

Farmville Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
January 22, 2020

**Town of Farmville Planning Commission  
Town Council Chamber of the Town Hall  
116 North Main Street, Farmville, VA 23901  
Wednesday, January 22, 2020**

**Planning Commission Members Present:** Patrick Crute, Jerry Davenport, Abbey O'Connor, Sherry Honeycutt, John Miller, Cameron Patterson, and Jayne Johnson

**Members Absent:**

**Staff Present:** Interim Town Manager, Scott Davis; and Administrative Assistant, Kristen Queen

**Approval of Agenda:**

On a motion made by Mr. Patterson and seconded by Mr. Crute and with all members voting "aye," the agenda for the January 22, 2020, Planning Commission meeting was approved.

**Annual Organization and Election of Officers:**

Dr. Miller opened the floor for nominations for the position of Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary. The following nominations and actions were taken.

**Chairman:** Ms. Honeycutt nominated Dr. Miller as Chairman. Mr. Patterson seconded the motion, and with all members voting "aye" the motion was carried.

**Vice-Chair:** Mr. Crute nominated Mr. Patterson as Vice-Chairman. Ms. Honeycutt seconded the motion, and with all member voting "aye" the motion carried.

**Secretary:** Mr. Davenport respectfully declined to continue to hold the role of Secretary. Ms. Honeycutt nominated Ms. O'Connor, Mr. Davenport seconded the motion, and with all members voting "aye" the motion was carried.

**Consideration of Minutes:**

On a motion by Mr. Patterson, seconded by Mr. Davenport, and with all members voting "aye," the minutes from October 23, 2020 Planning Commission meeting were approved.

**Public Hearing Notice:** No public hearings were scheduled.

**Public Participation Speakers:** Dr. Miller then invited members of the public who had signed up to speak during the public participation segment. Dr. Chuck Ross addressed his concerns with the proposed R3 rezoning in the draft Comprehensive Plan as it applies to Main St., High Street and Grove Street Park, and called for Planning Commission members to consider the historic value of this district and to keep this corridor within a thoughtful growth mindset for future planning development. He shared that the new "by-right" zoning ordinance will allow development to detract from its historic character and residents of the town should have more say in what goes into that district.

Ms. Faye Green spoke about concerns for the reconstruction of the intersection at Oak & Griffin as it applies to the language in the Draft Comprehensive Plan on page 54. She reminded the Commissioners about VDOT's strong recommendation to install a roundabout at this intersection during the last Town Council meeting.

After no further commentary, Dr. Miller moved to close the public hearings for public commentary.

**Staff Report:**

**Old Business:** None.

**New Business:**

**A. Consideration and Adoption of Amending Bylaws**

Dr. Davis introduced the proposal of amending the bylaws on Page 2, Article 5.2 with moving the regular meeting schedule from the fourth (4<sup>th</sup>) Wednesday of the month to the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) Wednesday of the month to allow for adequate public hearing notice on matters that the Planning Commission recommends to Town Council for vote on the next consecutive monthly meeting cycle.

On a motion made by Mr. Patterson and seconded by Ms. Honeycutt, and upon a roll call vote with all members voting "aye" the Planning Commission moved to accept and amend the bylaws.

**B. Consideration and Adoption of 2019 Annual Report**

On a motion made by Ms. O'Connor and seconded by Mr. Davenport and upon a roll call vote with all members voting "aye" the Planning Commission moved to accept and recommend the 2019 Annual Report to Town Council for consideration. Dr. Miller also added that he appreciated the thoughtfulness and diligence of the Commission members over the last year and appreciates their sincerity and consideration in all matters brought before them.

**C. Consideration and Adoption of 2020 Meeting Schedule – Tabled to conclusion of meeting.**

**D. Discuss Draft Comprehensive Plan**

Dr. Davis reiterated that the overall scope of the plan in its mission and overview are set and encouraged the Commissioners to review the draft item by item.

**Section 2:** Ms. O'Connor and Ms. Johnson stated concerns over the clarity with mapping graphics and colored charts for easier legibility. The Berkley group advised these will be a higher resolution in the final product.

**Section 4:** Ms. Johnson and Ms. O'Connor raised questions regarding accurate demographic criteria when accounting for Longwood students especially, those that are off campus, commuters and graduate students, and ensuring that data collected is compatible and comparable with past and present reports. The Berkley Group advised they will reevaluate the prior collection practices to ensure data integrity is in line with the best practices going forward.

**Section 5:** Ms. Honeycutt expressed concerns regarding the language used when describing the area public school systems and suggested the verbiage be revised. The Berkley Group, Mr. Davis, and other Commission members reiterated that the language was derived from community and professional surveys and data collection, and that overall performance standards of the public-school systems were of concern for potential residents and should reflect in the profile as applicable, just as much as the positive contributions. The Berkley Group will consider alternative wording to make the language less abrasive if possible.

**Section 6:** Dr. Miller questions the “Paulette Fund” in relationship to the scope of the airport. Dr. Davis clarified that this is wording that can be removed as the Paulette Fund refers to a budget line item for the care and maintenance of private cemetery located on the grounds and does not reflect the operations of the airport use or maintenance.

**Section 7:** Mr. Davenport addressed his concerns that Main Street/ Route 45 North map past the Appomattox River is lacking plans for growth. He would like to see this corridor outlined for potential growth and development. The Berkley Group advised that areas outlined for urban development were based on transportation data but will take another look and adjust the boundary if needed. Dr. Davis advised that land size limitations may apply.

Ms. O’Connor, echoing Dr. Ross’ comments earlier during public participation, called into question the urban land use house unit requirements outlined on page 40, stating the total maximum of 24 units per acre, and if the number will change in R3 from 24 units to 16 units per acre, and asked if this would always apply as a “by-right” use rather than a conditional use? Dr. Davis explained that the rationale is to reduce the amount of zoning districts and to show areas of low, medium and high-density zones. Further downzoning of a single area of concern along High/Beech/Buffalo and Appomattox Streets would not be advisable nor strategic in supporting the current housing trends for future home ownership that increases needs for both single family and multi-family homes in the area. Dr. Davis cited the Walk2Campus initiative the rehabbed several homes in the district that were derelict and successfully rehabbed them to conforming multi-family residences. This would remain a “by-right” use under the proposed zoning amendments to this district encompassed by R3 zoning.

**Commented [KQ1]:** Please review this section in more detail to make certain that the record accurately reflects the conversation that took place.

**Section 8:** Commissioners questioned a transportation plan outlined on page 54. Dr. Davis stated that on page 54 there is a data error regarding a new bridge noted to cross the Appomattox River to divert traffic. Dr. Davis advised this may not meet requirements or funding sources and is left over from the previous comprehensive plan update and will likely be removed for this rendition.

#### **Ordinance Updates:**

##### **Article 2:**

Page 10, Permit & Application Process: After consultation with the Berkley Group and Dr. Davis, the Commission members asked that the revised Comprehensive Plan include a stipulation to require a pre-application meeting with the Town Zoning Administrator before interested parties submit a preliminary site plan for development projects in the Town.

Minor grammatical corrections to pages 22 and including that the definition of “proffer” be added to the Glossary.

**Article 3:**

Ms. Honeycutt asked for further clarification between a campus dwelling and residential family units and their occupancy limits. It was stated that a campus owned dwelling related to Longwood University owned property and whereas four (4) unrelated individuals sharing the dwelling. A multi-family unit is defined as any property for residential occupancy with no more than three (3) unrelated people in the dwelling. The term "Campus Dwelling" refers to the existence of prior zoning districts (R4) that will no longer be applicable in the updated Comprehensive Plan. After much discussion it was determined to strike "Campus Dwelling" from the proposed Comprehensive Plan language and definitions going forward.

Ms. O'Connor cited Page 96 for clarifications on uses for Commercial Outdoor Recreation/Amusement in R1 districts. The Berkley Group provided examples of where such uses have occurred in other localities in the past, but that it did not really belong in R1 in this instance. The Planning Commission agreed that any uses in this matter be applicable for conditional use permitting only.

Ms. O'Connor asked about the "short term rental" definitions on Page 31. The Berkley Group and Dr. Davis advised this applies to properties for rent through AirBNB, VRBO, Homeaway, etc., and where there are no current regulations within the town code but will be in place in this proposed Comprehensive Plan.

Concerns were again shared with respect to the neighborhood areas along Oak/Buffalo/Appomattox and Beech Streets with regard to high density housing within the R3 usage, and Commission members again asked for reasons as to why downzoning or to include conditional use were not advisable options. The Berkley Group and Dr. Davis cited several areas that are problematic when downzoning, to include enforcement seeming arbitrary and seen as implied bias by the Planning Commission for a small area and citizen base and that to do so would require broader community support than has been expressed. Downzoning may also conflict with state mandated codes requiring housing opportunities to exist within the zoning district and would have to further decrease the number of units per acre/lot size to comply with these state mandates. Mr. Patterson urged Commission Members to leave the proposed zoning as is.

**Article 4:**

Mr. Crute asked for clarification on Page 60 regarding the installation of underground utilities. The Berkley Group explained that it was recommended that this be included for all future developers to require the underground installation of utility cables.

Ms. Honeycutt questioned the landscaping requirements outlined on Page 52 A and B, and felt these requirements were restrictive. Dr. Davis clarifies the needs of a clear and concise landscaping plan that defines the requirements for buffering, and the mitigation of ongoing erosion and watershed concerns. Mr. Patterson added that he felt these requirements were much needed and are clear ways to add responsibility to future developers to both enhance aesthetics and reduce the environmental impacts within the town.

Mr. Crute and Mr. Davenport asked for clarifications for neighborhood entrances and corridors, and design standards limiting gravel in subdivisions. The Berkley Group advised that currently, only commercial installations require surfacing. The current language states that for residential subdivisions the Zoning Administrator “may” require the need to surface other entrances as needed but is not currently mandated.

Dr. Miller noted a grammatical error on page 59.

Mr. Crute asked for clarification for variance processes for certain businesses, i.e. food trucks, during special events and holidays. The Berkley Group will review.

Ms. O’Connor questioned the language on Page 61, A1, prohibiting retailers from displaying their goods via outdoor displays, yet on Page 67 article T, outdoor retail display is allowed? The Berkley Group will better clarify these definitions when and where appropriate as to not impede pedestrian right of way.

**Article 6:**

Dr. Miller asked why the proposed plan is not calling for subdivision projects to install sidewalks. Dr. Davis and the Berkley Group advised that currently the only requirements for developers to install sidewalks falls to Public Works Director’s determination to include sidewalks, curb and gutter location. State code allows localities to require a developer to install sidewalks for future development and growth, and that the Berkley Group suggests echoing these requirements if the Planning Commission feels it is needed, although it cannot be required at the time the land is subdivided, but after development of the land begins. The Berkley Group will verify state code as applicable in this matter, but the Planning Commissioners feels it is prudent to require these stipulations upfront with developers so as not to pass along the cost burden to taxpayers for future sidewalks installation through Public Works.

After thorough discussion, Dr. Davis invited any further comments, questions, or suggestion regarding the draft Comprehensive Plan to be sent to him for dissemination with the Berkley Group for further consideration and revision.

The Planning Commission moved to schedule another public open house on behalf of revisions to the Comprehensive Plan to take place in February, in place of the regular monthly meeting, now occurring on the third (3<sup>rd</sup>) Wednesday of the month, on February 19, 2020.

If revisions and feedback are widely positive the potential to hold a public hearing on the Planning Commissions recommendation to accept the revisions and recommend to Town Council could take place as early as March.

Farmville Planning Commission  
Regular Meeting  
January 22, 2020

**C. Consideration and Adoption of 2020 Meeting Schedule** After being tabled earlier in the evening pending the discussion of the timeline for the Comprehensive Plan going forward, on a motion by Mr. Patterson and seconded by Mr. Davenport, with all member voting “aye”, the Planning Commission moved to adopt the 2020 meeting schedule following the amended by-laws.

Dr. Miller adjourned the meeting at 9:40 P.M.

---

John Miller, Chairman

---

Abbey O'Connor Secretary

APPROVED 5.20.20