

MINUTES
Planning Commission
County of Prince George, Virginia

October 26, 2023

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, October 26, 2023, in the Board Room, County Administration Building, 6602 Courts Drive, Prince George, Virginia by Mrs. Elder, Chair.

ATTENDANCE. The following members responded to Roll Call:

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

Also present: Robert Baldwin, Planning Director; Tim Graves, Planner II; Madison Sobczak; Planning Technician

INVOCATION. Mr. Waymack 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. Elder asked the Commissioners for a motion to approve the Agenda for the October 26, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Mrs. Canepa made a motion to approve the Agenda and Mr. Brockwell seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (7) Canepa, Elder, Bresko, Waymack, Joyner, Brockwell, Anderson

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.

At 6:32 p.m., Ms. Elder 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.

With no one present indicating they wished to speak, the Public Comment Period was closed at 6:32 p.m.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS.

Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners if they had any comments they would like to share. Ms. Elder stated she would like to take a moment of silence for Alan Foster for his 40 years of service to Prince George County.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

A-1. Adoption of the Work Session Minutes – September 25, 2023

Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners to review the Work Session Minutes from September 25, 2023. Mr. Bresko made a motion to approve the September 25, 2023, Work Session Minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Waymack.

Roll Call:

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

Abstain: (1) Joyner

Absent: (0)

A-2. Adoption of Business Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2023

Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners to review the Minutes of the September 28, 2023, Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Canepa made a motion to approve the September 28, 2023 Meeting Minutes as written. The motion for approval was seconded by Mr. Bresko.

Roll Call:

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

Opposed: (0)

Abstain: (1) Brockwell

Absent: (0)

PUBLIC HEARINGS.

P-1. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-23-07: Request to permit a commercial child care center within a General Business (B-1) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-393(28). The subject property is approximately 0.58 acres in size, located at 5844 Allin Road, and is identified as Tax Map # 230(26)00-004-0. The Comprehensive Plan indicates the property is planned for “Village Center” land uses.

Mr. Graves presented the applicant’s request to defer the public hearing to a later date:

Applicant’s Request:

The applicant has requested to defer the public hearing for this request because the application needed to be updated to change the subject property, and this occurred after the public hearing was advertised. As a result, staff will need to update the Staff Report and advertise a new public hearing date to consider the revised request.

Ms. Canepa made a motion to approve the applicant's request and defer the public hearing for SE-23-07 until the next Planning Commission meeting on November 16, 2023 or a later date if additional time is needed by the applicant or staff. Mr. Joyner seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (7) Elder, Joyner, Waymack, Bresko, Brockwell, Anderson, Canepa

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

P-2. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-23-08: Request to permit a special care hospital within a General Business (B-1) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-393(8). The purpose of the request is to allow an addiction treatment facility to open in existing buildings. The subject property is approximately 6.56 acres in size, located at 16905 Parkdale Road, and is identified as Tax Map # 580(05)00-004-B. The Comprehensive Plan indicates the property is planned for "Commercial" land uses.

Mr. Graves presented the Staff Report for SE-23-08 to the Planning Commission. (The staff report materials including the application materials are posted on the Planning Department website in the Planning Commission Meetings section.)

Additional comments by staff:

- Staff received one public comment letter from the owner of the adjacent mobile home park. The comment was provided to Planning Commission at the meeting. (A copy is attached to these minutes)
- Staff also received two phone calls one from an adjacent property owner regarding SE-23-08.

Mr. Graves stated the applicant wanted to speak to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Lawrence Williams introduced himself and stated:

- He is the Architect that has been working with the applicant, Mr. Parson.
- Mr. Parson has experience in operating these types of facilities.
- The impact to surrounding areas would be minimal.
- He wanted to reduce the rooms down to 50 units to allow for classrooms in the facility.
- The pool would be covered over to allow for an even larger campus.
- There would be resident security advisors at the facility 24 hours a day.
- Mr. Parson would be tearing down one of the wings to reduce the unit number and they would be spending money on renovating the inside of the building.

Ms. Canepa stated that an email was received from the owners of the adjacent property asking about security at the facility. She asked if there would be any further security such as security cameras rather than just the security Mr. Williams had already mentioned. She stated she felt that was a concern for the mobile home park.

Mr. Williams stated the tenants in the facility don't get the opportunity to leave the property and that security cameras would be put on the property. He stated Mr. Parson would speak further on the details.

Mr. Steve Parson introduced himself to the Planning Commission and stated the property already has cameras. He then stated they have already installed 40 additional cameras and would have patrolling security throughout the whole night. He further stated the entire property is gated with only one entrance and exit along with an office on each side of the building that would be staffed 24 hours everyday. He then advised there would be motion sensor lights in the hallways.

Mrs. Elder asked Mr. Parson if children would be present at the facility.
Mr. Parson advised there would be no children at the facility at this time.

Mrs. Elder asked what the age range of the patients would be.
Mr. Parson stated the typical age range is from 18-65.

Ms. Canepa stated she read about children accompanying their mothers and they had to be under the age of 11.

Mr. Parson stated that was a potential for further down the road but that would be a very specialized type of program for patients but it is not something they are looking to do right now.

Mr. Bresko asked how tall the property's perimeter fence was.
Mr. Parson stated the fence was 8 feet tall.

Mrs. Anderson stated that Mr. Parson had mentioned they perform intervention and asked if this was therapy or a medically assisted program. She then asked what the interventions looked like. Mr. Parson stated upon entry a patient would have a physical exam, drug tests, labs ordered, and they would see a medical professional to evaluate the severity of their addiction. He then stated that was preformed at a triage center and all patients needed to meet certain criteria to be eligible to be a part of the program. He further stated based off the results of the tests would determine the best placement for that patient in their program.

Mrs. Anderson stated most special treatment facilities like this one require 60 or 90 day stays. She then asked why was this facility only offering 30 day stays.

Mr. Parson stated this location is a 30 day stay facility but there are other facilities that offer longer stays for patients. He then stated the patients would stay there for 30 days and then step down to another location that would be a longer stay. He further stated that as they got better they would step down again into another facility with an even longer stay that helps them re-acclimate to daily life, similar to a halfway house.

Mr. Graves asked the Planning Commission if they had any questions for staff.

Mr. Bresko asked if the delinquent property taxes had been paid yet.
Mr. Parson stated they plan on paying the delinquent taxes will be taken care of as soon as possible.

Mr. Graves stated those had to be paid before the Board makes a decision.

Mrs. Elder opened the public hearing at 6:58 pm for anyone wishing to speak on the agenda item SE-23-08.

With no one from the public wishing to speak Mrs. Elder closed the public hearing at 6:59 pm.

Ms. Canepa made a motion to forward request SE-23-08 to the Board with a recommendation for approval subject to the recommended conditions in the staff report. She stated 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) Bresko, Waymack, Elder, Canepa, Anderson

Opposed: (2) Joyner, Brockwell

Absent: (0)

P-3. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CPA-23-04: Request to amend the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation for a specific property from “Commercial” to “Commercial / Industrial”. If the request is approved, the Comprehensive Plan would support industrial or commercial zoning districts and uses on the property. The subject property, approximately 44.235 acres in size, is identified by Tax Map #s 340(OA)00-007-D and 340(OA)00-007-E and is located at the end of Wagner Way. An additional portion of the property is located in the City of Petersburg.

Mr. Graves presented the Staff Report for CPA-23-04 to the Planning Commission. (The staff report materials including the application materials are posted on the Planning Department website in the Planning Commission Meetings section.)

(A copy of the comment received prior to the public hearing is attached to these minutes)

Mr. Graves stated the Applicant was present and would like to address the Planning Commission.

Mr. Andy Condlin introduced himself and stated he was speaking on behalf of the applicant and had with him Malachai Mills and John Mason, as well as Thomas Cross from the Virginia Port Authority who had provided a letter to the Commission similar to what was at the Planning Commission Work Session. Mr. Condlin said we believe this request is appropriate for the following reasons:

- This is not a rezoning, the Comp Plan is only a guide to the types of uses that would be available or appropriate for the property.
- A rezoning gets into details and we would be able to limit the types of uses.
- There is a difference between asking for Commercial/Industrial as opposed to Industrial.
- This request reflects the market changes and their assessment, they can accommodate industrial flex businesses that need light assembly, show rooms, distribution, office and warehouse.
- The anticipation is a 500,000 sf building with two or three users or more with over 600 jobs with a \$29 million facility.
- They provided a list of potential users to the Commission, showing over 60 users in the market today looking for this type of facility, ranging up to 150,000 sf.

- We think this is well situated for this type of change because of proximity to highways and there is already industrial in this area
- The property has been vacant for 30 years.
- We can and will address concerns for this type of use.
- A rezoning has to be reviewed by VDOT.
- There is opportunity to proffers include limiting the amount of traffic based on the ITE code.
- We know there are traffic concerns at this area and they will look at that and address that through VDOT and the County.
- The applicant is available if there are any questions.

Mr. Graves asked the Planning Commission if they had any questions for staff.

Ms. Anderson stated she was not used to seeing a policy decision being directed to only one parcel and asked how would the County policy be updated.

Mr. Graves there would be an overall Comprehensive Plan update process beginning soon to address larger areas within the County and the County as a whole. He then stated that an applicant is able to request an amendment to the plan as specific as this one, and if this were to be approved it would only apply to this specific parcel and the Commission could consider the broader area as part of their decision.

Mrs. Elder opened the public hearing at 7:19 pm for anyone wishing to speak on public hearing item CPA-23-04.

Jim Quist, 9807 County Line Road, Disputant Va 23842, stated he had major concerns about the traffic at the intersection and the dangers that it poses to the general safety of the public. He then stated he would like for the Planning Commission to postpone or decline this request until the safety concerns can be addressed and improved, and asked the County to work with Petersburg to address the safety concerns with the intersection.

William Steele, 9921 County Line Road, Disputanta Va 23842, stated he wanted the Planning Commission to put this decision on hold and look closer at the policy. He stated the policy needed to be reviewed to see if that is where we wanted the County to go. He further then stated he didn't want a Richmond city, or a Petersburg city, he wanted a Prince George County. He asked Planning Commission to postpone the case to allow time to look at the policy further before approving this request.

Mrs. Elder asked if there was anyone else wanting to speak on agenda item CPA-23-04. With no one else wishing to speak, Mrs. Elder closed the public hearing at 7:24 pm.

Ms. Canepa stated that she lives within a mile of this intersection and drives it frequently. She then stated in Work Session she has previously asked about the traffic because of the accident that was brought up. She further stated she was told they have a chance to fix that issue when the rezoning case comes up.

Motion:

Mrs. Canepa motioned to move CPA-23-04 to the Board with a recommendation for approval and the reason for this recommendation is the recommended changed to the future land use map are compatible with the envisioned land uses for the subject property and adjacent properties.
Mr. Joyner seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (7) Elder, Canepa, Joyner, Brockwell, Waymack, Bresko, Anderson

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

P-4. SUBSTANTIAL ACCORD SA-23-01: Determination by the Prince George County Planning Commission on whether or not the large-scale solar facility proposed by RWE Clean Energy in Special Exception Application # SE-23-09 is in substantial accord with the Prince George County Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for Residential or Agricultural uses, and the County's adopted Solar Energy Facility Siting Policy provides guidance for the siting of new facilities within the County. The visually buffered development area for the facility is proposed to total +/- 506 acres and the total area of the parcels involved is +/- 1,270 acres. The property is identified by Tax Map #s 440(0A)00-071-0, 440(0A)00-072-0, 530(01)00-00B-0, 530(0A)00-001-0, 450(0A)00-028-0, 530(0A)00-046-0, and 530(0A)00-045-A, and is located near the intersection of Pumphouse Road and Thweatt Drive.

Mr. Graves presented the Staff Report for SA-23-01 to the Planning 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 that 13 comments were received prior to the meeting and were provided to the Commissioners before the meeting.
(A copy of the comments is attached to these minutes)

Mr. Graves stated the applicant was present and wished to address the Planning Commission.

Natalie Gerber introduced herself and stated she was representing RWE. She provided information along with a Powerpoint presentation:

- The project is a proposed 100- megawatt photovoltaic solar facility situated near the intersection of Prince George Drive and bisected by Pumphouse Road.
- The total project area includes approximately 1,259 acres of forested and agricultural land that is currently commercial timber land or being farmed.
- The project area including panels, roads, fencing, stormwater basins, and a 50-foot vegetative buffer is approximately 506 acres.
- The majority of the site already has an existing vegetative buffer.
- At the end of the project's life span the land would be able to be reverted to farm land.
- Project timeline: Assuming full Special Exception approval by the end of the year, the target commercial operation date would be Q3 2026.
- Fiscal impact over 40 years of \$1.1 to 9.9 million depending on if the County adopted a revenue share agreement. A siting agreement could be negotiated for \$3 million over 36 months.

- There is only one other operable solar project in the county at this time which is the Fort Powhatan Solar Facility.
- The Bakers Pond project was issued an interconnection service agreement.
- Bakers pond also submitted for an interconnection service agreement for battery storage.
- All other projects in the queue, other than Bakers Pond, would not have a projected operable date until the end of this decade.
- The current application for Bakers Pond is for the 506 acres, which is over the acreage cap by 22 acres but when the application was submitted it was approximately 3.7 acres over the cap.
- The Warwick project acreage was adjusted after Bakers Pond application was submitted, which leaves Bakers Pond at 22 acres over the cap.
- The Fort Powhatan acreage was based on the full parcel acreage and so the acreage criteria was different for Fort Powhatan.
- Approximately 35% of the proposed total acreage is within the Rural Conservation Area with the remaining acreage lying just inside the Prince George Planning Area.
- In the future land use plan, both parcels that were used for commercial timber are considered residential but they are currently designated for commercial and agricultural.
- Even though it has been planned to be zoned residential there is no planned wastewater or sewer infrastructure in this location.
- RWE did an analysis based on the criteria in the Siting Policy to examine what sites are possible in the Rural Conservation Area. They found four possible sites based on the criteria:
 - Located in Rural Conservation Area
 - Contiguous parcels between 500 to 1000 acres
 - Along a 115kV line or greater
 - Small number of parcels
- One site meeting the criteria was the Fort Powhatan site. After reviewing each property meeting the criteria they determined the location they applied for was the best suited for their project.
- There would be minimal grading needed for the proposed project. They would be willing to provide a topo map.
- They performed a desktop analysis and it showed there were no previously recorded resources present on the proposed site. A full study would need to be completed as part of the VA DEQ process.

Ms. Canepa asked what the reasoning was for monitoring the site remotely versus keeping jobs local.

Ms. Gerber stated the monitoring center is where all solar projects are monitored by 24/7 staff. She then stated there will be full time staff available [locally] in the event an alarm were to sound or if any situation arose that needed attention.

Ms. Canepa asked how many full time jobs would be kept locally.

Ms. Gerber stated two to four.

Mr. Graves asked if there were any questions for staff.

Mrs. Elder opened the public hearing at 7:54 pm for anyone wishing to speak on agenda item SA-23-01.

William Steele, 9921 County Line Drive, Disputanta Va 23842, stated he was asking the Planning Commission to reject SA-23-01. He then stated the policy cap is set for a reason and the fact RWE is asking to exceed the limit alone is enough reason to deny the request. He further stated building in the planning area is also against policy. He stated the bottom line is the citizens do not want any more solar in Prince George County.

Aaron Story, 13610 Pumphouse Drive, Disputanta Va 23842, stated the map he received shows the neighborhood that he lives in would be completely land locked by solar panel if this request were to be approved. He then stated concerns about the project diminishing wildlife and property value. He further stated major concerns about rain runoff contaminating his well. Mr. Story stated he would like to see the Planning Commission vote against SA-23-01.

Kathy Bennett, Arwood Road, stated she attended the community meeting at the library and she didn't care for her experience with the applicant there. She stated the entire County is historic. She has public health concerns about living within a certain distance to a solar farm. She then stated she was concerned about the panels raising the temperature in the surrounding areas. She asked the Planning Commission to vote against SA-23-01.

William Hedgepeth, 6214 Thweatt Drive, stated he is an adjacent property owner and he did not want to have a solar farm in his backyard. He then stated he didn't want to displace the animals with the solar panels, and he didn't want the increase in temperature that comes along with having solar panels. He asked Planning Commission to vote against SA-23-01.

Katherine Rosbicki, 8406 Robin Road, stated her farm abuts the proposed solar farm. She then stated concerns for the eagles that are present on the property. She then stated the land is not as flat as RWE claims it to be. She further stated if the temperature goes up 20 degrees she will not be able to grow crops at her farm.

Jay/ Chase Stovell [did not state address] stated that his hunt club leases 500 acres of the proposed Bakers Pond project and he manages the land. He then stated concerns about steps being skipped in the process by not posting signs on the property. He also stated safety concerns about the surveyors not using the sign in-book at the front gate to access the land even though hunting season is in. He further stated there has already been destruction of the land and wetlands. He stated he already felt the company was not working with the community.

Sharon Jackson, 6502 Thweatt Drive, stated she did not receive a letter and she has concerns about the displacement of wildlife. She then stated she did not want anymore businesses and solar farms in the county of Prince George. She asked that Planning Commission consider that when making their decision. She further stated she was concerned about the private wells around the proposed project site.

Mary Jo Tinson, 15303 Arwood Drive, stated concerns about soil, air, water, and animals. She then stated she had concerns about the battery storage that will be at the solar facility. She further stated she had major concerns if the panels were to catch on fire because instead of the fire

department putting them out, they would let them burn. She stated the county doesn't have the trucks or manpower to be able to fight a fire of that capacity if the panels were to catch fire.

Joshua Ingram, 7205 Thweatt Drive, stated one of the entrances to the facility is directly across the street from his house. He then stated there are three points in the county policy that the project does not comply with instead of two. He stated the first topic that doesn't comply was the county acreage limit and if you include the total acreage of all the parcels impacted that will not be useable for at least 20 years, the total is roughly 1,200 plus acres, instead of the purposed 506 acres. He then stated 65% of the project is going in the planning area which prohibits it from being developed into the proposed future land use. He provided the Planning Commission a map showing the land is not flat and once RWE starts to develop the land for solar panels they would have to grade the area which will effect runoff and erosion. He asked the Planning Commission to vote against SA-23-01.

Robert Cox Jr., 13640 Taylor Drive, stated he lives across the street from an adjacent property owner. He then stated concerns about RWE having the County and its citizens best interest at heart. He then stated the project is not supposed to be in the Planning Area but 65% of the project is going in the Planning Area and 35% is going in a Rural Conservation Area. He further stated the energy that would be produced from the solar farm wouldn't benefit or be used for the citizens of Prince George County. He stated concerns about the displacement of wildlife. He asked the Planning Commission to vote against SA-23-01.

Dawn Aucoin, 13620 Taylor Drive, stated she moved to the County 3 years ago and she has concerns a decrease in her property value and the project going against the set solar policy. She then stated she did not feel the solar farm would generate enough revenue to be beneficial. She further stated the residents around the purposed solar farm already have issue with their wells when they have heavy rainfall and she is worried the issues would only increase due to runoff from the solar farm. She asked Planning Commission to vote against SA-23-01.

Brenda Renee Garnett, 4092 Basswood Road, stated she has heard from many citizens in District 1 who do not want the solar farm in Prince George Couty. She asked that Planning Commission hear the citizens voices and vote against SA-23-01.

Jim Quist, 9807 County Line Road, Disputanta Va 23842, stated section seven of the siting policy was not complied with and no public comments from the community meetings held by RWE have been provided to anyone. He then stated the phrases or words "should be" and "substantial" that are used in the siting policy let the reader know what ought to happen. He further stated that proposed solar facility goes does not comply with the solar siting policy. He stated that he had major concerns about the battery storage facilities that will be on the property and they will need five acres set aside.

Mrs. Elder closed the public hearing at 8:27 pm.

Ms. Canepa stated she does believe in general in solar but what she has an issue with and why she will motion that no it is not in substantial accord is the 65%. She then stated to her that is a clear disrespect to the policy that exists.

Motion

Ms. Canepa motioned that the Planning Commission adopt the Resolution Determining that Application #SE-23-09 is not in substantial accord with the Prince George Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons: It does not adhere to the general guidance of the Comprehensive Plan including the Solar Energy Facility Siting Policy, specifically: to avoid the Prince George Planning Area.

Mr. Brockwell seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (7) Joyner, Waymack, Elder, Bresko, Brockwell, Anderson, Canepa

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Graves stated for everyone's knowledge that the motion was to find that SA-23-01 was not in substantial accord and that the motion stops the case, and the applicants have the right to appeal that decision of the Planning Commission to the Board of Supervisors within 10 days.

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

- There were none. The October meeting was canceled.

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

- October 10 they recognized Joseph Simmons, former Planning Commissioner, for his years of service.
- October 24 the Board approved the ordinance amendment for the tattoo and body piercing as an allowed use in the General Business zoning district.
-

C-2. Upcoming Planning Commission Cases for November

- Information on upcoming cases will be provided at a later date.

Ms. Canepa stated that she made a mistake with a previous motion by saying "meeting minutes" when she was making the motion on approving the meeting agenda and wanted to put the correct motion on record.

Mr. Graves stated she could make another motion.

Ms. Canepa motioned to approve the agenda for the October 26, 2023 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Brockwell seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In Favor: (7) Canepa, Elder, Joyner, Waymack, Bresko, Brockwell, Anderson

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

Mr. Graves stated that concluded the communications.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8:31 p.m., Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners if they had any additional questions. If not, she would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Bresko made a motion to adjourn, and Ms. Canepa seconded the motion. Roll was called on the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (7) Canepa, Elder, Joyner, Waymack, Bresko, Brockwell, Anderson

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (0)

Attachments:

- Public comment for SE-23-08 received prior to the Public Hearing
- Public comment for CPA-23-04 received prior to the Public Hearing
- Public comments for SA-23-01 received prior to the Public Hearing

Public Comments for
SE-23-08
(received prior to
public hearing)

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:20:46 PM

From: [Info Main](#)

Mail received time: Thu, 26 Oct 2023 16:43:33

Sent: Thu, 26 Oct 2023 12:42:59

Subject: PG Planning Commission Hearing Oct 26th - Memorandum of Concern SE-23-08

Sensitivity: Normal

Attachments:

[10.26.2023_MEMORANDUM OF CONCERN_SE-23-08.pdf](#) 

Dear Distinguished Members of the Prince George Planning Commission,

We are writing to express our concerns about the application submitted by Lawrence Ellis Williams Consulting LLC on behalf of SPTwelve Properties LLC for a special care facility catering to patients suffering from drug addiction (SE-23-08). As the adjacent property owner and owners of Bexley Manufactured Housing Community (Tax Parcel # 580110000A0), we are disappointed with the short notice given for public comment and lack of engagement with neighbors by the applicant.

Bexley is home to over 70 families, many with school-age children. While we believe that special care facilities for people suffering from addiction have a place in today's world, we think that locating such a facility adjacent to one of the only family-oriented, affordable housing options in the county is not appropriate without far more community input and details from the applicant.

Safety is paramount when designing modern, affordable housing that works in conjunction with the county's goals of smart growth. The current application makes little mention of security measures to prevent loitering or access to the adjacent community.

The applicant and Bexley share the operation of a wastewater treatment plant, but it has been difficult to communicate with the applicant about joint responsibilities. Our requests for regular business discussions about operations are met with long delays, silence, and little follow-up.

As the owners of Bexley, we have invested heavily in our property to ensure it operates in a safe, compliant, and community-focused manner. Many of our partner tenants do not have options to move as home prices, fixed incomes, or jobs tie them to the community. We implore you to strongly consider the implications of this request and focus heavily on how we can prevent the exposure of the many children who call Bexley home to the dangers, consequences, and disastrous results of alcohol and drug addiction.

We are not against the fair and humane treatment of our neighbors suffering from addiction. However, we strongly believe that the location in question is not the right one without further assurances. There is no access to nearby medical attention, the nearest police precinct is 13.1 miles away, and there are schools within 4.9 miles. There is no public water or sewer in the area, a need that should be focused on before allowing for dense transient use, something the applicant alludes to in the application and comments. We believe that at the very least, this hearing should be postponed so that the Board of Supervisors and adjacent property owners can engage with the applicant to fully understand the plan.

Your stewardship of the County and the protection of so many families is truly appreciated.

Respectfully,

WAP MHC I LLC

Public Comments for
CPA-23-04
(received prior to
public hearing)



VIRGINIA PORT AUTHORITY
600 World Trade Center, Norfolk, VA 23510
(757)683-8000

October 25, 2023

Prince George Planning Commission
P.O. Box 68
6602 Courts Drive
Prince George, VA 23875

Re: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CPA-23-04:

Dear Chairwoman Elder, Vice-Chair Anderson, and Members of the Planning Commission,

The Port of Virginia would like to express support for the comprehensive plan amendment CPA-23-04. Recent years have shown the significance of the supply chain and the need for commercial/industrial space to accommodate cargo moving through the Commonwealth. Because Virginia performed exceptionally well during the supply chain crisis, more businesses are looking to diversify their supply chain and make Virginia a part of theirs. This amendment can help us meet that demand and create economic opportunity for Prince George County.

The underlying mission of the Port of Virginia is to foster economic development and job creation across the Commonwealth. To that end, the Port is strategically investing \$1.4 billion over the next four years on land and waterside infrastructure projects to ensure that Virginia remains the most modern gateway for international trade, as well as a thriving economic engine for the state. We are witnessing billions of dollars being invested in the state's transportation networks. These investments provide the opportunity for Prince George County to secure new commercial and industrial developments. This amendment can help meet the demand and create new jobs with skill growth opportunity, competitive wages, and essential benefits.

We ask for your consideration and support of this comprehensive plan amendment, and remain available for further discussion at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Stephen A. Edwards
CEO and Executive Director

Cc: Mr. Jeffrey Stoke, County Administrator, Prince George County
Mr. Robert Baldwin, Director of Planning, Prince George County

Public Comments for
SA-23-01
(received prior to
public hearing)

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:14 PM

From: [Tim Graves](#)

Sent: Mon, 16 Oct 2023 19:46:29

To: [William Hedgepeth](#)

Cc: [Alias-Planning](#)

Subject: RE: Bald Eagles living Bakers Pond - proposed site of solar farm

Sensitivity: Normal

Mr. Hedgepeth, this is something that the applicant addressed in their Environmental Impact Assessment. It indicates that there were no known Bald Eagle sites in the area.

Here is a link to all of the application materials including the Environmental Impact Summary.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1yetufQIBLZGW1R4c3cN1gKQFabBGJwDD/view?usp=sharing>

The application materials include contact information for the point person Natalie Gerber, which you can find on the application forms.

I recommend contacting the applicant to discuss if you have a concern.

Tim Graves

Planner

Prince George County, Virginia

(804) 722-8678

[Click here to access the Online Maps Tool for Prince George County](#)

From: William Hedgepeth <ollie.hedgepeth@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, October 15, 2023 11:01 AM

To: Alias-Planning <Planning@princegeorgecountyva.gov>

Subject: Bald Eagles living Bakers Pond - proposed site of solar farm

I was out this morning and once again noticed at least 2 Bald Eagles.

These Eagles live directly behind 6214 Thweatt Dr, Disputanta, VA 23842 - which means they are right at the site of the proposed solar farm.

Is there a way to add the Bald Eagles to the environmental impact study?

Hedgepeth

804-399-9484

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:15 PM

From: brandon.g.luck@dominionenergy.com

Sent: Thu, 19 Oct 2023 18:14:28

To: [TJ Webb](#); [Donald Hunter](#); [Floyd Brown](#); [Alan Carmichael](#); [Marlene Waymack](#); [Jeff Stoke](#); [Alias-Planning](#)

Subject: Objection to Baker's Pond Solar Facility

Sensitivity: Normal

Hello to everyone,

I am formally writing to give my strong objection to the Baker's Pond Solar Facility. In working for Dominion Power I have first hand seen how solar farms are detrimental to county residents in property value, living conditions, environmentally, and resale value. Just beside the Baker's Pond location there is 450+ acres along Pumphouse Rd, Robin Rd and Thweatt Drive that has already been deemed a future subdivision. Do you think anyone would want to move out to a remote part of the county and have to see that every day? Although I do not live there I am around the area quite frequently hunting and visiting friends that will be affected. There is no excuse why a company out of Orting, Washington and a European solar company should reek all the benefits of the solar farm and the residents have to suffer for it. Please do as you are elected and represent the residents in denying any solar developers.

Below is an example from Louisa County called Belcher Solar. In the video you can see the impervious rain water caused by the solar farm is affecting the neighbors. This is a common theme with solar farms and because they are fairly new to Virginia more unknown hardships are being found regularly.

[Virginia farmers claim Dominion is destroying their land \(wtvr.com\)](#)

Please do what is right for the county and deny the approval of Baker's Pond and any other solar facility coming to Prince George. This is cannot the legacy that you want to be remembered by and with elections coming up this will be a stain left on it if this is approved.

Brandon Luck
Transmission Strategic Projects Advisor
5000 Dominion Blvd
Glen Allen VA, 23060
Office – (804) 257-4674
Cell - (804) 397-9881

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This electronic message contains information which may be legally confidential and or privileged and does not in any case represent a firm ENERGY COMMODITY bid or offer relating thereto which binds the sender without an additional express written confirmation to that effect. The information is intended solely for the individual or entity named above and access by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please reply immediately to the sender that you have received the message in error, and delete it. Thank you.

Dawn Aucoin
13620 Taylor Dr
Disputanta 23842

Formstack Submission For: [Public Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/20/23 3:37 PM

Please do not rezone to allow the Solar Farm in our backyard. If rezoning is allowed it will be over the preset limit for Solar Farms in the County. We fought hard to get those limits in place. This area as shown on RWEs map is surrounded by wetlands. We need to protect out wetlands. The Governor is implementing stricter rules in this regard. We need to keep the Conservation area and not allow the planned area spill over into it. The Solar Farm is not a good fit for this area.
Thank you.

Formstack Submission For: [Public Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/22/23 2:58 PM

Please vote no to allow the rezoning of residential, agricultural and conservation land to allow a Solar Farm. There is an article on your website that talks about a 2018 study on the affects of house prices next to a solar farm. It was up to 30% in 2018. What is it now with all the known negative impacts from Solar Farms? Our property would border the farm. We can't afford to lose the value of our property and bring down values on nearby properties.

Would you like these comments entered into the meeting minutes?:

Yes

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:23 PM

From: [Diane Devers](#)

Mail received time: Fri, 20 Oct 2023 03:58:43

Sent: Thu, 19 Oct 2023 23:58:25

To: [Tim Graves](#)

Subject: Solar farms

Sensitivity: Normal

Why can't this be on the ballot in Nov let the people vote ..I don't want any more solar farms here in Prince George .We don't need them .I SAY NO TO SOLAR FARMS .

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:24 PM

From: [No Reply](#)

Sent: Tue, 24 Oct 2023 14:52:39

To: [Public Comment](#)

Subject: Planning Commission from Ford Pugh

Sensitivity: Normal



Formstack Submission For: [Public_Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/24/23 10:52 AM

Name:	Ford Pugh
Address:	13305 college road South prince george 23805
Comment/Question regarding::	Planning Commission
Comments:	I would like to register comments against the proposed Bakers Pond solar installation. I believe we should accept any currently completed projects as our new cap and freeze any further solar developments and amend the current policy to cap acreage at what we have even though it is below the originally stated acreage of the policy.
Would you like these comments entered into the BoS meeting minutes?:	Yes

Copyright © 2023 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.

Formstack, 11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:27 PM

From: [Jim Quist](#)

Mail received time: Wed, 25 Oct 2023 00:23:26

Sent: Wed, 25 Oct 2023 00:22:36

To: jmstaaj@yahoo.com; tammycrc@aol.com; abjrfarms@aol.com; nyjdb16@gmail.com; scstephen@aol.com; joynerpaint@verizon.net; brianwaymack@verizon.net

Cc: [Alias-Planning](#)

Subject: RWE Solar Case - Bakers Pond SA-23-01

Sensitivity: Normal

10/24/2023

To: The Prince George County Planning Commission,

I ask that you decline this special exception request, and clearly state that Special Exception Request SE-23-09 **IS NOT** in substantial accord with the Prince George County Comprehensive Plan.

As a retired Electrical Engineer of 45 years, now a new farmer and resident of Prince George County, I want to clearly voice my opposition to the RWE proposed solar site at Bakers Pond and the "special exception request" (SUBSTANTIAL ACCORD DETERMINATION – SA-23-01). Just a year after the Comprehensive Plan update in 2022), the very first solar case that comes up asks this Commission to:

- 1) Ignore the clearly imposed acreage limits, and
- 2) Ignore the clearly stated policy that "***Siting of a (solar) facility within the Prince George Planning Area should be avoided. (except in M-3)***".

The words "***should be***" are very clear. Meaning we "expect or assume" something to be true. The County clearly used these words to state a position that ought to happen.

"***Should be***" is a simple phrase used express an outcome which is anticipated, and expresses an obligation to the reader.

RWE is asking that you ignore their application where over two-thirds of their project (940 acres) would be sited in the Prince George Planning Area - against the clearly worded policy for such industrial solar sites. They ask that you ignore the clear language of the Solar siting policy developed and passed by this very Planning Commission. A policy that reflects the citizens wishes to carefully control such industrial activity.

In addition, RWE by leaving the planned Tier 2 Battery Storage Facility (and its minimum 5-acre requirement), out of this initial case is subtle but deceptive. The citizens and this Commission deserved to see this case in its entirety. Including the truth about the battery storage requirement, its impacts to the area, and the unique environmental and fire hazards they present. The environment, the homeowners, and the public safety personnel who would be asked to fight fires and protect the community, deserved an honest and complete application from RWE. In other words, lying by omission is still a lie. Attached below are three (3) photos of 20 MW battery storage implementations. Sixteen (16) structures, each filled with 1.25 MW of lithium-ion batteries along with the associated cooling and inverter equipment.

The very first time the Solar Siting Policy is being used – is **NOT** the best time to ignore and waive the policy. Using a substantial accord argument for this case sends a message that any clearly written policy can be waived for the questionable promise economic gain.

Again, I ask that you decline this special exception request, and clearly state that Application # SE-23-09 IS NOT in substantial accord with the Prince George County Comprehensive Plan

Thank you,

Jim Quist
9807 County Line Road
Disputanta, VA 23842

Cell: 804-396-9420



Imogene S. Elder, Chair
10409 Old Stage Road
Prince George, VA 23875
Home: (804) 458-3529
Email: jmstaaj@yahoo.com

Tammy Anderson, Vice-Chair
8620 King Drive
Disputanta, VA 23842
Home: (804)991-3551
Cell: (804)292-5583
Email: tammycrc@aol.com

Alex Willie Bresko, Jr., Member
10080 Pole Run Road
Disputanta, VA 23842
Home: (804) 861-0587
Cell: (804) 691-0813
Email: abjrfarms@aol.com

Roy Stephen Brockwell, Member
19915 Halifax Road
Carson, VA 23830
Cell: (804) 720-7459
Office: (434) 246-4646
Email: sccstephen@aol.com

Jennifer D. Canepa, Member
4163 Baxter Ridge Drive

Prince George, VA 23875
Cell: (631) 774-1384
Email: nyjdb16@gmail.com

V. Clarence Joyner, Jr., Member
7320 Laurel Spring Road
Prince George, VA 23875
Home: (804) 446-3571
Email: joynerpaint@verizon.net

M. Brian Waymack, Member
7201 Laurel Spring Road
Prince George, VA 23875
Mobile: (804) 691-7133
Email: brianwaymack@verizon.net

Secretary of the Planning Commission
P O Box 68
Prince George, VA 23875
Work: (804) 722-8678
Fax: (804) 722-0702
Email: planning@princegeorgecountyva.gov

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:31 PM

From: [No Reply](#)

Sent: Sun, 22 Oct 2023 22:33:21

To: [Public Comment](#)

Subject: Planning Commission from Kathleen DuCharme

Sensitivity: Normal



Formstack Submission For: [Public_Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/22/23 6:33 PM

Name:	Kathleen DuCharme
Address:	613 Hidden Oaks Place Prince George 23875
Comment/Question regarding::	Planning Commission
Comments:	Say "NO" to rezoning to allow solar farms in PG County!!!
Would you like these comments entered into the BoS meeting minutes?:	Yes

Copyright © 2023 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.

Formstack, 11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:33 PM

From: [L Myers](#)

Sent: Mon, 23 Oct 2023 01:47:58

To: [Alias-Planning](#)

Subject: Baker's Pond Solar Farm project application - public comment

Sensitivity: Normal

Hello,

I will be unable to attend your hearing on October 26, 2023 in person. I submit my comments in writing.

According to the Baker's Pond RWE package prepared for October 26 Planning Commission hearing, the proposed site for this solar farm will have 35% of its land located in the PG Rural Conservation Area of the county – that should be a huge reason to deny this application. Also, according to the package materials, if this project is approved using the proposed maximum of 506 acres including required buffer areas, it would result in the upper limit being exceeded by 22.3 acres (of the county's set aside acreage limit).

Also, the project schedule mentions "Mid-October - hosts third Community Meeting". As of October 22, less than a week before the PC hearing, there has been no announcement about the date of such third community meeting.

This solar farm project will effectively deny access to affordable healthy food for numerous PG County residents who rely on hunting season to feed their families through their hunt clubs.

Solar farms are not green or efficient by any measure. They destroy natural wildlife habitat which will never be restored to its original condition. These projects require too much energy to mine the materials and produce the solar panels; all the while burning the same coal that everyone is supposedly trying to reduce the use of; the panels are not efficient without regular cleaning which requires use of huge quantities of water (RWE representative stated that the company does not intend to use any water to clean the panels, instead they will let the rain do the cleaning); the panels' technology becomes obsolete before the end of solar farm's life cycle and panels are not recyclable as of this time. The solar farms heat the air around them during hot season and cool the air around them during cold season – they do not act similar to the natural soil; this will increase extreme weather fluctuations in the immediate area. The solar farms do not create jobs; after the construction phase, they only employ only few people at most (according to RWE representative's own words at the community meeting).

Prince George Rural Conservation District residents do not support or need such a project which brings no direct benefits to them, and only has negative impact on our way of life.

Thank you,

Leyla Myers
Disputanta Va

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:35 PM

From: [No Reply](#)

Sent: Tue, 24 Oct 2023 11:01:51

To: [Public Comment](#)

Subject: Planning Commission from Mary Ann Corker

Sensitivity: Normal



Formstack Submission For: [Public_Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/24/23 7:01 AM

Name:	Mary Ann Corker
Address:	6850 Michelle Court Spring Grove 23881
Comment/Question regarding::	Planning Commission
Comments:	I do not support the Bakers Pond solar project. Solar is not goofy for the environment. The solar companies take perfectly good land, whether farm land or woodland, and kill it. The wildlife is displaced, the cooling and cleaning effect of nature is destroyed. Solar farms are extremely ugly and the amount of energy produced is not worth the destruction. Please do not approve this solar farm. We already have enough in Prince George County.
Would you like these comments entered into the BoS meeting minutes?:	Yes

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:38 PM

From: [No Reply](#)

Sent: Fri, 20 Oct 2023 17:14:20

To: [Public Comment](#)

Subject: Planning Commission from Sheila Ferebee

Sensitivity: Normal



Formstack Submission For: [Public_Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/20/23 1:14 PM

Name:	Sheila Ferebee
Address:	17855 Loving Union Road Disputanta 23842
Comment/Question regarding::	Planning Commission
Comments:	<p>This is in regards to the Planning Commission Meeting scheduled 10/26/23. I would like to express my disapproval for the planned solar farm at Bakers Pond. The project appears to be unnecessary and lacks studies on the environmental impact for the area. Monitoring of the solar "farm" should be within the state not halfway across the country in Texas if ever constructed. The construction workers employed for the project are not likely to be local but will come in from other areas to perform the work and then leave so the economic impact for local construction workers will be limited. The economic impact for the area only seems to be for the land owners. Will the power for those near the solar "farm" including businesses be provided at a reduced rate? And this looks as though it is industrial not residential or agricultural use of the land. Farm really is a misnomer for these projects. They are not pleasant to look at and the "farm" on Rives Road is a case in point. It is not camouflaged by any sort of vegetation. Please vote NO on this location for a solar farm. Please submit these comments for the above referenced meeting.</p>
Would you like these comments entered into the	Yes

**BoS meeting
minutes?:**

Copyright © 2023 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.

Formstack, 11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:41 PM

From: [No Reply](#)

Sent: Thu, 26 Oct 2023 14:09:12

To: [Public Comment](#)

Subject: Planning Commission from Tyler Preston

Sensitivity: Normal



Formstack Submission For: [Public_Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/26/23 10:09 AM

Name:	Tyler Preston
Address:	11075 Webb road Disputanta 23842
Comment/Question regarding::	Planning Commission
Comments:	Opposed to the solar panel farm! Keep Prince George rural and beautiful! Solar is not efficient at producing energy and causes way more issues than are stated.
Would you like these comments entered into the BoS meeting minutes?:	Yes

Copyright © 2023 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.

Formstack, 11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:43 PM

From: [No Reply](#)

Sent: Tue, 24 Oct 2023 10:23:09

To: [Public Comment](#)

Subject: Planning Commission from Valerie Kipper

Sensitivity: Normal



Formstack Submission For: [Public_Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/24/23 6:23 AM

Name:	Valerie Kipper
Address:	7109 west quaker road Disputanta 23842
Comment/Question regarding::	Planning Commission
Comments:	Please keep our county and county! Why add solar which has more negative effects than positive. Let the citizens decide this because that has not happened in the past.
Would you like these comments entered into the BoS meeting minutes?:	Yes

Copyright © 2023 Formstack, LLC. All rights reserved. This is a customer service email.

Formstack, 11671 Lantern Road, Suite 300, Fishers, IN 46038

Archived: Thursday, November 9, 2023 6:25:46 PM

From: [No Reply](#)

Sent: Mon, 23 Oct 2023 13:13:47

To: [Public Comment](#)

Subject: Planning Commission from William (Bill) Steele

Sensitivity: Normal



Formstack Submission For: [Public_Comment](#)

Submitted at 10/23/23 9:13 AM

Name:	William (Bill) Steele
Address:	9921 County Line Rd Disputanta 23842
Comment/Question regarding::	Planning Commission

REQUEST THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION 'REJECT' RWE's request for a "Special Exception" to the county's current solar police / zoning plans so it can build a solar site at the Bakers Pond location.

(1) THE PROPOSED SITE EXCEEDS THE MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE OF ACERAGE FOR SITING SOLAR SITES – contrary to Para #4 of the County's Solar Policy. The county has set a limit for solar sites – 4,603.5 acres or 2.74% of the county. The proposed plan by RWE will exceed that limit. Two years ago, the vast number citizens of PG expressed displeasure that the Board would set the limit so high. Now that the Board has set the limit, this Commission has no right to reject at the Board's stated intent to NOT exceed that line, THUS MUST recommend to reject the request for 'special exception'.

(2) A PART OF THE PROPOSED SITE IS TO BE BUILT WITHIN THE PG CO CONSERVATIONS DIST, which is contrary to ART 2-2a of the Solar police [NOTE: This writer believe that the "INTENT" of this line of the Solar Policy is to avoid building in the Conservation

Comments:

Dist, though the policy actually states 'avoid the Planning Dist??. RWE's proposed site crosses over into the PG Co Conservation Dist. Dist 1 of PG Co is a 'CONSERVATION DISTRICT' for a reason. The residents of DIST 1 live here for the open green space. We residents do NOT want our district to be transformed into a Chesterfield Co or Richmond. We do not want to be forced to deal with 'industrial creep' which is what RWE's request for 'special exception' will engage in. THUS since the 'special exception will allow RWE to sit the solar site in Conservation Dist, the Planning Commission MUST reject the special exception.

(3) This Board MUST comply with County Code Section 90-1 which defines 'Special Exception' as: "a use that would not be appropriate generally or without restriction throughout the zoning district but which, if controlled as to number, area, location or relation to the neighborhood, would promote the public health, safety, welfare, morals, order, comfort, convenience, appearance, prosperity or general welfare. Since neither STAFF nor RWE can articulate to residents of DIST 1 exactly how this "special exception" complies with Code 90-1, The Planning Commission MUST reject this special exemption request.

I reserve the right to comment about RWE's statement regarding 'Economic Benefits' as stated in Para 1.2 of their proposal if that issue is brought up at the PC's Public Hearing on 26 Oct.

Thank you

VR

W. Bill Steele
Property Owner/Taxpayer
Disputanta, VA

Would you like these comments entered into the BoS meeting minutes?:

Yes