

DRAFT MINUTES
Planning Commission
County of Prince George, Virginia
Business Meeting
March 28, 2024

County Administration Building, Board Room, Third Floor
6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia 23875

CALL TO ORDER. The Regular Meeting of the Prince George County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 28, 2024, in the Board Room, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia by Ms. Anderson, Chair.

ATTENDANCE. The following members responded to Roll Call:

Alex Bresko	Present
Stephen Brockwell	Present
Tammy Anderson, Vice-Chair	Present
Jennifer Canepa	Present
Imogene Elder, Chair	Present
Clarence Joyner	Absent
Brian Waymack	Present

Staff present: Robert Baldwin, Planning Director; Tim Graves, Planner II; Koty Gray, Planner I; Madison Sobczak, Planning Technician

INVOCATION. Ms. Anderson provided the Invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG. Mr. Bresko led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States flag.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA. Ms. Anderson asked the Commissioners for a motion to approve the Agenda for the March 28, 2024, Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Bresko made a motion to approve the Agenda and Mr. Brockwell seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Anderson, Canepa, Elder, Waymack, Bresko, Brockwell

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

At 6:33 p.m., Ms. Anderson opened the Public Comment Period to anyone who wished to come forward to speak to the Commissioners on topics that were not on the Agenda as Public Hearings. Citizens were asked to limit their comments to three (3) minutes.

Richard Tetterton Jr. of 9750 Blackwater Farm Lane stated he wanted to support all home businesses anything to discourage small home businesses in the county would be a disgrace. He then stated he was against proffers for the following reasons:

- Average home buyers are already spending more on mortgage payments because of inflation.
- Proffers increase the monthly cost to home buyers.
- Proffers increase the value of houses which increases the real estate taxes.
- Home buyers are being told the developer pays the proffers.
- Proffers make it difficult to have affordable housing because it adds additional cost to the home.

With no one else wishing to speak Ms. Anderson closed the Public Comment Period at 6:37 p.m.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS.

Ms. Anderson asked the Commissioners if they had any comments they would like to share.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

A-1. Adoption of the Work Session Minutes – February 20, 2024

Ms. Anderson asked the Commissioners to review the Work Session Minutes from February 20, 2024. Ms. Canepa made a motion to approve the February 20, 2024, Work Session Minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Elder.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Elder, Waymack, Bresko, Brockwell, Anderson, Canepa

Abstain: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner

A-2. Adoption of Business Meeting Minutes – February 22, 2024

Ms. Anderson asked the Commissioners to review the Minutes of the February 22, 2024, Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Waymack made a motion to approve the February 22, 2024, Meeting Minutes as written. The motion for approval was seconded by Ms. Canepa.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Waymack, Bresko, Brockwell, Anderson, Canepa, Elder

Opposed: (0)

Abstain: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner

A-3. Adoption of Revised 2024 (to Jan. 2025) Meeting Schedule

Ms. Anderson asked the Commissioners to review the revised 2024 Meeting Schedule. Mr. Bresko made a motion to adopt the Revised 2024 Meeting Schedule. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brockwell.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Anderson, Elder, Bresko, Waymack, Canepa, Brockwell

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner

PUBLIC HEARINGS

P-1. REZONING RZ-24-01: Request to conditionally rezone 8.761 acres from R-2 (Limited Residential District) to R-TH (Residential Townhouse District). The purpose of the rezoning is to develop up to 56 townhomes in Prince George County. The subject property is located west of the intersection of Monroe Ave. and Butor Rd. on the border with the City of Hopewell, and a larger portion of the overall development is proposed to be located in the City of Hopewell. The property in Prince George County consists of 4 tax parcels identified as Tax Map #s 120(01)00-002-0, 003-0, 004-0 and 005-0. The Comprehensive Plan indicates the property is planned for Residential uses. **[5] Tim Graves**

Mr. Graves presented RZ-24-01 to the Commission. (The staff report materials including the application materials are posted on the Planning Department website in the Planning Commission Meetings section.)

Mr. Graves stated the applicant was present and had a presentation for Commissioners.

Mr. David Monds introduced himself and stated he was the Development Manager for this project. He stated he hoped the Commissioners made a recommendation for approval for the following reasons:

- The development would provide several amenities to the community.
- It's an opportunity to increase housing stock in the County.
- Increases tax revenue.
- It's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and future land use.

With no questions or concerns from the Commissioners, Ms. Anderson opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.

Richard Tetterton stated he supported the project for the following reasons:

- Preserves the rural areas of Prince George but also gives you 56 additional homes in the county.
- The proposed townhouses would be easier for first responders and police.
- This project aligns with the direction the world is going and helps save land.
- This will be more than just entry level homes and will also appeal to senior citizens in the county.

He then stated he does not support the proffers in this project for the following reasons:

- It makes the houses less affordable in a market where there is already a housing shortage.

He stated he would like to see a regional builder build the townhomes versus national builders.

Chris Austin of 4903 Edenberg Court introduced himself and asked how this project would impact taxes. He stated the project abuts his property line and he wanted to know how close the tree buffer would be to his property line.

With no one else wishing to speak, Ms. Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 7:12 p.m.

Mr. Monds stated they are not opposed to hiring a local or regional builder to develop the townhomes. He then stated they are required to have a minimum of 100 feet in separation from their property to adjacent property owners, and there are wetlands present near the shared property line so they would not be affecting that area at all.

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Graves if there was anyone present that could answer Mr. Austin's question about taxes.

Mr. Graves stated that The Board of Supervisors makes all decisions regarding taxes and he could not predict if it would have any impact or not.

Ms. Elder asked how many bedrooms each unit would have.

Mr. Monds stated all units would have 3 bedrooms, 2 and a half bathrooms, with a 1-car garage.

Ms. Anderson asked for the square footage of each unit.

Mr. Monds stated each unit would have a minimum of 1,250 square feet.

Ms. Anderson asked if the Commissioners had any further questions for staff. With there being no further questions Ms. Anderson stated she would entertain a motion.

Ms. Canepa motioned to forward request RZ-24-01 to the Board with a recommendation for approval, subject to the proffered conditions dated 3/12/2024; The reason for this recommendation is it is expected to benefit the general welfare of the community. Mr. Waymack seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (5) Canepa, Bresko, Brockwell, Anderson, Waymack

Opposed: (1) Elder

Absent: (1) Joyner

- P-2. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-23-11:** Request within a General Business (B-1) Zoning District to permit a private school (pre-school) for children ages 3 through 5, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-393(32), and to permit a child-care center (religious exempt daycare) for children ages 3 through 12, pursuant to Section 90-393(28). The subject property is located at 5258 Oaklawn Boulevard, and is identified as Tax Map # 120(03)00-00C-0. The Comprehensive Plan indicates the property is planned for "Commercial" land uses. **[6] Tim Graves**

Mr. Graves presented SE-23-11 to the Commission. (The staff report materials including the application materials are posted on the Planning Department website in the Planning Commission Meetings section.)

Mr. Graves stated the applicant was not present to answer questions from Commissioners.

Ms. Anderson asked if the childcare closing at 5 p.m. would cause any sort of violation if the children were to be picked up late due to parents work schedules.

Mr. Graves stated the county is not recommending any conditions be placed on the business hours.

With no questions or concerns from the Commissioners, Ms. Anderson opened the Public Hearing at 7:24 p.m. With no one wishing to speak, Ms. Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 7:24 p.m.

Ms. Anderson asked if the Commissioners had any further questions for staff. With there being no further questions Ms. Anderson stated she would entertain a motion. Ms. Canepa made a motion to forward request SE-23-11 to the Board with the recommendation for approval subject to the recommended conditions in the Staff Report; the reason for this recommendation is it is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and surrounding land uses and zoning districts. Mr. Waymack seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Canepa, Anderson, Brockwell, Bresko, Waymack, Elder

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner

- P-3. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-24-01:** Request within a Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zoning District to permit extraction of natural resources (borrow pit) pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-103(21), and to permit processing of agricultural and forest products pursuant to section 90-103(11), and to permit landscaping supplies sales pursuant to Section 90-103(8). The purpose of the request is to allow designated areas of the land to be excavated and backfilled, and to mulch agricultural and forest products onsite, and to provide online sales pickup for materials stored on-site. The subject property, which is located on the southwestern quadrant of the intersection of James River Drive (SR10) and Ruffin Road, is identified as Tax Map #s 130(0A)00-074-0, 140(0A)00-003-0, and 140(0A)00-005-0. The land uses are proposed to occur in work areas totaling approximately 85 acres out of a total parcel area of approximately 238 acres. The Comprehensive Plan indicates the property is planned for Village Center and Residential land uses. [7] **Tim Graves**

Mr. Graves presented SE-24-01 to the Commission. (The staff report materials including the application materials are posted on the Planning Department website in the Planning Commission Meetings section.)

Mr. Graves stated the applicant was present to answer questions from Commissioners.

Mr. Bresko asked if the 250 loads a day would require turn lanes.

Mr. Graves confirmed that VDOT did not require turn lanes for this project and stated that would be reviewed again at the time of site plan submittal.

Ms. Anderson asked if a permit from the Department of Energy would be needed before the beginning of mining operations on the property.

Mr. Graves stated the permit from Department of Energy is only applicable to regulate the extraction of resources and not the sale and production of materials.

Mike Ellis introduced himself to the Commission and stated he is helping the property owner reclaim her property from the kudzu after many attempts to spray the overgrowth. He also stated materials would be distributed throughout the county to citizens.

Ms. Elder asked Mr. Ellis about traffic impacts if citizens are allowed to bring in debris from their residence.

Mr. Ellis stated that it would increase traffic in and out of the property but it would be a benefit to residents to be allowed to drop off brush and yard debris.

Mr. Brockwell suggested to see how traffic is impacted first without residential drop-off and if the traffic is not impacted like Mr. Ellis thought it would be, that he could revisit the idea of opening it up to the public to be able to drop off residential debris and brush.

Mr. Ellis stated he had spoken to Mr. Graves about the potential traffic impact with residential drop-off and explained that it would be hard to accommodate the increase in traffic because there is no way to know or regulate how many potential loads would be coming in or out at any given time.

Ms. Anderson stated she had to have multiple trees removed from her residence and spent over \$1,000.00 to take and dispose of the wood at the landfill. She then stated the debris at the landfill is not being used or mulched and being able to take the debris to the borrow pit would be a good alternative because it would benefit the citizens.

Mr. Graves stated if the request is approved, Mr. Ellis is able to come back to the Planning Commission and ask to modify and add public drop-off to the request if it goes forward as is. He then stated there are other things that would need to be looked at before being able to change the request such as if any additional permits were required, and if it would change the borrow pit to a landfill of natural debris. He explained if Mr. Ellis wanted to proceed with the change on the request, staff would recommend postponing a decision for approval, but if he wanted to move forward as it is, Mr. Ellis can come back later and modify the request.

Ms. Anderson asked how residential drop off was outside of the request because the original request did not say importing was limited to commercial use.

Mr. Graves stated Staff talked with Mr. Ellis to determine where the importing of material would come from and the recommendations from Staff are based on Mr. Ellis being able to have control of incoming and outgoing trips.

Ms. Anderson asked if Mr. Ellis could consider setting up appointments for residential drop-offs to allow more control over the incoming and outgoing traffic.

Mr. Graves stated staff would need to discuss and review that first before providing a recommendation on that.

Mr. Ellis explained residential drop-off is something will be included in the site plan review.

Mr. Bresko stated it could be changed to be an appointment based drop-off only.

Ms. Canepa stated residential drop-off is currently not allowed in this request.

Ms. Anderson asked if the Commission could recommend approval as is or if the Commission, as a part of a motion, could add the change into their motion.

Mr. Graves stated the Commission could add a change to the motion but he encouraged the Commission to allow staff time to review the change before moving forward with it.

With no further questions or concerns from the Commissioners, Ms. Anderson opened the Public Hearing at 7:54 p.m. With no one wishing to speak, Ms. Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 7:54 p.m.

Ms. Anderson asked if the Commissioners had any further questions for staff. With there being no further questions Ms. Anderson stated she would entertain a motion. Mr. Waymack made a motion to forward request SE-24-01 to the Board with the recommendation for approval subject to the recommended conditions in the Staff Report; the reasons are including but not limited to, the Borrow Pit will supply materials to a number of different projects in our area as well as contribute to road construction projects with VDOT, it will be reclamation of pasture land in this proposal, and the intake of wooded vegetation and materials for recycling to create mulch and compost will be incorporated into topsoil for landscape use is beneficial. Mr. Brockwell seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Elder, Anderson, Waymack, Bresko, Brockwell, Canepa

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner

- P-4. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-24-02:** Request of Donald D. and Sheryl S. Deaver to permit a “furniture sales and repair shop” as a “home occupation within an accessory building” within a Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Sections 90-103(10) & 90-103(53). The subject property is approximately 8.73 acres in size, located at 15200 Lindberg Drive, Disputanta, VA 23842, and is identified as Tax Map # 510(12)00-016-0. The Comprehensive Plan indicates the property is planned for Agriculture uses. **[8] Koty Gray**

Mr. Gray presented SE-24-02 to the Commission. (The staff report materials including the application materials are posted on the Planning Department website in the Planning Commission Meetings section.)

Mr. Gray stated the applicant was present to answer questions from Commissioners.

With no questions or concerns from the Commissioners, Ms. Anderson opened the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m. With no one wishing to speak, Ms. Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 8:00 p.m.

Ms. Anderson asked if the Commissioners had any further questions for staff. With there being no further questions Ms. Anderson stated she would entertain a motion. Mr. Waymack made a motion to forward request SE-24-02 to the Board with the

recommendation for approval. The reason for this recommendation is it is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan, current surrounding land uses and zoning districts, and any off-site impacts seem to be adequately addressed in the conditions. Mr. Bresko seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Bresko, Waymack, Brockwell, Canepa, Anderson, Elder

Opposed: (0) Elder

Absent: (1) Joyner

- P-5. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-24-03:** Request of Alyssa J. and Charles M. Johnston to permit a “reupholstery shop” as a “home occupation within an accessory building” within a Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Sections 90-103(10) & 90-103(53). The subject property is approximately 5.29 acres in size, located at 17000 Jolly Road, Disputanta, VA 23842, and is identified as Tax Map # 600(0A)00-025-0. The Comprehensive Plan indicates the property is planned for Agriculture uses. **[9] Koty Gray**

Mr. Gray presented SE-24-03 to the Commission. (The staff report materials including the application materials are posted on the Planning Department website in the Planning Commission Meetings section.)

Mr. Gray stated the applicant was present to answer questions from Commissioners.

Mr. Bresko asked how the furniture would get to the property if there is no pick-up or drop-off allowed.

Mr. Johnston stated he would be traveling to the customers’ residences for pick-up and drop-off.

With no further questions or concerns from the Commissioners, Ms. Anderson opened the Public Hearing at 8:06 p.m. With no one wishing to speak, Ms. Anderson closed the Public Hearing at 8:06 p.m.

Ms. Anderson asked if the Commissioners had any further questions for staff. With there being no further questions Ms. Anderson stated she would entertain a motion. Ms. Canepa made a motion to forward request SE-24-03 to the Board with the recommendation for approval and the reason for this recommendation is it is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and current surrounding uses and zoning districts. Mr. Brockwell seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Elder, Brockwell, Bresko, Waymack, Canepa, Anderson

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner

COMMUNICATIONS.

C-1. Actions of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA)

- There were none. The March meeting was canceled.
- Staff is still confirming with the applicant the status of their case and if there will be a meeting in April.

C-2. Actions of the Board of Supervisors (BOS)

- There were no Planning items that happened at the March 26 meeting.

C-3. Upcoming Planning Commission Cases for April 2024

- Two subdivision waiver requests.

C-4 Comprehensive Plan Update Process

- Staff is filling in slots for focus groups.
- The survey is live on the county website.

Ms. Anderson asked if the flyers for the survey were being mailed to citizens.

Mr. Graves stated they were not being mailed.

Mr. Waymack asked if the focus groups were limited for attendance.

Mr. Graves stated the focus groups are for attendees that are invited because they are experts in those topics, but the public workshops in the evenings are open for anyone wanting to attend.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8:12 p.m., Ms. Anderson asked the Commissioners if they had any additional questions. If not, she would entertain a motion to adjourn. Ms. Canepa made a motion to adjourn, and Mr. Brockwell seconded the motion. Roll was called on the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Canepa, Anderson, Brockwell, Bresko, Waymack, Elder

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Joyner