

The Smithfield Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Tuesday, February 10th, 2015. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. Members present were Mr. Bill Davidson, Chairman; Ms. Julia Hillegass, Vice Chair; Mr. Charles Bryan, Mr. Mike Swecker, Mr. Randy Pack, Dr. Thomas Pope, and Mr. Michael Torrey. Staff members present were Mr. William G. Saunders IV, Planning and Zoning Administrator and Mr. William H. Riddick III, Town Attorney. There were approximately eighty (80) citizens present. The press was represented by Ms. Abby Proch of The Smithfield Times and Mr. Ryan Murphy of The Daily Press.

Chairman Davidson – I would like to welcome everyone to the February 10th, 2015 Planning Commission meeting. If everyone will stand, we will say the Pledge of Allegiance.

Everyone present stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Davidson – I would like to welcome Mr. Mike Torrey the newest member of the Planning Commission. We will now move to the Planning and Zoning Administrator Activity Report.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – Thank you, Chairman. We have two items on the report tonight. The first is Cypress Creek Phase 7-B and C. The engineer is working on making amendments to that after a round of comments. We expect resubmittal sometime soon. The O' Reilly Auto Parts has recently resubmitted what we hope to be the final iteration of their site plans. They are currently under review. Thank you.

Chairman Davidson – The next item is Upcoming Meetings and Activities. On February 16th the town offices will be closed in observance of Presidents Day. The Board of Historic and Architectural Review will meet on February 17th at 6:30 p.m. The Board of Zoning Appeals has been cancelled. The Town Council Committee meetings will be held at 4:00 p.m. on February 23rd and 24th. The next Town Council meeting is on March 3rd. The next Planning Commission meeting is on March 10th. The next item on the agenda is Public Comments. The public is invited to speak on any matter except what is scheduled for a public hearing. We do not have anyone signed up. Is there anyone who would like to speak under public comments that do not include our public hearing? Hearing none, we will move to Planning Commission Comments. Does

anyone have any comments? Hearing none, we will turn the meeting over to our Town Attorney for the Election of Officers.

Town Attorney – Members of the Planning Commission it is a new session of the Planning Commission. The first order of business is to elect a new Chairman and Vice Chairman. The floor is open for nominations for Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Swecker – I would like to nominate Mr. Bill Davidson to be Chairman.

Mr. Pack – Second.

Town Attorney – Are there any other nominations? Hearing none, nominations are closed. All those in favor of electing Mr. Davidson say aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, seven members were present. Mr. Bryan voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Pack voted aye, Mr. Swecker voted aye, Vice Chair Hillegass voted aye, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, and Chairman Davidson abstained. There was one abstention. The motion passed.

Town Attorney – You have been reelected Mr. Davidson. The floor is open for nominations for Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Swecker – I would like to nominate Ms. Julia Hillegass to be Vice Chair.

Chairman Davidson – Second.

Town Attorney – Are there any other nominations? Hearing none, the floor is closed for nominations. All those in favor of electing Ms. Hillegass as Vice Chair say aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, seven members were present. Mr. Bryan voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Pack voted aye, Mr. Swecker voted aye, Vice Chair Hillegass abstained, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, and Chairman Davidson voted aye. There was one abstention. The motion passed.

Town Attorney – Mr. Chairman it is your meeting again.

Chairman Davidson – Thank you. Next we have a Public Hearing: Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Future Land Use and Growth Area Map – Town of Smithfield, applicant. Could we have a staff report please?

Planning and Zoning Administrator – We are here to discuss the future land use map and growth area map for the Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Smithfield. As some of you may know the Comprehensive Plan is just as it is labeled. It is effectively a

twenty year plan for a municipality. It is to be updated every five years. This map and the work sessions that the Planning Commission has had in regard to this map is a result of the update process. This map includes the future land use designations which are not the same as zoning. Zoning is the current land use of your property. Future land use is what that property is envisioned to be over the course of the next twenty years. Also included in this map are potential growth areas. These are areas where the town boundaries could be expanded in the future by one of several ways. Growth is ideally accomplished by towns in the state of Virginia by voluntary agreement with the County. Sometimes it is not voluntary which is what everyone refers to as annexation. Our last Comprehensive Plan was done in 2009 did not include a potential growth area map. At that time we have just completed a voluntary boundary line adjustment with the County. We were still in a ten year agreement phase where there would be no more expansion outside of the town boundaries however, the agreement has since lapsed. Currently this Comprehensive Plan does envision future growth. If annexation is acted upon in the future then it may be in some of these areas that are outlined here. It may be in some of them, none of them, or part of them. These are just areas for exploration. If an area is annexed into the town from the County it automatically is rezoned to the closest zoning district that the town has to what that land is currently zoned in the County. Therefore if a field is in agricultural use then it would go into Community Conservation when it comes into the town that is the closest thing that we have to agricultural. If a developer wanted to build something there or we wanted to change that zoning from what it is currently in the County then that would either come from a future Comprehensive Plan update which would also include public meetings, public hearings, and various board meetings or by the applicants request at a rezoning which would also include public hearings at the Planning Commission and Town Council. I am going to go through item by item on the map of the future land use changes and the growth areas. Then at that time Chairman Davidson will open up the public hearing. Areas that have changed from low density residential future land use to a medium density residential. The area that I am outlining with the cursor on the map the Little's farm is at the intersection of Waterworks Road and Route 258 has gone to from low density residential to medium density residential. This is due to the expectation of market demands since the last plan

was done and also the carrying capacity of that land. The next area is the Jersey Park West Subdivision that is currently developed at a higher density than our low density residential designation. Therefore it is logical not to expect that to be less dense so therefore that one was changed in the same way. The Lakeside Heights Subdivision was also changed from low density residential to medium density residential for the same reasons. The two sections of Historic Downtown Neighborhood Residential area were changed from low density residential to medium density residential. They are already more dense than the future low density residential designation. The corner of James and Washington Streets has been changed from low density residential to public or semi-public. It was previously going to be a relocation asset for the Pinewood Heights Relocation project. However, it was not well received by the citizens. It is now being envisioned as an asset to compliment the public uses in that area. Some areas have changed from parks and recreation to medium density residential. The piece of property known as Pierceville Farm that borders Cary Street and Main Street was currently envisioned for a ball field complex at the time of the last Comprehensive Plan. It is not envisioned as such anymore. Therefore that was changed. Also there were small lots back on Riverview Avenue along the riverfront that were at one time envisioned as a public boat ramp that is not currently in any of the town plans. It has gone back to the medium density residential that is similar to the surrounding property. We have an area that has changed from Light Industry to Retail Commercial. The red section on the map on the corridor across from Westside Elementary School and further down that used to be industrial it is now changed to Highway Commercial so it is more consistent with the commercial corridors that are adjacent to it. We prefer to have the industrial uses outside of the roadway corridor. The Pinewood Heights Subdivision has changed from Heavy Industrial to Light Industrial. It will accommodate the Light Industrial / Heavy Commercial Park that is envisioned there after the relocation project has been completed. One area that has changed from low density residential to Community Conservation is the parcel of land between the bypass and Windsor Castle Park to be consistent with the low impact nature of this planning area. This basically covers all of the changes to the future land use map that have been envisioned so far in the Comprehensive Plan update. Now I will discuss some of the potential growth areas that

are shown on the map. The western growth area that is outlined in yellow will encompass a town own lake. We currently only have the dam for the lake within town limits. It would potentially provide the open space for one hundred and ninety-eight to three hundred and thirty homes at three to five homes per acre. It would provide 3,300 linear feet of commercial corridor for forty-five acres of commercial use. The southwestern growth area is outlined in green. It would provide an open area for one thousand seven hundred and twenty to two thousand eight hundred and seventy homes at three to five per acre. It also has good connectivity with Route 10 bypass via the overpass onto Fairway Drive. The southern growth area is in blue. It provides an open area for nine hundred and sixty to one thousand six hundred homes at three to five per acre. It also provides 3,986 linear feet of commercial corridor or fifty-five acres. The eastern growth sector provides the open area for one thousand and thirty to one thousand seven hundred and thirty at three to five per acre. The northwestern growth area provides an open area for one thousand two hundred and eighty to two thousand one hundred and thirty homes at three to five per acre. It also contains current developments comprising twenty percent of the existing water customers of the Town of Smithfield.

Chairman Davidson – Thank you. Before I open the public hearing I would like to just give you a little history. The Planning Commission was tasked with the job of suggesting future growth to the Town Council. This is something that we have to do as we revisit our Comprehensive Plan every five years. We have identified these sections on the map and nothing else. I will open the public hearing. We would like to limit any public comments to five minutes. As you come to the podium please give your name and address for the record.

Town Attorney – If anyone agrees with what a previous speaker has said then you do not have to state it over and over. It would be perfectly reasonable to say that you agree with what others have said and then add whatever you choose to so it not to be repetitive. It would be appreciated. I think it would expedite things.

Chairman Davidson – Thank you. The public hearing is now open. Do we have a signup sheet?

Town Attorney – There seems to be a buzz about the signup sheet. Just to calm everyone's concerns if you are not on the sheet there will be an opportunity to speak at the end.

Chairman Davidson – Everyone that wants to speak will get a chance to speak. Again, I would like to welcome all of you. I have been on the Planning Commission for seven years. If you took all of the people that have been to our meetings over seven years we would not have what we have tonight. I wrote a piece in the paper wanting people to get involved. Thank you all for getting involved.

Mr. Bodson – My name is Rick Bodson. I live at 115 Commodore Lane. I am a Gatling Pointe resident. I am here as a private citizen tonight not a representative of one of the many organizations that I typically come to represent. The eastern, southern, southwestern, and western growth areas look consistent with the Comprehensive Plan guidelines. The boundaries are logically drawn and do not interfere as best that I can tell from the County's development service district plans. It is hard to reconcile the eastern one based on the way the maps are laid out. There may be some need to reconcile eastern. As the districts are pushed out in commercial corridors I would encourage that you recommend to Town Council that the Entrance Corridor Overlay follow those expansions. There is significant value in the Entrance Corridor Overlay. The northeastern growth area includes the Scott farm, Gatling Pointe, and Battery Park areas. I would like to offer for consideration three pros, one con and a recommendation. The pro is that it is consistent with the future use guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan. The north Battery Park Corridor section of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan it specifies that there are undeveloped areas. Mr. Saunders pointed out how they can be rezoned. The Scott farm for example is specifically called out as part of that north Battery Park Corridor which would be a single family low density development. The second positive is immediate revenue growth. Obviously you have in place a real estate property tax base that would immediately benefit the town and you also protect the \$250,000.00 per year of water revenue that you are currently getting paid by the County. On a personal side should that growth area become part of the town I feel a little better knowing that it is a sixteen cent real estate hit. I can quantify that based on a presentation that I attended last night the impact of tax overlay tax district is not quantified. I know there is

a tax increase in our future. One is sixteen cents and the other one so far is unquantified that makes me a little bit nervous. The negative has nothing to do with what your charter is because you do not address annexation. It is for the Town Council to do. If you decide to propose to the Town Council that the northeastern area growth be considered as part of the revision to the Comprehensive Plan I would suggest that you would be well served and the citizens of Smithfield would be well served if you put an addendum on that recommendation. It should point out that any annexation of Gatling Pointe and Gatling Pointe South will be done with a lot of acrimony and a lot of push back. The citizens are not going to be pleased with that. It will distract from a very well run and very well managed Town Council from its current agenda which is looking out for the welfare of the town. I think it will be a major distraction. The Town Council meetings will start taking on the character of the Board of Supervisors meetings which frankly I would not wish on anyone. As an alternative, I would suggest that the Planning Commission consider suggesting to the Town Council that they go back to the negotiating table and do a boundary line adjustment for the Scott farm. We have a Comprehensive Plan today that is very specific about low density housing. It gives an opportunity frankly for the Napolitano Homes developer to work with one jurisdiction rather than play one off of the other to get the plan in place and the revenue generated from that. Thank you for your consideration.

Mr. Mortimer – My name is Ed Mortimer. I live on West Creek Place in Gatling Pointe South. The last time that annexation came up I was president of our Homeowner's Association at the time. You said that you have spoken to people that favor this annexation. I can tell you that we polled Gatling Pointe South and two people out of the whole area did not object to annexation. One thought it was a good idea and one could not make up his mind. I think that you will find from most of the people here tonight annexation is not a democratic process at all. Those being annexed really do not have much of a vote in it. I think it is pretty much like the Germans occupying Poland. From the people who are here tonight you will get the general tenor that the majorities do not favor annexation. The break down which was published in the Smithfield Times as to the disadvantages or advantages financial of Gatling Pointe being annexed by

Smithfield are totally understated. When we figured those the last time they were two to three times the values that were quoted in the Smithfield Times.

Chairman Davidson – We normally do not respond to speakers but several people have come up to me tonight and said that I was quoted in the Smithfield Times as having spoken to residents of Gatling Pointe who told me that they were in favor of annexation. That is not true. I did not say it. I have not spoken to any residents that have said they are in favor of it. It is now on the record.

Ms. Daughtrey – My name is Glenda Daughtrey. I live in Gatling Pointe South on Creekside Drive. I also served on the Homeowner's Board of Directors with Mr. Ed Mortimer when he was president of our association. I can attest to what he has said tonight. We are ready to circle the wagons.

Mr. Joyner – My name is L.D. Joyner. I live at the farm right beside Gatling Pointe. All of these homes that you are thinking about doing around town on either side where is the traffic going to go? In the afternoons coming home from work you have to go from the light at Nike Park Road all the way past to the bridge before you can get anywhere. So how is this going to help the people that live at Gatling Pointe or Battery Park? I just do not see it.

Mr. Horne – My name is Jeff C. Horne. I live at 11224 Beechwood Point. I own three homes in Gatling Pointe as well. I guess we are all kind of thinking the same thing. It would seem that there is some form of legal precedent here that has not been explained to any of us about what the state laws call for and what happens when the County and the town disagree and the citizens get caught in the middle. I would suggest through the Smithfield Times or some other methodology you explain if there is no foreseen benefit whatsoever to the people being annexed that somehow that is acceptable. I cannot seem to understand it. If it were a new development and you were going to be laying roads or building schools then I might get it. I have not seen any discussion anywhere about any additional schools in the town. Maybe they are there but I do not see them on your maps. I think one thing that would help us all to understand this a little better is better articulation of what the benefit is to the folks that are being affected. I am probably wrong but your personal property taxes are probably the highest south of Williamsburg. For all of us that live on or near the water including some of us

that do a little work at the Smithfield Station if you increase the personal property tax you will cut that many more boats that are in this area. You are going to run other folks that want to live here off as well. I thought the community was about quality of life and an agricultural lifestyle. I encourage you to consider those two points and let us know what you think. Thank you.

Mr. Carlson – My name is Peter Carlson. I live at 117 Commodore Lane in Gatling Pointe. I would join with what my compadres have spoken against annexation. My concern is simply the cost of becoming part of the town. Not only the direct cost due to the immediate taxation issue but the potential of a tax overlay that really has not been covered at all in terms of any specificity. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hancock – My name is Rich Hancock. I live at 203 James Landing Circle in Gatling Pointe. On the issue of annexation, I am not sure which is better because I heard Isle of Wight last night and I am not very impressed at all with their plan. In fact I do not think they have a plan. I grew up in Virginia Beach. I am telling you right now that the Virginia Beach City Council ruined that town and Chesapeake did the same thing. I caution you that the reason we live in Smithfield is because we had a choice. I make good money. I am highly educated. I picked this place because it is special. You have the power to preserve it or the power to destroy it. What really concerns me is the growth proposed by the County or the Town of Smithfield without the right infrastructure being in place first. How many fatalities have we had on Smiths Neck Road? Is that road at capacity? I say that it is over capacity at least at rush hour because I do not know how many accidents I have witnessed and too often they are fatal. The road is dangerous. You cannot tell me whether it is the County's development plan or the town unless you address the roads and how people get to and from safely. You are going to put our citizens at risk. If you want to see what I am talking about go down Indian River Road in Virginia Beach or Greenbrier Parkway. Please don't do that to this community. It is a beautiful gem. I brag on this place all the time. My biggest concern is that it will not be preserved. We are going to see strip malls and zero lot line developments come in. Then we will see the negative that comes with that such as crime, traffic, congestion, and schools. I know it is about dollars. The County and the Town of Smithfield is short on dollars. When you increase the residents then you also increase demand for

services. I would submit if you can tell me that the funds are there to support the required infrastructure to facilitate that growth then I will salute smartly and say good plan gentlemen. If not, I guess I will be putting my house up for sale and going somewhere else. Thank you.

Mr. Buehlman – My name is Mark Buehlman. I live at 12475 Windjammer Court. I agree with everyone else. When Mr. Saunders was going through the changes to the plan there was one area that you did not change or changed back due to the resident's wishes. Is that correct? I hope that you consider that with any other plans that you have such as the whole northeast sector.

Mr. Faison – My name is Robert Faison. I live at 20370 Hayes Lane on Battery Park. I live in the northeastern sector. I am here to speak on behalf of my property as well as my wife's siblings who have a farm on Jones Creek of about fifty acres. It is to the northeast in the corner on the map of Gatling Pointe South. Gatling Pointe South wraps around our farm. We are at the end of Hayes Lane which is one of the few dirt roads left in Isle of Wight County. I am told that it is supposed to be paved this spring. I will believe it when I see it. I have been told that many times. There are several farms down on Country Way with ours probably being the largest one of them. Most of the properties are owned by families that have owned them for years. To the best of my knowledge from having spoken to some of my neighbors they have no intentions of selling their property. If the town and County would just leave us alone and not tax us to death we would be perfectly happy to keep our properties in our family's names for as long as we can afford to do so. I personally do not see any benefit of me being taken into the Town of Smithfield. The only thing I see is another sixteen cents on top of my already high taxes that I pay to the County. There is no water or sewer that comes down that road. I do not even get mail delivered to my house. I pick it up at the Battery Park Post Office. I do not have internet, gas, or any utilities. The only thing I really get from the County is police, fire, and rescue service. They do a fine job. I do not see needing anything from the Town of Smithfield in that regard. I cannot understand how we got put into this. I can somewhat see the Scott farm because that family sold out. It lies right next to the town and if that is what they want more power to them. I do not live in Gatling Pointe. I did not want to see Gatling Pointe built. I know quite a few people that

live in Battery Park. We are kind of our own people there and want to be left alone. I do not know of anybody in the Battery Park area on that side of Gatling Pointe wants to be in the Town of Smithfield. I hope you will take all of that into consideration and recommend that they not do this. Thank you.

Mr. Burckard – My name is Albert Burckard. I live at 12303 Titus Point Lane. I am one of your eastern neighbors. I know this public hearing is not about annexation but of course we all think it is. The way that I read the Virginia Code right now is that there is a moratorium on annexations until 2018. What you are doing tonight is premature. Your recommendation to the Town Council is premature. I would suggest you recommend to Town Council to table this to give us a chance to think about it. I am not sure that attitudes are going to change. You are not going to be able to do anything for three years anyway. It is nice to have a plan. My recommendation to you is just simply recommend to the Town Council that they sort of postpone this whole discussion for at least a couple of years.

Mr. Arnold – My name is Devin Arnold. I live at 10311 Park Street in Battery Park. I am the fourth generation that lives in the house I currently live in. I could have made other choices to go to other places like bigger cities with more to do. I chose Battery Park because of the history, the identity, and my roots to that area. No one really knows about Battery Park. My allegiance is with Battery Park. We have our own identity. We are our own historic village. We have our own seafood business, post office, and our own zip code. I can see where Gatling Pointe could be a benefit to the town since it is an already developed area. I know the other people in Gatling Pointe will not like me saying that but it could be a benefit to the town. Battery Park has its own identity, culture, people, and village. We see no benefit at all being part of the Town of Smithfield.

Mr. Kelpien – My name is Terry Kelpien. I live at 14125 Hayloft Lane. The proposed annexation will be right at my back yard. Previously it was reported in the paper that the line was going to come down Beechwood Lane but not include the residents of Beechwood Lane. We all wondered how that was even possible. The picture in the paper was not expandable and was not able to be looked at but the one on the website is. None of them have seen any reports of any benefits that they would

receive from this annexation. All of neighbors have agreed with me that annexation for the purposes of garnering tax revenue is wrong. This is the same thing that is happening in Russia with Ukraine, Syria, and Iraq with the local ISIS people. Ask them how they feel about it. They do not like it. The annexation process needs to be revamped. I realize that is not your purview for you to do that. This process needs to be reviewed by our Attorney General and anybody else in the Virginia government to stop this type of process. The people who are being annexed have no vote on whether to be annexed or not. Annexation or incorporation into the town should be at the request of the residents not the request of the town. The town people should have a vote on whether they would want to absorb these people into their infrastructure. The people being absorbed also need to have a vote on this process. I just heard that there was a three year moratorium on annexation. I do not know why but it kind of relieves me a little bit. I would like to see the annexation process reviewed by the state legislature because this annexation process now is nothing but a hostile takeover for us that is the way we feel. I have had this monkey hanging on my back ever since I read about it back in October. Are we going to get overtaxed? Will we be forced to hook up to water and sewer? We moved to the County in 1981. My parents bought part of the Latimer farm to split it up into five acre parcels so that each five acre parcel was one family. Now I hear that we will have ten households per acre. It would be a townhouse, apartment or condominium. It is not why we moved here to the County. Everybody moved to the County to be separated. They could have moved to any city but they wanted the separation from the hustle and bustle. I think the annexation process needs to be reviewed. I have already notified Mr. Rick Morris. I think that we need to get the Attorney General to check on this too to verify the legalities of this situation. Thank you.

Ms. Vaccarelli – My name is Debbie Vaccarelli. I live at 10270 Park Street. First of all I want to say that I absolutely love Isle of Wight County. I live in Battery Park that is my home. I know we are not here to talk annexation but it has been the big topic. I think that you really need to reconsider your growth area. I cannot say anything about the other areas but I can tell you that everyone I have talked to wants the Battery Park area to stay like it is right now. I grew up in the Battery Park area. My family goes back to the late 1800's when my great grandparents built their home there. I have been living

there since 2001. The growth in this area is unbelievable. It is because everybody wants to live here. It is a great place to live. Please reconsider the growth area that you have marked especially the purple area. Thank you.

Mr. Egan – My name is Bill Egan. I live at 205 Clipper Creek Lane. I wanted to go on record saying that I am opposed to the annexation of Gatling Pointe. I do not see any benefit. No services are increased. Maybe there is something hidden that could be revealed that would show some advantage but at this point I do not see anything.

Mrs. Egan – My name is Betsy Egan. I live at 205 Clipper Creek Lane. I thank you for all of the hard work on the plan. Long range planning is a challenge. I agree with the comments that are against the expansion into the purple area. I do not believe in involuntary annexation. I believe this meeting is about annexation because if you do not build it they will not come. You paved the way with your plan for the annexation. I would like to clarify Mr. Burckard's comment as I understand it about the moratorium on annexation by cities of county land that came about in 1987. It has been repeatedly extended. In 2018 is when it will be reviewed again and probably will be extended again but it is different for towns and counties. There is a big difference between a town and a city. A website called Virginia Places goes into that very clearly. I do not think the moratorium applies here but I could be wrong but that is how I understand it. The reason for that was because involuntary annexations were a nightmare. The whole state of Virginia did away with it for cities. With the counties a panel of judges at the state level approves annexations as I understand it. There have been zero denied or withdrawn annexations in that area since the 1970's because it was too expensive to go into lawsuits and legal fights. Compromise paved the way and there were just approvals. This will probably go the same way because we are cordial and friendly people. We want the best for each other. I think the traffic is going to be a nightmare. It has not been addressed with this. I thank you for your careful planning. Please put a finer point on some of these areas and listen to your neighbors. Could we have a show of hands for all of those who deferred to speak who agree to not annexing the northeast growth area? Thank you.

Mr. Gonzalez – My name is Larry Gonzalez. I live at 20521 Madison Court. I have been there for about twelve years. I came from Fort Lauderdale and before that I

came from High Point, North Carolina. We lived in a community very similar to Gatling Pointe in High Point. It was a country area out of town. It was a very lovely place. The city wanted us. The city came across a lake to survey lines that were incorrect. Somehow they still got us. Within a year they were breaking ground and built thousands of little tacky houses with vinyl sides on it. Today they are looking for more land because the infrastructure is greater than the taxes that they are receiving. When I moved to Fort Lauderdale I ended up with the same thing. They had millions of dollars of infrastructure that they had to put in. Their taxes did not cover all of the expenses. I have been here for twelve or thirteen years. I love it. The first place I was taken by the realtors was Chesapeake. I felt that it was another Fort Lauderdale. I want country living. After I finish work I want to come across the bridge to see cornfields and trees. I want to come home to a nice community so we moved to Gatling Pointe. By the way the town of Plantation is very close to filing for Chapter 11. They have gotten so deeply involved in cost that their revenues are just unbelievable. I spoke to one of the folks last night about the infrastructure on our roads. Battery Park is two lanes and a little two lane bridge that goes across it. She said that the plans are to go across the open area that is all wooded to connect to Route 17 and it will cost \$7 million dollars. They plan for an extension but it would cost \$7 million dollars for that small extension. I figure you guys are going to have to increase Battery Park Road to a four lane road at least and then put a new bridge in with four lanes. You are talking about millions of dollars of infrastructure. I do not know if that is going to be a very good investment. I think they need to look at how much it is really going to cost. If you put two thousand homes up there many will have kids so you will need new schools which is another \$20 million. You will need a new fire department because the density will be greater than what you have for your police and fire department now. There are all kinds of other little amenities that you are going to have to get involved in. Are you going to repair our streets like they are now or will they look like Main Street in Smithfield. Basically I think in the long run these annexations cost more than they really bring in. None of us are interested in annexation. The whole idea is that if it is going to benefit each group then I can understand it. I do not see a benefit for either of us. Thank you very much.

Mr. Petty – My name is Mike Petty. I live at 100 Mariners Point Lane in Gatling Pointe. I am the president of the Gatling Pointe Homeowners Association Board of Directors. I thank you for setting the record straight about the things people are saying about whether Gatling Pointe residents want to be annexed or not. The Homeowners Association Board sent out a survey to our residents to ask if they wanted to be annexed into the town. In that survey we received really good results as far as volume. The results showed 93.4% of the people surveyed said that they were absolutely against annexation, 1.9% undecided, and 4.7% in favor. We took those numbers and immediately thought that was a good indication of the residents not being in favor of it. One of the residents suggested that we get a petition together for the Planning Commission meeting on Tuesday night. The petition says by signing below I hereby state that I am adamantly opposed to Gatling Pointe's annexation into the Town of Smithfield. This was Saturday night. We have one hundred and one signatures on this paper right now. I hope with this data that we are coming across clear. We have no intentions of being in favor of being annexed into the town. We are asking you to remove Gatling Pointe, Gatling Pointe South, Scott's farm, and Battery Park from the proposal. Do not move it forward. We are here to try to persuade you to not even consider it when you send it to the Town Council. Thank you.

Vice Chair Hillegass – What are the numbers? You said you had 93% of residents.

Mr. Petty – We polled by residence. We normally have one email address per family. There are two hundred and sixty homes in Gatling Pointe. The people who responded were just over a hundred so a hundred homes out of two hundred and fifty. The poll was only done on Gatling Pointe. We have had similar conversations with the south side and it has been overwhelmingly in the same direction.

Mr. Torrey – The one hundred people are only since Saturday.

Mr. Petty – The one hundred and one signatures on the petition was since Saturday. Little over a hundred people responded to the survey that was done a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Edwards – My name is Garrett Edwards. I represent the eastern growth sector except the two or three lots up in the northern corner. Mr. Harvey Saunders owns

five hundred acre farm right at the bridge. Your map is incorrect. I believe that the earlobe to the west has already been annexed by Smithfield about twenty acres I believe. I may be incorrect. Basically there are four voting members on the farm six if you include my children. I polled them all night and none of us are interested. I want to let everyone know what the eastern growth sector is about. The eastern growth sector is a farm. I think I heard that maybe a thousand to one thousand and three hundred homes were proposed. My father may say sure for \$200,000.00 or \$300,000.00 per house. Maybe we would agree to it but I do not think so. The farm is a century farm. It has been in our family for over one hundred years. I have always voted so I have also considered myself to be involved in government. About four weeks ago it came to my attention that the County had drawn a line straight through the middle of our farm. It was a proposal. The proposal was made without even mentioning it to us. No one asked if we would consider letting the line come through the farm. I realize that you cannot go out and talk to thousands of people. I think government has gotten so complicated. I do not mean anything bad about attorneys but if you need an attorney to understand how the government works then that is just sad. I think what I would like to see the County and town sit down together. I realize that growth is important. A gentleman said that Mercury Boulevard was once all farms. It is all going to grow. Does growth really have to happen? Is there a point where we cover this entire country with homes? I think there is a reason to leave some of this alone. There is nothing wrong with that. What I would like to propose is the Planning Commission get together with the County. If this ends up in the paper I would also appreciate the paper getting the facts correct. I do not like reading incorrect information. If you own a piece of property and you want to develop it I do not think there is a thing in the world wrong with it as long as you follow whatever guidelines are setup. But if I do not want develop my piece of property then I do not have to. When it snows I scrap part of Nike Park Road so that I can go back and forth to my family's house. I remove trees. I realize we are in a different position because we have equipment. There are not too many services that you are going to offer me or my family. I may be wrong about that. My kids may decide to but we do not want to. We are 100% against being taken in including my children and the twenty-five cows. If you can offer us something that may be worthwhile maybe we would consider it. What I would

really like to see is the County and town talk to people before they make these decisions. I am probably a bit naïve because I do not think you can come out and do this. I appreciate attorneys for different things but I do not think we need an attorney to figure government out. If government has gotten so complicated from here all the way to the top then I think it needs to change. Thank you.

Mr. Degroft – My name is Herb Degroft. I live at 15411 Mill Swamp Road. The only reason that I asked to speak was relative to schools. I have only heard two people mention schools. It is the sneaky one in looking at growth. As far as the whole Comprehensive Plan is concerned I believe the Weldon Cooper Center at the University of Virginia is the source by law in the Virginia code that says that you are supposed to use their data. As we found relative to the ISLE 2040 plan they did not do that. They chose to disregard it. The County says there will be five thousand and one hundred more school children by year 2040 than there are now. We have about five thousand and five hundred children in the County now. If you look at the simple average growth over the last fourteen years that is thirty-five students per year and if you multiply thirty-five by fourteen it comes out to eight hundred and seventy-five. It is a whole lot different than what the County came up with. In your planning that is why I would strongly recommend it. Kids can sneak up on you. Do you remember when the lights went out in New York City back in the 1950's? They hooked up the USS Lafayette to the power grid to keep essential things going. People made babies and nine months later a whole bunch of them showed up. I do not want it to happen in Isle of Wight County even if you guys go with medium or high density. A hurricane could come along and cause that kind of problem. Low density I think is the way to go in the areas that you are looking at changing on the periphery of Smithfield whatever you choose to do. Low density will maintain the quality of life. It will minimize the impact on transportation. I have argued relative to the ISLE 2040 plan that I hardly think the state of Virginia is going to build another parallel bridge to the James River Bridge, Chuckatuck Creek Bridge, or the Godwin Bridge just to get people to Isle of Wight County. I would hope that the Smithfield Planning Commission would recommend to the Town Council that they keep density low and minimize acquiring too much. If we use the kiss principle many of us in

the military know what that means it will keep things a whole lot better. Thank you very much for your efforts.

Ms. Hulick – My name is Victoria Hulick. I live at 20655 Creekside Drive in Gatling Pointe South. I am one of those young families you are trying to bring into Smithfield. We used to live in Portsmouth so it was a local move. My husband works for the Department of Defense in Norfolk. One of the reasons we moved to Isle of Wight County was because we liked seeing the fields and horses. We did not get that in Portsmouth. Portsmouth is a great place to live too but it is not Isle of Wight County. We moved here because the schools are better. We moved here because there was space. I cannot tell people what to do with land they own. I did not move out here to have my property value drop a year and a half after I move because they are putting in lower density housing. The Isle of Wight County plan was different than yours. The roads are a mess. They had to hire another kindergarten teacher at Carrollton Elementary because it was overcrowded. There were thirty kids in the classroom which is without any development. I am very concerned about the schools. I am also concerned about environmental factors which nobody has talked about at all. What about light pollution? When I lived in Portsmouth I could see the North Star and the moon that was it. Now I can go in my back yard and see a massive amount of stars. They are beautiful. It is part of what makes this County beautiful. You take away the things like the stars and the sweet smell of air when you get that warm breeze off the water. You take that away by crowding hundreds of people into this area. It is disappointing and disheartening. I feel like we can do better not just for ourselves but for our kids and grandkids. To me annexing seems like a big mess between the pipeline with the water and getting tax revenue. I really feel for the people in Battery Park because they are getting nothing from you. I just hope you consider that. It looks like the purple area in general and the gentleman who owns the eastern corridor does not want to be in Smithfield. We love Smithfield. We love Isle of Wight County. We want to keep our space. We think you would be better off that way too. Thank you.

Mr. Williams – My name is Rex Williams. I live at 107 Watch Harbour Circle. I was involved in the last one you did in 2005-2006. We went through the analysis. At that time, it appeared that for about a 20% increase in taxes we got trash pickup twice per

week. We considered that really was not a good deal. I would encourage you if you have any influence about what goes into the newspaper that you try to get the facts right. The analysis that was done was published in the newspaper very conveniently forgot that if the Gatling Pointe Yacht Club gets annexed then you will put tax on what we eat and drink and the boat owners will also have a hefty boat tax put on them. It was not mentioned in the analysis that was published in the paper. The people that you are trying to annex get no benefit out of it basically. Thank you.

Chairman Davidson – Would anyone else like to speak? If not, I close the public hearing. We will move on to consideration.

Mr. Pack – We certainly heard some opinions tonight. One of the things when we started discussing the growth plan and annexation is that we wanted to make sure that we were fair, open, and honest about it. It is part of what this meeting is about this evening particularly the open part. It is really supposed to be more of an invitation to invite people into the Town of Smithfield. I am the Town Council representative to the Planning Commission. One of the things that we discussed is that we want folks to be able to come to Smithfield not be forced into Smithfield. I would be willing to bet that everybody in this room feels that they are being forced which is what I heard. In lieu of that I think it makes sense for the Planning Commission to reconsider these maps before we make a recommendation to Council. Our job is to make a recommendation. One of the great things about Smithfield is that we do not force folks to do anything they do not want to do. We are trying to protect our town. I think that every member of the Planning Commission has the same interest as these folks do in protecting the town. A lot of people asked me how I was going to vote tonight. I told them that this was just all about the future and what we think. I said I would probably vote for this until an hour and a half ago. I think we should look at this map a little harder.

Mr. Swecker – I was going to propose before Mr. Pack spoke up that we delay this for another thirty days. Thirty days is not going to make or break us. These people gave up their time to come out tonight. If my calculations are right only one person said they were okay with annexation. Like I said before, we are all one not two different identities. We are all Isle of Wight County no matter how we look at it. We can come back next month to decide what we want to do then. Let us re-evaluate and listen to

these people who work and vote whether they live in the town or in the County. They still make Smithfield look good. We should wait thirty days to look at it again.

Dr. Pope – Are we going to develop any more work sessions in order to keep working through this?

Chairman Davidson – I would think we have to.

Dr. Pope – I think we are going to have to talk about it and go through it more.

Mr. Pack – As you said we are under no time constraints. If we do not do this next month it is not going to hurt anything.

Chairman Davidson – We had to open this process. You are right. There are no time constraints on this.

Mr. Pack – I would suggest discussing it at our Planning Commission meeting next month so the public has input rather than a work session. So we can have an open discussion about what our ideas are. We could do a work session too. There is no real hurry unless I am wrong to get this absolutely done.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – The Comprehensive Plan update is an ongoing process. The growth area issue was something that was pushed to the forefront so that we could get this work behind us at the work sessions on a timeline. If the Commission has a consensus tonight on how they want to see the map revised then we can make those revisions and bring it back to the next Planning Commission meeting. If there is no consensus tonight then we could have a work session as part of the regularly scheduled meeting or a separate work session. It is really however you all want to do it. We can have a portion of the regular meeting be a work session. If we just have another regular meeting it does not mean there will be another public hearing unless we specifically advertise it.

Mr. Pack – I was talking about another work session with the public.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – We can certainly do that.

Vice Chair Hillegass – I am not sure we have consensus on map revisions. I would also like to hear input from other citizens about the other growth areas that we have identified. We have heard a great outpouring from Gatling Pointe. We definitely hear you. We will certainly make changes based on those comments. I would also like

to hear from other residents that are impacted by some of the other areas. I think we need to take a fresh look at this map in its entirety.

Chairman Davidson – One thing that I would like to make perfectly clear is whether we are having work sessions or actual Planning Commission meeting the public is always invited. I really want you to understand that. We do not do things behind closed doors. We now move to Planning Commission Comments?

Mr. Bryan – I think the main objective and what we cannot lose sight of is that there is a reason for this which is to manage growth around the town boundaries. This growth is going to happen whether it is the town or the County managing it. Looking at the way it is projected now concerning Battery Park it is a low density residential area which would extend to Gatling Pointe. Anything that is farmed there would still be permitted. Farm land would not go away because of that. I also like the idea of a boundary adjustment. If we can talk to the County then that would be fine. The County is encroaching on the town's border which is our concern. Our concern is not to grow the town. It is to manage the growth around the town. One of the advantages if Gatling Pointe would be annexed is you would actually have a voice in what the town does. Right now you do not. Another point that I would like to make is the possibility of Gatling Pointe incorporating and becoming a town. It may not sound viable at the moment but this is to deal with future growth ten or twenty years out. It is what we have to address here as part of this Planning Commission. Growth is going to happen. The only question is who is going to manage it. The town wants to maintain some control of what is happening on its borders. That is what this is about mainly. What is the real fear? I am not sure I understand the real fear here. Is it growth? That is going to happen. Is it taxes? Taxes are going to happen. No one here tonight mentioned the County's water deal.

Chairman Davidson – We need a time out. We are not getting into another public discussion. You all had your chance to speak now we are having Planning Commission comments.

Mr. Bryan – I am sure that Mr. Bodson is aware of this. The County is looking for revenue to pay for the water deal. It is going to fall on someone.

Mr. Torrey – I think it is obvious that we need to go back and look at multiple sectors. I think we need another work session.

Chairman Davidson – If everyone is done speaking I will entertain a motion.

Mr. Swecker – I would like to make a motion that we table this for at least thirty days. We have listen to the citizens about what they want. We will make the best decision that we can.

Town Attorney – It needs to be deferred to a certain time like your next regularly scheduled meeting. It cannot be for thirty days. It needs to be a certain date. I would suggest the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Swecker – I would like to make a motion to defer this until the next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting.

Vice Chair Hillegass – Second.

Chairman Davidson – A motion has been made and properly seconded that we table the future land use growth area map until our next regular Planning Commission meeting, March 10th, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. All those in favor say aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, seven members were present. Mr. Bryan voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Pack voted aye, Mr. Swecker voted aye, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, Vice Chair Hillegass voted aye, and Chairman Davidson voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Davidson – The next item is Pierceville Subdivision Conceptual Plan. It is just for information. Could we have a staff report please?

Planning and Zoning Administrator – A developer has expressed interest in purchasing the Pierceville farm and creating a residential subdivision. We have had a pre-application meeting prior to any type of site plan submittal or rezoning application. This is the conceptual plan that was submitted for that pre-application meeting. There is some site data on it. It would have one hundred and fifty-two lots approximately 2.6 dwelling units per acre. The average lot size would be a minimum of 6,000 square feet. This subdivision does fall within the town's historic district. The construction of homes within it would fall under those guidelines. It will connect to the sidewalk network of downtown so it will add to that. There is a long way to go on this. We do not know if they will make it all the way. We have brought the plan and some elevations to the Board of

Historic and Architectural Review to get some feedback. This plan has been brought to the Town Council for feedback. Now we are bringing it to the Planning Commission as an information item. You can provide feedback on record that can be turned over to the developer as he goes through these preliminary stages of drawing up this subdivision application.

Vice Chair Hillegass – Is there anyone representing the developer tonight?

Planning and Zoning Administrator – No, Ma'am.

Town Attorney – He did not come to the Board of Historic and Architectural Review meeting either. It was a criticism there because if you are asking for feedback then you should be there to receive it.

Vice Chair Hillegass – I know some of the issues that the Board of Historic and Architectural Review had with the proposal were drawings of proposed structures. There were five different structures proposed and two of them were flips of two other designs. The variety was not there. There were not a lot of things that would create any sort of architectural character. They certainly used materials that we had approved before but there was nothing that gave them the character and the charm of the historic district. I do not think you have those drawings in your packet tonight. They were basically slab type houses with a quasi-Victorian look which is being generous. We had some concerns but again no one was there to answer any of our questions. We did not take any action.

Mr. Pack – I understand that the developer was not at the meeting. In his defense from our meeting we had with the developer for the pre-application hearing we met on a Tuesday and the following Tuesday was the Board of Historic and Architectural Review meeting. Staff asked if we could present this to the Board of Historic and Architectural Review. The developer was certainly fine with putting some basic notes on it but did not promise that he could be there. I do not want that to be held against him because it was not an official final presentation. He was not looking for approval. He was looking for a little bit of feedback. I assume he has been given that.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – This is not an action item just strictly to try to get feedback from all of the boards and committees that would provide that to the developer.

Mr. Pack – I was at the meeting as well when we met with the developer. A couple of things that we asked him to look into from my standpoint really more around this entrance next door to the former Little's Supermarket and the Schoolhouse Museum. I wanted to insure that the sidewalks tied into Main Street. You will see the extension of Grace Street that goes across to make sure all of the sidewalks in that area are easily accessible to the folks in the neighborhood to access downtown. There are several groups in the area that think this is potentially a huge benefit to the downtown merchants including restaurants and shops. With one hundred and fifty homes I would be willing to bet that doubles the size of downtown Smithfield. I do not know exactly how many homes are down there but this would be a significant chunk of them. We want to make sure that this flows into downtown. It is the last piece of developable land of any size in downtown Smithfield. We need to make sure that if we approve this then we do so correctly and that it fits the model of what we already have in downtown Smithfield. The last thing I want to see is a junk neighborhood on this property in the downtown Smithfield area. We should make sure that this gets done correctly. We need to protect what makes Smithfield so cool. As Board of Historic and Architectural Review suggested we need some Victorian style homes. Of course they would be subject to all the design regulations and material specifications that Board of Historic and Architectural Review requires. I am not opposed to having one hundred and fifty homes down there. I think it is a great opportunity for us. As a Planning Commission I think we need to make sure that this project proceeds so that it is done correctly. So when a brand new neighborhood goes in you do not know that it is a brand new you think you are on Cary Street, Grace Street, or Cedar Street.

Vice Chair Hillegass – There are some examples just up from the YMCA. There is a big new house where Mr. Davidson owns some property. There is a cottage at the back of Institute Street. It is a small house but in keeping with the architectural elements. There are lots of examples of what could be done. The other issue that has been brought to my attention by some citizens is the fact that it looks like some of the outbuildings were going to be let go. I wondered if there was some more information on that. How many of the structures will be saved or let go in terms of the barns and the house?

Mr. Pack – It was addressed. My understanding from the developer is that the house and the barn immediately close together are landmarked historic and will be preserved whereas the other barns that are falling down will not be saved.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – We actually had a meeting with the developer months ago. The chairman of the Board of Historic and Architectural Review, Mr. Roger Ealy, and me met with the developer and his planner. We had already done an inventory of the barns to look for historical significance as well as their current condition in 2010. Using that survey as well as the circumstances on the site at the time, we identified three outbuildings that should be preserved as part of this project. The balance of them was either beyond repair or did not garner significant historic quality or quantity to make it feasible to save them. Basically there was one small outbuilding near the house and two of the large structures that are closer to the old health department building were three that were identified to be saved. As the Board of Historic and Architectural Review chairman said basically to get his recommendation that the Board of Historic and Architectural of Review approved demolish of the balance those three would need to be saved.

Vice Chair Hillegass – The house and the three outbuildings.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – The two largest barns next to the old health department and the one other outbuilding that is in the yard proper were recommended to be saved.

Dr. Pope – What type of recommendation do we have about the Dominion Virginia Power utility line running right down the center of this subdivision? Is there a way to get that removed or rerouted? Can the power come from another location within the town to eliminate this eyesore going down the middle of the subdivision?

Mr. Pack – Apparently it is a major power grid that feeds the power plants and the packing plants. It is expensive to get buried. They are saying that they cannot move that. Do we have any authority as a Planning Commission?

Town Attorney – No but you do not have to approve it. It is beyond the scope of what you can require.

Vice Chair Hillegass – We could recommend it. Expensive is a relative term.

Town Attorney – If you equate it is a lot less distance that was done on South Church Street. The South Church Street Project cost millions. It is a major trunk line that runs through there. This is a modern subdivision design to get as many lots on a piece of property as you can get. There needs to be some creative thinking.

Vice Chair Hillegass – It is my concern. Is this one hundred and fifty-two by-right?

Town Attorney – Actually he could get more.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – It is not rezoned. Currently it is zoned Community Conservation. The density that he gets will be subject to what rezoning he gets approved. They are looking at the same zoning district the downtown neighborhood residential that is being used in the bulk of the historic residential areas right now. It is less dense than what that zoning district would allow for currently and part of that has to do with the amount of easement, stormwater management, green space shown and accommodating part of the Pierceville house and barns on a larger piece of it. They could put a lot more density if it were rezoned to Downtown Neighborhood Residential than what is shown here.

Vice Chair Hillegass – From a staff perspective, other than preserving the historical structures and green spaces, what amenities are we getting? Are there proffers being offered?

Town Attorney – There is not even an application yet.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – There is no application for a rezoning. Typically proffers would come in the application for rezoning. They only amenities shown are a couple of pocket parks. They have a pocket park shown across from the YMCA and another closer to the Pierceville house. It is really just a suburban type subdivision in the historic district.

Vice Chair Hillegass – I would think it would be an important recommendation once this application comes before to offer proffers in addition to some design direction.

Chairman Davidson – Is there any other feedback?

Dr. Pope – Are they going to put sidewalks to the YMCA? I would imagine that a lot of these residents would use that facility.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – They had discussed putting a crosswalk across from the pocket park to connect to the YMCA new sidewalks. It is not shown on this plan.

Chairman Davidson – They do not even have sidewalks all the way up Cary Street to the YMCA right now.

Mr. Swecker – Is the Town Council supposed to be looking into that as far as getting the sidewalks up Cary Street?

Mr. Pack – Yes. We discussed it. It is County property.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – Actually Mr. Bill Hopkins and Ms. Beverly Walkup were discussing it prior to January. I believe the Town Manager is going to have the town engineer discuss it since it is County property.

Mr. Pack – We will bring it back up. I will see if the Town Manager can give us an update at committee level.

Mr. Swecker – I was just thinking about it when he asked if it would connect. There is nothing there to connect.

Mr. Pack – Does the YMCA have a sidewalk to connect all the way up to Cary Street? Do they already have one in place?

Mr. Torrey – The sidewalk wraps all the way around the fitness center and goes down by the parking lot.

Chairman Davidson – I know when we had the pre-application meeting he was looking to come in at a particular price point certainly 4000 square foot would not be in it.

Mr. Swecker – It is the last piece of land in town to develop. It has to be done right.

Mr. Bryan – The little structure in the top left corner there is something reserved for commercial downtown zoning. Do we have any idea what would go there?

Mr. Pack – The planner says probably nothing because it is not big enough. They are in negotiations with the Mr. Bobby Little but are not sure how that is going to go. If they are not able to acquire it the thought is that eventually somebody will be able to. At which time there would be enough space in the front to have some sort of commercial activity.

Mr. Bryan – Is anything in here considered affordable housing?

Chairman Davidson – The only thing I heard was he was striving for the \$250,000.00 range.

Planning and Zoning Administrator – I think he said that he would have some units in the \$180,000.00 range then the balance would go up from there.

Chairman Davidson – Is there any further discussion on the Pierceville property? Hearing none, we will move to Approval of the December 9th, 2014 Meeting Minutes.

Town Attorney – Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed them and made minor corrections and would recommend the minutes be approved as corrected.

Vice Chair Hillegass – So moved.

Mr. Pack – Second.

Chairman Davidson – A motion has been made and properly seconded that we approve the minutes. All those in favor say aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, seven members were present. Mr. Bryan voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Pack voted aye, Mr. Swecker voted aye, Vice Chair Hillegass voted aye, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, and Chairman Davidson voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Davidson – Is there any further business? The meeting is adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.



Bill Davidson
Chairman



William G. Saunders, IV
Planning and Zoning Administrator