



Minutes
Louisa County Planning Commission
Thursday, July 14, 2022
7:00 PM
Louisa County Public Meeting Room

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Tommy J. Barlow	Mountain Road District Supervisor	Present	7:00 PM
Gordon Brooks	Commissioner	Present	7:00 PM
Ellis Quarles	Commissioner	Present	7:00 PM
Garland Nuckols	Mayor/Louisa Town Representative	Absent	
Cyrus Weaver	Commissioner	Present	7:00 PM
George Goodwin	Commissioner	Present	7:00 PM
John Disosway	Chairman	Present	7:00 PM
H. Manning Woodward	Vice Chairman	Present	7:00 PM
James Dickerson	Commissioner	Present	7:00 PM
Tony Henshaw	Town of Mineral Representative	Absent	

Others present: Josh Gillespie, Director of Community Development; Helen Phillips, County Attorney (via Zoom); Kyle Eldridge, Assistant County Attorney; Tom Egeland, Senior Planner; Bridgette Bittle, Planning and Zoning Technician.

INVOCATION

Mr. Dickerson gave the Invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Quarles.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Goodwin motioned to approve the agenda. Mr. Disosway added a presentation by Ms. Phillips to the Discussion period of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brooks and opposed by none, accepted without further discussion

APPROVAL OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**Planning Commission - Regular Meeting - Jun 9, 2022 7:00 PM**

Mr. Goodwin motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Brooks. The minutes were approved without opposition.

CONSENT AGENDA

None.

PUBLIC ADDRESS

Mr. Disosway opened the public address.

There were no speakers.

Mr. Disosway closed the public address.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Goodwin reminded the commission members of unfinished topics not ready for discussion at this time.

- Transportation impacts on applications.
- Viability issue of rezoning actions.
- Comprehensive Plan addendums.

PUBLIC HEARINGS**Meadows Four Brothers, LLC REZ2022-01**

Mr. Egeland presented to the Planning Commission the rezoning request from The Meadows Four Brothers, LLC. He stated that a request had been received to rezone approximately 18 acres out of 286.048 acres from Agricultural (A-1) to Agricultural (A-2) for a potential subdivision. Mr. Egeland concluded the staff presentation with a recommendation that the applicant provide a concept plan for the subdivision of the eighteen (18) acres and documentation that VDOT would be receptive to multiple driveways as development of the eighteen (18) acres into a maximum of six (6) parcels would become a subdivision by definition.

Mr. Dickerson asked if the applicant had provided such information.

Mr. Egeland stated that he had not received any concept plans for the parcel at this time.

Mr. Quarles inquired about whether the multiple driveways would be coming off of Red Hill Rd. or a private drive.

Mr. Egeland explained that either are possible but the private drive would have further requirements.

Mr. Dickerson asked if the application process requires a site plan for rezoning.

Mr. Egeland stated that it does not. It only requires a plat.

Mr. Brooks followed up, asking if the site plan was required for the subdivision process.

Mr. Egeland explained that the subdivision process wouldn't start until the rezoning was approved but a site plan would be required during that process.

Mr. Weaver asked if the lots had to be perc tested before the process is complete.

Mr. Egeland stated that he would have to refer that question to the health department.

With no further questions for staff, Mr. Disosway opened the public hearing and the applicant's agent Torrey Williams spoke on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Williams gave an overview of the property, its owners, and their background. He stated that the applicants desire to undertake estate planning including the 18 acres on the east side of Red Hill Rd. He explained that the larger area of the parcel is under a conservation easement, however the Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) was not interested in the acreage on the east side of the road and the applicant would now like to utilize that property in some way by dividing it.

Mr. Williams further explained that this property was part of the mass rezoning in 1996, where property owners were given the option to choose their agricultural zoning district by return mail. If a return letter was not received the properties were zoned A-1 by default. During this time the family had suffered the loss of their father and their mother had sustained a traumatic brain injury, and the family supposes the rezoning might have been overlooked. Mr. Williams also noted that staff had reported no findings of the returned rezoning letter in the file.

Mr. Williams concluded that the applicant completed soil work and surveys, but no site plan was provided because the applicant isn't certain on what it would look like at this time and that the surrounding properties are majority A-2 zoned.

Mr. Woodward asked if the application was missing information on questions 4 and 5.

Mr. Williams explained that the handwritten part completed the sentence in the packet.

Mr. Goodwin inquired about the surveys and was under the impression that the finding of new acreage would be considered or constitute a boundary line adjustment. He asked if the conservation group had been notified of such.

Mr. Williams assured Mr. Goodwin that they had been in contact with the conservation group, and they had no issue with the rezoning of the 18 acre section of the parcel.

Mr. Goodwin asked if it would be prudent on the commissioners' part to request proof of that.

Mr. William's stated that his understanding is that VOF won't send a letter until the final recording of the approved plat triggers the review and written letter.

Mr. Goodwin stated that he was very reluctant to set a precedent of approving a rezoning without a site plan of the desired subdivision.

Ms. Phillips stated that the VOF has an interest in the adjoining land because of the conservation easement and they should be informed as an adjoiner on the public notice letter that is sent out regarding the public hearing going forward. Ms. Phillips asks that the commission makes that a requirement moving forward.

There was extensive discussion between the Commission, staff, and the agent regarding the division rights and parent parcels; concluding that the maximum number of divisions for the property would be up to 7 but no more than 3 could be used on the easement side. If the applicant were to divide the 18 acre portion from the parent parcel, it would use 1 division right leaving 6 to remain and be divided between the then 2 parcels.

Mr. Dickerson motioned to forward a recommendation of approval to the Louisa County Board of Supervisors on the request for rezoning approximately 18 acres of tax map parcel 8-3 from Agricultural (A-1) to Agricultural (A-2); with the stipulation that the Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) be formally notified of the request prior to the Board of Supervisors meeting; seconded by Mr. Brooks. The motion passed by a vote of 5-2.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

DISCUSSION

Ms. Phillips announced that the General Assembly made no changes to the FOIA requirements to attend meeting remotely for localities.

Mr. Eldridge briefed the Commission on how many meetings can be attended remotely per calendar year:

Remote Attendance for Personal Reasons - 2 meetings or 25% of the meetings, whichever is greater (i.e., 12 meetings would allow for 3 remote meetings, 14 meetings allows for 4 remote...)

Mr. Goodwin asked how many can be attended for medical reasons.

Mr. Eldridge stated that attending remotely hasn't changed and there is only a limit to attending remotely for personal matters.

Mr. Brooks asked if anything should be added to the bylaws regarding this matter.

Mr. Eldridge confirmed that the Commission would not need to update the bylaws since there was no change in policy.

REPORTS

Mr. Gillespie presented a draft annual report for the Commission's review. The report covers the fiscal year from July 2021 to June 2022.

Mr. Gillespie prefaced this report with a memorandum on the Commission's behalf. He stated that standard practice of similar reports were from the Chairman on behalf of the Commission to be presented to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Quarles pointed out one correction to page 1 that Commissioner "Roberts" should be "Reynolds."

Mr. Disosway corrected the county name in the last paragraph of the last page.

Mr. Gillespie stated that he would like for this report to make it to the Board of Supervisors by the August meeting.

Mr. Goodwin asked if there was value in having the report cover the fiscal year instead of the calendar year, as the Commission and the Board change according to the calendar year.

Mr. Gillespie explained that his goal was to capture the last 6 months without limiting the report to the last 6 months in order to provide a current report. He stated that the report could be revised as a 6 month report or a 2021 report but given the timing he felt the fiscal year report was most appropriate.

Mr. Gillespie welcomed feedback on what the time frame should be for the annual report now and moving forward.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Brooks motioned to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Quarles. The motion carried 7-0. The regular meeting of the Louisa County Planning Commission was closed at 8:25 PM.

BY ORDER OF:

JOHN DISOSWAY, CHAIRMAN
PLANNING COMMISSION
LOUISA COUNTY, VIRGINIA