

**MINUTES**  
Planning Commission  
County of Prince George, Virginia

April 27, 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, April 27, 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:

Mr. Waymack	Absent
Mrs. Elder	Present
Mr. Bresko	Present
Mr. Joyner	Present
Ms. Anderson	Absent (arrived at 6:32 p.m.)
Mrs. Canepa	Present (called into the meeting – traveling)
Mr. Brockwell	Present

Also present: Julie C. Walton, Director; Andre Greene, Planner II; Tim Graves, Planner I; Missy Greaves-Smith, Office Manager

**INVOCATION.** Mrs. Elder 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.** Mrs. Elder asked the Commissioners for a motion to revise the Agenda for the April 27, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. The revision request was to move P-6 Special Exception SE-23-04 to P-1. Mr. Brockwell made a motion to move P-6 to P-1 on the Agenda and Mr. Bresko seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Canepa, Elder, Anderson, Brockwell, Bresko, Joyner  
Opposed: (0)  
Absent: (1) Waymack

Mrs. Elder as asked the Commissioners for a motion to approved the revised Agenda for the April 27, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Brockwell made a motion to approve the revised Agenda for the April 27, 2023 meeting and Ms. Anderson seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Canepa, Elder, Anderson, Brockwell, Bresko, Joyner  
Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Waymack

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.**

At 6:34 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 6:35 p.m.

**COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS.**

Mrs. Elder asked the Commissioners if they had any comments they would like to share. No one had any comments to share.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS.**

**A-1. Introduction of New Planning Commissioner – Brian Waymack**

Mrs. Elder announced that Mr. Brian Waymack was the newly appointed Commissioner to the Planning Commission. She stated he was unable to attend this evening and so he would be welcomed at a later date.

**A-2. Adoption of the Work Session Minutes – March 20, 2023**

Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners to review the Work Session Minutes from March 20, 2023. Mr. Bresko made a motion to approve the March 20, 2023 Work Session Minutes. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderson.

Roll Call:

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

Opposed: (0)

Abstain: (1) Joyner

Absent: (1) Waymack

**A-3. Adoption of Business Meeting Minutes – March 23, 2023**

Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners to review the Minutes of the March 23, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Anderson made a motion to approve the March 23, 2023 meeting minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Canepa.

Roll Call:

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

Opposed: (0)

Abstain: (1) Joyner

Absent: (1) Waymack

**A-4. SUBDIVISION WAIVER SW-23-01:** Request of DLDGH, LLC (Donnie Bostic) for waiver of a requirement of Article VII of the Subdivision Ordinance as authorized under § 70-208, to permit a subdivision of one lot into two in the Prince George Planning Area without constructing a sidewalk as required in § 70-752. The subject property is zoned R-2 Limited Residential Zoning District, identified as Tax Map 230(07)00-00B-0 and is located on Baxter Road.

Mr. Graves presented SW-23-01 to the Planning Commission. He provided a location map, aerial view map, street view and a survey map from the subdivision plat. Mr. Graves continued by explaining the applicant's request.

**Request Summary:**

Applicant's Goal:

Subdivide one 1.083-acre lot into two smaller lots on Baxter Road (as proposed on a subdivision plat showing the proposed division)

Requirement:

The Subdivision Ordinance requires certain design standards at the time of subdivision, including the provision of a sidewalk when the subdivision occurs in the Prince George Planning Area and the density exceeds 1.0 unit per acre.

The applicant has requested a waiver of this requirement.

Applicants' Justification:

"Baxter Road is already developed as a residential use with no sidewalks in place. A sidewalk on this parcel would start and end solely on this parcel with no plan of future development in the area."

Mr. Graves reviewed the ordinance requirements for sidewalks in the Prince George Planning Area relevant to the subject property.

Article VII, Section 70-752 requires:

*"Sidewalks shall be provided along existing streets in the Prince George Planning Area, when lots are proposed to be platted along existing streets."*

*"They shall be located within the public right-of-way and shall be constructed to VDOT specifications."*

Mr. Graves stated that Section 70-208 of the Subdivision Ordinance authorizes the Planning Commission to waive standards of Article VII and specifies the criteria for granting approval:

*“In cases of unusual situations or where strict adherence to the general regulations in this ordinance would result in substantial injustice or hardship...”*

*“No waiver shall be granted which is illegal or which would prejudice the health and safety of citizens of the county.”*

**Review Comments:**

Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT):

“VDOT’s policy for sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities requires that the facilities provide a public benefit in order to be state maintained.

VDOT assesses whether the facility will provide a public benefit by looking at the starting and ending locations for the proposed sidewalk. VDOT looks to determine if the starting point is likely to generate pedestrian traffic and that the destination is somewhere that people would travel to.

VDOT will accept and maintain sidewalk that is proposed in conjunction with private development projects when the county has a comprehensive plan for providing pedestrian facilities and it can be demonstrated that the sidewalk fits within this plan.

VDOT’s evaluation is that this proposed sidewalk would not provide a public need and would only be accepted for state maintenance if part of a larger county pedestrian plan.”

Planning & Zoning:

The resulting lots on the submitted plat generally comply with the remaining standards of the zoning and subdivision ordinances. Mr. Graves stated that if this request is approved, the resulting lots will still need to meet all other applicable requirements prior to final plat approval by the Subdivision Agent.

Per VDOT’s comments, even if the sidewalk were constructed inside the right-of-way as required by County Code, it would not be accepted by VDOT for state maintenance, because it “would not provide a public need and would only be accepted for state maintenance if part of a larger county pedestrian plan.”

The adopted Comprehensive Plan does not include a pedestrian plan, nor any specific plans for sidewalk connections. Mr. Graves explained that it is recommended that this be addressed in the next Comprehensive Plan update.

Mr. Graves stated that the Planning Commission has previously considered and approved subdivision waiver requests related to the following: public water and sewer connection requirements for single-lot divisions in the Prince George Planning Area, and for additional lots on a private road. However, this is the first time that another section of the Article VII design standards has been requested.

Staff reviewed the request against the criteria for making a decision, as provided in Section 70-208 and found that it does appear to meet the criteria provided.

Mr. Graves stated that this request is for an exception to the standard ordinance requirements, and is therefore similar to a variance request to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Staff is not providing a recommendation on approval or disapproval. Staff does note that it appears to meet the criteria for a waiver.

If the Commission wishes to approve this request, Mr. Graves explained that it is required to find that the request meets all of the criteria provided for in the ordinance. Criteria for this type of request, as defined in Section 70-208:

- In cases of unusual situations or where strict adherence to the general regulations in this ordinance would result in substantial injustice or hardship
- There is no prejudice to the health and safety of the surrounding citizens

Mr. Graves stated that adjacent property owners were notified and that this case was not a public hearing. He explained that the property owner and his surveyor were present to answer any questions.

Ms. Anderson moved that subdivision waiver request SW-23-01 to divide the two lots without requirements of a sidewalk, be approved. The applicant would bear the financial burden to construct a sidewalk that would not be accepted by VDOT for maintenance, and that would not connect any other foreseeable development in this area. Mr. Bresko seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Waymack

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS.**

- P-1. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-23-04:** Request of the County of Prince George to permit “Buildings or uses for local governmental purposes” within a Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-103(35). The purpose of the request is to allow a convenience center, which is a facility allowing residents and business to drop off solid waste and recyclable materials to be collected and taken away to off-site transfer stations or landfills. The facility would occupy approximately 7 acres of land located on the southeast portion of the subject property. The subject property, approximately 175 acres in total size, is located on the east side of Prince George Drive at the intersection with East Quaker Road, and is identified as Tax Map 350(OA)00-046-0. The Prince George County Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for “Public / Semi-Public” land uses.

Mr. Graves presented SE-23-04 to the Planning Commission. Mr. Graves explained that the applicant is requesting to construct a convenience center on approximately seven acres. The facility would allow residents and businesses to drop off solid waste and recyclable materials to be collected and taken to off-site transfer stations or landfills. He

provided a location map, aerial view map, zoning map and photos for convenience centers in the area.

**Background:**

Mr. Graves provided the following information:

Convenience Center: *A location for depositing household trash/recycling before it is hauled away to off-site locations. A convenience center is different than a transfer facility and a landfill because there will not be collection vehicles or waste disposal in the ground.*

Current Convenience Center Sites in Prince George County:

- Union Branch (full time)
- Burrowsville Library (limited hours)

In 2018, the BOS began evaluating possible locations in the County for an additional convenience center in a more central location.

The BOS evaluated all of the possible county-owned properties, which could accommodate such a facility and decided upon the “Yancey Tract” as the best location. The Yancey Tract was originally planned for schools, sports fields, a library and a community center. A Special Exception was approved for that Master Plan in 2007.

The Yancey Tract offers multiple possible sites for a convenience center within the 175 acres. The County contracted with an engineer firm to design a plan for the facility and evaluate the best location on the property, before selecting this part of the property.

**Applicant’s Request:**

The applicant’s request considers approximately seven (7) acres with the facility mapping 3-4 acres, buffer areas, screening, entrance road, etc. The layout is similar to the Union Branch Convenience Center.

The engineer firm provide the following information in reference to the site location:



**Selected Location C:**

- Creates opportunity for future development and county uses on remainder of property.
- Maintains good screening from roadways and adjacent properties.
- VDOT: preliminarily no turn lanes or roadway widening needed. County may desire to widen roadway from entrance to the intersection for better maneuverability approx. 2000 LF from intersection. East Quaker Road is narrow, approximately 20 ft wide roadway.
- 3 Phase electrical service will need to be upgraded along E. Quaker Rd. from Prince George Dr. to the new site location.
- There are no public water and sewer utilities. New wells for water services and drainfields or pump-and-haul for sanitary will be necessary.



Visual: Presence of dumpsters and waste collection materials

Mitigation: Visual screening from the road and adjacent properties using perimeter fencing and vegetation

Noise: Sounds from compactors, dumping of materials into containers, and waste collection materials retrieving collected materials

Mitigation: All containers will be located at least 150 feet from adjacent property lines and a vegetative buffer including trees (variable depth) will surround the facility on all sides.

Odor: Odor from waste materials and collection containers

Mitigation: All containers will be located at least 150 feet from adjacent property lines and a vegetative buffer including trees (variable depth) will surround the facility on all sides. All containers shall be emptied on a regular basis. This should prevent any significant accumulation of odors outside of the facility.

#### Frequently Asked Questions & Responses:

What are the surrounding land uses?

Answer: Primarily Public (land owned by the County), Agricultural (across the street) and there are limited adjacent residential uses located at 9511, 9517 and 9523 East Quaker Road

Is this request compatible with surrounding uses and zoning districts?

Answer: Yes, there is adequate separation from adjacent uses and surrounding zoning districts are the same.

Is this request consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?

Answer: Yes, because the Future Land Use Map indicates this property is planned for Public / Semi-Public uses.

Mr. Graves stated traffic impacts have been considered and no Chapter 527 TIA is required. Turn lanes may be required if warranted during Site Plan review, however, VDOT has indicated that turn lanes may not be warranted based on their experience with similar development.

All design requirements will be reviewed at the time of Site Plan, including stormwater management regulations, and including entrance requirements such as the need for any turn lanes.

#### Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT):

No trip generation data or turn lane warrant analyses were submitted with the application. Right and/or left turn lanes will be required if warranted. Based upon experience with similar type projects and it is not anticipated that any turn lanes will be warranted.

A commercial entrance will be required to provide access to the proposed project in accordance with VDOT standards.



The Conceptual Plan shows a partial widening of the roadway along the site frontage. VDOT does not support partial roadway widening. It is suggested that the entire roadway from Prince George Drive to the site entrance be proposed for widening if a wider roadway is desired. A commercial entrance with the 12' setback and 4 to 1 tapers would provide a wider entrance for easier access than the entrance and pavement widening shown on the Conceptual plan.

The proposed access gate must be a sufficient distance from East Quaker Road so that a vehicle can pull up to the gate and not extend into East Quaker Road.

VDOT has no objection to the proposed special exception.

Recommended Conditions:

1. The Convenience Center land use shall be consistent with the definition in the Virginia Solid Waste Management Regulations within the Code of Virginia
2. Hours of operation between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m.
3. Development shall be in general conformance with the Conceptual Plan.
4. The site shall be entirely fenced in, with gate(s) locked after close of operations.
5. All waste and recycling materials and storage containers shall be located a minimum distance of 150 feet from all property lines.
6. The County shall maintain a vegetative buffer, including trees and shrubs, around the perimeter of the Convenience Center, which shall be sufficient to effectively screen, contain and separate the on-site activities from adjacent properties under private ownership.
7. The primary access drive for the facility shall be located on East Quaker Road and the gate shall be located a sufficient distance from the right-of-way so that a commercial vehicle can pull up to the gate without extending into East Quaker Road.

Staff's recommendation is for approval, on the following basis:

- The County explored all publically owned land options in the County and this is the most appropriate location selected by the BOS to serve County residents.
- The applicant's request appears to be reasonably compatible with current and future surrounding land uses.
- Staff has recommended the above conditions for this request which are intended to ensure applicable code requirements are met and limit any

expected impacts on adjacent property owners and the surrounding community.

Mr. Dean Simmons, Director of General Services, represented the County as the applicant for this project. Mr. Simmons explained that the County started their search in 2018. He stated that citizens came to the BOS meetings and expressed a need for an additional centralized location for a convenience center.

Mr. Bresko expressed concerns with the width of East Quaker Road and it not having any turning lanes. Mr. Simmons stated that in the Conceptual Plan, it showed widening the road in that area. The entrance and driveway into the facility is longer to get the traffic off the road. Mr. Simmons said that the County will do whatever VDOT recommends to do for the project.

Ms. Anderson stated that based on some of the comments received from the public were other County owned parcels in the industrial park considered for this project. Mr. Simmons explained that he was not aware of any parcels in the industrial park that were available.

Mr. Graves shared with the Commissioners that the request was advertised in the newspaper, a sign was posted on the property and adjacent property owners were mailed a notification letter. Three comments were received prior to the meeting.

James Glazier  
9610 North Verlinda Court  
North Chesterfield, VA 23237  
STAFF NOTE: Mr. Glazier owns property adjoining the Yancey Tract

Comment:

I do not wish to have a convenience center/ dump beside my property that's going to devalue my land. I don't want to sit on my grandma's front porch and look across the hay field and see a dump. I do not want to hear the truck traffic coming and going . This convenience center / dump should be put in the industrial park that is 2 miles down the street we're it's is already zoned for .why put a dump on a good piece of land. This is just as bad as the sewage treatment plant that was proposed a few years ago. When this land was brought it's intended purpose stated by Jerry Skalsky then a board of supervisor for a community center and a middle school . This convenience center/ dump is way off from what it was intended for. It will also create a traffic problem when people are making a left turn into the convenience center/ dump . Traffic can be backed up making a left turn and when a truck or bus comes over the top of the hill it's a blind spot they will crash into them.

David Hart  
704 Butler Branch Road  
South Prince George, VA 23805

Comment:

I am opposed to building a convenience center on the Yancey tract land. It would serve the county's best interest if it was built in the industrial park that's a few miles away. It will serve all county residents better and have easier access to the convenience center.

Juan Jones  
5260 Mistr Farm Lane  
Prince George, VA 23875

Comment:

I am opposed to the convenience center on Yancey tract land. I believe it should be put in the industrial park that is 2 miles away.

At 7:07 p.m., Ms. Elder opened the Public Hearing to anyone wishing to speak for or against the request. Citizens were asked to state their name and address and they would have three minutes to speak.

Rick Tetterton, 9750 East Quaker Road, expressed concerns with the 150 feet buffer in reference to the odor. He questioned the location on East Quaker Road near houses and stated that an entrance of Prince George Drive would be safer. He voiced his opinion on the intersection at East/West Quaker Road and Prince George Drive being the "most dangerous intersection in Prince George County" and it already needing a turning lane. Mr. Tetterton asked if a citizen committee was formed to look into this project. He also expressed concerns with the County paying money to hire an engineer firm before this location was approved. Mr. Tetterton suggested the Buren property as being a good centralized location for the facility.

Mary Ann White, 7500 Trailing Rock Road, spoke representing the Southside Virginia Association of Realtors. She expressed her concerns for the traffic accidents, odor, rodents and the location chosen. She asked the Commissioners to consider the property values and the wellbeing of the citizens of the County.

Diane Hart, 7418 West Quaker Road, new homeowner across the street from the proposed location. She expressed her concerns for the traffic and stated the roads are too narrow and odors would be horrible.

Gene Shanks, 9673 Blackwater Farm Lane, is an adjacent property owner and spoke in reference to the property value decreasing. He referred to the property value of the houses near the Union Branch facility. He stated his concerns with the intersection, traffic and the county's plan to use a well and septic system. He also stated he did not receive a notification about the meeting.

James Glazier, property owner of the east side of the subject property, stated he did not want a "dump" beside his land. He expressed his concerns with the safety for school buses, traffic, odor, property values, and the need for turning lanes. He stated he was opposed to the request.

Zachary Glazier, 9610 N. Verlinda Court, North Chesterfield, the son of James Glazier, stated his concerns with the safety of the nearby intersection and questioned whether this request meets the definition of special exception.

With no one else coming forward to speak, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:26 p.m.

Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners if they had any additional questions. Mr. Bresko made a motion to move SE-23-04 to the BOS with a recommendation of denial for the following reason: "More insight needs to be given into this special exception." The motion was seconded by Mr. Joyner.

Roll Call:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Waymack

Mr. Graves stated that the request would be forwarded to the BOS with a recommendation of denial and the public hearing would be advertised.

- P-2. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CPA-23-02:** Request of It's His Land, LLC to amend the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation for the property identified as Tax Map 350(0A)00-044-A from "Residential" to "Commercial", in order to support a companion rezoning request for the same property. The property is approximately 14.8 acres in size, and is located on the West side of Prince George Drive at the intersection with West Quaker Rd.

Mr. Graves presented CPA-23-02 to the Commissioners. He explained the request and described the subject property as being approximately 14.8 acres located on Prince George Drive at the intersection with West Quaker Road. The request is to change the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map from Residential to Commercial. Mr. Graves shared the Location Map, Zoning Map, Aerial View Map and site photos.

Background:

Mr. Graves provided the following information:

The property has been zoned R-A since the County blanket rezoned this area from A-1 General Agricultural in 1995.

The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) has indicated this area is planned for Residential uses since at least 1986. However, the entire FLUM is due for review and update.

The applicant divided this property from the larger property to the North, with plans to develop a mini storage on the subject property.

The Planning & Zoning office advised the applicant that he would need a rezoning and special exception in order to develop the property as planned, and that the Future

Land Use Map did not currently support a rezoning for commercial uses, but it was due for an update.

The applicant subsequently requested to change the Future Land Use Map with this request.

**Request Summary:**

The applicant is requesting to change the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation for Residential to Commercial.

**Review Comments:**

**Planning & Zoning:**

The Future Land Use Map has not benefitted from a full-scale review in at least 15 years, so there has not been ample opportunity to consider whether the “Residential” designation remains appropriate. It is reasonable to revisit the future land use plan for this property as well as the surrounding area and traffic corridor.

The Comprehensive Plan provides descriptions for the various future land use designations. Below are the current and proposed designations:

	<b>Residential</b>	<b>Commercial</b>
<b>Description from the Comp Plan</b>	<i>This category includes areas within the PGPA where small lot residential development is encouraged. Public water and/or wastewater facilities are available and required for such development.</i>	<i>This category designates areas where commercial developments have occurred and where future urban and suburban commercial developments are encouraged. Public water and wastewater facilities are generally available or planned for these areas.</i>

Mr. Graves stated that the property is situated at an important intersection for vehicular traffic. It is consistent with best planning practices for commercial development to be located where there is high traffic volume and visual exposure to potential customers. Mr. Graves explained that this property is more conducive to Commercial Development than Residential.

This property is located within the Prince George Planning Area, which is the designated area for residential, commercial and industrial development in the County.

Based on recent discussions with the Utility Department related to the Water & Wastewater Master Plan, this area falls within areas planned to be served by public water and sewer service lines at such time as they are extended by private development. This supports a Commercial future land use designation.

Mr. Graves stated that staff recommends approval of the change from Residential to Commercial with the basis: "Commercial" appears to be the most appropriate future land use designation for this property based on vehicular access, future utility plans, and current and future anticipated land uses on surrounding properties.

Mr. Graves advised the Commissioners that the case was advertised in the newspaper and all adjacent property owners were notified. Mr. Graves stated that the property owner was present to answer any questions and he reminded them that this case was only about the request to change the Comprehensive Plan and not about the rezoning or special exception cases which would only be heard if this request is approved.

Tim Stewart spoke for It's His Land, LLC. He stated he is the owner/operator of Nanny's Restaurant, and he is a lifetime resident of Prince George County. His goal is to diversify and spend his money in Prince George. He wants his taxes to go to his children and wants the County residents to benefit from his taxes.

Mr. Joyner asked Mr. Stewart if he was the property owner. Mr. Stewart explained that he, his brother and another resident own the property.

Mr. Graves presented the public comments that the Planning & Zoning office had received prior to the meeting.

Tammy Tucker  
7111 West Quaker Road  
Disputanta VA 23842

Comment:

I recently saw the rezoning sign at the intersection of 156 and West Quaker and therefore contacted the Planning Office to inquire. I was told that in addition to the county wanting to add a "dump station" to East Quaker and 156, there is a request to rezone West Quaker and 156 from residential/agriculture to business so they can put in storage units and eventually office space and restaurant. As a lifelong resident of the county, I totally disagree and do not support such rezoning or additions of such properties. We want our county to remain as such, a rural county. We do not want to expand to restaurants, office space, storage units to the rural community and definitely not at that intersection! There are more than enough of those currently in PG (near Food Lion on 156 and Jefferson Park as well). In addition, those types of businesses take away from the rural county we love and, in my opinion, only encourages those who often do not have good intentions to come out into the county. If you, the BOS and Planning Commissioner listen to your residents you will see and hear we do not want to a Chesterfield County. We are in PG for a reason and that is the rural, scenic country living that we love! If others want growth and to turn their property into something else, perhaps they are in the wrong county! Please listen to your residents and deny these requests!

Judy Hamby  
7180 West Quaker Road  
Disputanta, VA 23842

Comment:

I am Judy Hamby, I live at 7180 West Quaker Road, Disputanta, VA. I would like to express concerns about rezoning the 14.8 acre property for mini storage (self-storage), outdoor boat/RV storage, office, retail and potentially restaurant uses.

1. The entrance to the property is between a curve on Prince George Drive and the intersection to West Quaker Road. This is a dangerous area on West Quaker and would not accommodate another entrance that close to 156.
2. Our new neighbor just built a beautiful home in our rural area. Now he will be surrounded by these storage units. He wasn't notified about the rezoning until I took the Progress Index to him.
3. In April 2022, the Industrial Development Authority identified this property for potential development but the owner was listed as unresponsive. At that time he owned 141 acres but sold all but 14.8 acres in August , 2022. Is this enough land for the proposal?
4. If you would like to observe an eyesore of boat storage, travel on 106 in New Kent County and you will see trees growing up around boats that have been left for an indefinite time.
5. Before rezoning any property, I would ask you to balance the Rural feel of our County with growth by:
  - Including at least a 100 foot buffer of trees between homes and businesses
  - Restrict signage

At 7:39 p.m., Ms. Elder opened the Public Hearing to anyone wishing to speak for or against the request. Citizens were asked to state their name and address and they would have three minutes to speak.

Alfred Hart, 7418 West Quaker Road, stated he is the adjacent property owner to the subject property that could potentially be transferred into commercial land. He and his family recently built a new home on West Quaker Road and he is opposed to this change. His concerns are with decreasing property values and traffic.

Mary Ann White, 7500 Trailing Rock Road, spoke representing the Southside Virginia Association of Realtors. She expressed her concerns for the traffic situation and stated she did not think it is a good location for a commercial site.

Judy Hamby, 7180 West Quaker Road, stated she had submitted a written comment (attached above) and wanted to speak in person also. She said the curve right before Quaker Road on Prince George Drive, is “an accident waiting to happen”. Mrs. Hamby also expressed concerns about the development plan to have mini storage, outdoor boat storage, retail space and a restaurant on only 14 acres.

Cecil Smith, 8530 Bowbridge Road, member of the Prince George School Board, his concerns are with the safety of the students, the traffic in the area and width of West Quaker Road.

Sterling Drewry, 7222 West Quaker Road, expressed his concerns with the current and potential drainage issues.

James Glazier, 9610 North Verlinda Court, North Chesterfield, property owner on East Quaker Road, stated he did not get a notice for this case and the notice he received for SE-23-04 was received a week and a half before the meeting. He stated that not enough people are being notified and not enough time is being given to the people that are being notified.

With no one else coming forward to speak, the Public Hearing was closed at 7:51 p.m.

Mrs. Elder asked the Commissioners if they had any additional questions or statements.

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Graves if there was another public comment submitted before the meeting. Mr. Graves responded by reading Tammy Tucker's statement which was received on April 24 (text provided above).

Ms. Anderson stated that this is a very concerning issue and we want advancement within the County that benefits all the residents. The approval methods that we normally look at are the compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan ("which it is") and the general welfare of the community. Ms. Anderson expressed her concerns about the safety risks for the community.

Ms. Anderson made a motion to move "RZ-23-02" (CPA-23-02 was the current case being presented) to the BOS with the recommendation of denial for the following reason: "There is a genuine concern with it being a true benefit to the welfare of the community, when weighing the risk of safety of the citizens." Mr. Bresko seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (5) Canepa, Elder, Anderson, Bresko, Joyner

Opposed: (1) Brockwell

Absent: (1) Waymack

Mr. Graves stated the request CPA-23-02 would be forwarded to the BOS with the recommendation of denial. He indicated that the case would be advertised for the late May BOS meeting.

Mr. Graves explained that since a recommendation for denial for the commercial uses in the CPA-23-02 was approved, he requested that the Commissioners postpone RZ-23-02 and SE-23-03 until a future Planning Commission date.

Mr. Brockwell made a motion the postpone RZ-23-02 and SE-23-03 until the BOS make a determination on CPA-23-02. This motion was seconded by Ms. Anderson.



Roll Call:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Waymack

- P-3. REZONING RZ-23-02:** Request of It's His Land, LLC to conditionally rezone 14.8 acres from Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zoning District to General Business (B-1) Zoning District. The applicant seeks to develop the property for a mini storage facility, as well as office, retail and potentially restaurant uses. The subject property is identified as Tax Map 350(0A)00-044-A and located on the West side of Prince George Drive at the intersection with West Quaker Rd. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for "Residential" land uses; however, the applicant has requested to change the Future Land Use designation to "Commercial". **This item was postponed per the above motion and vote.**
- P-4. SPECIAL EXCEPTION SE-23-03:** Request of It's His Land, LLC to permit warehousing with indoor storage within a General Business (B-1) Zoning District, pursuant to Prince George County Zoning Ordinance Section 90-393(15). The purpose of the request is to allow the development of a mini storage (self-storage) facility with outdoor boat/RV storage. The subject property, approximately 14.8 acres in size, is identified as Tax Map 350(0A)00-044-A and is located on the West side of Prince George Drive at the intersection with West Quaker Rd. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for "Residential" land uses; however, the applicant has requested to change the Future Land Use designation to "Commercial". – **This item was postponed per the above motion and vote.**
- P-5. REZONING RZ-23-03:** Request of Roslyn Farm Corporation to conditionally rezone approximately 159.64 acres from Residential Agricultural (R-A) and Limited Residential (R-2) Zoning Districts to General Industrial (M-2) Zoning District. The purpose of the rezoning is to allow development of the property for industrial uses. The subject property is located on both sides of Rives Road in between the interchanges for Interstate 95 and Interstate 295, and is identified by seven (7) Tax Map Numbers: 330(0A)00-015-0, 016-A, 018-0, 019-0, 020-0, 0-21-0, and 024-A. The overall development plan extends across the County line into the City of Petersburg. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map indicates the property is planned for "Commercial / Industrial" land uses.

Mr. Green presented RZ-23-03 to the Commissioners. He shared the Location Map, Zoning Map, Aerial View Map, Future Land Use Map and the Proposed Site Layout – Conceptual Plan.

Background:

The applicant wishes to rezone approximately 159.64 acres for speculative industrial uses. The site in question is located on both the northern and southern sides of Rives Road (SR 629) between I-95 and I-295.

The conceptual plan submitted with the Rezoning application shows five (5) industrial buildings ranging in size from 59,880 square feet to 868,000 square feet. The proposed project extends across the County line into the City of Petersburg. The plan shows two (2) of the five (5) proposed industrial buildings located on land situated in the corporate limits of the City of Petersburg.

The projected capital investment is \$108,993,516 and the estimated job creation is 1,685.

In 2020, the applicant received rezoning approval from the City of Petersburg for two (2) parcels (totaling approximately 45.75 acres) on Rives Road. The parcels were rezoned from B-2, General Business to M-1, Light Industrial.

### **Review Comments:**

#### **Planning and Zoning:**

The proposed use of the property is for speculative industrial development.

Current land uses on adjacent properties:

- West – Vacant land in the City of Petersburg which is a part of the project
- East – Residential (single-family dwellings) and I-295
- North- Vacant
- South- Industrial (Quality Properties)

Expected impacts of proposed uses on adjacent properties and roadways include:

1. Additional traffic on Rives Road

- The applicant prepared a Traffic Impact Study and the proposed land use will generate 3,364 vehicles per day.

Mitigation

- In order to facilitate traffic flow resulting from the proposed project, the Traffic Study recommended the following turn lane improvements:
  - Construct an eastbound left turn lane with a 200 foot storage capacity; construct an eastbound right turn lane with a 200 foot storage capacity,
  - Construct a westbound left turn lane with a 200 foot storage capacity,
  - Construct a northbound left turn lane with a 200ft storage capacity;
  - Construct a northbound through-right lane, and
  - Construct a southbound left turn lane with a 200ft storage capacity; construct a southbound through-right lane

2. Noise

- Will vary by traffic flow, time of day, and by type of industry

Mitigation

- Existing Noise Ordinance and buffering

3. Visual

- Will vary by industrial use

### Mitigation

- Landscaping and buffering requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for Site Plans

The proposed use appears to be compatible with the existing surrounding uses. The project is located in between two major Interstate Highways (I-95 and I-295).

The proposed zoning district and land use is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because the Future Land Use Map calls for Industrial Uses in this area.

The site also adjoins other properties zoned for industrial land uses.

Public water and sewer will be provided by the City of Petersburg.

Approvals required before construction and operation include; site plan, building permit(s), zoning permit(s), land disturbance permit, DEQ approval and Army Corp of Engineers permits for any wetland disturbance.

The Office received a letter of support from the City of Petersburg and letter of concern from a property owner that resides on Rives Road.

### Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT):

The Virginia Department of Transportation, Southern Region Land Development Office has reviewed the Chapter 527 TIA dated 11-17-22 received at the Petersburg Residency on 11-22-22 and the 3-6-23 responses to VDOT's comments received on 3-20-23 and finds the TIA acceptable. As was stated in the response letter, the project does not meet the Chapter 527 TIA regulatory threshold of 5,000 VPD and is not subject to the Chapter 527 requirements. VDOT has reviewed the additional information provided in the response letter and concurs with the recommendations and conclusions provided in the response.

### Utilities Department:

The County and the City of Petersburg have previously agreed that the development of these parcels would be served by public water and sewer of the City of Petersburg. Any site development plans will require review by the City of Petersburg.

### **Proffered Conditions:**

1. *Prohibited Uses:* The applicant voluntarily proffered to prohibit the following land uses on the subject Property: Petroleum storage, sawmills and planing mills, game preserves, sanitary landfills, tree stump landfills, animal board place, feed and feed stores, veterinary or dog or cat hospitals and kennels, airports with conditional use permit, bingo hall, temporary outdoor firework, Christmas tree and holiday item sales, commercial fairgrounds, commercial racetrack, dance hall, circus, carnival, zoo, outdoor flea market, laundries, churches, libraries, funeral homes, clubs and lodges, waterfront

business activities, Radio/Television, Massage parlor, Public and private schools, vehicle impound lot.

2. *Lighting*: Except for the lighting inside the building(s) and dock lighting packages, lighting installed on the Property shall be directed downward and inward to the site to avoid casting lighting on adjacent residential parcels or into the night sky.
3. *Access*: Access points will be used to enter the property off Rives Road in general conformance with Exhibit A, submitted with the application materials, and as approved during the site plan process.
4. *Traffic improvements* will be made along Rives Road to provide dedicated turn lanes into the property as recommended in “Rives Road Industrial Site – Response to Comments/Revised Analysis”, dated March 6, 2023, which was reviewed and approved by VDOT on March 31, 2023.

Mr. Greene stated the staff recommends approval, subject to the applicant’s proffered conditions.

This recommendation is based on the following considerations:

- The applicant’s request is compatible with existing and surrounding land uses
- A rezoning from R-A to M-2 and R-2/R-A to M-2 is consistent with the Prince George County adopted Comprehensive Plan
- There are no major concerns from other County departments or outside agencies
- The site currently adjoins other properties (in the County and City of Petersburg) zoned for industrial uses (M-1 and M-2)
- A site plan is required which will address road improvements, erosion and sediment control, stormwater runoff, buffering, landscaping, parking and outdoor lighting concerns
- No major negative feedback was received from adjacent property owners or community prior to publishing the Staff Report. A letter of support was received from the City Manager of the City of Petersburg. (Mr. Greene stated that a letter from an adjacent resident was received this afternoon.)
- The applicant has proffered several conditions which staff finds acceptable and supports

Nick Walker of Roslyn Farm Corporation, the owners of the property and applicant for the project, introduced the development team for the project. Mr. Walker stated that he had added to the proffers to include eliminating the meat, poultry and fish processing use and dredge material disposal site that was expressed as a concern in the Planning Commission’s Work Session.

At 8:19 p.m., Mrs. Elder opened the Public Hearing to anyone wishing to speak for or against the request. Citizens were asked to state their name and address and they would have three minutes to speak.

Shirley Givens, 3219 Rives Road and 3301 Rives Road, expressed her concerns in her former family's farm land being used as a commercial use. She asked the Commissioners to consider not rezoning the property.

James Hill, 3315 Rives Road, stated he was concerned with what was going to happen to his land he has owned for 90 years.

Angela Hill, 3315 Rives Road, stated that the map she received was unclear to what was going to happen to the families, traffic and rural area around her.

Brani Hammond, stated her family lives on Rives Road, she expressed her concerns with the traffic and the effect this project will have on this area on Rives Road.

With no one else coming forward to speak, the Public Hearing was closed at 8:83 p.m.

Mr. Bresko made a motion to forward request RZ-23-03 to the BOS with a recommendation for approval subject to the proffered conditions and the reason stated was it is compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and current surrounding uses and zoning districts. Mr. Joyner seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

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

Opposed: (0)

Absent: (1) Waymack

## **COMMUNICATIONS.**

- C-1.** Actions of the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA)
  - a. BZA met March 27<sup>th</sup> and approved SE-BZA-23-01
  - b. May BZA Meeting cancelled due to no cases filed
- C-2.** Actions of the Board of Supervisors (BOS)
  - a. March 28: BOS approved RZ-22-05 and recognized Floyd Brown Sr. and Erma Brown for their years of service to the County
  - b. April 11: BOS appointed Brian Waymack to the Planning Commission
  - c. April 25: BOS approved a amendments for the zoning request for Bull Hill Road, approved the Comprehensive Plan change, approved the rezoning request for the bakery on James River Drive and approved the special exception for the adult daycare facility on Prince George Drive
- C-2.** Upcoming Planning Commission Cases for May
  - a. One new rezoning case – Travel Center on South Crater Road

## **ADJOURNMENT.**

At 8:37 p.m., Ms. Elder asked the Commissioners if they had any additional questions. If not, she would entertain a motion to adjourn. Mr. Brockwell made a motion to adjourn and Mr. Bresko seconded the motion. Roll was called on the motion.

Roll Call:

In favor: (6) Canepa, Elder, Anderson, Brockwell, Bresko, Joyner  
Opposed: (0)  
Absent: (1) Waymack