market value as actual sale; and he has not seen reductions in market value in the County. Mr. McDonald stated the system was as good as the information and that property owners could help improve the information by calling the

Real Estate Assessments Office to report information about a specific parcel. Mr. McDonald said the office can provide information to property owners on how a specific parcel was assessed and what standards were used. Mr. McDonald stated he would invite property owners to give information as the County performs a mass appraisal and that a property owner can provide information not taken into consideration. He stated staff would like to hear from and respond to citizens.

Mr. Goodson asked if there is a computer printout for each property available to citizen to disclose how property was assessed.

Mr. McDonald stated this printout exists and is available to citizens upon request.

Mr. Goodson asked if the County was audited last year and asked for confirmation that the County assessment was 20 percent lower than market sales.

Mr. McDonald stated the report was based on the median of the property value versus what the property sold for and that the County was at 83 percent of the assessment versus actual sales value, which meant the assessment was low. Mr. McDonald explained that the County values were using actual sales, and the State was using prices of historical sales.

Mr. Harrison asked what the process was to appeal a property assessment.

Mr. McDonald stated the first step was to assert that the assessment is not correct, and that the Real Estate Assessments Office would perhaps offer to make an adjustment. If the citizens chose to appeal, there would be a form to give supportive information, including comparable sales or assessments or specific characteristics that would decrease the assessed value of the property.

Mr. Harrison asked if an assessor is sent out.

Mr. McDonald stated that an assessor is sent if the property owner requests one in order to analyze the property or respond to questions.

Mr. Icenhour stated he went to the Real Estate Assessments Office and asked questions and commented there was a perception that the assessments were done by computer, and the public would be surprised if they went to the office. Mr. Icenhour explained that the assessments were not done by community, but were broken down by section. Mr. Icenhour expressed concern that the assessment values were based on a built-in 12-24 month lag, as well as concern on how the State audits the County. Mr. Icenhour thanked Mr. McDonald for the education and invited citizens to go to the office and look at the assessments.

17. Mr. Dan Masciullo, 3740 Cherry Walk, stated the Board should consider if the property tax rate is out of hand; asked if the revenue required to maintain increases proportionally to the increase in property taxes; commented on the effects of the tax rate on retired citizens with fixed income; asked the Board to remember that citizens need security; and stated a house in the County would not sell for a market price that would allow the owner to afford another house in the County.

18. Ms. Ronnie Goldstein, 108 Shinnecock, commented on the budget and stated surplus should be returned to the people.

19. Ms. Lucy Szrama, 117 Teal Way, stated her assessment went up and commented that if the Virginia legislature was responsible, it needed to be addressed and that the formula for assessment needed to be changed.

Mr. Goodson closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Goodson stated that in this case the County was shifting costs from businesses to homeowners. Mr. Goodson commented that the proposed property tax rate decrease was revenue-neutral and that since the budget was passed several months ago and commitments had been made, only a certain amount of tax relief was available without making specific adjustments to the budget.

Mr. Harrison commended citizens for speaking to this matter. He clarified that he was reluctant to ask staff questions because they had been communicating about this matter all along, but he wanted to hear from citizens. Mr. Harrison stated he was in the same situation as the citizens and it was a backwards process to set budget since there was not the same audience during budget process. He explained that the audience during the adoption of the budget encourages the Board to spend for schools, utilities, roads, and other services. Mr. Harrison suggested that the budget growth be capped, with a fixed-rate of eight percent growth annually. He commented that the County does not have the level of commercial development needed to adequately offset the burden of property taxes from property owners. Mr. Harrison suggested an expansion of the relief program through an increase in annual salary and extending the program to low-income citizens living in affordable housing. He stated the reduction in rate at 1.5 cents did not seem like a lot but he was concerned with giving that much back based on the budget and future need. Mr. Harrison suggested looking at ways to cut costs, including what citizens had mentioned about County vehicles going home and new vehicles being purchased. He explained the difficulty in making cuts without hearing from the people.

Mr. Icenhour stated the County cannot do certain things based on powers from the State, but can address these powers through a legislative agenda. He encouraged citizens to contact the representatives and encouraged the Board to build the legislative agenda. Mr. Icenhour stated the Board's budget process was backwards, commented that the land book should be created before the budget, and the tax rate should be set at that point to eliminate guessing what property tax revenue should be. He stated part of this need for revenue was the capital projects going on, including four new schools within three years. Mr. Icenhour stated there needed to be a more consistent rate and assessment process. He proposed basing the assessment cycle on calendar year rather than the fiscal year so the blue sheet from the Real Estate Assessments Office would come out in February when the Board started putting the budget together so citizens could help decide what needed to be cut. Mr. Icenhour proposed changes to the exemption program and commented that affordable housing was becoming non-existent, which was pricing people out of County. He recommended an increased annual salary for elderly and disabled from \$35,000 to \$50,000. Mr. Icenhour asked that staff bring back information with a careful analysis of the impacts of revenue to support infrastructure of the County and suggested the County take the same tax exemption program and increase exemption for lower-income property owners regardless of age. He stated he was in favor of the resolution to decrease the tax rate.

Mr. Bradshaw thanked citizens for attending and speaking to this matter, and highlighted important comments, including the assertion that the tax system was a regressive tax. He explained that the County favors real estate taxes rather than a higher sales tax because it is normally progressive; however, this was no longer the case. Mr. Bradshaw stated the need to refocus on development of businesses and commercial enterprises and a uniform tax rate. He commented that any collection over the budget should be returned, which was what the Board was attempting to do. Mr. Bradshaw stated the need to look at different alternatives and though he would like to increase the tax exemptions for elderly and disabled citizens, he did not want to transfer the tax burden to other groups. He stated the Board could not do many suggestions at this meeting, but the suggestions would be revisited.

Mr. McGlennon stated the Board thinks seriously about spending tax dollars and though the Virginia tax system is not defensible, this demographic received a much greater increase than the average assessment increase. He urged people to appeal their assessments. Mr. McGlennon explained that this was the only system that allowed for funding County government in Virginia, creating a reliance on real estate for the majority of

Mr. Goodson closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Goodson stated that in this case the County was shifting costs from businesses to homeowners. Mr. Goodson commented that the proposed property tax rate decrease was revenue-neutral and that since the budget was passed several months ago and commitments had been made, only a certain amount of tax relief was available without making specific adjustments to the budget.

Mr. Harrison commended citizens for speaking to this matter. He clarified that he was reluctant to ask staff questions because they had been communicating about this matter all along, but he wanted to hear from citizens. Mr. Harrison stated he was in the same situation as the citizens and it was a backwards process to set budget since there was not the same audience during budget process. He explained that the audience during the adoption of the budget encourages the Board to spend for schools, utilities, roads, and other services. Mr. Harrison suggested that the budget growth be capped, with a fixed-rate of eight percent growth annually. He commented that the County does not have the level of commercial development needed to adequately offset the burden of property taxes from property owners. Mr. Harrison suggested an expansion of the relief program through an increase in annual salary and extending the program to low-income citizens living in affordable housing. He stated the reduction in rate at 1.5 cents did not seem like a lot but he was concerned with giving that much back based on the budget and future need. Mr. Harrison suggested looking at ways to cut costs, including what citizens had mentioned about County vehicles going home and new vehicles being purchased. He explained the difficulty in making cuts without hearing from the people.

Mr. Icenhour stated the County cannot do certain things based on powers from the State, but can address these powers through a legislative agenda. He encouraged citizens to contact the representatives and encouraged the Board to build the legislative agenda. Mr. Icenhour stated the Board's budget process was backwards, commented that the land book should be created before the budget, and the tax rate should be set at that point to eliminate guessing what property tax revenue should be. He stated part of this need for revenue was the capital projects going on, including four new schools within three years. Mr. Icenhour stated there needed to be a more consistent rate and assessment process. He proposed basing the assessment cycle on calendar year rather than the fiscal year so the blue sheet from the Real Estate Assessments Office would come out in February when the Board started putting the budget together so citizens could help decide what needed to be cut. Mr. Icenhour proposed changes to the exemption program and commented that affordable housing was becoming non-existent, which was pricing people out of County. He recommended an increased annual salary for elderly and disabled from \$35,000 to \$50,000. Mr. Icenhour asked that staff bring back information with a careful analysis of the impacts of revenue to support infrastructure of the County and suggested the County take the same tax exemption program and increase exemption for lower-income property owners regardless of age. He stated he was in favor of the resolution to decrease the tax rate.

Mr. Bradshaw thanked citizens for attending and speaking to this matter, and highlighted important comments, including the assertion that the tax system was a regressive tax. He explained that the County favors real estate taxes rather than a higher sales tax because it is normally progressive; however, this was no longer the case. Mr. Bradshaw stated the need to refocus on development of businesses and commercial enterprises and a uniform tax rate. He commented that any collection over the budget should be returned, which was what the Board was attempting to do. Mr. Bradshaw stated the need to look at different alternatives and though he would like to increase the tax exemptions for elderly and disabled citizens, he did not want to transfer the tax burden to other groups. He stated the Board could not do many suggestions at this meeting, but the suggestions would be revisited.

Mr. McGlennon stated the Board thinks seriously about spending tax dollars and though the Virginia tax system is not defensible, this demographic received a much greater increase than the average assessment increase. He urged people to appeal their assessments. Mr. McGlennon explained that this was the only system that allowed for funding County government in Virginia, creating a reliance on real estate for the

majority of revenue that comes in, but over the last ten years, there was not an increase in reliance on property tax, which has declined. He stated the County makes efforts to even the balance on citizens and other sources of income, as some revenue came from inter-governmental transfers and that the State has increased the amount of money received in recent years, including a reimbursement for car taxes. Mr. McGlennon commented that there was a myth perpetuated on what the County does for economic development, insisting the County drove Wal-Mart away from locating in James City County and although none of these Board members served on the Board when Wal-Mart decided to go to York County and the City of Williamsburg would not allow Wal-Mart to build within the City, the County approached the corporation, which informed the County that it does not respond to communities for location decisions. Mr. McGlennon stressed that one establishment does not make or break a County situation and that the County was fortunate to have robust economic activity including New Town, the Prime Outlets expansion, the Wal-Mart Distribution Center, and other entities with higher salaries in more skilled jobs, including the Avid Medical, Inc. expansion, doubling jobs created. He explained these are not as visible but are just as productive for revenue. Mr. McGlennon stated the Board was trying to be a good steward of County revenue and certain powers to tax that were held even by the City of Williamsburg, such as cigarettes, were not permitted in a county, as well as restrictions on other sources of revenue such as lodging taxes. He assured the citizens that the Board and staff were trying to find the best ways to provide quality services without placing too much burden on property owner and that the high assessments in recent years helped to fund the extraordinary increase of costs on local government that has far exceeded the cost of living with construction costs. Mr. McGlennon stated the Board had asked the School Board to cut back provisions for school construction to make costs within the budget but they could not find sufficient reductions. He stated that the County looked for other ways of dealing with cost and adopted a cash proffer system for developers to pay for new facilities and that a compromised version will be enhanced in future, as an effort to share the tax burden with property owners. Mr. McGlennon stated the Board cannot stop growth, but has voted down several developments this year and that some members have voted against proposals consistently, due to the belief that the County can expect higher standards for proposed development and greater mitigation of the effects of development. He clarified that State law does not allow for retroactive rezoning decisions and there have recently been expensive school propositions. Mr. McGlennon stated the citizen comments are helpful and although the Board cannot make the requested change in tax rate, the Board and staff were trying to find alternative sources of revenue, adjust rate of growth, pace of development, and cost of growth, but these actions could not be immediate, as the Board would have to dismantle the budget to do what citizens expected. Mr. McGlennon stated his support for the resolution and he would like to return the amount of funds above what was budgeted.

Mr. Goodson stated he was happy to hear from citizens and complimented Mr. Icenhour for his suggestions. He stated the Board had changed the assessment in the past, but there needed to be a consensus. Mr. Goodson stated progress could be made through advancing the legislative agenda to lobby for the power to cap some assessments and make homestead exemptions. He stated if the assessment was available when the budget was passed, he may have voted differently on the budget; however, the County needed to keep its budgeted obligations. Mr. Goodson stated his support for the 1.5-cent reduction.

Mr. McGlennon made a motion to adopt the resolution.

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Harrison, Icenhour, McGlennon, Bradshaw, Goodson (5).
NAY: (0).

RESOLUTION

REAL PROPERTY TAX RATE

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County is in receipt of the County landbook as of July 1, 2006; and

WHEREAS, the total value of the landbook exceeds earlier estimates used in approving the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2007 (FY 2007); and

WHEREAS, estimated tax collections for FY 2007, using the values in the July 1, 2006, landbook, exceed those in the adopted budget by \$1,600,397; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors desires to lower the tax rate to \$0.77 per \$100 assessed value as a result of the higher actual landbook value, resulting in \$141,151 in additional revenue in FY 2007.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby amends the FY 2007 Budget by reducing the tax rate on real property for FY 2007 from \$0.785 to \$0.77 per \$100 of assessed value.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the FY 2007 Budget be amended and \$141,151 in additional real property tax revenue be appropriated to the Non-Departmental category of the County's General Fund to assist in funding road improvement and water-quality projects

Mr. Goodson recessed the Board for a short break at 9:05 p.m.

Mr. Goodson reconvened the Board at 9:12 p.m.

2. Case Nos. Z-2-06/MP-3-06/SUP-19-06. Mason Park - Reduced Street Width Request

Mr. Goodson opened the Public Hearing and explained the applicant had asked for a deferral to the October 10, 2006, Board meeting.

Mr. Goodson deferred the Public Hearing to October 10, 2006.

3. Case No. Z-3-06/SUP-21-06/MP-4-06. Pleasant Hill Station

Mr. Jason Purse, Planner, stated Mr. James Peters has applied to rezone a 4.7-acre portion of the 403-acre Hill Pleasant Farm parcel located at 7152 Richmond Road from A-1, General Agricultural, to B-1, General Business, with proffers, with a Special Use Permit (SUP) for the development of a car wash, as well as two other commercial uses. The property is also known as Parcel No. (1-5) on James City County Real Estate Tax Map No. (24-1).

Staff found the proposal generally consistent with the 2003 Comprehensive Plan as outlined in the staff report. Staff believed the proffers would adequately mitigate impacts from this development.

At its meeting on August 7, 2006, the Planning Commission voted 6-0 with one abstention to approve the application.

Staff recommended the Board of Supervisors approve the Rezoning, Master Plan, and SUP applications with the acceptance of the proffers.

Mr. Goodson opened the Public Hearing.

1. Mr. Vernon Geddy, III, on behalf of the applicants, gave a presentation which outlined the application, including uses, architecture and design, landscaping, traffic information, stormwater management, and master plan.

Mr. McGlennon asked how the connectivity would operate and how it would relate to whether a traffic signal would be warranted.

Mr. Geddy responded that the signal would be based on the general traffic in the area.

Mr. McGlennon stated it would be to the advantage of both property owners to have the signal but there would be no cost sharing and asked if the adjacent property owners were interested in the connection.

Mr. Geddy stated there was none and they were very interested in the connectivity.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the only access would be at the main entrance at the far end of the property.

Mr. Geddy confirmed this.

Mr. Icenhour asked for more details about the car wash, including whether it would be drive-through or self-serve.

The applicant responded that the car wash would be drive-through with a detail shop and a self-serve option as well.

Mr. Icenhour asked what would ultimately happen to the water that was recycled from the car wash and asked what remained after filtration.

Mr. Tim Fitzpaltrick, Mid Atlantic Autec, explained that the car wash would recycle 85-90 percent of the water and that the septic tanks would need to be pumped once a quarter.

Mr. Icenhour asked if any water would go into the storm sewer or the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Fitzpaltrick stated it would go into neither.

Mr. Icenhour asked about how the water would be disposed of once it was pumped out of the tanks.

Mr. Fitzpaltrick stated he was uncertain, but believed there were restrictions on how the septic companies were allowed to dispose of the water.

Mr. Icenhour asked how the water would be disposed of from the self-serve bays.

Mr. Fitzpaltrick stated the water would be filtered and go straight to the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Icenhour asked what percentage of vehicular waste was removed from the water in the filtration process.

Mr. Fitzpaltrick stated about 75 percent was removed.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the history of other jurisdictions and the restrictions on the filtration system due to requirements by the Hampton Roads Sanitation District (HRSD) as what is sent to the sewer ends up in the watershed.

Mr. Fitzpaltrick said this was correct.

Mr. Goodson stated there were certain rules set forth by the HRSD about what goes into the system.

Mr. Geddy stated this was correct.

Mr. Goodson stated that though this application would be a water use, those using it would be citizens who would wash cars in driveways and waste more water. He stated his support of the resolution in that regard. Mr. Goodson stated that a possible lube shop could be located on the property and asked for confirmation that motor fuels could be sold without an SUP change.

Mr. Sowers stated gasoline could not be sold without a separate SUP.

Mr. Bradshaw asked about the selection of the name, noting the inversion of "Hill Pleasant" and "Pleasant Hill."

Mr. Peters stated permission would have to be granted by the landowner to use the name of Hill Pleasant Farm.

Mr. Bradshaw stated the historic name was good, a name of historical significance, but wanted to clarify the inversion of the name as the Hunt family corrected others when the name was incorrect. Mr. Bradshaw stated he wanted assurance that those landscaping the property knew what effort was involved in caring for an orchard.

Mr. Peters stated there was specific language for landscaping, which resembled an orchard.

Mr. Goodson closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bradshaw disclosed that he has represented Hill Pleasant Farm in the past but as they were not current clients; he believed he could fairly act on this item.

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to adopt the resolutions.

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Harrison, Icenhour, McGlennon, Bradshaw, Goodson (5).
NAY: (0).

RESOLUTION

CASE NO. Z-03-06/MP-4-06. PLEASANT HILL STATION

WHEREAS, in accordance with §15.2-2204 of the Code of Virginia and Section 24-15 of the James City County Zoning Ordinance, a public hearing was advertised, adjoining property owners notified, and a hearing scheduled on Case No. Z-03-06/MP-4-06, with Master Plan, for rezoning 4.7 acres from A-1, General Agricultural, to B-1, General Business, with proffers; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of James City County, following its Public Hearing on August 7, 2006, recommended approval, by a vote of 6 to 0; and

WHEREAS, the property is located at 7152 Richmond Road and can be further identified as Parcel No. (1-5) on James City County Real Estate Tax Map No. (24-1).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, does hereby approve Case No. Z-03-06/MP-4-06 and accepts the voluntary proffers.

RESOLUTION

CASE NO. SUP-21-06. PLEASANT HILL STATION

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors of James City County has adopted by ordinance specific land uses that shall be subjected to a Special Use Permit (SUP) process; and

WHEREAS, Mr. James Peters has applied for an SUP to allow for the development of a car wash, as well as a traffic generation rate which is over 100 peak hour trips; and

WHEREAS, the property is located on land zoned B-1, General Business, and can be further identified as Parcel No. (1-5) on James City County Real Estate Tax Map No. (24-1); and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, following its Public Hearing on August 7, 2006, voted 6 to 0 to recommend approval of this application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, does hereby approve the issuance of Special Use Permit No. 21-06 as described herein with the following conditions:

1. If construction has not commenced on this project within 36 months from the issuance of an SUP, the SUP shall become void. Construction shall be defined as clearing, grading, and excavation of trenches necessary for the water and sewer mains.
2. This SUP is not severable. Invalidation of any word, phrase, clause, sentence, or paragraph shall invalidate the remainder.

4. Case No. SUP-24-06. Coleman Family Subdivision

Ms. Leanne Reidenbach, Planner, stated Mr. David L. Coleman has applied for an SUP to allow a family subdivision generating two lots less than three acres in size in an A-1, General Agricultural District, located at 9024 Barnes Road. Ms. Reidenbach stated the existing property is approximately 3.13 acres and can be further identified as Parcel No. (5-1D) on James City County Real Estate Tax Map No. (10-2), and was currently owned by Ms. Yook Coleman. Ms. Reidenbach stated the proposed subdivision would create one new 1.78-acre parcel (Lot 1-D2) to be conveyed to Mr. David Coleman, her son, and the remaining parcel (Lot 1-D1) would be approximately 1.34 acres, both lots with access off Barnes Road. Ms. Reidenbach explained the applicant had expressed that the purpose of the subdivision would be so that he could locate on Lot 1-D2 and construct a retirement home for his mother on the new parcel, enabling Mr. Coleman to more easily provide care for his mother. Ms. Reidenbach stated the property was located in the A-1, General Agricultural

District, and the minimum lot size in A-1 for single-family detached units was three acres, while Section 24-214, paragraph (d) allows for a minimum lot size of less than three acres if the creation of said lot is for use by a member of the owner's immediate family (children 18 years of age or older or parents of an owner) and an SUP is issued. Ms. Reidenbach stated the Zoning Ordinance required only the Board of Supervisors to review and approve this type of SUP.

Staff found the proposal to be consistent with the surrounding zoning and development and Section 19-17 of the James City County Subdivision Ordinance.

Staff recommended approval of this application with the conditions listed in the attached resolution.

Mr. Bradshaw asked when the property was purchased.

Ms. Reidenbach responded the property was purchased in July 2006.

Mr. Bradshaw asked if there was any other dwelling on the parcel.

Ms. Reidenbach stated there was not.

Mr. Goodson asked if an auxiliary housing unit could be built on a property without subdividing the land.

Ms. Reidenbach stated the property would need to demonstrate that it would be subdividable, and she stated she would research this matter.

Mr. Goodson asked in order to develop an auxiliary structure, if there would need to be a subdivision.

Mr. Rogers stated the parcel would need to demonstrate that it would be able to be subdivided if it was a two-family parcel and on A-1 parcel and if the property is three acres, it would not meet the A-1 requirements for subdivision.

Mr. Purse quoted Section 24-189 of the Zoning Ordinance where two or more residential uses were permitted on a parcel provided all other requirements of the zoning district that were met for each of the principle residential uses.

Mr. Goodson asked if a duplex would be allowed without subdividing.

Mr. Sowers stated a two-family development would require an SUP.

Mr. Goodson opened the Public Hearing.

1. Mr. David Coleman stated he wanted a separate home for his mother to care for her when she retires.

As no one else wished to speak to this matter, Mr. Goodson closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Bradshaw stated the Code says a family subdivision may be granted if it was not an attempt to circumvent the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Bradshaw commented the applicant wanted two homes on a property, which circumvents the ordinance. Mr. Bradshaw stated he would be more comfortable if the property had been held in a family for a longer period of time and if it had been developed. Mr. Bradshaw stated he did not support the application.

Mr. Harrison stated he appreciated Mr. Bradshaw's comments and stated this would be an opportunity to create a legacy, whereas a developer would not preserve this. He commented he felt the application met the criteria and stated support for the resolution.

Mr. Goodson stated concern because with lot size requirements for Rural Lands changing from three acres to 10 acres, this type of application could become more prevalent. He explained that if a family is initially living on a parcel, once subdivided, the individual parcels were separate and could be sold separately. Mr. Goodson stated this provision was intended to give property owners who have owned a parcel property for years an opportunity to pass it down to their children, and he felt it was important for the Board to set a precedent. Mr. Goodson stated he did not support the application.

Mr. McGlennon stated this matter was a discretionary action of the Board and required a higher standard, and though it was hard to establish a time length requirement for ownership, the property should be owned more than a few months. Mr. McGlennon stated concern that the lot size was barely over minimum lot size for the zoning district and stated he could not support the application, as it would send a message that family subdivisions was a way to more aggressively develop outside the Primary Service Area (PSA).

Mr. Icenhour stated there was a recommendation from staff based on strict assessment of the Zoning Ordinance, yet the Board was raising issues that were not clearly defined in the Ordinance; that he could understand if the applicant believed he could get the application approved if he read the Ordinance when looking for property for this purpose, and suggested that beyond this case, these concerns needed to be incorporated in this Ordinance. Mr. Icenhour stated he did not support the application.

Mr. Goodson stated that the Board was setting a precedent with this decision.

Mr. Harrison stated a family subdivision was created to prevent developers from subdividing land.

Mr. McGlennon stated originally it had to be family-owned, but there was no requirement to stay in the family possession.

Mr. Harrison stated that should be considered.

Mr. Bradshaw stated he believed there was a three-year requirement of ownership of family.

Mr. Rogers stated that this was a matter of an exception to the Subdivision Ordinance and the exception should be narrowly construed to effectuate the purpose. Mr. Rogers explained this was not an application for an exception to the family Subdivision Ordinance, but an SUP for an exception to the Zoning Ordinance for a smaller lot size than required. He stated the Board could incorporate a holding period for a family subdivision, which is an acceptable provision to effectuate the purpose of a family owning property to subdivide and give to an heir. Mr. Rogers stated a holding period requirement would be an acceptable provision to make to the Subdivision Ordinance; however, this application was truly an SUP to the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Goodson asked what changes could be made to the Ordinance, such as a minimum lot size.

Mr. Rogers stated the Ordinance does provide for that in the Subdivision Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance, but it seems the only change to that would be in the family Subdivision Ordinance to provide for by-right family subdivisions that would require a holding period for the property owner to own or live on the property for a period of time, which was an acceptable provision for a family subdivision exception.

Mr. Goodson stated that would be setting policy.

Mr. Rogers stated that was correct, and in dealing with a Zoning Ordinance SUP, if that was in the Subdivision Ordinance, that would be a criterion that staff would need to apply.

Mr. Harrison made a motion to approve the resolution.

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Harrison, (1). NAY: Icenhour, McGlennon, Bradshaw, Goodson (4).

5. FY 2007 Budget Amendment - Matoaka Elementary School

Mr. John E. McDonald, Manager of Financial and Management Services, stated the budget amendment would appropriate \$4 million to the construction of Matoaka Elementary School, which required \$4.3 million in additional funding, \$4 million of which was to come from the County. He stated the budget amendment would move \$2.8 million from funds for the school multiuse building, reduce Contingency by \$.25 million, and that \$.95 million would be collected from bond proceeds. Mr. McDonald stated \$1.2 million was generated from bonds issued for a high school and \$228,227 was included as a budget amendment for lighting and other facility needs. He stated the project would be budgeted in full, but if it was necessary to borrow money to provide funds, the Chairman, the County Administrator, representatives from Davenport Financial, and he would meet to discuss.

Mr. Harrison asked if there are other items connected to Matoaka Elementary School that could drive costs higher.

Mr. McDonald stated the unfinalized acquisition price may increase the needed funds for the elementary school.

Mr. Goodson opened the Public Hearing.

1. Mr. Henry Howell spoke, on behalf of the Letitia Hanson Trust and Travis Armistead, to encourage the Board to cease development of the Matoaka Elementary School site until after the November 8, 2006, hearing on the condemnation. Mr. Howell listed items that in his opinion refute the legality of the condemnation of the property, including no title exam being done, not identifying the correct owners, no title report being done, no negotiations with the correct owners, no bona fide offer to owners before condemnation, no plans for project, the need to condemn more land, no notice required to condemn an Agricultural and Forestal District, and a resolution that did not comply to laws for Counties by indicating the owners and money offered to each person. Mr. Howell stated the Armistead family had handled another expensive condemnation when land was taken for the desalination plant. Mr. Howell commented on obtaining an SUP on land that was not yet condemned and a failure to manage the property during Ernesto, causing flooding. Mr. Howell asked the Board to stop development until the court hearing.

As no one else wished to speak to this matter, Mr. Goodson closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. McGlennon made a motion to adopt the resolution,

On a roll call vote, the vote was AYE: Harrison, Icenhour, McGlennon, Bradshaw, Goodson (5). NAY: (0).

RESOLUTION

FY 2007 BUDGET AMENDMENT - MATOAKA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of James City County has previously budgeted funds for the construction of Matoaka Elementary School; and

WHEREAS, despite rebidding the contract, the construction contract for Matoaka Elementary School exceeded budget estimates by approximately \$4 million, with the County share estimated at \$3,756,134; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has previously endorsed a contract award for the construction of Matoaka Elementary School and needs to identify and appropriate the needed additional funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors of James City County, Virginia, hereby amends the FY 2007 Budget and appropriates additional funds, as follows:

CAPITAL BUDGET

Revenue:

Contribution from Debt Service \$ 956,403

Expenditures:

Matoaka Elementary School \$2,796,403
School Multi-Use Building (2,800,000)
Matoaka Elementary School Road Improvements 960,000
\$ 956,403

DEBT SERVICE BUDGET

Revenue:

Interest on Bond Proceeds \$1,184,630

Transfers:

Capital Budget \$ 956,403
Operating Budget 228,227
\$1,184,630

OPERATING BUDGET

Revenue:

Contribution from Debt Service \$ 228,227