

LANCASTER COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes

March 17, 2011

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Lancaster County Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Old General District Courtroom of the Lancaster County Administration Building, Lancaster, Virginia.

Present were David Jones, Chairman, Robert Smart, Tara Booth, Steve Sorensen, Glenn Pinn, David Chupp, and Ty Brent.

Also present were Butch Jenkins, Board of Supervisors Representative, Don Gill, Planning/Land Use Director, Sergeant Jeffrey Haywood, Lancaster County Sheriff's Department, John Mann, Lancaster County School Director of Operations, and Charles Costello.

Mr. Jones asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes of the February 17, 2011 regular meeting.

Mr. Jones moved to approve the February 17, 2011 minutes as submitted. **VOTE: 7-0.**

CONSIDERATION ITEM #1

UPDATE TO THE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT BUDGET (CIB) - FY 2012-2016

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Gill to present the issue.

Mr. Gill stated that the two-page summary cost sheet that the Planning Commission members received in their packets is identical to that received the prior month. He further stated that the discussion at the February meeting generated some questions and requests for additional information that should be provided for clarification at this meeting. He stated that all representatives from the departments submitting CIB requests have been asked to attend the meeting to answer any remaining questions. He stated that the CIB would need to be docketed for public hearing once the review is complete.

Mr. Jones stated that one change noted from last month was the cost of the high school bleachers had dropped from \$150,000 to \$30,000.

Mr. Gill stated that Sergeant Haywood was present to give an update on the voice recorder request for the Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Gill stated that the pager request was being removed from the CIB and going into the operating budget.

Mr. Gill stated that the Emergency Services vehicle request was for \$20,300 and that Mr. Hudson had provided the maintenance and repair statements that Mr. Jenkins had requested.

Mr. Jenkins stated that the only time the Board has approved vehicles for CIB was for school buses and that the vehicle request this time should not be considered a capital improvement item.

Mr. Jenkins stated that the pagers requested to meet the FCC requirement for narrow banding the frequencies should be removed from the CIB and their cost spread over two cycles of the general operating budget.

Mr. Gill stated that the pager request had already been submitted for the operating budget.

Mr. Gill stated that according to the Code of Virginia, a capital improvement item is something that has a life span of five or more years and a total cost of \$10,000 or more.

Mr. Jenkins stated that the Mary Ball Washington Museum Board has asked if their restoration work can be combined and done with the restoration work planned at the old courthouse.

Mr. Gill stated that all of the restoration work planned at the old courthouse thus far is interior work.

Mr. Jenkins stated that it would seem to make sense that similar work on these two historical structures be performed at the same time.

Mr. Jones stated that he agreed, but it would still be a capital improvement item.

Mr. Jones asked the Commission what they thought the number one item should be.

Mr. Smart stated that he thought the voice recorder should be number one and asked what the update was on that item.

Sergeant Haywood stated that two weeks ago one of the drives failed on the voice recorder. He stated that they couldn't find parts for it because of the age of the item.

Mr. Chupp stated that he thought that both of the requests from the Sheriff's Office were critical and should be at the top of the list.

Mr. Jones stated that he agreed with those requests being number one.

Mr. Smart stated that he liked the cost savings on the high school bleachers.

Mr. Jones asked if the old jail restoration was on anyone's priority list.

Mr. Chupp stated that he did not feel that they had enough information on the proposed project. He stated that he would like to see some estimates for the work.

Mr. Gill stated that the estimate that is listed on the summary sheet is an old estimate. He stated that estimate was to include roof work, brickwork and painting the old jail.

Mr. Smart stated that if the building is to be saved, it needs to be somewhere on the list.

Mr. Jenkins stated that he did not think it should be high on the priority list for this year.

Mr. Jones stated that he would like to see it stay on the priority list even if it is the last item.

Mr. Jones stated that he thought the next priority was the motorized bleachers for the high school and he thought it was a great deal. He asked if the Commission agreed.

The Commission members agreed.

Mr. Jones asked about the next priority item.

Mr. Brent stated that he thought the Emergency Services vehicle should be next, particularly since a grant has been secured for it for this year.

Mr. Jenkins stated that as a Board of Supervisors member, he would not agree with the vehicle being on the CIB.

Mr. Chupp stated that he agreed with Mr. Brent.

Mr. Jones stated that the EMS vehicle would be the number three item.

Mr. Jones asked what the number four item should be.

Mr. Smart stated that the HVAC replacement for the middle school is a multi-year project.

Mr. Jones stated that he was stuck between the HVAC system for the middle school and the windows for the bus garage and school board office.

Mr. Jones stated that the windows at the bus garage are in bad shape.

Mrs. Booth stated that she thought the HVAC system should be a higher priority because the units can be replaced in a rotation, so there won't be a huge expense all at once.

Mr. Chupp stated that the windows may be in bad shape, but he would give the higher priority to the HVAC system as well.

Mr. Jones asked if everyone was in agreement that the HVAC system for the middle school should be number four.

The Commission members agreed.

Mr. Jones asked which building's windows should be the next item.

Mr. Smart suggested putting the two items together as the number five item.

The Commission members agreed.

Mr. Jones asked about the two remaining items, which were the diesel generator for the primary school and the restoration of the old jail.

Mr. Brent asked what the proposed generator would power at the primary school.

Mr. Mann replied that the generator would power the well pump, egress lighting, exit signs, sewage pumps, fire alarms, and the telephone system.

Mr. Jones asked if the middle school already had that kind of generator.

Mrs. Booth replied yes.

Mr. Jones asked if the Commission agreed with the diesel generator being item number six and the old jail being number seven.

The Commission members agreed.

Mr. Jones stated that to recap the items according to priority, they are as follows: 1) voice recorder and time server 2) motorized bleachers for the high school 3) EMS vehicle 4) HVAC system for the middle school 5) windows for the bus garage and school board buildings 6) diesel generator for the primary school and 7) repair old jail and clerk's office.

Mr. Brent stated that the bleachers' cost was going from \$150,000 to \$30,000 and the EMS vehicle was going from \$45,000 to \$20,300.

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Gill to make those changes on the summary sheet.

Mr. Jones stated that the eighty pagers were being scratched, as they will be dealt with through the general operating budget.

Mr. Jones asked about the District 3 refuse collection site for fiscal year 2013.

Mr. Gill stated that that item would be back next year with a more viable estimate.

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Gill if the review was complete.

Mr. Gill replied yes and that the CIB needed to be scheduled for public hearing at next month's Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Jones made a motion to schedule the amended CIB for public hearing next month. **VOTE: 7-0.**

DISCUSSION ITEM #1

BLUE-GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING

Mr. Gill stated that Stuart McKenzie, Environmental Planner with the Northern Neck Planning District Commission, was present to discuss his findings about potential reservoir sites and which one may affect the least amount of tax map parcels or landowners.

Mr. McKenzie stated that some areas in the county have higher conservation value than others and it might be a good idea to protect those areas for future generations. He stated that development often takes the best land, but with future planning, there can be contiguous natural areas as opposed to having fragmented areas, such as vacant lots.

Mr. McKenzie showed maps depicting natural areas in the county.

Mr. McKenzie stated that the potential reservoirs in the county now are Little Branch of the Corrotoman River One, Little Branch of the Corrotoman River Two, Balls Branch, Camps Mill Pond, McMahon Swamp One and McMahon Swamp Two. He stated that he was not saying that reservoirs are needed, but he believes it is helpful to research them for possible future use.

Mr. McKenzie stated that the Commission had asked him to determine which potential reservoir sites affected the least amount of tax map parcels. He stated that twenty-four properties would be affected at the Balls Branch site, seventeen at the Camps Mill Pond site, twenty-two at the Little Branch of the Corrotoman River One, ten at the Little Branch of the Corrotoman River Two, forty-three at McMahan Swamp One and forty-seven at McMahan Swamp Two.

Mr. McKenzie stated that a good portion of these areas is already protected by the Resource Protection Area (RPA) of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act.

Mr. McKenzie stated that it might be beneficial to the county if a blue-green infrastructure plan was in place for some of these areas to keep them in a natural state.

Mr. Smart asked if those areas already protected by the RPA were made into a reservoir, would the RPA move back.

Mr. Jones stated that a culvert installed near the old school in White Stone connected a drainage ditch to a RPA feature and the town was advised by the State Attorney General's office that the RPA would extend beyond that recently installed culvert.

Mr. Gill agreed and stated that any new structures created on pre-Bay Act lots are subject to the one hundred foot RPA. He stated that any existing structures located within the RPA on pre-Bay Act lots are allowed as authorized non-conforming structures.

Mr. Gill asked Mr. McKenzie if the RPA information shown in his presentation was for the current level or the proposed reservoir flood pool level.

Mr. McKenzie replied it was for the current level.

A citizen asked what the difference was between the RPA and the eight hundred foot buffer.

Mr. Gill stated that Article 18 of the Lancaster County Zoning Ordinance, the Waterfront Residential Overlay District, states that any property that is within eight hundred feet of tidal water requires certain things, such as a two-acre minimum lot size and two hundred feet of water frontage.

Mr. Gill stated that the RPA or Resource Protection Area is a one hundred feet buffer required by state law under the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act to keep nutrients out of the Bay. The buffer was increased from fifty feet to one hundred feet on June 1, 2005. He stated that Lancaster County was one of the last, if not the last county on the Chesapeake Bay to change from fifty feet to one hundred feet.

Mr. Jenkins stated that it was another example of how the state forces counties to enforce their standards. He added that with a fifty foot RPA the county was already

requiring best management practices for existing structures within that area to promote clean up of the Bay.

Mr. Smart stated that the public has said they want to retain natural beauty. He stated that the County had a highly dendritic topography and this lends itself to establishing some of the natural areas. He further stated that other things, such as how many acre-feet of water would be retained in the potential reservoir sites could help prioritize their conservation value as well.

Mr. Jones thanked Mr. McKenzie for his several presentations on Blue-Green Infrastructure and stated that this topic may be discussed again during the next update to the Comprehensive Plan, which is scheduled for 2012.

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Gill what was on the agenda for next month's meeting.

Mr. Gill replied that as of now, the public hearing for the Capital Improvement Budget was the only item.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

ADJOURNMENT

The March 17, 2011 regular meeting of the Lancaster County Planning Commission was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.