

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
BUSINESS MEETING
County Government Center Board Room
101 Mounts Bay Road, Williamsburg, VA 23185
May 25, 2021
1:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

P. Sue Sadler, Vice Chairman, Stonehouse District
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Jamestown District
Ruth M. Larson, Berkeley District
John J. McGlennon, Roberts District
Michael J. Hipple, Chairman, Powhatan District

Scott A. Stevens, County Administrator
Adam R. Kinsman, County Attorney

Mr. Hipple requested a motion to amend the Agenda to remove Item No. 5 from the Consent Calendar as the County Attorney's Office has deemed this item is subject to a public hearing and will be considered at the June 8, 2021, Regular Meeting.

A motion to Amend the Agenda was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

C. PRESENTATION

1. AARP Tax Aide Volunteers Recognition

Mr. Hipple requested Ms. Betsy Fowler, Williamsburg Regional Library (WRL) Director, and Mr. George Richmond, AARP Tax-Aide District Coordinator, and his team come forward. He read a commendation acknowledging the WRL, in conjunction with AARP tax aide volunteers, for free tax return preparations to citizens over 50 years old with low to moderate income for more than 30 years. Mr. Hipple noted many AARP tax aide sites in Virginia were unopen due to the COVID-19 pandemic. He further noted despite restrictions, the 55 Internal Revenue Service certified volunteers continued to offer the tax service at both the Williamsburg and James City County Libraries. Mr. Hipple noted 5,590 AARP tax aide volunteer hours were logged during the tax season, which ran from February 17, 2021 to April 15, 2021. He further noted 817 tax returns were completed with approximately \$1.2 million in refunds. Mr. Hipple commended both groups for their service to the community.

The Board thanked the group for its work.

D. BOARD DISCUSSIONS

1. Facilities Master Plan Update

Mr. Shawn Gordon, Chief Civil Engineer, addressed the Board noting Mr. Tony Bell,

ADOPTED

JUN 22 2021

Board of Supervisors
James City County, VA

Managing Principal, and Mr. Adam Bricker, Project Manager, with Moseley Architects were present. Mr. Gordon noted the presentation before the Board reflected a 75% update of the Facilities Master Plan. He further noted two options would be presented: 1) on-site and 2) new locations. Mr. Gordon noted some recommendations were no expansion on current sites, thus the new location criteria. He further noted the Facilities Master Plan included the Williamsburg-James City County School Administration and the Williamsburg-James City County Courthouse, adding a recent court stakeholder meeting and a June 1, 2021 meeting with the School Board. Mr. Gordon noted the Board's feedback and comments would help develop the best option for the County's Facilities Master Plan over the next 20 years.

Mr. Bricker addressed the Board noting in some circumstances only one option was apparent. He noted comments from the Board and alternative options were welcome. Mr. Bricker further noted the highlights of the space needs assessment in a PowerPoint presentation and the number of County facilities. He noted some facilities, such as the independent fire stations, would clearly remain independent entities. Mr. Bricker continued the PowerPoint presentation noting the 19 County facilities and the goal of addressing the County's 20-year space needs, which would carry to 2040. He noted the presentation's exhibits reflected the vision for the respective facilities in 20 years. Mr. Bricker noted the naming pattern for the different sites as shown in the PowerPoint presentation. He further noted Option 1 was represented in blue on the PowerPoint diagrams, with Option 2, if available, in red. Mr. Bricker continued the PowerPoint presentation noting the option of relocation for the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) to be with other County administrative functions. He noted when the EOC was active, everyone would be together. He further noted Satellite Services and Fire Station 1 would remain at the Forge Road campus. Mr. Bricker noted Option 2 addressed a purpose built space for Satellite Services instead of expanding its current space. He further noted positive feedback on the Satellite Services location for that end of the County, adding Option 2 would occur in the nearby vicinity. Mr. Bricker noted the four remaining Fire Stations were stand-alone sites and the next point in the PowerPoint presentation. He further noted Fire Station 2 had two options: Option 1 was same-site replacement, possibly later in time; and Option 2 was renovation and expanding to the current facility. Mr. Bricker noted the saddlebag design of fire stations with personnel areas on either end and equipment bays in the middle of the building. He further noted the design of newer fire stations as the reason for Option 1, which addressed less personnel moving through the equipment bays to avoid possible contamination. He further noted the goal for the master plan was to have one option for everything, adding the Board's input on direction was necessary. Mr. Bricker continued the PowerPoint presentation addressing Fire Station 3 and the Fire Training Administration options. He noted discussion on moving the Fire Administration with other administrative functions, with the training aspect as a separate piece. Mr. Bricker continued the PowerPoint presentation noting Fire Station 4 was a newer design. He noted this location only had one option, which was on-site expansion. Mr. Bricker further noted Fire Station 5, an older building, had two options similar to those cited for Fire Station 2. He continued the presentation addressing the Tewning Road Campus which housed the James City Service Authority (JCSA) and many of General Services' divisions. Mr. Bricker noted the proposal for this campus was a JCSA-only site as the majority of JCSA's infrastructure was already in place there as well as administration. He further noted land limitations, adding if General Services relocated then JCSA could expand its facility. Mr. Bricker noted a consolidation of the smaller on-site buildings for manageability. He further noted the option of keeping the General Services fleet building on-site as that division is responsible for JCSA fleet maintenance and public safety equipment. Mr. Bricker continued the PowerPoint presentation addressing the Colonial Community Corrections facility and Williamsburg/James City County Courthouse options. He noted one option for the Health and Human Services Center and ongoing discussion regarding Olde Towne Medical Center. Mr. Bricker further noted the James City County Recreation Center's recent use as an in-person voting location and space needs on an as-needed basis. He noted the options for this site. Mr. Bricker continued the presentation noting the Warhill Tract/Opportunity Way site, which he added was the largest one. He noted the details of Option 1 highlighted inclusion of

departments in a single building over 100,000 square feet. He further noted the site also included plans for future Fire Station 6 and the existing Law Enforcement Center (LEC). Mr. Bricker continued the presentation showing the Warhill Sports Complex, the LEC, and surrounding County facilities in this site. He noted the LEC was basically the same for both options as it had been built with a 20-plus-year plan. Mr. Bricker highlighted future space needs which included a new centralized County Administration building and Fire Station 6. He noted this site was also being considered as a possibility for the Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) School Administration. Mr. Bricker noted Moseley Architects had worked with WJCC Schools on its master plan and a June 1, 2021 meeting with the School Board was scheduled. He further noted WJCC School division needs regarding parking and expansion. Mr. Bricker noted the option to include the Fire Training Facility at the Opportunity Way site and designated it on the PowerPoint presentation map.

Mr. Hipple noted the option of the main building and a secondary building. He further noted it would be less cost to the County to add floors rather than build a separate building. Mr. Hipple noted personnel consolidation under one roof and the possibility of an underground parking garage. He further noted the benefits of the garage included staff security and inclement weather. Mr. Hipple noted it was more affordable to build up rather than construction of an additional building. He further noted extra floor space for future needs, a staff café, and other points in favor of a centralized multi-floor facility.

Mr. Bricker noted the next step was looking at cost and evaluation of the options. He asked Mr. Hipple if he envisioned the parking all underground or a partial level.

Mr. Hipple noted staff would use the underground parking with visitors using outside parking. He further noted the impact to greenspace and Best Management Practices (BMPs). Mr. Hipple noted some instances where spare floors were rented to outside vendors as a revenue source until the space was needed.

Mr. Bricker noted the dashed line in the diagram outlined wetlands on the property site. He further noted construction was possible in wetlands, but very expensive and challenging.

Mr. Hipple noted the advantage of adding floors and going up on the existing facility to save space and costs. He further noted the land behind the LEC as walking trails.

Ms. Larson asked if the Warhill Tract was the only option for land. She asked about the option for adding upward in the current location.

Mr. Stevens noted the latter had not been done based on discussion at the Board's retreat in January 2021. He further noted that point could be considered as an option. Mr. Stevens noted other sites could be considered that were more centrally located, adding if the Board wanted to pursue that route, other locations could be reviewed.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson noted the site would need to be located where citizens had access either through private transportation or the Williamsburg Area Transit Authority (WATA).

Mr. McGlennon noted if this site was chosen, the need for a satellite office in the southern end of the County, similar to the northern end, would be warranted.

Mr. Bricker noted this point was not in the master plan, adding the popularity of the satellite services on the western side of the County. He further noted the possibility of a similar satellite site for the eastern side if this location was chosen.

Ms. Sadler asked Mr. Stevens if the County already had the property to do an expansion.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes, the County had the property at the Warhill site.

Ms. Sadler noted Ms. Larson's comment regarding convenience for citizens as a consideration.

Mr. Hipple noted the distance to the Mounts Bay location and the more centralized site for citizens. He further noted a satellite facility at the other end of the County, particularly near a WATA route.

Mr. McGlennon asked about Thomas Nelson Community College's offer to return some property where expansion was intended.

Mr. Stevens confirmed yes the property had been transferred back to the County. He noted it was the property behind the LEC, adding much of it was not developable. Mr. Stevens further noted the area was 20 acres and difficult to access.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the EOC was relocated, would a backup site be available. He noted exploring possibilities for such a site. Mr. McGlennon asked if the plan accounted for changes in employment practices such as the ones seen in federal government with telecommuting. He noted possible reduced staff on-site in the future.

Mr. Bricker noted the space needs were based on the recent study. He further noted that study was pre-COVID and teleworking. Mr. Bricker noted the understanding that teleworking may be optional in the County, but not as a full-time option. He further noted if staffing was reduced by 30% at on-site facilities, then the space needs would change. Mr. Bricker noted no space needs update had been made as there had been no discussion on that option being a plan.

Mr. Stevens noted discussion among localities regarding telecommuting and the future. He further noted a presentation would be presented to the Board for discussion at a later date. Mr. Stevens noted most staff had returned to their working spaces, adding Social Services Department was an exception. He further noted square footage of buildings could be impacted if new construction was involved.

Mr. Icenhour asked how many square feet were in the Mounts Bay Government Complex.

Mr. Bricker noted that number was not in the presentation, but it was significantly less than what was planned.

Mr. Icenhour noted the Government Complex Campus would be absorbed as well as others like Fire.

Mr. Bricker confirmed yes. He noted the biggest jump in the space needs was not based on current space as no major construction for a large building had been done. He further noted making up the deficit from current space to current need for space. Mr. Bricker noted the next part of the presentation addressed the other half of the Warhill Tract, which was named the Water Tower Site. He further noted locating General Services and the Fire Training facility in this area as Option 1. Mr. Bricker noted the details of this option. He further noted Option 2 for the Jolly Pond Road Campus involved General Services Solid Waste Division. Mr. Bricker noted this was also considered a possibility for the Fire Training Facility location. He further noted utility issues at the location, including fiber connections and water service size. Mr. Bricker noted the need for larger utility improvements. He further noted this location was a farther distance for General Services to travel for vehicle servicing, which equated to lost time.

Mr. Bricker noted the Transfer Station for the Solid Waste Division would remain at the Jolly Pond Road location. He further noted the other County convenience centers were slated for replacement with larger facilities as an option. Mr. Bricker continued the PowerPoint presentation noting the properties that were not slated for expansion or development, but the property could be reviewed if the Board deemed it. He noted the sites included Mounts Bay Road, Palmer Lane Campus-Ironbound Road, and Information Resources Management (IRM) Video Center. Mr. Bricker noted the last two sites housed staff from departments with administrative facilities elsewhere in the County. He further noted in the PowerPoint presentation a summary of the options for the Facilities Master Plan. Mr. Bricker noted the WJCC School options would be discussed in more detail at a later date. He further noted the Courthouse was only 20 years old so the option there would include expansion and renovation in place.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the Mounts Bay Government Center square footage.

A consulting staff member noted it was 58,500 square feet.

Mr. Icenhour noted 100,000 square feet in the new building.

Mr. Bricker confirmed yes, adding that included some functions currently not on-site at the Mounts Bay Campus.

Ms. Sadler asked if schools were included.

Mr. Bricker noted the footprint did not include schools.

Mr. Icenhour noted the 20-year plan and the details of expansion. He asked about the total 20-year capital requirement, adding he felt it would be a significant amount to that price tag.

Mr. Bricker noted that analysis was the next step. He further noted developing project budgets so the Board would have the costs. Mr. Bricker noted this presentation offered the Board an opportunity to give feedback on site preferences, particularly regarding combining staff in the most effective way.

Ms. Sadler asked about existing land and land purchase.

Mr. Bricker noted land purchase was not applicable to any of the current options presented. He further noted the site reviews had been on existing County-owned property.

Ms. Sadler thanked Mr. Bricker.

Mr. Hipple noted the cost study would need to include maintenance and upkeep to existing facilities. He further noted the ability to sell existing property that may not be needed. Mr. Hipple noted the initial costs, but the long-term savings on maintenance and other factors with one building would prove beneficial in his opinion. He further noted different building materials that were long-lasting and durable.

Ms. Larson noted General Services would be her first priority. She asked if that piece could be addressed separately. Ms. Larson noted the cost for each piece.

Mr. Bricker confirmed yes. He noted separate costs for Administration, Fire, and others would be available.

Ms. Larson noted the cost of construction for additional Fire buildings. She noted the age of some of the General Services buildings, whereas expansion to existing Fire Stations may be

more efficient.

Mr. Bricker noted it would depend on the timing of the project. He further noted an add-on would align with a shorter timeline. Mr. Bricker noted if it was a long-term project, it could be incorporated into the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). He further noted replacement may not be a current option, but a long-term one over the next 15-20 years.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the analysis would incorporate traffic impacts.

Mr. Bricker noted that point had been discussed. He further noted the volume of activity particularly at the Warhill Tract, especially at the Sports Complex.

Mr. McGlennon noted the timing of sports team near the end of the business day. He further noted schools in that area.

Ms. Larson noted the traffic concerns on Jolly Pond Road. She further noted the need for a traffic impact study.

Mr. Bricker noted no traffic study had been done. He further noted that site as an option was based on the property being County owned. Mr. Bricker noted the heavy equipment that General Services maintained and not locating a facility in a residential neighborhood. He further noted that site was considered as Option 2 due to its remoteness, road conditions, utilities, and longer travel time.

Ms. Larson noted the School Division Operations Center was located on Jolly Pond Road. She asked if expansion of that facility was an option or was the facility serving the current needs.

Mr. Bricker noted the School Division was currently looking at expansion.

Ms. Larson asked about joining both groups' fleets. She noted bus service as well as some vehicular service. Ms. Larson asked if two large properties were being considered with one piece for County and the other for the School Division.

Mr. Bricker noted a combination had not been addressed. He further noted the School Division expansion was more limited than the County's General Services. Mr. Bricker noted the School Division needed more bay space and administrative space.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the School Division had room on the existing property for expansion.

Mr. Bricker confirmed yes. He noted available land to the west of the facility. He further noted a building expansion and some site improvements for better bus circulation. Mr. Bricker noted this was a more limited expansion than General Services, which incorporated many different pieces being brought together.

Mr. Hipple noted Option 1 for General Services worked well. He further noted the infrastructure and costs.

Mr. Icenhour addressed Mr. Stevens noting the cost analysis and a priority list for the next 20 years with incremental projects planned. He noted compiling the list based on priority and cost.

Mr. Stevens noted evaluating the list by groups and then with the five-year CIP. He further noted this would be an ongoing discussion with the Board for any necessary adjustments.

Mr. Bricker noted the goal of the long-term vision. He further noted some adjustments could be needed, adding the teleworking aspect as a possible example. Mr. Bricker noted the need for space was evident as growth was occurring.

Ms. Sadler thanked Mr. Bricker for the thorough presentation.

2. Briefing on the Engage 2045 Comprehensive Plan Update Process

Mr. Hipple recognized Mr. Jack Haldeman, Planning Commission Chairman, was in attendance.

At approximately 2:04 p.m., Mr. Haldeman called the Planning Commission May 25, 2021, meeting to order.

Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, called the roll.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commissioners Present:

Barbara Null
Julia Leverenz
Frank Polster
Tim O'Connor
Rich Krapf
Jack Haldeman

Planning Commissioners Absent:

Rob Rose

Mr. Holt noted as the Planning Commission meeting this evening was a public meeting with a physical quorum present. He further noted Dr. Rose requested remote participation to the meeting. Mr. Holt noted per State Code and adopted Planning Commission policy, a majority vote of the Planning Commission members physically present was required for the remote participation. Mr. Holt sought a motion for the remote participation.

Ms. Leverenz made the motion for acceptance of remote participation.

Mr. Holt called Roll and the motion was passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Dr. Rose joined the meeting remotely.

Ms. Ellen Cook, Principal Planner, noted this meeting marked the seventh Comprehensive Plan update process to the Board. Ms. Cook noted Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic, Principal with EPR P.C., and Ms. Leigh Anne King, Clarion Associates, were in attendance. She further noted Ms. Ginny Wertman, a member of the Planning Commission Working Group (PCWG) and Chairman of the Community Participation Team (CPT) was in attendance. Ms. Cook noted updates to the Comprehensive Plan chapters were highlighted in the PowerPoint presentation. She further noted final revisions from the PCWG, which are included in the Board's packet. Ms. Cook continued the presentation highlighting the topics for discussion. She noted the first topic was Mooretown Road Extended. Ms. Cook further noted background and other details of Mooretown Road Extended in the PowerPoint presentation, adding staff requested Board direction on inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan/Land Use Map and language addressing various forms of funding. Ms. Cook noted Mr. Haldeman would provide the PCWG's summary.

Mr. Haldeman noted discussion on the Hill Pleasant Farm Economic Opportunity (EO) and the possible extension of Mooretown Road. He further noted there were six key points made by the group that did not want Mooretown Road removed from the map: 1) beneficial transportation corridor in the future as a parallel route to Route 60 to alleviate congestion; 2) removal will lessen the County's ability to push economic opportunities with private developers between Lightfoot and Croaker; 3) protective rights through specific descriptors of funding; 4) York County's work along the corridor and James City County's preparation in light of that work; 5) residents' comments to increase density within the Primary Service Area (PSA), while maintaining protection of rural land outside the PSA; and 6) some members indicated a preference for private funding, but noted public, private, or shared funding should also be considered. Mr. Haldeman noted the points for Mooretown Road Extension removal were: 1) adding additional lanes in the 1.25-mile corridor will encourage more sprawled development in the area; 2) degradation of the area's economic opportunity zone if used as a cut-through for traffic with congestion as a deterrent to business deliveries while providing enhanced marketability for businesses to York County, whereas a single dedicated entrance serving the economic opportunity businesses would be more attractive for James City County; 3) the solar farm on this site gives the County a 30-year respite from these threats. Mr. Haldeman noted the recommendation to remove the extension and reassess it in the 2075 Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the PCWG's vote of 4-2 with two absences and the recommendation to remove the extension.

Mr. Haldeman confirmed yes to both points.

Ms. Sadler asked about the Planning Commission.

Mr. Haldeman noted the PCWG recommended removal of the extension from the Land Use Map.

Ms. Sadler asked about comments from other PCWG members.

Mr. Holt noted with the conclusion of Mr. Haldeman's points, other members could be called upon for comment.

Ms. Sadler noted she would like to hear from Ms. Null and Mr. O'Connor as both are residents in the area. She further noted they may have heard additional citizen comments.

Mr. O'Connor noted he and Ms. Null cast dissenting votes with Mr. Krapf and Dr. Rose at that meeting. He further noted removing the Mooretown Road extension 'handcuffed' future opportunities, adding retaining it in the Comprehensive Plan served as a placeholder. Mr. O'Connor noted as a resident of the Toano area, traffic conditions were steadily degrading, adding railroad crossings in the area were also detrimental.

Ms. Sadler noted if the extension remained in the Comprehensive Plan and continued, development would need to come before the Board for approval.

Mr. Holt noted it would need to be a future legislative case to rezone the property with a master plan.

Ms. Sadler noted either way the Board would review the case if the extension remained in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Ms. Sadler noted the neighboring jurisdiction had numerous apartments in the area. She asked about plans for the apartment complex regarding residential and traffic concerns.

Mr. O'Connor noted he was unsure of plans. He further noted continued residential development along the Home Depot area of Mooretown Road toward Airport Road.

Mr. Holt noted he had not heard any plans. He further noted much of that property was owned by the Williamsburg Pottery, adding the York County part of the property would not come before the James City County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. McGlennon noted if the extension was removed, it would require an act, particularly if a developer came forward with private funding for the road, then legislative action could occur.

Mr. Holt noted traditionally the Board had not chosen to make changes to the Comprehensive Plan in an off-cycle year, but it could be done.

Mr. McGlennon noted the James City County portions of the area were predominately designated as residential development in the briefings.

Mr. Holt noted on the County side, as with the EO version, residential would be limited.

Mr. McGlennon asked about the Williamsburg Pottery on the James City County side and the suggested use of its land.

Mr. Holt noted residential would be inconsistent with the current 2035 Comprehensive Plan vision.

Mr. Icenhour asked if a developer wanted to come in and build and requested a rezoning, and the Board approved it, then the action would not have to wait until a Comprehensive Plan cycle to proceed.

Mr. Holt noted the Board historically did not entertain off-cycle changes to the Comprehensive Plan. He further noted the Board could make those changes.

Mr. Icenhour noted if the developer wanted to proceed, the Board could approve it regardless of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes the Board could approve it.

Mr. Icenhour noted with the removal of the Mooretown Road extension, if a developer wanted to proceed, there was nothing to prevent the Board from approving it.

Mr. Holt noted that would be an inconsistent piece of the Comprehensive Plan and would factor in staff recommendations, but ultimately it could be done.

Ms. Sadler noted the potential of a delay if the placeholder was not in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Holt noted the Comprehensive Plan assisted staff in communication with developers. He further noted when a developer presents the conceptual plan to staff, one of the initial questions addresses if the development master plan is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Holt noted the Comprehensive Plan's policies and procedures drives the developer's plans. He further noted funding and if the road was removed from the Comprehensive Plan, then no request for transportation funding would be pursued. Mr. Holt added that funding could be pursued if the Board deemed it.

Ms. Sadler asked for Ms. Null's comments.

Ms. Null addressed the Board, noting her concurrence with Mr. O'Connor's comments. She noted the traffic concerns with congestion and the railroad. Ms. Null further noted there was no need to remove Mooretown Road Extended from the Comprehensive Plan at this time, adding removal could serve as a deterrent to potential businesses. She noted the access to Interstate 64 (I-64) would be advantageous for businesses and commercial traffic, adding the tax revenue from businesses was important. Ms. Null noted schools and homes were not being built, but business was being built by retaining the extension in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Sadler thanked Ms. Null.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Frank Polster, Planning Commissioner, to come forward. He noted the road was conceptual, and did not actually exist, adding the County had no plans of building the road with its funding. Mr. Icenhour further noted if someone wanted to develop the property, the County would require that party to put a road in and identify the plan to make that happen. He noted a traffic study.

Mr. Polster noted a traffic study was done. He further noted the traffic study confirmed that the intersections at Route 60 and Croaker Road, Lightfoot Road and Richmond Road, and Mooretown Road and Lightfoot Road were red with a Level of Service (LOS) of EF, adding the Board's LOS standard is C. He further noted that was the study result if the road was not built. Mr. Polster noted if the road was built, there was no change to the LOSs with all remaining red.

Mr. Icenhour noted if a development was allowed, with a road to service it, then traffic generated by the development would still have congestion issues and basically maintain the current traffic level.

Mr. Polster noted it was not just the Mooretown Road development, but building occurring in the Fenton Mill and Old Mooretown Road areas that were problems. He further noted the LOS would remain the same regardless of the road extension.

Mr. Hipple noted discussion on development and industrial sites as two different points. He further noted industrial sites would not generate the same level of traffic as a development. Mr. Hipple noted the developments were already being built or in planning stages, which would impact the traffic. He further noted with the road and the commercial growth, the tax revenue would increase.

Mr. Polster noted the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) traffic study and its projections for those particular intersections.

Mr. Icenhour noted when the EO zone was developed, it was not only commercial, but was designed to be industrial, commercial, and include a workforce housing component. He further noted these areas are designed to have a mix, but historically the mix is usually more residential. Mr. Icenhour noted when VDOT conducted the traffic study, the projection showed some residential component was incorporated and it was not an industrial complex, adding the EO zone was more like a Mixed Use. He further noted the Comprehensive Plan was a visionary document for what the community would look like 20-25 years in the future. Mr. Icenhour noted the concentration on preserving the rural aspect outside the PSA, while focusing on more intense development within the PSA. He further noted the County had an EO zone outside the PSA, which made no sense. Mr. Icenhour noted a definitive decision needed to be made. He further noted most of the rural area over the next 20 years would be occupied by a solar farm. Mr. Icenhour noted he was glad some EO zones were inside the

PSA. He further noted two contradictory points in the Comprehensive Plan which addressed intense commercial/industrial development in an area that are rural lands outside of the PSA per the Plan.

Ms. Sadler noted if the placeholder remained, and was outside of the PSA, would that still be part of the process for Board approval. She asked Mr. Holt about the process.

Mr. Holt noted this land was designated EO on the Future Land Use Map as Mr. Icenhour had mentioned. He further noted a small part was located within the PSA, but the majority was outside the PSA, including the area for the solar farm construction. Mr. Holt noted if a proposal came in to rezone the land outside of the PSA to an EO Zoning District, there was a requirement that the land be located inside the PSA and that the development be served by public water and sewer. He further noted a concurrent request to the Board would need to be made to include the land inside the PSA when the rezoning was considered.

Ms. Sadler asked how much residential was involved on the James City County side.

Mr. Holt noted no more than 15% residential was allowed in the EO zone.

Mr. McGlennon noted 15% of developable land area.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes. He noted he was unsure how that percentage translated in terms of dwelling units in response to Ms. Sadler.

Mr. McGlennon noted the EO zone examples shown during a Board meeting were Tyson's Corner in Northern Virginia and Short Pump in western Henrico County as representative visions. He further noted EO zone language which addressed the possibility of bus rapid transit and light rail service within a quarter mile of the residential units in the EO zone. Mr. McGlennon noted the vision showed dense high-rise residential.

Mr. O'Connor referenced Mr. Icenhour's comments. He noted discussion at the time the EO zone was created and the pace of the County's growth rate. He further noted the area was identified as an Urban Development Area (UDA) and was not recommended to be included in the PSA at that time.

Mr. Haldeman noted the residential development versus commercial business value aspect. He further noted no removal of the commercial aspect of the EO zone, adding the components of the EO zone would need an access road. Mr. Haldeman noted the location of the road, whether all the way from Croaker Road to Lightfoot Road or just come in from Croaker Road and service the businesses up to the James City County/York County line. Mr. Haldeman noted he had been in support of removing Mooretown Road from the map, adding the degradation of commercial value with the road as a major cut-through for commuting and residential traffic. He further noted a dedicated road that serviced the businesses in the EO zone and emptied onto Croaker Road within a quarter mile of I-64 was a valuable selling point in his opinion for the commercial aspect. Mr. Haldeman noted the time spent discussing the concept of induced demand or "build it and they will come". He further noted two of the larger residential developments in York County along Lightfoot Road came after the proposal to put in the cut-through road. Mr. Haldeman noted the national trend of widening or lengthening highways resulted in residential frontiers being pushing back. He further noted the Washington, D.C. area with 16-lane roads leading in and out of that area, and it still was not enough roadway. Mr. Haldeman noted areas in the County where traffic congestion were problems, adding never enough was the rationale behind the four Commissioners who asked for the extension removal.

Ms. Sadler noted the road was not enough now and having the option of the placeholder was

valid. She further noted addressing the situation, adding if it is a problem now, it will continue to be a future one as well.

Mr. Haldeman noted the problem was caused by poor land use planning, not transportation.

Mr. Hipple noted the possibility of a cul-de-sac off Croaker Road as the area grows. He further noted his change of thoughts since his involvement on the various Transportation Boards and understanding VDOT's plans on traffic alleviation. Mr. Hipple noted Route 199 with traffic lights impacting the traffic flow, adding the lights creating a bypass with segregated parts that curtailed movement. He further noted the need for a road or possibly a partial road, adding a developer will only develop as far as they needed for the cost of roads. Mr. Hipple noted the possibility of patches of road and the Planning Division's involvement with the connector to avoid patches.

Mr. Haldeman noted the development of this EO zone would be done under a master plan for the entire area.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. Haldeman noted that point would eliminate the patch work.

Mr. Hipple noted if the extension was removed from the Comprehensive Plan and a developer wanted to come in and develop a particular piece of land, then another developer could come in and do the same, which would create tie-ins to different pieces of development. Mr. Hipple noted more detailed planning was a better alternative than individual requests to the Board for development and it was already in place. He further noted with the removal of the extension, VDOT's SmartScale funding was no longer available.

Mr. Holt noted a majority of SmartScale's scoring was related to congestion relief.

Mr. Hipple noted if Mooretown Road Extension was removed then there would be no SmartScale scoring.

Mr. Holt noted the road would need to connect all the way through to be in accordance with the traffic analysis for congestion relief. He further noted that aspect would be required also. Mr. Holt noted a consistent thread among the traffic corridor study included tying in the road at both ends based on the stated need for the road at that time. He further noted if the road did not go through or provide congestion relief, then the road would not rank well in the SmartScale process.

Mr. Icenhour noted there was no discussion of state or federal money to build the road. He further noted this road was to be built by a developer and that no James City County tax money would go into the project.

Mr. Holt noted the current language reflected an expectation of private and/or public-private funding.

Mr. Hipple noted Skiffes Creek was an example of funding to alleviate congestion.

Mr. Icenhour noted the County was building that connector, not a developer.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Mr. McGlennon noted Mooretown Road had never been prioritized. He further noted this road had never been on the list for state or federal funding to construct transportation.

Mr. Holt noted there had been other priority roads such as Skiffes Creek connector, Longhill Road widening Phase I, Croaker Road widening, and several others.

Ms. Larson asked about other interest in the property.

Mr. Holt noted none from the Croaker Road side. He further noted mention of possible activity in York County at the Pottery property.

Mr. Icenhour noted a meeting regarding the Pottery's project which was similar to a Disney-type facility with hotels and an amusement park.

Ms. Sadler asked if the Board would have to approve it.

Mr. Icenhour noted most of it would have been in York County.

Ms. Larson noted Mr. Haldeman had addressed the traffic strain coming to the Lightfoot area when affordable housing was being reviewed in the Norge area.

Ms. Larson asked how much SmartScale would provide to assist with the congestion issues. She noted no one was coming forward to build the road.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes. He noted SmartScale funding was an every other year cycle so it would be available next summer (2022). He further noted if the Board wanted staff to pursue Mooretown Road for consideration, part of the SmartScale process involved a resolution from the Board, an application, and likely six to 10 years before acceptance into the program.

Ms. Larson asked if a private developer had come forward to build the road.

Mr. Holt noted not on the James City County side.

Ms. Sadler asked if any residential came forward, would that be a separate item for the Board to review.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple noted the placeholder allowed for options. He further noted the placeholder gave the Board the ability to move forward if needed.

Mr. Icenhour noted two traffic problem areas in which both were level CSX train track crossings. He further noted neither James City County, York County, or other groups were going to be able to do a short-term fix regardless of residential development. Mr. Icenhour noted the track issue was a separate problem and a function of the railroad. He further noted people's driving habits and using alternate routes to avoid going over the railroad tracks.

Ms. Sadler noted she was in favor of maintaining the placeholder.

Ms. Larson noted she was unsure as she recognized the merits of both sides. She further noted she wanted more time to research the subject, but questioned if an answer was needed today.

Mr. McGlennon noted the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan and no projects sitting before the Board currently. He further noted when a project did come forward, it would likely be two-three years into the Comprehensive Plan, which would coincide with the time to prepare for the next Comprehensive Plan. Mr. McGlennon noted that would be a reasonable time to

consider revision to the Plan.

Mr. Holt noted several large policy implications requiring Board guidance. He further noted the need for a consensus to guide the Planning Commission and staff for the draft Comprehensive Plan and draft proposed Future Land Use Map for the public hearing process. Mr. Holt noted the current timeline for presentation of those drafts to the Planning Commission was prior to the end of June, followed by a public hearing at the Board's July 13, 2021, meeting. He further noted consensus on the Board's direction would be helpful if known at the current meeting, adding today was not when the Board would vote on the Plan. Mr. Holt noted this draft Comprehensive Plan would still come before the Board for a vote, adding more discussion could take place in July.

Mr. Hipple noted providing guidance to staff in preparing the draft Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Hipple made a motion to retain the Mooretown Road Extension in the draft Comprehensive Plan. The motion failed with two Ayes (Hipple and Sadler) and three Nays (Icenhour, Larson, and McGlennon).

Mr. Holt noted a second motion would be helpful for clarification at the public hearing.

Mr. Icenhour made a motion to remove the Mooretown Road Extension in the draft Comprehensive Plan. The motion passed with three Ayes (Icenhour, Larson, and McGlennon) and two Nays (Hipple and Sadler).

Ms. Larson asked for clarification on the motion regarding the public hearing.

Mr. Holt noted the consensus from the motion on the table would be for staff's removal for the public hearing draft. He further noted it could still be added back in before the Board's final vote on the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Holt noted if the Extension was not included in the Plan, based on Board consensus, then funding would not need to be addressed.

Mr. McGlennon confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple concurred.

Mr. Holt noted Mr. Icenhour's earlier comment on the EO designation and if it should remain in place if the road was not there.

Mr. Icenhour noted to address that point later. Mr. Holt noted the EO designation was tied to the road. Mr. Icenhour noted more discussion on the EO could follow later.

Mr. Holt agreed and moved to the next topic.

Ms. Sadler asked for a short recess.

At approximately 3:01 p.m., the Board recessed for a break.

At approximately 3:09 p.m., the Board reconvened.

Mr. Gavrilovic addressed the Board on the new Rural Lands Policy recommendations and a brief history. He noted the 2035 Comprehensive Plan recommended very low density development. Mr. Gavrilovic further noted public input expressed a recurring theme of protecting rural lands from conversion to residential subdivisions. He noted revisions were made to the language of the Land Use Chapter text, Goals, Strategies, and Actions (GSAs), and the Rural Lands Designation Description based on that input. Mr. Gavrilovic further noted in the PowerPoint presentation that density in Rural Lands be reduced to one unit per 20 acres

either through large lot or cluster development. He noted this was a policy consideration and not a proposed Ordinance change. Mr. Gavrilovic further noted possible changes to the Ordinance could reflect this point by addressing utility regulations and other factors. He noted Mr. Krapf would address the PCWG's guidance on this section.

Mr. Krapf addressed the Board noting the discussion on rural lands with the public as well as the PCWG and CPT. He noted the PCWG's consensus to preserve the rural lands for agricultural and forestal use, while recognizing the rights of rural landowners. Mr. Krapf noted developing initiatives which provided monetary return to landowners without rural residential development. He further noted those initiatives could be in the form of rural economic development and other factors. Mr. Krapf noted review was done on peer localities to see how they deal with rural land development and densities. He further noted the research paper from the consultant team, adding state-wide initiatives were documented regarding rural character preservation analysis. Mr. Krapf noted one finding showed rural land zoning density of one to 10 acres was ineffective in the long run in the preservation of rural character. He further noted the densities of 20 to 50 acres were required for preservation. Mr. Krapf noted the PCWG reviewed utilities and independent water requirements for rural developments. He further noted the consultant team's paper indicated when a central independent water system was eliminated in rural lands, then a greater demand for development occurs with financial viability to the developer to have larger lots. Mr. Krapf noted if the County chose to eliminate the independent water supply requirement, certain offsetting requirements would need to be in place. He further noted options included one house per 20 acres or conservation easements on open land to prevent further development. Mr. Krapf noted the PCWG's premise of minimized development in rural lands with growth within the PSA. He further noted the long-term evaluation of the A-1 Zoning District with any Ordinance changes and consideration of those changes as the A-1 Zoning District encompassed all the rural lands. Mr. Krapf noted based on discussions, the PCWG gave staff feedback to proceed with the Land Use draft as prepared and move forward.

Ms. Larson asked if the PCWG's decision was unanimous.

Mr. Krapf noted a unanimous decision.

Ms. Larson noted the uniqueness of James City County in reviewing peer areas. She further noted very populated areas and businesses as well as the rural areas within the County. Ms. Larson noted Mr. Holt nodded other localities had been reviewed.

Mr. Krapf noted the consultants' paper included the counties of Isle of Wight, Fauquier, Fairfax, Hanover, and Albemarle. He further noted Albemarle County was 95% rural lands, but continued to build 300 homes annually since the 1980s. Mr. Krapf noted Albemarle County's system of development credits, which was five credits per parcel, ensured limited development and open land.

Mr. Icenhour noted the 20-acre parcel provision for the future while smaller parcels currently in the County would remain unchanged.

Mr. Krapf noted yes.

Mr. Icenhour noted a provision to allow for family subdivisions.

Mr. Krapf confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour noted the family subdivisions were happening in the rural lands.

Mr. Hipple asked about the current number and the projected number if the change was made

to 20 acres.

Mr. Holt noted the potential number of lots with the current minimum three acres in A-1 zoned land as approximately 6,521. He further noted an approximately 336 additional lots in the R-8 zoned land outside the PSA. Mr. Holt noted with the 20-acre lot minimum, A-1 would have 662 with approximately 40 in R-8.

Mr. Hipple noted a significant reduction. He further noted removal of the central water system.

Mr. Holt noted that would be a consideration point. He further noted costs and impacts to the James City Service Authority (JCSA).

Mr. Hipple noted cluster development with a central water system, rather than individual well and septic. He further noted the central system is a cost to the citizens.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple noted maintenance on all the individual systems as opposed to a central system. He further noted this proposed change would be one home per 20 acres and elimination of the central water system. Mr. Hipple noted there could be some clustering for land preservation.

Mr. Krapf noted the clustering would be consistent with the one to 20 density.

Mr. Hipple noted yes.

Mr. McGlennon noted understanding the economics in relation to the property owner. He further noted the value of the land.

Mr. Krapf noted that point was a major concern. He further noted more discussion on what tools were available for property owner compensation. Mr. Krapf noted properties that were grandfathered and criteria around that point. He further noted additional discussion was needed if the Board chose to go the one per 20-acre route.

Mr. Holt noted the one to 20 was most directly attributable to residential development outside the PSA and residential development in rural lands. He further noted reference to non-residential uses within rural lands.

Mr. McGlennon noted property owners addressing what they could do on three acres versus 20 acres. Mr. Holt noted A-1 Zoning Ordinance changes and if those changes address new non-residential uses.

Mr. Icenhour noted the previous work of the Rural Lands Working Group and the factor of larger land parcels. He further noted discussion about a threshold, grandfathering, and lot size, while protecting landowners.

Ms. Larson asked if anyone had heard from any landowners who would be impacted.

Mr. Krapf noted no, adding he had spoken with individual landowners in his area who were supportive. He further noted they were in favor of no residential development in rural lands. Mr. Krapf noted he had not heard from owners of large tracts of property. He further noted landowners and investment in their futures with the PCWG's focus on providing some tools for compensation.

Ms. Sadler asked if compensation referenced the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program. Mr. Krapf noted yes to the PDR program. He further noted other innovated

development ideas may be available, such as viticulture, adding several wineries were within 20 miles of James City County.

Ms. Larson asked the dollar amount for the compensation, adding that amount may be unknown.

Mr. Holt noted the amount was unknown as no direction on the Ordinance had been determined to date. He further noted that staff would need to return with alternatives.

Ms. Sadler noted the reference to reexamining utility regulations and asked what other utilities in addition to water.

Mr. Holt and Mr. Krapf noted that referenced the central water system.

Mr. McGlennon asked if 50 units were required for the central water system.

Mr. Holt noted no, adding it was six units or more.

Mr. Icenhour noted if the change was one to 20, reconsideration of that policy would need to be addressed.

Mr. Krapf noted it was not an easy decision.

Mr. Icenhour noted the costs to developers as well as JCSA rate payers to support the system. He further noted most rural lands had private well and septic and that appealed to the rural landowners.

Mr. Krapf noted deficits with the central water system.

Mr. Holt noted a vote was not necessary with the general consensus of the Board.

Mr. Hipple agreed.

Mr. Holt noted rural lands and its policies were involved in almost every chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. He further noted the need to know if the Board wanted to pursue other directions.

Mr. Icenhour noted there was still more work to be done. He made the motion to move forward with the concept.

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Cook noted the next presentation was on Economic Development Designation and Mr. Gavrilovic would discuss this one.

Mr. Gavrilovic noted three areas in the County were designated EO. He further noted the consultant team was asked to review and assess this designation in the new Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Gavrilovic noted the recommendation to retain the EO designation due to strategic importance as areas of significant economic impact to these key locations. He further noted the analysis recommendation for the County to conduct an initiative for master planning of the EO for more predictability for landowners and public. Mr. Gavrilovic noted a portion of the Mooretown Road area outside of the PSA and the analysis recommendation was refinement of the PSA boundary during master plan development for the particular area. He further noted Mr. O'Connor would address the PCWG's perspective.

Mr. O'Connor noted EO and Mixed Use designations were major points of discussion. He further noted the PCWG's consideration of the EO land use concepts included elimination of the Mooretown Road/Hill Pleasant Farm area. Mr. O'Connor noted the PCWG voted 5-2 with one abstention to not move forward or change the existing EO designation. He further noted some members felt a portion of the parcel outside the PSA should not be designated EO, but instead become part of the Croaker Mixed Use designation. Mr. O'Connor noted some members felt the EO designation allowed for commercial growth while limiting residential development, adding the proximity to railroad could support a potential transportation hub to support commercial development. He further noted PCWG discussed eliminating the Toano/Anderson's Corner EO and Anderson's Corner Mixed Use designations, adding PCWG voted 5-3 to not move forward on any changes to existing EO and Mixed Use designations. Mr. O'Connor noted little consensus with conflicting views of maintaining open rural farmland versus an urban environment at this important intersection in this part of the County. He further noted some members felt proximity and description of adjacent Mixed Use parcels was sufficient, while other members felt the EO designation offered more rural economic development strategies than the Mixed Use designation. Mr. O'Connor noted PCWG was not interested in altering the designation fundamentally in terms of consolidation with another designation. He further noted the PCWG's thoughts on the Toano/Anderson's Corner EO area included the need for coordinated planning of EO and Mixed Use areas, adding many of them are adjacent and create transitional uses from industrial areas to Anderson's Corner. Mr. O'Connor noted significant discussion on EO and its appropriateness as a land use designation with the PCWG noting EO still remained a useful designation.

Ms. Sadler asked for clarification on Anderson's Corner.

Mr. O'Connor noted Anderson's Corner had some Mixed Use and some EO designation. He further noted the recommendation was those designations stay in place there.

Mr. McGlennon noted he wanted to see examples of the EO zone success, adding he was unconvinced it was a useful zoning category. He further noted changing Mixed Use with some residential use limitations in that zone.

Mr. O'Connor noted the benefit point had been a major part of discussion. He further noted the master plan and the vision of the community. Mr. O'Connor noted the vision of economic opportunity in James City County and York County in the area were very different.

Mr. McGlennon noted the RT zone and if any parcels were in it. He further noted if the EO was such a strong attractant, why had no one shown interest.

Mr. Icenhour noted he had no opposition to the EO designation. He further noted it should have focused on places within the PSA from the beginning. Mr. Icenhour noted two areas within the PSA currently. He further noted retaining the designation in the Comprehensive Plan, adding future changes would come before the Board.

Mr. Holt noted no changes to the EO designation.

Mr. Icenhour confirmed yes.

Mr. Hipple noted the Board's consensus.

Ms. Cook noted the Land Use application, LU-20-0020, would be the next point of discussion. She further noted the application was for the parcels adjacent to Colonial Heritage on Richmond Road. Ms. Cook noted the application would change the redesignation of two parcels from Community Commercial to Mixed Use-Lightfoot area. She further noted the specifics of the application as it pertained to land use. Ms. Cook noted staff sought Board

guidance on redesignation of the parcels. She further noted Ms. Wertman would address the PCWG's discussion on the application.

Ms. Wertman addressed the Board noting the Mixed Use designation allowed for moderate density residential. She further noted that implication was the focal point when the PCWG reviewed the application. Ms. Wertman noted each of the Mixed Use land designation change applications involved traffic discussion and putting all of the population growth within the PSA. She further noted the discussion of managing that growth and where to put it. Ms. Wertman noted the primary concerns of traffic and noise, particularly with current traffic conditions along Richmond Road and in the Lightfoot area. She further noted consideration of this concern in reference to the 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Wertman noted noise concerns from the go-kart facility if residential was put in place. She further noted three positive points if the parcels were designated Mixed Use, adding the change could possibly limit further strip shopping center development; Mixed Use designation would support the complete community concept with improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists; and the moderate density residential aspect could be used for the inclusion of workforce housing. Ms. Wertman noted a 6-2 vote in favor of the Mixed Use designation change with the condition to lower the allowed density and intensity of development in the Mixed Use category generally and in particular, the Lightfoot area. She further noted the specifics of the designation, classified Mixed Use Level One, which allowed for a maximum eight dwelling units per acre with a maximum three-story building height. Ms. Wertman noted these conditions addressed a balance of key items, with staff instructed to develop language which encouraged workforce housing.

Ms. Sadler asked Mr. Holt how workforce housing was part of this designation.

Mr. Holt noted many of the recommendations generated from the Workforce Housing Task Force's work several years earlier and their inclusion into the Comprehensive Plan. He further noted an expectation of building affordable workforce housing as a component of new residential development under the former Housing Opportunities Policy (HOP). Mr. Holt noted the Candle Station development was an example. He further noted while the HOP program no longer existed, the hope and expectation for developments to address the need for affordable and workforce price points.

Ms. Sadler noted Candle Station development as a model if the development came.

Mr. Holt noted yes, if it came.

Mr. Icenhour noted one of the parcels was a thriving car dealership. He further noted the second parcel was a prime candidate for redevelopment. Mr. Icenhour noted his concern about the Neighborhood-Commercial designation and the possible same zoning.

Ms. Cook noted it was designated Community Commercial with zoning partially B-1 and partially A-1.

Mr. Icenhour noted his concern about addressing the impact with Mixed Use. He further noted that point had been addressed with the conditions Ms. Wertman had referenced. Mr. Icenhour noted the notion of Mixed Use would offer variety, but too often it was residential with some small medical office or storage facility. He further noted a need for true Mixed Use.

Ms. Sadler noted her agreement and her concern along that corridor with more people. She further noted more guidance would be helpful.

Mr. Holt noted future action on either the A-1 or B-1 part would require future legislative action. He further noted the redevelopment term and determining the best areas for that redevelopment. Mr. Holt also noted reviewing future areas for the redevelopment and the

collective efforts from the different groups.

Mr. Icenhour asked if there were different standards for Mixed Use-Lightfoot. He questioned how that point translated to the Ordinances.

Mr. Holt noted that was a good question. He further noted the Mixed Use-New Town was different than the Mixed Use-Lightfoot. Mr. Holt noted each Mixed Use had its own text description within the Comprehensive Plan and was implemented through the legislative process. He further noted the Mixed Use Ordinance did not have specific Zoning Ordinance criteria depending on the different districts. Mr. Holt noted more work was needed to determine if certain language needed to transfer into the Ordinance, but those would be later discussion with the Board and the Planning Commission.

Mr. McGlennon noted the objective of providing additional opportunities for workforce housing. He question what was meant by workforce housing as it covered a wide range of possibilities. Mr. McGlennon noted the sale of properties like Candle Station and the affordability for people. He further noted some mechanisms in place for income restriction and other factors.

Mr. Holt noted recommendations from the Workforce Housing Task Force and the PCWG has recommended those be translated into Goals, Strategies, and Actions (GSAs). He further noted as the Comprehensive Plan moved into implementation, those items would be reviewed by staff. Mr. Holt addressed the GSAs and the Average Median Income.

Mr. McGlennon noted the volume of GSAs. He asked if some of the GSAs could be consolidated with an ancillary checklist for some of the broader items. He noted the detailed list focused on mobile home parks as an example. Mr. McGlennon further noted reviewing the list and determining what could be done during the five years of the plan.

Mr. Holt noted there was no one recommendation to address affordable housing, thus the development of a “toolbox” and the detailed GSA list. He further noted the assumption that not all GSAs could be addressed in five years, but the Strategic Plan process helped staff prioritize the recommendations in conjunction with the annual budget process.

Ms. Larson noted the importance of workforce housing. She further noted unavailable transportation and employment locations as factors for consideration.

Ms. Sadler asked how those points would be addressed.

Mr. Holt noted the PCWG’s recommendation attempted to resolve those points specific to the Richmond Road location. He further noted this location was on the Williamsburg Area Transit Authority (WATA) bus line as well as employment opportunities within walking distance.

Ms. Larson noted those points, adding these were retail areas. She further noted the increase in minimum wage, but that was difficult to support a family on that wage. Ms. Larson noted the need to have more discussion and consider many points. She further noted how workforce housing and economic development are linked together.

Mr. Holt asked if the Board consensus was to retain the Community Commercial zoning or change the property to Mixed Use per the PCWG recommendation.

Ms. Sadler asked if the discussed items would need to be incorporated.

Mr. Holt noted Board consensus was needed, adding the recommendations of both residential and non-residential components for the complete community concept would be included.

Mr. McGlennon noted the traffic issues on Richmond Road. He further noted discussion on workforce housing, particularly affordable housing for service workers, and the proximity of the housing to established single-family home neighborhoods as a flashpoint. Mr. McGlennon noted an initially integrated economic neighborhood helped ease some of the conflict. He further noted housing was one piece of the whole issue and there was continual pressure to provide workers in retail, food services, and other areas with affordable housing. Mr. McGlennon noted the need to have a more age-balanced community when considering economic development. He further noted the Mixed Use designation for this application made sense.

Ms. Sadler noted to Mr. Icenhour's point how is residential controlled when it seems to overtake and dominate the use.

Mr. Holt noted legislative process would address that point through the master plan for Board approval.

Mr. Icenhour noted the Mixed Use designation was good, but the Ordinances needed to allow for more control so the balance would be there. He further noted the Mixed Use needed to be more than just condominiums.

Ms. Sadler noted she did not want a New Town on Richmond Road.

Mr. Icenhour made a motion to accept the change to Mixed Use for the Land Use application with the considerations discussed. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Larson requested to be excused to address a County-level matter for a Board of which she was a member.

At approximately 4:07 p.m., Ms. Larson excused herself to address the matter.

Mr. Hipple noted yes to the request. He further noted the meeting would continue to which Ms. Larson agreed.

Ms. Cook noted the next topic was a potential change to the Future Land Use Map in the vicinity of the Croaker/I-64 interchange. She further noted interest in removing parcels on the east side of the interchange from the PSA. Ms. Cook noted this area was not currently serviced by public water or sewer with utilities likely needed to be extended under I-64 for this area to be served. She further noted an initial assessment indicated 15 parcels could be impacted by this potential redesignation. Ms. Cook noted staff had prepared information relating to a portion of this area for the application LU-20-0016. She further noted this application applied to two parcels on the eastern side, owned by the Historic Virginia Land Conservancy. Ms. Cook noted the PCWG recommended redesignation to Community Character Open Space or Recreation. She further noted the parcel designations in a PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Cook noted staff sought Board guidance on the specific parcels, adding the PCWG had not voted on the larger parcel and no formal summary was available.

Ms. Sadler asked how many acres were included.

Ms. Cook noted it was slightly over 500 acres.

Mr. Icenhour noted the land to the right of the interchange and the two parcels owned by the Historic Virginia Land Conservancy would all move outside the PSA.

Ms. Cook and Mr. Holt confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour asked if Mixed Use was the current proposed land use. He noted a change to Open Space or A-1 would possibly be needed.

Mr. Holt noted land typically outside the PSA would be Rural Lands.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the redesignation on the two parcels.

Ms. Cook noted the PCWG voted the two parcels be changed to Community Character Open Space or Recreation. She further noted there were other parcels outside the PSA designated that as well.

Mr. Icenhour asked where the PSA line would be drawn.

Mr. Holt noted the understanding of the request was the PSA line would move to the center line of I-64.

Mr. Hipple noted the difficulty of getting across the interstate and the PSA.

Ms. Sadler asked if that was infrastructure.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour asked if the residential to the north were on well and septic systems.

Mr. Holt noted there may be some independent systems, referencing the map and the red PSA line.

Mr. Icenhour asked outside the PSA.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes. He noted farther out was Riverview Plantation, which was on an independent system. Mr. Holt further noted everything outside of the red line was rural.

Mr. Hipple noted it did not make sense to have property that was not available to access. He further noted future options for the PSA in other areas with changes made at this location.

Mr. Icenhour noted the bulk of space, in addition to the two parcels, was the Kiskiack golf course. He further noted the long stretch of predominantly farmland.

Mr. Holt noted that property was the site of a previously approved Special Use Permit for construction debris disposal and the storage area for the Presidential heads from Presidents Park. He further noted the orange parcel of the map was the 7-Eleven store with the remaining parcels commercial or vacant.

Ms. Sadler agreed the infrastructure would likely be an issue, so she could agree with it.

Mr. McGlennon asked about any Economic Development Authority discussion.

Mr. Holt noted obtaining a consensus from the Board. He further noted outside of the Land Conservancy owned land, this designation would be new and staff would prepare notice for property owners of the request and public hearing for the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Hipple asked the number of parcels.

Ms. Cook noted staff was still reviewing, but it was 15 or 16 parcels.

Mr. Holt noted that number included the parcels in orange on the other side of Croaker Road. He further noted several small parcels were in that area.

At approximately 4:15 p.m., Ms. Larson rejoined the meeting.

Mr. McGlennon asked if some of those parcels were residential units.

Mr. Hipple confirmed yes.

Ms. Sadler noted she was in support of taking the line to I-64, adding it seemed like the logical move.

Mr. Icenhour noted drilling under the interstate for utilities.

Mr. Holt noted he was unsure of the Virginia Department of Transportation's (VDOT) process to accommodate the utilities. He further noted VDOT would not allow open trenching, adding the numerous federal highway regulations that would need to be met.

Mr. Hipple asked about the acreage. Ms. Cook noted approximately 500 acres total.

Mr. Icenhour asked about the property's history, specifically when it was designated Mixed Use and why. He noted the Mixed Use rationale was focused around the I-64 interchange. Mr. Icenhour further noted there was no infrastructure to develop the property nor minimal interest in it.

Mr. Holt noted the property had been in the master plan for a long time with plans for a winery, development, and other factors. He further noted timeshare units around the golf course also, particularly at a time when timeshares were very popular.

Mr. Hipple noted taking these 500 acres and moving to another area to expand for PSA use. He further noted this could be discussion for a later time, adding it could be a swap for another area closer to the County's infrastructure.

Mr. Holt noted if a request to move the PSA to the center line of I-64 with lands to the side would be designated Rural Lands on the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map. He further noted the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning process were two separate entities. Mr. Holt noted this land already a non-agricultural zoning which would remain.

Mr. Icenhour noted Mr. Hipple's comment on a property swap regarding the PSA. He further noted he was unsure if he wanted to tie both together at this time. Mr. Icenhour noted the parcel was inside the PSA, but not likely to be developed. He further noted the swap could potentially boost development elsewhere. Mr. Icenhour noted the PCWG had worked diligently to reduce the densities and development outside of the PSA and move them inside of it. He further noted the balance, but added public input impact and what citizens wanted. Mr. Icenhour noted control of the housing aspect and the Comprehensive Plan as the tool to control development. He further noted his support of drawing the line down I-64 and removing the designation.

Mr. Hipple noted this could be a future discussion. He further noted development was not likely there.

Ms. Sadler noted moving the PSA line to the interstate.

Ms. Larson noted she would abstain as she was not in attendance during the majority of the discussion.

Mr. McGlennon noted removal as it did not seem likely for development.

Mr. Hipple noted consensus to move the PSA line down the interstate.

Mr. Holt noted the motion would indicate the PSA line would move to the center line of the interstate with everything on the other side designated Rural Lands, but for the two parcels that the PCWG recommended be changed to Open Space or Recreation component which reflected the easement status.

Mr. McGlennon asked if a rural economic development opportunity with no need for public water came along, would that still be acceptable in those parcels.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes because of the underlying zoning.

Mr. Icenhour asked if a formal motion was needed.

Mr. Holt noted four nodding heads with one abstention.

Ms. Cook noted the next topic was the Comprehensive Plan name. She further noted the update process had used the name Engage 2045. Ms. Cook noted at the PCWG's May 12, 2021 meeting, the PCWG recommended Our County, Our Shared Future James City County 2045 Comprehensive Plan as the name. She asked the Board if it wished to proceed with this name for the Plan.

The Board gave unanimous consensus.

Mr. Holt noted the next steps and the challenge of the legal ad for the Comprehensive Plan. He further noted using the formal name of the Plan in the public hearing ad was important and having Board consensus was helpful.

Ms. Julia Leverenz, Planning Commissioner, noted the original name suggestion had been Our County, Our Future. She further noted other Board members wanted to emphasize the volume of citizen participation so "Shared" had been added to the Plan name.

Mr. Holt noted discussion would take place on any items the Board wished to address.

Ms. Sadler noted she had several items. She commended all participants who had worked on the draft Comprehensive Plan, adding everyone was good stewards of the environment through stormwater, trash, or other areas. Ms. Sadler further noted the variety of ways everyone has worked together to protect the land. She noted four items she felt were currently overarching and overreaching with regard to the state and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Ms. Sadler noted these items were in an email and addressed Public Facilities (PF) 4.7, Environmental 1.17, Environmental 3.8.1, and Environmental 4.6. She further noted using state legislation to address those particular items, adding the unknown time and cost for the County, citizens, and businesses to address them. Ms. Sadler noted removal of those four items and await state guidance on how to proceed and achieve the goals listed, adding a similar process to the criteria adjustment made when the state addressed sea level rise and established guidance. Ms. Sadler further noted directing staff to revise the language concurrent with the Board's legislative agenda.

Ms. Larson asked if the change would be in the Comprehensive Plan or the legislative agenda.

Ms. Sadler noted the legislative agenda.

Mr. McGlennon noted these items related to Ordinance adjustments due to changes in the County. He further noted extensive rainfall, more storms, more applications for renewable energy sources, and other factors and the need to revise County Ordinances that address the new technology and climate related issues. Mr. McGlennon noted environmental concerns and the path for fossil fuel utilization and energy consumption reduction. He further noted in reviewing the future of County facilities, consideration and incorporation of energy efficiency, improved air quality, and other factors. Mr. McGlennon noted a better understanding of technology such as solar farms so that County Ordinances protect the County, its residents, and businesses when such projects are approved by the Board. He further noted the items that addressed stormwater issues that had come before the Board in the past decade, adding citizen awareness of pollution generated from excessive stormwater and an increase in it. Mr. McGlennon noted the Comprehensive Plan should reflect Ordinances and how they appropriately address these issues.

Ms. Sadler noted obtaining measurable costs on these items. She further noted rural lands with corridors of windmills and solar panels throughout the state, adding she did not want to see that in the County's rural lands.

Mr. McGlennon noted reviewing the Ordinances could help ensure protection of the land.

Ms. Sadler noted the state could determine the guidance, which staff could address and incorporate into the Ordinances.

Mr. McGlennon noted staff recognized the increased pressure for the County to move toward 100% carbon neutral. He further noted review of Ordinances to see if the County was moving in the right direction.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour noted the Comprehensive Plan was a vision for the County. He further noted the items reflected review, exploration, and such, but not a definitive action, adding most of them were levied from the state or federal level. Mr. Icenhour noted legislation will direct the steps to become carbon free, with the County reviewing and adapting for the best way to get there. He further noted studying these items so research would be done when climate change and other factors needed to be addressed. Mr. Icenhour noted he would not remove the items from the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hipple noted he agreed with Ms. Sadler. He questioned what 100% carbon neutral looked like and was it a graduated scale that this time next year would be 95% and so on. Mr. Hipple noted he had asked Mr. Holt if staff was capable of identifying what 100% carbon neutral looked like and how to achieve it by a particular point in time. He further noted Mr. Holt replied no, adding someone would need to be hired to identify it. Mr. Hipple noted the Comprehensive Plan was the County's document for guiding it, adding if the County was not carbon neutral by a specified date, and the Comprehensive Plan indicated it, then citizens could question why it had not happened. He further noted leaving the items in the Plan were equivalently to a bulls-eye. Mr. Hipple noted changes in the world and processes in place to protect the earth. He further noted waiting for state guidance that could then be addressed at the County level, adding James City County did an excellent job with stormwater. Mr. Hipple noted the uncertainty of management and metrics for the four items, adding now was not the time, but they could be addressed later as needed.

Ms. Larson noted her responsibility for the Comprehensive Plan. She further noted reviewing carbon neutral criteria through the legislative agenda. Ms. Larson noted retaining Environmental 1.17 with additional information on 3.8.1 and 4.6 and how staff would measure achievement on those items.

Mr. Holt noted those items, for the Comprehensive Plan as a whole, were not critical to the Planning Commission vote. He further noted the Plan would be brought before the Board again.

Mr. McGlennon noted in reference to Mr. Icenhour's earlier comments that most instances were research, investigation, and consideration of the items. He further noted if citizen complaints about windmills and noise were known, those points merited investigations so when wind turbine applications came before the Board, concern for the noise level would be recognized as a factor. Mr. McGlennon noted in reviewing the public's attitudes in the County that citizens expected decisive action to improve the County's environment. He further noted positioning the County in terms of decisions regarding environment impact, fiscal responsibility, and priorities.

Ms. Sadler asked Ms. Larson if she was in favor of removal of 4.7.

Ms. Larson confirmed yes.

Mr. Polster addressed the Board noting the aspirational point was true. He noted the carbon neutral piece in the Public Facilities section. Mr. Polster further noted the Planning Commission, as part of the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) facility, had reviewed two projects which were not formally submitted. He noted the projects proposed solar panels to reduce the overall electrical bill. Mr. Polster noted General Services was asked about solar panels for electrical cost reduction and carbon footprint. He further noted the response was the study was done, cost was known, but uncertainty about the other facility plans. He noted that point would be addressed at design time. Mr. Polster further noted the analysis used standards to achieve LEED certification, which is required for County public facilities, adding all of those things were part of reducing the carbon footprint. He noted the possibility of a request for electric school buses and the cost. Mr. Polster further noted looking at possible reduction and the costs associated as preparation for a decision. He noted a second point addressed Ordinances associated with solar and wind, adding two had been approved with another one coming on Racefield Drive. Mr. Polster noted the DEQ had spent two years with a citizen survey to evaluate standards, buffering, and other factors, adding those studies were completed and certified. He further noted the issue of sea level and the work of the Hampton Roads Planning Organization in adopting a C-PACE Ordinance, which allowed commercial firms to take a low-cost loan to replace some HVAC systems or solar panels. Mr. Polster noted those funds could also be used for loans to elevate or fix properties that were known would be damaged. He further noted the state standards which were currently available and applying those to the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) overlay to determine flooding, property damage, sea level rise, and other factors. He further noted Chickahominy Haven would have excessive flooding by 2040. Mr. Polster noted the same problem the Grove area had would be seen in Chickahominy Haven, adding flooding will cause the sewer systems and fields to fail. He further noted the opportunity to put an Ordinance in place to obtain the low-cost loan and remediate the problems. Mr. Polster noted he had contacted Mr. John Carnifax, Interim Assistant County Administrator, regarding Phase II of the James City County Marina. He further noted the GIS database for flooding at 1.5 feet would put the parking lot at the Marina underwater. Mr. Polster noted rural lands and reimbursement for resident participation, adding state programs and funding such as the Stormwater Local Assistance Fund (SLAF) program. He further noted for additional funding, the need for a resiliency plan would be required.

Ms. Sadler asked Mr. Holt if a vote was needed to remove 4.7 from the Comprehensive Plan.

He noted he saw three nodding heads, but deferred that point to the Board.

Ms. Sadler noted she was good with that point. She asked if sea level rise was being addressed.

Mr. Holt noted the difference in this Comprehensive Plan process and the one five years previously addressed adoption of the State Code regarding strategies to address sea level rise.

Ms. Sadler noted those were issued from the state.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes. He noted that legislation was specific to the Hampton Roads region of which James City County was a part of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (PDC).

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Holt to get back to her about 3.8.1 and 4.6.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes, adding he would send the information to the Board.

Mr. Icenhour noted 1.1.7 would remain with three votes.

Mr. Holt confirmed yes. He noted one item to keep in, one item to remove, and two to come back with additional information. He further noted that concluded the presentation.

Mr. Icenhour noted he had a question on a Land Use application that he wanted the Board to consider. He further noted he was referencing LU-17, the four parcels on Monticello Avenue across from Monticello Marketplace. Mr. Icenhour noted originally it was Residential, changed to Commercial, and the recent request for rezoning, which was denied based on traffic congestion and other factors. He further noted the proposal was Low Density Residential at staff's recommendation.

Ms. Cook confirmed yes. She noted staff recommendation was Low Density Residential.

Mr. Icenhour noted the PCWG had declined that change and retained the property as commercial. He further noted the property had been commercial and development had been denied based on the adverse impact created in such a congested area. Mr. Icenhour noted it should change to Low Density Residential, adding two of the four parcels already had homes on them. He further noted housing was the ideal solution with back access from Ironbound Road, adding commercial property and access would intensify the traffic problem there. Mr. Icenhour asked the Board to consider changing the zoning to Low Density Residential.

Ms. Sadler asked about the acreage and the number of homes. She asked if this was a large development.

Mr. Icenhour noted no. He further noted the WindsorMeade traffic light at Monticello Avenue area.

Discussion ensued.

Ms. Larson noted the two homes had been there prior to the development of Monticello Avenue. She asked Mr. Haldeman if he would address the decision to remain commercial.

Mr. Haldeman noted development would have required a left-bound turn off Monticello

Avenue, immediately after the exit ramp. He further noted this location was the highest traffic accident area in the County. Mr. Haldeman noted the property was located inside the PSA, in-fill development, and other factors. He further noted neighborhood-commercial required 40,000 square feet limit maximum coverage while this area was only 14,000-15,000 square feet. Mr. Haldeman noted the Planning Commission voted against this application based on the traffic situation and configuration of Monticello Avenue. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Icenhour noted there were valid reasons why neither zoning should apply. He further noted using the property as Greenspace. Mr. Icenhour noted commercial did not seem a viable option, adding residential may not bring development.

Ms. Sadler asked if that area was a Commercial Corridor.

Mr. Haldeman noted it was the last piece.

Ms. Sadler noted she was not in favor of zero revenue from the property. She asked about guidelines to assist a potential business for road access.

Mr. Holt noted no for Low Density Residential, which was a designation applied County-wide. He further noted the Mixed Use did not have separate areas.

Ms. Sadler asked the current zoning of the property.

Mr. Holt noted Neighborhood-Commercial, adding it was zoned Rural Residential.

Ms. Larson noted this property and its relation to the Comprehensive Plan. She further noted an empty bank just down the street that could become a business or something that would impact traffic on Monticello Avenue. Ms. Larson asked what the plans were.

Mr. Haldeman noted the property owners had land that had been rendered unusable.

Ms. Larson noted 'by us'.

Mr. Icenhour noted it had been changed from residential to commercial.

Ms. Larson noted everything around the property had been changed.

Mr. Icenhour asked when the property changed from Residential to Commercial.

Ms. Tammy Rosario, Assistant Director of Community Development and Planning, noted the 2009-2015 timeframe. Mr. Icenhour noted when New Town was being built, the property was still Residential.

Ms. Rosario confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour noted during the 2009 Comprehensive Plan, it was changed to Commercial.

Ms. Rosario noted staff's recommendation was not to change the zoning. She further noted an application for Community Commercial at that time. Ms. Rosario noted traffic concerns and Neighbor-Commercial was the compromise.

Ms. Larson asked if the landowner requested the change.

Ms. Rosario confirmed yes.

Mr. Icenhour noted if the zoning remained Neighborhood-Commercial, then the landowner would know commercial aspects may be considered. He further noted when the application comes before the Board for legislative change, then other factors such as traffic create issues. Mr. Icenhour noted fairness to the property owner. Ms. Larson noted the possibility of commercial development.

Mr. Icenhour noted if a piece of property was zoned Commercial, the landowner will want to get as much as possible from it.

Mr. Hipple agreed.

Mr. Icenhour noted yes also. He further noted the denial would be based on the adverse impacts such as traffic. Mr. Icenhour noted the possibility of Low Density Residential with Habitat for Humanity purchasing the property for a house to be built there.

Ms. Sadler noted consideration of the property owner.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Hipple noted contacting the landowner.

Ms. Larson noted the landowner was unaware of the Board's discussion.

Ms. Cook noted the landowner had been notified as this was a Land Use application which had been considered by the PCWG. She further noted all the property owners had been notified.

Ms. Larson asked if the owners knew the application would be addressed by the Board at this meeting.

Mr. Holt noted the landowners had been notified of the process moving forward.

Ms. Larson noted the owners knew the PCWG had reviewed the request, adding the possibility they thought everything was alright.

Mr. Holt noted the owners could track the PCWG's recommendation, adding they would be aware of the additional phases of public hearings. He further noted he was unsure if each of the owners tracked updates daily, but added each owner had been notified. Mr. Holt noted correspondence had been received from some owners, while others not so. He further noted the public hearing advertisement could serve as notice to the landowners also.

Mr. McGlennon asked if all the properties were currently owned by the same person or individually owned.

Ms. Cook noted they were not owned by the same person.

Mr. Hipple noted this was Mr. Icenhour's district and how to proceed.

Mr. Icenhour noted changing the property back to Low Density Residential, but acknowledged his Board peers may differ. He further noted the disconnection, adding the Comprehensive Plan should say what the Board supports. Mr. Icenhour noted the property was in his district and he was unwilling to support the intensity of development that would be requested. He further noted it would have to be a very unusual commercial operation for his support.

Ms. Sadler asked how intense could the development be on four lots.

Mr. Icenhour noted not much. He further noted taking the existing three-way intersection and potentially making it a four-way one at that location. Mr. Icenhour noted that was an area of citizen concern. He further noted limited accessibility for any incoming commercial development. Mr. Icenhour noted a doctor's office with limited traffic could prove more supportable.

Mr. Hipple noted installing a traffic light to address the four-way pattern. Mr. Icenhour noted that proposal never reached the Board, adding that proposal generated more negative feedback than anything from the past 15 years.

Mr. Hipple asked if Mr. Icenhour was making a motion.

Mr. Icenhour made a motion to change the property back to Low Density Residential. The motion failed with three Nays (Hipple, Larson, and Sadler) and two Ayes (Icenhour and McGlennon).

Mr. Holt noted if there was no more Board discussion, the Planning Commission meeting would need to be adjourned. He further noted a request for a motion for adjournment until the June 2, 2021, Regular Meeting for the Planning Commission.

Mr. Haldeman addressed the Board noting the foundational aspect of the planning work. He noted the consultants had based the Land Use Model on two scenarios. He further noted Scenario A assumed no impacts to the Comprehensive Plan or Land Use Map. Mr. Haldeman noted Scenario B involved reduction of development capacity in the rural lands and directing it into the PSA, adding the development would be organized into complete communities. He further noted both scenarios accounted for the population growth with the current 77,000 to 120,000 in 2040 in comparison in each scenario of the County's fiscal condition, traffic, and environment. Mr. Haldeman noted the consultants had used 120,000 as an estimate and not a target goal, adding the information would assist planners in the future. He further noted Scenario B was the citizens' choice. Mr. Haldeman noted the lack of a third scenario which addressed reduced development capacity in rural lands and protection of Open Space and Community Character within the PSA. He further noted the scientific University of Virginia survey from April 2019, which indicated 94% of respondents noted James City County had enough or too much housing, retail and office space. Mr. Haldeman noted only 6% thought development should occur either in or out of the PSA. He further noted a question about rural land protection during Round 3 of the public engagement, in which 30% of the respondents selected the option of reducing the allowable development potential outside and also inside the PSA, adding this was the most popular option selected. Mr. Haldeman noted of the 13 Land Use applications, which would increase population density, residents voted no to 12 of them. He further noted of the eight applications to decrease density, residents voted for seven. Mr. Haldeman noted the need for affordable housing, which had been discussed. He further noted meeting this need with adaptive reuse, maintenance, and redevelopment per subsequent outreach. Mr. Haldeman noted in Round 3, all five High Density alternatives were ranked in the lowest preference category by citizens, adding the only option in the Mixed Use category that had more than two stories received the lowest score. Mr. Haldeman noted during the two-year community outreach process, it is obvious that citizens want rural, historic, and natural ambiance protected, as integral parts of the County's community character and economy. He further noted this pattern was obvious in the past two Comprehensive Plans. Mr. Haldeman noted upcoming public hearings and meetings on development standards and designation descriptions on the Land Use Map, adding Scenario C should be a consideration for reduced land use capacity in rural lands as well as Open Space and Community Character protection within the PSA.

Mr. Hipple noted the wonderful job the PCWG had done over the past 18 months. He further noted the time and effort that goes into the process and to express that appreciation to the group.

Ms. Larson requested the last Land Use application, LU-17, be reopened for vote. She asked Mr. Kinsman if that was allowed.

Mr. Kinsman confirmed yes, noting it would be a motion to reconsider.

Ms. Larson made a motion to reconsider the last vote.

Mr. Hipple noted a motion to reconsider the last vote to change to Low Density Residential.

Mr. Kinsman noted as a point of clarification that this was a motion to reconsider, which becomes open for discussion, and then another vote can be made.

As there was no discussion, Mr. Hipple asked for a roll call.

The motion to reconsider passed with three Ayes (Icenhour, Larson, and McGlennon) and two Nays (Hipple and Sadler).

Ms. Larson made a motion to make the property Low Density Residential.

The motion to change to Low Density Residential passed with three Ayes (Icenhour, Larson, and McGlennon) and two Nays (Hipple and Sadler).

Mr. Holt asked Mr. Krapf if a motion to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting had been made.

Mr. Krapf confirmed yes.

Mr. Holt noted the adjournment motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

At approximately 5:25 p.m., the Planning Commission adjourned its meeting.

E. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Minutes Adoption

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

The Minutes Approved for Adoption included the following meeting:

-March 12, 2021, Joint Meeting

-April 13, 2021, Regular Meeting

-April 27, 2021 Business Meeting

2. Acceptance of Community Participation Team Reports for Engage 2045

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

3. Acceptance of Funds - Distribution to Local Law Enforcement - \$68,585

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

4. Contract Award - Solid Waste Consolidation Study

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

5. Grant Award - American Rescue Plan Act

Item moved to June 8, 2021 meeting.

6. Grant Award - Circuit Court Records Preservation Program - \$22,216

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

7. Grant Award - Southeast Recycling Development Council (SERDC) and O-I Glass, Inc.

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

8. Fiscal Year 2021 Budget Amendment for Sales Tax for Education

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

9. Reappointment and Authorization of Police Powers and Fire Prevention Powers for Assistant Fire Marshal Jared Randall

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

10. Suspension of Convenience Fees

A motion to Approve was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.

AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

F. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)

None.

G. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES

Mr. McGlennon noted he would wait until the next meeting for his comments.

Ms. Larson noted her empathy for the landowner of the case previously discussed. She further

noted after hearing Mr. Haldeman's comments, it seemed the Board was not in a position to approve the application and it was not right to keep the landowner in a state of flux. Ms. Larson noted her explanation of why she changed her vote. She further noted the Tourism Council met and the visitation numbers were good, with an increase in leisure. Ms. Larson noted business and group travel had not reached their levels, adding she was hopeful those numbers would increase soon. She further noted Ms. Vicki Cimino, Chief Executive Officer of the Williamsburg Tourism Council, was proactive in having industry leaders speak at the Council's meetings and give national news. Ms. Larson noted the President of the Bus Association had been a recent speaker. Ms. Larson further noted the issue of labor and finding enough bus drivers for tours and such. She noted employment opportunities if anyone was interested. Ms. Larson noted the recent activity for the College of William & Mary's graduation and the upcoming Memorial Day weekend. She further noted the positive feedback on social media that focused on Jamestown and Yorktown. Ms. Larson noted her recent attendance at the LPGA golf tournament at Kingsmill Resort, adding the tournament went very well. She further noted she had a Wednesday morning meeting with Cox Communications to discuss broadband. Ms. Larson noted she would be talking with Mr. Mark Morrow from Greenwood Christian Academy, adding the Academy has seen enrollment numbers significantly increase. She further noted the Academy may need to make some changes and would be coming before the Board in the future.

Ms. Sadler congratulated the County's new Police Chief, Eric Peterson. She noted her appreciation of some recent help in her district. Ms. Sadler noted at a recent Economic Development Authority (EDA) meeting she had extended appreciation on behalf of the Board to Mr. Tom Tingle, who was completing his term with the EDA. She further noted Mr. Tingle's many years of service.

Mr. Icenhour noted the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) and PDC meetings were via Zoom. He further noted the total budget passed unanimously with TPO at \$7.4 million and the PDC was \$9 million. Mr. Icenhour noted the per capita fee from localities was raised 80-85 cents, which cost the County \$3,750. He further noted a special meeting would be held to adopt the Long-range Transportation Plan in June.

Ms. Larson noted she finished her third certification class for the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo). She expressed her thanks to the Board for its support.

H. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Stevens addressed the Board noting the vaccination progress in the community was significant. He commended everyone who had participated. Mr. Stevens noted if citizens still wanted a vaccination, most local pharmacies were available to provide it. He further noted continued support of vaccinefinder.org for assistance. Mr. Stevens noted he would be introducing Police Chief Eric Peterson. He further noted his appreciation to Deputy Chief Steve Rubino for serving as the department's Interim Chief since January 2021. Mr. Stevens noted three internal candidates had expressed interest in the Chief position, adding the high caliber of leadership within the department. Mr. Stevens further noted the details of the selection process. He noted Chief Peterson's 26 years of service to the County's Police Department, citing his education, leadership, and service accolades. Mr. Stevens noted Chief Peterson's telephone number was 757-259-5143.

The Board joined Mr. Stevens in congratulating Chief Peterson.

Chief Peterson noted it was his honor and pleasure to be selected. He further noted accountability and transparency start with him at the top as the Chief of Police. Chief Peterson noted he was looking forward to working with the Board and Mr. Stevens.

I. CLOSED SESSION

A motion to Defer was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

Mr. Hipple noted the Closed Session would be deferred until the next meeting.

1. Appointment to the Board of Zoning Appeals
2. Appointments - Economic Development Authority

J. ADJOURNMENT

1. Adjourn until 5 p.m. on June 8, 2021 for the Regular Meeting

A motion to Adjourn was made by John McGlennon, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Hipple, Icenhour Jr, Larson, McGlennon, Sadler

At approximately 5:37 p.m., Mr. Hipple adjourned the Board of Supervisors.


Deputy Clerk