

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

March 13, 2014

3:00 p.m.

County Government Center, Building D

1.) Roll Call

Present

Mr. Tim O'Connor
Mr. Rich Krapf
Ms. Robin Bledsoe
Mr. John Wright

Staff Present

Mr. Paul Holt
Ms. Ellen Cook
Mr. Jason Purse
Ms. Leanne Pollock
Ms. Kate Sipes
Mr. Scott Whyte
Ms. Jennifer VanDyke
Mr. John Rogerson
Ms. Beth Klapper

Mr. Tim O'Connor called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

2.) Minutes

a. February 13, 2014

Mr. Rich Krapf moved to approve the minutes.

In a unanimous voice vote the minutes were approved as submitted (4-0).

3.) New Business

a. Agricultural and Forestry Industries (AFID) Grant Update

Ms. Leanne Pollock, Senior Planner II, stated that the County applied for and received a \$20,000 state grant for rural economic development planning. She stated that they have been working in partnership with the Office of Economic Development and the Rural Economic Development Committee.

Ms. Pollock stated that the state grant supports the Economic Development and Land Use Goals, Strategies, and Actions that are in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Pollock stated that the purpose of the project is how to support the viability of agriculture and timbering industries; how to encourage business growth; diversification of the tax base through rural economic development; and how to foster new business enterprises that are compatible with or support rural lands goals in the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Pollock further stated that they have been working with a consultant to complete the process and have held stakeholder interviews which included rural land holders, Agricultural and Forestal District and Purchase of Development Rights participants, participants in previous rural lands discussions, local chefs, existing rural businesses, and leaders in the health, institutional and school industries, among many others. Ms. Pollock further stated that they completed a

fiscal assessment of rural activity which is intended to complement the stakeholder interviews in developing a list of actions and projects that promote rural economic development goals.

Ms. Pollock stated that a draft list of actions and projects has been developed ranging from marketing, rural recreation and agri-tourism to infrastructure projects such as food hubs and community gardens. Ms. Pollock stated the Rural Economic Development Committee is in the process of evaluating the projects to narrow the focus and more fully develop the scope of the projects. Ms. Pollock stated that the next steps would entail hosting a workshop and gathering public comment with a goal of having the information ready for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Robin Bledsoe inquired how staff would determine which projects were feasible and/or of interest to the community.

Ms. Pollock stated that many of the projects were developed from public input gathered during the stakeholder interviews. Ms. Pollock further stated that ultimately the consultants would flesh out the projects, determine the feasibility and develop a timeframe for implementation.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired whether the County would be implementing the projects or whether the idea was to develop a tool kit so that other entities could implement some of the projects.

Ms. Pollock stated that it would depend on the nature of the project. Some projects would be geared toward a private investment; however, staff would be available to support the effort in the community.

Mr. John Wright inquired whether the criteria for evaluating the projects included a measure to determine how successful a project would be.

Ms. Pollock responded that the Rural Economic Development Committee would provide feedback on the potential success of a project; however, the initial evaluation criteria were geared more toward timeframe, cost and resources required.

Ms. Kate Sipes, Business Development and Retention Coordinator, stated that criteria for the second round of evaluations would be refined and weighted.

Ms. Pollock noted that one of the criteria is how well a project furthered the goals for rural economic development and the benefit to rural property owners.

Mr. Tim O'Connor inquired whether the feedback from rural property owners indicated that they wanted to continue to farm their land.

Ms. Sipes stated that the responses had varied greatly. Ms. Sipes further stated that one of the study goals was to ensure that continuation of productive farming and timbering would be made practically possible by developing options that have a reasonable chance of success.

Mr. O'Connor inquired what the response was from local chefs and restaurants.

Ms. Sipes responded that there is a large demand for locally sourced products. Ms. Sipes noted that the response included not only restaurants but also institutions such as the schools, continuing care facilities and the jail.

Mr. Krapf noted that he was impressed with the consultant's efforts and believed they brought a valuable perspective to the project.

b. Longhill Road Corridor Study - Update

Mr. Carroll Collins, Kimley Horn and Associates provided a presentation on the status of the Longhill Road Corridor Study. The presentation covered feedback from the Project Advisory Committee, the Technical Advisory Committee and public meetings. The presentation also covered recommendations for typical road sections and access management at the various intersections.

Mr. Krapf inquired if it was possible to determine at this stage what percentage of privately owned property would be impacted by roadbed changes.

Mr. Collins responded that this not been part of the considerations to date.

Mr. Krapf inquired if that would be done prior to the final report.

Mr. Collins stated that it could be touched on briefly for the final report but that the effect on properties would not be fully determined until the project was in the design phase.

Mr. Krapf noted that his question related not only to impact on the properties but also to what the effect of acquiring property would be on the project cost.

Ms. Bledsoe inquired if the process would be to purchase the property.

Mr. Collins responded that in most cases it would only require purchasing the portion of the property required for the project.

Mr. Wright inquired about the costs associated with relocation of utilities.

Mr. Collins responded that an estimate of utilities costs would be included in the final report.

Mr. O'Connor inquired what the recommendation is for the intersection at the Warhill Sports Complex.

Mr. Collins stated that the recommendation is a signalized intersection; however, it will require a further study to determine if the warrants are met.

Mr. O'Connor inquired if the speed limit would remain at 45 mph.

Mr. Collins confirmed.

Mr. O'Connor inquired about the plans for the segment of the road between Rt. 199 and Williamsburg West/Lane Place.

Mr. Collins stated that the intention would be two lanes with an exclusive right turn lane at Lane Place.

Mr. O'Connor inquired about the effect of the wetlands between Longhill Grove and Fords Colony on the project; whether there would be sufficient space to construct the typical three lane section.

Mr. Collins stated that one of the benefits of the realignment option is that it would shift the road away from the wetlands as well as away from the pond and the cemetery.

Mr. O'Connor thanked Mr. Collins for his presentation and stated that he was pleased with the way the improvement options are shaping up.

4.) Old Business

a. Case No. ZO-0007-2013, Zoning Ordinance Amendment to Consider the Keeping of Chickens in Residentially Zoned Areas of the County

Mr. Scott Whyte, Senior Landscape Planner, II stated that at its February meeting, the Policy Committee instructed staff to prepare draft ordinance options for consideration. Mr. Whyte stated that both draft ordinances would restrict the use to domestic purposes, single family residences and permit only the keeping of hens. Mr. Whyte further stated that both draft ordinances also include regulations for coops and their location and construction and a permitting process. Mr. Whyte noted that where the draft ordinances differ is in the number of birds allowed based on lot size and one requires a permit processing fee where the other does not.

Mr. Krapf noted that the sample ordinance from Prince William County addressed the proximity of chicken coops to the RPA streams and non RPA streams and inquired whether that was a concern that should be considered.

Mr. Jason Purse, Zoning Administrator, stated that staff could bring the question to the attention of the Engineering and Resource Protection division for feedback.

Mr. Krapf noted that his concerns were related to chicken waste leaching into a stream.

Mr. Whyte stated that if the number of birds was restricted to a maximum of 12, the amount of waste produced would be less than the amount of fertilizer generally used on lawns.

Ms. Bledsoe requested clarification on whether section 3.1-796.116 of the Code of Virginia, Dogs killing, injuring or chasing livestock or poultry applied to backyard chickens.

Mr. Paul Holt, Planning Director, stated that there is no distinction in this section or its matching section in the County Code for the various zoning districts. Mr. Holt stated that in County Code there are, however, prohibitions on the discharge of firearms based on the specific neighborhood. Mr. Holt stated that further review would be required to determine on which regulation takes precedence.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether the recommendation was for three or four square feet of space per bird.

Mr. Holt noted that this portion was to define the inside portion and not the outside run area.

Mr. Wright inquired whether the recommendation was for the birds to always be confined.

Mr. Holt responded that the birds were not limited to the coop only but could have an outside run area.

Mr. O'Connor noted the Prince William County ordinance included a prohibition on dispatching chickens on the property.

Mr. Krapf inquired what the purpose of such a prohibition might be.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the sight of a chicken being dispatched might be upsetting to neighbors.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the Prince William County ordinance also prohibited chicken coops near wellheads.

Mr. Holt stated that he could inquire what the Health Department regulations might be.

Mr. O'Connor inquired whether the Committee had a preference between the two ordinances.

Mr. Holt noted that the Committee would want to choose between the options for minimum lot size as well as the option for a permit fee.

Mr. O'Connor noted that the Committee would want to review the ordinance once more before forwarding a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Krapf concurred, noting that there were still several outstanding questions and concerns.

The Committee concurred that they would choose item (b) from draft ordinance option #1. The Committee recommended including a setback restriction that addresses flag lots and corner lots. The Committee also concurred that a permit processing fee should be included.

Mr. Holt stated that staff would bring back a revised ordinance for review at the Committee's April meeting along with answers to the several questions noted.

5.) **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m.



Tim O'Connor, Chair of the Policy Committee