

Virginia:

AT A REGULAR MEETING of the Nelson County Board of Supervisors at 2:00 p.m. in the General District Courtroom located on the third floor of the Nelson County Courthouse, in Lovingston, Virginia.

Present: J. David Parr, West District Supervisor – Chair
Ernie Q. Reed, Central District Supervisor – Vice Chair
Thomas D. Harvey, North District Supervisor
Jesse N. Rutherford, East District Supervisor
Dr. Jessica L. Ligon, South District Supervisor
Candice W. McGarry, County Administrator
Amanda B. Spivey, Administrative Assistant/Deputy Clerk
Linda K. Staton, Director of Finance and Human Resources
Maureen Kelley, Director of Tourism and Economic Development
Kimberly T. Goff, Commissioner of Revenue

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Parr called the regular meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. with five (5) Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

- A. Moment of Silence
- B. Pledge of Allegiance – Mr. Rutherford led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

William Percy, Lovingston, VA

Mr. Percy requested that the Board and the County Administrator have another look at the possibility of School Zone Speed Enforcement. He noted that there was a second company interested in providing that service to the County. He suggested that a town hall or a citizen focus task force may better serve to evaluate the benefits, compare the options, solicit public input, present recommendations and negotiate a contract to the Board. He referenced an article from the day before in the Richmond Times Dispatch that he had forwarded by email along with some attachments and a recommendation that Nelson County might consider regarding the proposed wastewater treatment facility at Dillard Creek on the Larkin property. He commented that the proposed project would be a long term project, and he noted that there could be an opportunity to participate in leading edge technology as well as potentially benefitting from available DOJ grants funding.

Mr. Percy stated that he was disappointed but not surprised that the Highway 29 overpass at Callohill was not included in this year's smart scale projects submitted to VDOT. He suggested that perhaps the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) Six Year Improvement Plan for projects exceeding \$25 million, or the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Project grants, would be a more successful route to approach the concept. He commented that he knew it was a large project, but he believed that it could happen in due time.

Mr. Percy then suggested a point of order to the Board. He said that when a motion was brought forward, that it should be worded in the affirmative. He explained that a “yes” vote by the majority would be to pass the proposed topic affirmatively, not to deny the proposition. He commented that he believed that the “yes” vote to deny confused, or distorted the intended outcome of the vote. He noted the vote regarding the speed camera enforcement from a prior Board meeting in the fall. He indicated that he was still unclear whether a motion could be amended if it had received a second, but had not yet been voted on.

III. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Parr noted that there were a few items on the agenda that the Board wished to address individually first, and they would then vote to approve the Consent Agenda as a whole.

Mr. Rutherford read aloud **Resolution R2024-21**, Recognition of Armand and Bernice Thieblot. Mr. Parr noted that the Board appreciated all that the Thieblots had done for the community during their time in Nelson.

Mr. Harvey read aloud **Resolution R2024-22**, National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week April 14-20, 2024. Mr. Parr recognized John Adkins and the dispatchers in attendance and he thanked them for their service.

Dr. Ligon read aloud **Resolution R2024-23**, Animal Care and Control Appreciation Week. Dr. Ligon thanked the Animal Control Officers present at the meeting. Mr. Parr thanked Officer Wright and his team for their work.

Mr. Reed read aloud **Resolution R2024-24**, April is Fair Housing Month.

Mr. Parr read aloud **Resolution R2024-25**, April is Child Abuse Prevention Month.

Mr. Reed made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented and Dr. Ligon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the following resolutions were adopted:

A. Resolution – R2024-19 Minutes for Approval

**RESOLUTION R2024-19
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
(January 9, 2024)**

RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors that the minutes of said Board meetings conducted on **January 9, 2024** be and hereby are approved and authorized for entry into the official record of the Board of Supervisors meetings.

B. Resolution – R2024-20 Budget Amendment

**RESOLUTION R2024-20
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AMENDMENT OF FISCAL YEAR 2023-2024 BUDGET
April 9, 2024**

I. Appropriation of Funds (General Fund)			
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Revenue Account (-)</u>	<u>Expenditure Account (+)</u>
	\$ 4,718.00	3-100-002404-0017	4-100-021060-3160
	\$ 10,310.00	3-100-002404-0017	4-100-021060-3160
	\$ 1,443.00	3-100-002404-0034	4-100-031020-1014
	\$ 1,560.00	3-100-002404-0034	4-100-031020-1014
	\$ 176.00	3-100-003303-0026	4-100-033010-3002
	<u>\$ 18,207.00</u>		
II. Appropriation of Funds (School Fund)			
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Revenue Account (-)</u>	<u>Expenditure Account (+)</u>
	\$ 741,000.00	3-205-004105-0001	4-205-063100-9303
	<u>\$ 741,000.00</u>		
III. Transfer of Funds (From General Fund to School Fund)			
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
	\$ 741,000.00	3-100-009999-0001	4-100-093100-9203
	<u>\$ 741,000.00</u>		
IV. Transfer of Funds (General Fund Departmental)			
	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Credit Account (-)</u>	<u>Debit Account (+)</u>
	\$ 5,500.00	4-100-022010-1001	4-100-031020-1001
	<u>\$ 5,500.00</u>		

C. Resolution – R2024-21 Recognition of Armand and Bernice Thieblot

**RESOLUTION R2024-21
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
RECOGNITION OF ARMAND AND BERNICE THIEBLOT**

WHEREAS, in 1991, Armand and Bernice Thieblot acquired over 600 acres of land in the Schuyler region of Nelson County, including portions of a former soapstone quarry which had once been actively mined but had fallen into use as a refuse dumpsite; and

April 9, 2024

WHEREAS, the Thieblots dedicated over 20 years of their lives to reclaiming and restoring this land, eventually opening the Quarry Gardens, designated a Virginia Treasure by Governor Terry McAuliffe in 2016 as a site that serves to “preserve, protect and highlight Virginia’s most important ecological, cultural, scenic and recreational assets as well as its special lands;” and

WHEREAS, the Thieblots have each offered occupational and life skills training to individuals incarcerated at the Albemarle-Charlottesville Regional Jail; and

WHEREAS, in January 2021, Armand Thieblot was appointed to the Nelson County Electoral Board, serving in the position of Chairman until his departure in March 2023; and

WHEREAS, Bernice Thieblot also served three years as an Officer of Election for the Faber Precinct; and

WHEREAS, during their tenure the Thieblots endeavored to support and sustain Nelson County’s standard of excellence in election administration; and

WHEREAS, Armand and Bernice are tremendous assets to this community through their endeavors as public servants and as private citizens;

WHEREAS, Armand and Bernice Thieblot truly exemplify the noble aim to leave a place better than when found and in doing so, inspire all of us to do the same;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors, in recognition of the outstanding contributions of Armand and Bernice Thieblot, do hereby encourage all citizens to thank the Thieblots for their contributions and dedicated service to our community, wish them the very best as they embark on a new life in Texas, and honor them by perpetuating their legacy of service and support for our neighbors.

D. Resolution – R2024-22 Public Safety Telecommunicators Week

**RESOLUTION R2024-22
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK
April 14-20, 2024**

WHEREAS, emergencies can occur at any time that require law enforcement, fire or emergency medical services; and

WHEREAS, when an emergency occurs the prompt response of law enforcement, firefighters and paramedics is critical to the protection of life and preservation of property; and,

WHEREAS, the safety of our first responders is dependent upon the quality and accuracy of information obtained from citizens who telephone into the Nelson County Emergency Communications Center; and

WHEREAS, Public Safety Telecommunicators are the first and most critical contact our citizens have with emergency services; and

WHEREAS, Public Safety Telecommunicators are the single vital link for our deputies and firefighters by monitoring their activities by radio, providing them information and insuring their safety; and

WHEREAS, each dispatcher has exhibited compassion, understanding and professionalism during the performance of their job in the past year;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors declares the week of April 14-20, 2024 as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week in Nelson County, in honor of the men and women whose diligence and professionalism keep our county and citizens safe.

E. Resolution – R2024-23 Animal Care and Control Appreciation Week

**RESOLUTION R2024-23
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL APPRECIATION WEEK**

WHEREAS, the National Animal Care & Control Association (NACA) is committed to setting the standard of professionalism in animal welfare and public safety through training, networking, and advocacy; and

WHEREAS, animal care and control professionals dedicate their lives to the health and safety of at-risk and helpless animals; and

WHEREAS, animal care and control professionals work to rescue and protect animals from injury, disease, abuse, and starvation; and

WHEREAS, NACA has designated the second full week of April as Animal Care and Control Officer Appreciation Week; and

WHEREAS, federal, state, and local government officials throughout the nation take this time to recognize, thank, and commend all animal care and control professionals for the dedicated services they perform and for fulfilling the commitment to providing the highest and most efficient level of customer service;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Nelson County Board of Supervisors does hereby recognize April 14-20, 2024, as **ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL APPRECIATION WEEK** in Nelson County, and we call this observance to the attention of our citizens.

F. Resolution – R2024-24 April is Fair Housing Month

**RESOLUTION R2024-24
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APRIL 2024 IS FAIR HOUSING MONTH**

WHEREAS, April is Fair Housing Month and marks the 56th anniversary of the passage of the federal Fair Housing Act (Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988); and

WHEREAS, the Fair Housing Act provides that no person shall be subjected to discrimination because of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, or familial status in the rental, sale, financing or advertising of housing) and the Virginia Fair Housing Law also prohibits housing discrimination based on elderliness); and

WHEREAS, the Fair Housing Act supports equal housing opportunity throughout the United States; and

WHEREAS, fair housing creates healthy communities and housing discrimination harms us all;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors supports equal housing opportunity and seeks to affirmatively further fair housing not only during Fair Housing Month in April, but throughout the year.

G. Resolution – R2024-25 April is Child Abuse Prevention Month

**RESOLUTION R2024-25
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APRIL IS CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION MONTH**

WHEREAS, preventing child abuse and neglect is a community problem that depends on involvement among people throughout the community; and

WHEREAS, child maltreatment occurs when people find themselves in stressful situations, without community resources, and don't know how to cope; and

WHEREAS, the majority of child abuse cases stem from situations and conditions that are preventable in an engaged and supportive community; and

WHEREAS, all citizens should become involved in supporting families in raising their children in a safe, nurturing environment; and

WHEREAS, effective child abuse prevention programs succeed because of partnerships created among families, social service agencies, schools, faith communities, civic organizations, law enforcement agencies, and the business community.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors do hereby recognize April as Child Abuse Prevention Month and call upon all citizens, community agencies, faith groups, medical facilities, and businesses to increase their participation in our efforts to support families, thereby preventing child abuse and neglect and strengthening the communities in which we live.

IV. RESOLUTION – RECOGNITION OF SUSAN HUFFMAN (R2024-26)

Mr. Parr read aloud **Resolution R2024-26**, Recognition of Susan Huffman. He congratulated Ms. Huffman. Ms. Huffman thanked the Board for everything they had done to support her.

Mr. Rutherford noted the Library project had started in 2019. Ms. Huffman indicated that the construction was completed in 2020 just before the construction costs went up. Mr. Rutherford noted that he and Ms. Huffman, along with former South District Supervisor Larry Saunders had discussed how they saw the future of libraries and what that meant to a community. Mr. Rutherford noted that in talking with Ms. Huffman, he learned that libraries were not just a place of academia, they were a place of commerce, a place where literacy crafted a child’s future, as well as an adult’s. He thanked Ms. Huffman for her service and the legacy that the library would be over the coming decades.

Mr. Parr made a motion to approve **Resolution R2024-26** and Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2024-26
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
RECOGNITION OF SUSAN HUFFMAN**

WHEREAS, Susan Huffman has retired as of March 31, 2024, after serving Nelson County for nearly 10 years as the librarian and branch manager at Nelson Memorial Library; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Huffman guided the library through a major renovation and expansion to the building which doubled the size of the library, all while maintaining service to the citizens of the County; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Huffman brought together the Grow Nelson Library fundraising group that supported the library expansion with a new collection of books and materials, and continues to provide support for special projects; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Huffman has continued to find ways to provide 24/7 library access to the County with the addition of a holds locker located on the exterior of Nelson Memorial Library, a newly added book kiosk in Nellysford, a bookmobile, and an Outreach vehicle to bring story times and programming to the County; and

WHEREAS, with the support of Grow Nelson Library, Ms. Huffman brought a makerspace to the Nelson Memorial Library Business Center that includes: a laser engraver, vinyl cutter, poster printer, digital converter for VHS tapes as well as film scanning, a Cricut, book scanner, sewing machine, and a laminator all for public use; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Huffman pioneered the “Nelson Reads” program within both elementary schools, which has students read and rank books to select one winning children’s book each year; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Huffman worked to bring Dolly Parton’s Imagination Library to Nelson, which provides children from birth to age five with one free book per month, mailed to their home to grow their very own library; and

WHEREAS, Ms. Huffman has dedicated herself to our community and library in countless other ways;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors wishes Susan Huffman continued health, happiness and prosperity upon her well-deserved retirement.

V. PRESENTATIONS

A. VDOT Report

Mr. Robert Brown of VDOT provided the following report:

Mr. Brown reported that VDOT litter contractor should be picking up in Nelson. He noted that the litter pick up should be completed very soon. He reported that they were hoping to have Jenny’s Creek Road back open by the end of the week. He indicated that the new structure was being installed now. Mr. Brown noted that VDOT was still cutting brush along the banks on 151 near Nellysford and toward Route 250. He indicated that most of the work had been completed and it had opened up the sight distance significantly.

Supervisors then discussed the following issues:

Mr. Rutherford:

Mr. Rutherford thanked Mr. Brown for taking the time to meet with him to look at Whippoorwill. He noted that he learned there were various roads in Nelson that were once maintained right-of-ways that no longer existed. He noted that he looked forward to learning what potentials could exist, whether it be through Revenue Sharing, or VDOT taking over maintenance.

Mr. Rutherford noted that he did see people picking up trash along Route 56, and a few other highways. He thanked Mr. Brown for that work. He asked that trash pickup take place whenever it could be done. He commented that there was a big push in the community, especially in his district along 56 where they were trying to get more communities active in cleaning up roadways. Mr. Rutherford asked Mr. Brown to email details on clean-up programs. Mr. Brown noted that VDOT had an Adopt a Highway program where citizen groups could adopt sections of highways for litter pick-up. He explained the process, noting that VDOT did install permanent signs to indicate who had adopted that portion of highway. He reported that VDOT furnished the bags and safety vests, and VDOT picked up the bags. He explained that VDOT requested the clean-up crew to send VDOT a postcard once the pick-up had been completed to indicate how many bags had been picked up. Mr. Rutherford asked if the highway had to be adopted to pick up. Mr. Brown indicated that it did not, but he noted that it was neat to be recognized. Mr. Rutherford asked Mr. Brown to send information on the program so that he could share it with community groups. Mr. Brown reported that the Adopt a Highway coordinator was Karen Scott. He noted that anyone could reach out to Ms. Scott for more information.

Mr. Harvey:

Mr. Harvey had no VDOT issues to discuss.

Dr. Ligon:

Dr. Ligon had no VDOT issues to discuss.

Mr. Reed:

Mr. Reed had no VDOT issues to discuss.

Mr. Parr:

Mr. Parr had no VDOT issues to discuss.

B. VDOT Secondary Six Year Plan Work Session (R2024-27)

Mr. Brown reviewed the draft of the FY25-30 Secondary Road Six Year Improvement Plan which included:

1. Cow Hollow Road (Route 674)
2. Davis Creek Road (Route 623)
3. Hunting Lodge Road (Route 646)
4. Jennys Creek Road (Route 674)
5. Buffalo Station Road (Route 606)
6. Fork Mountain Road (Route 667)
7. Gulleysville Lane (Route 629)
8. Berry Hill Road (Route 613)
9. Wheelers Cove Road (Route 640)
10. Walk Around Lane (Route 764)
11. Green Field Drive (Route 721)
12. Eagle Mountain Drive (Route 648)

Mr. Brown reported that VDOT had been successful in completing the projects in a timely manner with the funding that they had. He noted that priority number one (1), Cow Hollow, would still be in the Six Year Plan because it had not been financially closed. He confirmed that the project on Cow Hollow was complete. He explained that Davis Creek was the last remaining project in the FY24-29 Six Year Plan. Mr. Brown noted that everything listed below Davis Creek (priority 3 through priority 12) had come from last year's priority list, which emptied the list. He explained that all of the projects that were waiting to go into the Six Year Plan had now made it into the Plan this year and were funded. Mr. Brown noted that priority number 7, Gulleysville Lane, had not been taken off the list, but it had been moved back due to some issues. Mr. Brown indicated that he was not sure if they needed to be concerned with those issues or not, but they needed to get a handle on it before the list was presented. Mr. Brown suggested that he and Mr. Reed discuss the road further at a later time. Mr. Reed indicated that he had a recommendation they could discuss. Mr. Brown reported that there was a mile and a half section of Wheelers Cove for priority number 8. Mr. Brown noted that the remainder of Green Field Drive was on the list. He indicated that the request for Eagle Mountain Drive was last year's addition to the list, which was a half mile long section.

Mr. Brown noted that last year's list which had been presented and approved, had now been emptied, as those roads had made it to the Six Year Plan. Mr. Brown offered to answer any questions on the proposed Six Year Plan. He noted that the projects that had moved into the plan were based on the Board's priority and the requests of the residents.

Mr. Rutherford asked if Gulleysville had been taken off the list. Mr. Reed noted that Gulleysville had been bumped down the list. Mr. Reed indicated that because of the level of development and the amount of car trips on Berry Hill, he wanted to move Berry Hill up on the list. He noted that it was becoming a well traversed area, and it was steep and windy, which would cost a lot of money to keep the road up otherwise. Mr. Brown suggested moving Berry Hill to priority number 7. Mr. Reed was in agreement to move Berry Hill to priority number 7, and he suggested that they could discuss Gulleysville more later.

Mr. Parr asked how much maintenance VDOT was having to do on Walk Around Lane. He asked if VDOT was having to send a grader over frequently. He asked if it was cheaper to complete the road, or to continue maintenance on it. He noted that it seemed the road had a lot of requests for maintenance.

Mr. Parr indicated that Walk Around Lane was off of Rhue Hollow. Mr. Brown commented that VDOT would like to finish the road, noting that would keep VDOT from having to go back there at all. He noted that Walk Around Lane was the only unpaved road left back there. Mr. Brown reported that Walk Around Lane had a traffic count last year of 50 vehicles per day (VPD) and the road was not that long. He noted that if the Board wanted to move Walk Around Lane up, they could. Mr. Brown indicated that he did not have any issues with how the Board did the priorities. Mr. Brown noted that they had set up a mile and a half of Wheelers Cove last year and it had a higher traffic count.

Mr. Rutherford asked if they had done anything with Warminster. Mr. Brown noted that they had not done anything with Warminster. He explained that the main reason for doing Hunting Lodge was to complete the loop from when they paved Aerial Drive (Route 645) a few years ago. Mr. Rutherford asked about considering Warminster, not in the current priority list, but in an upcoming list.

Mr. Brown noted they needed to keep in mind that most of the funding for unpaved roads was called District Grant Unpaved Road Funding. He indicated that the roadway had to have 50 vehicles per day (VPD) on it, and if it did not have 50 VPD, it was not eligible for that type of funding. He noted that Nelson County did get tele fee funding, but it was not a lot. He reiterated that there had to be 50 vehicles per day on the roads for them to be considered for the unpaved road funding.

Dr. Ligon noted that Wheelers Cove had businesses there operating seasonally. Mr. Rutherford noted that Wheelers Cove was unique as there were a lot of residents who did not want Wheelers Cove paved. He indicated that the intent with the one-and-a-half-mile section was to take care of those businesses. He noted that it was supposed to end just beyond the wildlife center. Mr. Brown noted that the roads on the new list were just for suggestion.

Mr. Rutherford suggested swapping Buffalo Station with Wheelers Cove. The Board was in agreement to swap Buffalo Station with Wheelers Cove on the FY25-30 Secondary Road Six Year Improvement Plan as follows:

1. Cow Hollow Road (Route 674)
2. Davis Creek Road (Route 623)
3. Hunting Lodge Road (Route 646)
4. Jennys Creek Road (Route 674)
5. Wheelers Cove Road (Route 640)
6. Fork Mountain Road (Route 667)
7. Gulleysville Lane (Route 629)
8. Berry Hill Road (Route 613)
9. Buffalo Station Road (Route 606)
10. Walk Around Lane (Route 764)
11. Green Field Drive (Route 721)
12. Eagle Mountain Drive (Route 648)

The Board reviewed the list of suggested roads on the Unpaved Roads list.

Nelson County							
Rural Rustic Draft Priority List - FY25/30							
PRIORITY	ROUTE	NAME	FROM	TO	LENGTH	TC - VPD	COST
	687	North Fork Rd	1.0 Mi North RTE 56	2.0 Mi North	1.00	110	\$ 250,000.00
	640	Wheelers Cove					
	780	Toms Lane	RTE 674 Cow Hollow	Dead End	0.40	60	\$ 100,000.00
	634	Spring Valley Rd	RTE 616 Hickory Creek Rd	Dead End	1.00	180	\$ 250,000.00
	681	Pigeon Hill Rd					
	662	South Powell Island	0.68 Mi North RTE 739	1.45 Mi N 739	1.45	60	\$ 362,500.00
						Total	\$ 962,500.00
		Estimates based on \$250,000 per mile					

Dr. Ligon indicated that she liked the suggestion of South Powells Island. She noted that road was a mess. Mr. Rutherford noted that the Board could change the priority of the Unpaved Roads list intermittently because they had years before they would make it into the Six Year Plan.

Mr. Rutherford asked why Wheelers Cove was mentioned a second time on the Unpaved Roads list. Mr. Brown noted that he was unsure. He indicated that he did not have a chance to look at the list as closely as he should have. Mr. Brown indicated that the two (2) most important roads to VDOT on the Unpaved Roads list were Spring Valley (Route 634) and the north end of North Fork Road (Route 687). He reported that Spring Valley off of Hickory Creek went back to the winery and had a VPD count of 180. He indicated that Spring Valley required a lot of maintenance. He then noted that the north end of North Fork had 110 vehicles per day on it, which he pointed out was a significant number of vehicles for an unpaved road. Mr. Parr noted that North Fork got a lot of washout. Mr. Brown confirmed that the road was high maintenance. Dr. Ligon asked whether they would do Zinks Mill where it attached to North Fork since it was gravel as well. Mr. Brown reported that Zinks Mill did not have a high traffic count. He noted that he had also looked at Bradley Lane and Spy Run Gap, but they were below 50 vehicles per day. Mr. Brown explained to the Board that they could put anything on the Unpaved Road list that they wanted. He noted that when it was time to work them into the Six Year Plan, they could do a special traffic count to see if the roads had 50 vehicles per day on them. He indicated that secondary unpaved road counts were counted about every five (5) years. Mr. Rutherford noted that they needed to get more roads on the list.

Mr. Brown noted that they had talked about doing the first mile of Findlay Gap from Keys Church because of the County property located down there, and the proposed outdoor park. He commented that he did not know whether that was still a priority or not. He indicated that the Board could prioritize North Fork and Spring Valley as #1 and #2 on the list, and then list the others any way they wanted. He noted that they could change it any way they wanted to the following year.

Mr. Parr commented that he was good with Spring Valley and North Fork being #1 and #2. He asked if they needed to rank the rest of the list. Mr. Brown noted they could. He explained that he put Toms Lane on the list, noting it was a dead end road off of Cow Hollow. He noted that he also added another section of South Powells Island. He reported that they had done another section on South Powells Island about 10 years earlier, down past Walkers Mountain subdivision. He explained that they had done some extensive work and paving so that when the river flooded, the road would not be damaged. He indicated that they were still having some issues in the unpaved section below Walkers Mountain subdivision. Mr. Parr asked for the traffic count on Toms Lane. Mr. Brown reported that it was 60 vehicles per day. Mr. Parr asked what the traffic count was on Pigeon Hill. Mr. Brown reported that the count was over 100. Mr. Parr suggesting putting higher priority on Pigeon Hill than Toms Lane. Mr. Brown suggested putting Pigeon Hill as #3. He noted that VDOT had hard surfaced part of Pigeon Hill several years ago, so there was only a section left to complete it. Dr. Ligon and Mr. Parr suggested putting South Powells Island as #4. Mr. Parr suggested putting Toms Lane as #5. The Board was in agreement with the roads prioritized as follows:

1. Spring Valley Road
2. North Fork Road
3. Pigeon Hill Road
4. South Powells Island
5. Toms Lane

Mr. Rutherford made a motion to adopt **Resolution R2024-27** as amended and Mr. Reed seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2024-27
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AUTHORIZATION FOR PUBLIC HEARING
FY25-FY30 SECONDARY SIX-YEAR ROAD PLAN
AND CONSTRUCTION PRIORITY LIST**

WHEREAS, The Virginia Department of Transportation and the Board of Supervisors of Nelson County, in accordance with Sections 33.2-331 and 33.2-332 of the Code of Virginia, are required to conduct a public hearing to receive public comment on the proposed Secondary Six-Year Plan for Fiscal Years 2025 through 2030 in Nelson County and on the Secondary System Construction Budget for Fiscal Year 2025,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that a public hearing will be held for this purpose in the General District Courtroom of the Nelson County Courthouse, 84 Courthouse Square, Lovingston, Virginia at 7:00 pm on Tuesday, May 14, 2024.

CLOSED SESSION PURSUANT TO §2.2-3711 (A)(3)

Mr. Reed moved that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors convene in closed session to discuss the following as permitted by Virginia Code Sections 2.2-3711- (A)(3) - “Discussion or consideration of the acquisition of real property for a public purpose, or of the disposition of publicly held real property, where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body.” Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote.

Supervisors conducted the closed session and upon its conclusion, Mr. Reed moved to reconvene in public session. Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation.

Upon reconvening in public session, Mr. Reed moved that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors certify that, in the closed session just concluded, nothing was discussed except the matter or matters specifically identified in the motion to convene in closed session and lawfully permitted to be discussed under the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act cited in that motion. Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion and there being no further discussion, Supervisors voted unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote to approve the motion.

VI. NEW & UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. County and Schools Project Financing (R2024-28)

Ms. McGarry introduced Roland Kooch of Davenport and Company, the County’s financial advisors. She noted that Mr. Kooch would present the results of the Bank RFP (Request for Proposals) for both the Schools’ Bond Anticipation Note (BAN) and the County’s BAN. Mr. Kooch explained that this was an update on where things stood with respect to the RFP process, with respect to the interim financing for both the Social Services project (County) and Schools. He noted that Davenport’s Debt Capacity/Affordability Analysis had included two (2) projects that were moving forward currently, including:

- The construction of a new facility that would house the County’s Department of Social Services (DSS building) estimated to cost \$9.5 million; and
- The renovation of Nelson County High School estimated to cost \$25.0 million (with \$2.5 million of that amount funded from a grant that had already been awarded for the project). Mr. Kooch noted that \$22.5 million would be source funded.

Mr. Kooch reported that the two (2) projects fit into the overall debt capacity analysis that Davenport had presented and discussed with the Board over the past year, which showed the County’s capacity and affordability to be a \$57 million maximum capacity.

Mr. Kooch explained that on behalf of the County, Davenport distributed a request for proposals (RFP) to over 100 local, regional, and national banks for two (2) Tax-Exempt Lease Revenue Bond Anticipation. He indicated that this would provide interim financing for the design and startup costs, to get the County to the point where they would have bids in hand for the projects, and the ability to proceed forward with actual construction and permanent financing of the Social Services building (County), as well as the School Board

to have the funds and the ability to have plans and specs to be positioned for permanent financing for the School project.

Mr. Kooch explained that they had structured the financing in the form of two (2) Tax-Exempt Lease Revenue Bond Anticipation Notes:

- A \$2.5 million Lease Revenue Bond Anticipation Note that would fund the initial costs related to the renovation of Nelson County High School; and
- A \$1.7 million Lease Revenue Bond Anticipation Note that would fund the initial costs related to the construction of the Social Services building.

He noted that they could independently track the spending on both projects, because they could involve two (2) separate financing vehicles. He explained that the County’s project could go through VRA (Virginia Resources Authority). He noted that VRA could do all kinds of government projects, with the exception of schools. He indicated that the School project could potentially be funded through Virginia Public Schools Authority (VPSA), would could only finance for schools. He noted that the reason for keeping the interim financing separate was for the purpose of accounting and being able to track that forward to permanent financing.

Mr. Kooch explained the RFP (Request for Proposals) process. He noted that the RFP requested proposals for a direct bank loan with a final maturity of two (2) years. He explained that the time frame was to allow sufficient time in terms of final maturity so that the permanent financing could be put into place. He estimated that permanent financing would be put into place around spring of 2025, if everything went well in regards to design and bidding for both projects. He noted that this would allow the County to proceed with all of the A&E (architecture and engineering) work, and the preliminary costs to get to the point where they would have firm bids in hand and be able to know what would be financed for each project. He explained that the approach would allow the County to take advantage of the current interest rate environment. He noted that currently, interest rates have been going up, so the reinvestment rates provided a natural arbitrage, which was the ability for the County to keep its fund balance intact and keep its reserves working to generate interest income at a higher rate than what they were paying on the Bond Anticipation Note. He noted that anytime they could use other people’s money to make more money on theirs, that was a natural plan of finance to take on.

Mr. Kooch explained that the interim financing would ultimately be permanently financed and rolled into long-term funding vehicles, whether it be through VRA, VPSA, or another form of financing. He noted that the RFP contemplated the use of Tye River Elementary School as collateral for both notes, particularly since they were financing school needs as well. He indicated that was typical and standard in a lease revenue transaction. He explained that once they rolled into permanent financing, that collateral would be freed up. He reiterated that Tye River was not permanently encumbered in any long term financing. Mr. Kooch reported that the County had previously done this in 2022 with its Bond Anticipation Note. He noted that the financing would go through the Economic Development Authority as they would be the actual issuer, and the County and School Board would be parties the transaction as well.

Mr. Kooch reviewed the comparison of the proposals received from four (4) banking institutions – First National Bank, Truist Bank, U.S. Bank and Webster Bank. He reported that First National Bank had the lowest interest rate and the most flexibility. He noted that the other three (3) banks provided the same sort of interim financing, but they were all providing a form of financing that was called a drawdown at closing, or a Bond Anticipation Note that would be fully funded at closing.

	First National	Truist Bank	U.S. Bank	Webster Bank
2024A Note				
Proposed Interest Rate	4.70%	5.05%	5.08%	4.645%
Annual Interest Cost	\$117,500	\$126,250	\$127,000	\$116,125
2024B Note				
Proposed Interest Rate	4.70%	5.22%	5.08%	4.645%
Annual Interest Cost	\$79,900	\$88,740	\$86,360	\$78,965
Key Terms				
Prepayment	Any time, whole or part, no penalty	Any time after 6 months without penalty	Prepayable on May 1, 2025	Prepayable in whole after 18 months without penalty
Drawdown	Line of Credit OR All drawn at closing	All drawn at closing	All drawn at closing	All drawn at closing
Real Estate	Requires evidence of title or title search	Not specified	Not specified	Requires title search & insurance, env. Survey
Other Fees	Lender's Counsel \$7,500	Lender's Counsel \$8,000	Lender's Counsel \$5,000	Lender's Counsel \$5,000

Note: First National would allow for a Line of Credit (interest would only be paid on amounts drawn down). For the purposes of the comparison above, all funds are assumed to be drawn at closing.

Mr. Kooch reported that First National Bank provided a drawdown option, but they also provided an option to drawdown as needed, which was more like a line of credit or a construction loan concept. He pointed out that the great feature with drawing down as needed, was that they would only pay interest on amounts drawn down. He reported that at 4.7 percent interest, the annual interest cost was roughly \$117,000 on the School side, and \$80,000 on the County side, if everything was drawn down at closing and everything was being paid for one year. He noted that as they draw that down, it would naturally be less than that. He estimated on a reasonable basis that the interest expense could be half of that amount. Mr. Kooch noted that it was a cost effective financing vehicle and on that \$4.2 million, it allowed the County to preserve its cash and earn in excess of 4.7 percent on its cash with respect to current reinvestment opportunities. He indicated that the standard investment would be opportunities such as Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP). Mr. Kooch reported that First National Bank provided the ability to prepay, in whole, or in part with no penalties. He noted that the other banks had some element of call protection, or a lockout window, with respect to prepaying. He reported that First National Bank came in with the best terms and conditions and the lowest cost.

Mr. Kooch reported that Davenport was respectfully recommending that Nelson County move forward with the First National Bank line of credit proposal because it met all of the County's goals and objectives with the lowest cost form of financing. He noted that it allowed the County to take advantage of their own money in terms of reinvesting, it provided the ability to prepay anytime without penalty, and it allowed the ability to draw down funds as needed and only pay interest on those amounts drawn down.

Mr. Kooch reviewed the timeline. He noted that they were present for the Board's resolution to proceed forward with the financing. He reported that the next two (2) actions that were required were the EDA's approval of its resolution, and the School Board's approval of its documents and collateral used to secure the Bond Anticipation Note line of credit. He noted that they were anticipating to close by April 30th and the funding would be in place at that time. He indicated that the County would then have access to those funds as needed to spend down on both projects. Mr. Kooch explained that since they were not using any County facility as collateral, there was no issue with respect to any location where the DSS building might be or property constraints.

Mr. Rutherford asked whether the Governor signed into place the 1 percent sales tax option. Ms. McGarry noted that he did not, he vetoed it. She indicated that there was a push to contact legislators. Mr. Reed asked if the Board were to adopt the resolution whether Mr. Kooch would be present at the EDA meeting the next day. Mr. Kooch confirmed that Davenport would be present at both the EDA and School Board meetings.

Dr. Ligon asked what the cost for Davenport's work would be. Mr. Kooch noted that all of the closing costs would be wrapped into the financing, which included bank closing costs, bond counsel closing costs and the financial advisor costs. He noted that the closing costs were fully funded and would require the County to pay out of its budget for anything related to closing costs. Ms. McGarry reported that the total cost of issuance would be about \$90,000, which included Davenport's cost, the Bond Counsel's cost, the Lender's Counsel, and a contingency amount in case of fluctuation. She noted that the closing costs were currently an estimate only.

Mr. Kooch noted the return to the County on its funds. He estimated that by the County being able to preserve its cash and earn at around five (5) to 5.5 (five and a half) percent, that would be about \$200,000 in interest earnings by preserving the County funds.

Mr. Kooch noted the LGIP and commented that a large number of Treasurers across the Commonwealth typically could and did, invest in the Local Government Investment Pool. He reported that the Local Government Investment Pool was run by the Department Treasury and was currently earning about 5.4 percent. He noted that when they thought about reinvestment of County funds, taking advantage of that kind of reinvestment rate, relative to borrowing rates, they could see where the spread could be. He indicated that they could earn more than they would pay on the type of facility.

Dr. Ligon commented that the County had \$6.6 million growing at only 2 percent. Mr. Kooch asked where that was invested because it seemed really low. Dr. Ligon noted that there was a money market earning 2.02 percent, and another at an average rate of 2.46 percent. Mr. Kooch suggested that may be something that Davenport could help with. Ms. McGarry asked if the information that Dr. Ligon was reviewing included anything for LGIP. Dr. Ligon reported that in LGIP there was \$12,219,000 at 5.49 percent. She noted the other investment pool had \$6.6 million at 5.5 percent.

Mr. Rutherford noted that they Count probably had to have a certain amount of funds liquid. Ms. McGarry noted that there were investment policies that the Treasurer had to adhere to. Mr. Kooch commented that with LGIP, as long as it was not the Extended Maturity Program, the regular LGIP was liquid, pretty much on 24 hours' notice. Dr. Ligon asked if Davenport advised the Treasurer at all. Mr. Kooch noted that they had not, but they would be glad to do so. He indicated that they did work with a lot of Treasurers on investment strategy. Dr. Ligon noted that part of the sales pitch was that they could make money on money,

but they were not. Mr. Kooch noted that they were making money with LGIP and by financing, they were preserving roughly \$4.7 million in LGIP. He noted that if the County did not finance, they would be pulling that money out of investment and the interest earnings would decrease. Mr. Kooch reported that Davenport had just started working with a locality in southwest Virginia on optimization of investment management. He noted that Davenport had an analytical program that could do that, and they would be glad to work with County staff to introduce the concept if Treasurer was willing to think about it. Ms. McGarry noted they could do that and see where it went. She indicated that it was ultimately up to the Treasurer as to where the County's funds were invested, and how, and how much. Mr. Kooch noted that money invested in LGIP and VIP (Virginia Investment Pool) was working for the County, and the financing for the projects would allow the County to maintain the money working for it. He noted if they did not finance, they would be drawing that investment amount down, which would reduce interest earnings and affect the 2025 budget.

Mr. Reed moved to approve **Resolution R2024-28** and Mr. Rutherford seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION R2024-28
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AUTHORIZATION OF FINANCING

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors (**the "Board of Supervisors"**) of the County of Nelson, Virginia (**the "County"**) requested the County's financial advisor Davenport & Company LLC (**the "Financial Advisor"**) to prepare and distribute a request for proposals (**the "RFP"**) to obtain financing proposals to finance (a) the design, improvement, expansion, renovation, construction and equipping of public school facilities, including design work for renovation and improvements to Nelson County High School (**the "School Project"**) and (b) the design, improvement, expansion, renovation, construction and equipping of County office facilities, including design work for facilities to be used for building inspection, planning and zoning, and department of social services purposes (**the "County Project" and, together with the School Project, the "Projects"**);

WHEREAS, the Financial Advisor reviewed responses to the RFP for the financing of the Projects and along with County staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors accept the proposal (**the "Proposal"**) from First National Bank (**the "Lender"**) for such financing with a selected interest rate as set forth in such Proposal and subject to such other terms as set forth therein;

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors requests the Economic Development Authority of Nelson County, Virginia (**the "Authority"**) to (a) issue, offer and sell its lease revenue bond anticipation notes in an amount not to exceed \$2,500,000 for the School Project (**the "2024A Note"**) and in an amount not to exceed \$1,700,000 for the County Project (**the "2024B Note" and together with the 2024A Note, the "Notes"**) to finance the Projects and pay certain costs of issuing the Notes, (b) lease the Tye River Elementary School (**the "Leased Property"**) from the Nelson County School Board (**the "School Board"**) under a Ground Lease (as defined below), and in turn, lease the Leased Property to the County under a Lease Agreement (as defined below) and (c) secure the Notes by an assignment of its rights under such Lease Agreement (except the right to receive indemnification, to receive notices and to give consents and to receive its administrative expenses) and the Ground Lease under an Assignment Agreement (as defined below), which is to be acknowledged and consented to by the County, all in accordance with a Note Purchase Agreement (as defined below);

WHEREAS, there have been presented to this meeting drafts of the following documents (**collectively, the "Documents"**) in connection with the transactions described above, copies of which shall be filed with the records of the Board of Supervisors:

- a. a Ground Lease, dated as of April 15, 2024, among the County, the School Board and the Authority conveying to the Authority a leasehold interest in the Leased Property (**the "Ground Lease"**);
- b. a Lease Agreement, dated as of April 15, 2024, between the Authority and the County (**the "Lease Agreement"**) conveying to the County a leasehold interest in the Leased Property which is to be consented and agreed to by the School Board;
- c. a Note Purchase Agreement, dated as of April 15, 2024 among the Authority, the County and the Lender, pursuant to which the Notes are to be issued (**the "Note Purchase Agreement"**);
- d. an Assignment Agreement, dated as of April 15, 2024 between the Authority and the Lender, assigning to the Lender certain of the Authority's rights under the Lease

April 9, 2024

Agreement and the Ground Lease, which is to be acknowledged and consented to by the County and the School Board (**the “Assignment Agreement”**); and

- e. a Specimen 2024A Note and a Specimen 2024B Note.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Nelson, Virginia:

1. All costs and expenses in connection with the issuance of the Notes, including the Authority’s expenses, the fees and expenses of the County, and the fees and expenses of Sands Anderson PC as the County’s Bond Counsel (**“Bond Counsel”**), the County Attorney, the Financial Advisor and the Lender, and other fees and expenses related thereto, for the sale of the Notes, shall be paid from the proceeds therefrom or other funds of the County.
2. The Board of Supervisors hereby instructs the Financial Advisor and Bond Counsel to take all such action as necessary or appropriate to accept the Proposal and conclude the purchase of the Notes, or either of them, by the Lender.
3. The following plan for financing the Projects is approved. The Authority shall use the proceeds from the issuance of the 2024B Note to finance the County Project and shall use the proceeds from the issuance of the 2024A Note to finance the School Project. The Authority shall lease the Leased Property from the School Board under the Ground Lease, and lease the Leased Property to the County under the Lease Agreement for a lease term not less than the term of the latest to mature of the 2024B Note and the 2024A Note at a rent sufficient to pay when due the interest and principal on the Notes. The obligation of the Authority to pay principal and interest on the Notes will be limited to rent payments received from the County under the Lease Agreement. The obligation of the County to pay rent under the Lease Agreement will be subject to the Board of Supervisors of the County making annual appropriations for such purpose. The Board of Supervisors on behalf of the County has adopted this resolution as its moral obligation to the repayment of the Notes and as a statement of its intent to consider the appropriation of funds sufficient to pay rent under the Lease Agreement annually during the term thereof. The Notes will be secured by an Assignment Agreement to the Lender as the holder thereof. If the Board of Supervisors exercises its right not to appropriate money for rent payments, the Lender may terminate the Lease Agreement or otherwise exclude the County from possession of the Property. The issuance of the Notes on the terms set forth in the Note Purchase Agreement is hereby approved.
4. The Board of Supervisors hereby approves the Proposal and the Documents. The Board of Supervisors approves the form of the 2024A Note in the principal amount of not to exceed \$2,500,000, with a fixed annual interest rate not to exceed 4.70% , and a maturity date of on or about May 1, 2026, subject to other terms as set forth therein with such changes, including but not limited to changes in the amounts, dates, payment dates and rates as may be approved by the officer executing it whose signature shall be conclusive evidence of his or her approval of the same. The Board of Supervisors further approves the form of the 2024B Note in the principal amount of not to exceed \$1,700,000, with a fixed annual interest rate not to exceed 4.70%, and a maturity date of on or about May 1, 2026, subject to other terms as set forth therein with such changes, including but not limited to changes in the amounts, dates, payment dates and rates as may be approved by the officer executing it whose signature shall be conclusive evidence of his or her approval of the same. The County Administrator or Chairman is hereby authorized to determine the final terms of each of the Notes, including, but not limited to the principal amount, maturity, number of Notes and amortization, whose determination shall be conclusive, as evidenced by his or her execution of the Documents to which the County is a party.
5. The Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, or either of them, and the County Administrator and Clerk of the Board of Supervisors are each hereby authorized and directed to execute the Documents and such other instruments, agreements and documents as are necessary to create and perfect a complete assignment of the rents and profits due or to become due in favor of the Lender, to encumber leasehold interests in the Leased Property for the benefit of the Lender, to issue the Notes or either of them, and to lease the Leased Property. The County hereby requests the Authority to issue the Notes pursuant to and in accordance with the Documents. The Board of Supervisors consents to Sands Anderson PC serving as bond counsel and acting in such capacity as well as Authority counsel in this financing.
6. The County represents and covenants that it shall not take or omit to take any action the taking or omission of which will cause the Notes to be “arbitrage bonds” within the meaning of Section 148 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (**the “Code”**) or otherwise cause the interest on the Notes to be includable in gross income for Federal income tax purposes under existing law. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the County shall comply with any provision of law that may require the Authority or the County at any time to rebate to the United States any part of the earnings derived from the investment of the gross proceeds from the sale of the Notes.

7. Any authorization herein to execute a document shall include authorization to deliver it to the other parties thereto and to record such document where appropriate.
8. All other acts of the officers of the County that are in conformity with the purposes and intent of this resolution and in furtherance of the plan of financing, the issuance and sale of the Notes and the financing of the Projects, are hereby approved and ratified.
9. The County by acceptance of this financing agrees to indemnify, defend and save harmless, to the extent permitted by law, the Authority, its officers, directors, employees and agents from and against all liabilities, obligations, claims, damages, penalties, fines, losses, costs and expenses in any way connected with the Authority, the issuance of the Notes or the lease of the Property.
10. Nothing in this Resolution, the Notes or any documents executed or delivered in relation thereto shall constitute a debt or a pledge of the faith and credit of the Authority or the County, and the Authority shall not be obligated to make any payments under the Note or the Documents except from payments made by or on behalf of the County under the Lease Agreement pursuant to annual appropriation thereof in accordance with applicable law.
11. This resolution shall take effect immediately.

B. Real Estate Tax Exemption Applications

Ms. McGarry introduced the Real Estate Tax Exemption applications. She reported that the Commissioner of Revenue received two (2) applications for tax exemption, one for the University of Virginia Physicians Group, and one for the University of Science and Philosophy. She explained that procedurally, the Commissioner reviews the applications, visits the properties, provides the Board with her recommendation, and the applications then come before the Board. Ms. McGarry noted that the Commissioner of Revenue, Kim Goff, along with the County Attorney, Phillip Payne, were present to answer any questions that the Board may have. Ms. McGarry explained that as far as action, the Board could table the applications and take no action, or if they were to take action, the action to take would be to authorize a public hearing on the tax exemption applications.

Commissioner of Revenue Kim Goff reviewed the applications for tax exemption. She reported that the first application was from the University of Virginia Physicians Group located in Nellysford. She explained that the University of Virginia Physicians Group was seeking exemption on the grounds that the property was being used as a medical provider's office, and to educate medical providers. Ms. Goff reported that she did visit the property, and she confirmed that it is a doctor's office. She recommended that the applicant did not meet any of the requirements for the exemption under the Code of Virginia §58.1-3606 and §58.1-3651.

Mr. Rutherford asked what the qualifications for exemption were and whether it had to be education. Ms. Goff indicated that it primarily had to be used for education. She noted that exemption was for incorporated colleges, or other institutions of learning, not conducted for profit.

Dr. Ligon asked if Blue Ridge Medical Center was exempt. Ms. Goff reported that they were not. Dr. Ligon noted that she did not think the applicant qualified. Mr. Parr agreed.

Ms. Goff then reviewed the application for tax exemption from the University of Science and Philosophy. She explained that when she wrote her letter of recommendation, there were 24 parcels (four (4) houses and 20 wooded lots without buildings) but six (6) of the lots had since been sold. She indicated that the University of Science and Philosophy was located in the Swannanoa area. She reported that the applicant was seeking exemption based on:

1. Education
2. Meeting rooms and lodging space for students and faculty
3. Meeting rooms and lodging for students and guests free of charge
4. 467 Russell Way (Tax Map #3A1 1 E 17) has a private burial ground where the founders were buried.

Ms. Goff explained that the University of Science and Philosophy had a home study course. She noted there was a museum in Waynesboro also. She reported that the founders, the Russells who also founded Swannanoa, were buried on the property in a small cemetery with three burial sites, maybe 12x12 in size.

Ms. Goff reported that she visited the houses. She reported that House #1 was currently being renovated. She noted that the house was currently vacant, but it would be used as a guesthouse and to also house students.

She then noted that House #2 was currently being lived in by an author. Ms. Goff reported that House #3 was being renovated due to water damage. She noted that House #3 was currently vacant but it would be used for the Executive Director. She then reported that House #4 was being lived in by an employee. She noted that the burial ground was located on the hill behind House #4.

Ms. Goff reported that she had visited the property. She recommended that the applicant did not meet the requirements for exemption under the Code of Virginia §58.1-3606 and §58.1-3651. She noted that it may be possible for the county assessor to review the cemetery during the next County assessment and make a portion of the property as an exempt cemetery.

Mr. Rutherford stated that the application did not meet.

Mr. Reed asked what the recourse would be if no action was taken. Mr. Payne commented that the applicants could not compel the Board to do it.

Ms. Goff asked whether the burial ground needed to be considered. Mr. Payne noted that private cemeteries did not have to be taxed.

There were no actions taken by the Board in regards to either application for exemption. Ms. Goff noted that she would inform the applicants that they did not qualify for exemption.

C. Lovington Logo Usage Agreement (R2024-29)

Ms. Maureen Kelley reported that they would like to move forward on the usage of the Lovington logo. She indicated that Resolution R2024-29 would authorize the County to execute an agreement. She thanked Mr. Payne for his work on the agreement. Mr. Rutherford noted that he was happy about it and it was good for the community. He commented that there were a lot of individuals who were waiting to utilize the logo as best they could.

Mr. Parr asked how they would make sure that the logo was either black and white, or the original logo colors as approved. Ms. Kelley indicated that she would be verifying the uses, along with the colors.

Mr. Rutherford made a motion to approve **Resolution R2024-29** and Dr. Ligon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2024-29
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APPROVAL OF THE NELSON COUNTY LOGO USAGE AGREEMENT**

WHEREAS, at their February 13, 2024 meeting, the Nelson County Board of Supervisors approved the Lovington logo; and

WHEREAS, the draft usage agreement will ensure that the brand is available for use but not altered, thus creating a consistent message for the village of Lovington;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors approves the attached Nelson County Logo Usage Agreement for the Lovington Logo.

REQUEST TO USE LOVINGSTON LOGO

1. Requests to use the Lovington logo must be made to the Nelson County Department of Tourism & Economic Development at info@nelsoncounty.org together with an application fee of \$25.00 payable to _____.

2. The applicant must provide detailed information describing how the logo will be used. The applicant must provide the County with a final proof or other visual depiction of the proposed use of the logo prior to final approval by the County. The logo may be either in single or full color and must not be scaled disproportionately.

3. The County reserves the right to approve or reject all uses of the logo.

4. Upon approval, logo will be provided by the County in electronic format.

NELSON COUNTY LOGO USAGE AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT, dated _____, shall constitute a non-exclusive license granted by Nelson County, Virginia, (the “County”) to _____ (User”) for the use of the Lovingston logo (the “Logo”) under the following terms and conditions:

1. This license shall commence on _____ and, unless earlier terminated under other provisions of this Agreement, shall expire upon rebranding or other modification of the Logo by the County.

2. User acknowledges that the Logo is the sole and separate property of the County and any use hereunder shall not give rise to any right of use or ownership except as set forth herein. The license under this Agreement is non-transferable. All use of the Logo must cease upon termination of the license.

3. Use of the Logo beyond that approved by the County will result in immediate termination of this license.

4. The Logo may neither be altered nor modified in any way. Users are prohibited from adopting a sub-brand Logo or any other variation of the Logo as their own primary logo. Failure to follow these guidelines might endanger trademark rights and can result in the immediate termination of the license under this Agreement.

5. Upon any violation of the terms of this Agreement by User, the County may terminate the license forthwith, and upon written notice to User to that effect, User shall cease all use of the Logo or likeness thereof and shall not thereafter use, broadcast, distribute, or display any items, documents or other materials containing the Logo or likeness.

6. In any suit or action instituted by the County to enforce any term of this Agreement, or to protect its trademark, in which the County substantially prevails, the User will reimburse the County for all its costs, legal fees, and related expenses.

Nelson County

_____ User

By _____

_____ User

D. Authorization for Public Hearing on FY25 Budget (R2024-30)

Ms. McGarry introduced the FY25 budget hearing authorization information. She noted that they currently had on the calendar to authorize the FY25 budget public hearing for May 14th. She indicated that she may want to recommend to the Board that the public hearing take place at a later date, potentially, June 4th if the June 11th budget adoption date was desired to be kept as planned. She indicated that they only needed seven (7) days between the budget public hearing and the budget adoption. Ms. McGarry reminded the Board that they had to have an approved budget by the end of June. She noted that she felt the delay would give staff and the Board more time to work through some of the remaining pieces of the budget. She indicated that the Board had a budget work session on Thursday, and a public hearing on the tax rate. She reported that the Commissioner of Revenue needed the tax rates by April 30th. She noted that a delay could allow more time to finalize things before going to public hearing.

Mr. Parr asked for the proposed date for the public hearing. Ms. McGarry noted that it was June 4th, which was the Tuesday before the June 11th regular Board meeting date. She also noted that the Board could hold the public hearing on June 11th and return one week later to adopt the budget then. The Board was in agreement to hold the public hearing on June 4th and the budget adoption on June 11th.

Mr. Rutherford made a motion to approve **Resolution R2024-30** as amended to hold the public hearing on June 4, 2024 at 7:00 p.m. Dr. Ligon seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote and the following resolution was adopted:

**RESOLUTION R2024-30
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AUTHORIZATION FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON FY25 BUDGET**

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Nelson County Board of Supervisors, that pursuant to §15.2-2503, and §15.2-2506 of the Code of Virginia 1950 as amended that a public hearing on the FY25 Budget is hereby authorized to be held on Tuesday, June 4, 2024 at 7:00 PM in the General District Courtroom of the Courthouse in Lovingston, Virginia.

VII. REPORTS, APPOINTMENTS, DIRECTIVES AND CORRESPONDENCE

A. Reports

1. County Administrator's Report

Ms. McGarry provided the following report:

- A. Comprehensive Plan:** The project website is www.Nelson2042.com. The Board held its public hearing on March 20th with consideration of proposed amendments to the draft plan as a result of the public hearings to be considered at the evening session. Staff has prepared an adoption resolution for the Board's consideration. Following adoption of the plan, the next step is to consider proposed Zoning and/or Subdivision Ordinance amendments identified by Berkley Group as bringing the Ordinances in line with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.
- B. Lovingson Front Street Sidewalk Improvements TAP Grant:** This project is part of the draft Six Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) that will be considered for approval by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The Lynchburg District Spring SYIP Public hearing meeting will start at 4:00 p.m. on Wednesday May 1, 2024, at 4303 Campbell Ave. Lynchburg, Virginia at the district office in the Ramey Memorial Auditorium. Formal public comment on District projects proposed to be included in the SYIP will be accepted at the meeting. Written comments may also be submitted during the meeting, or they may be mailed or e-mailed to Six-YearProgram@vdot.virginia.gov afterwards and accepted until May 20, 2024.
- C. Route 151 Through Truck Restriction: No Change,** this task is being delegated from Administration to Planning and Zoning.
- D. Lovingson System Water/Sewer Capacity Study:** The Consultant has the needed data from NCSA, has completed the summary of their current water/sewer usage, have developed preliminary water/sewer demands for the former Larkin Property, and are consulting with GIS Staff on getting some additional data. Once all data is assembled, County and NCSA staff and CHA will meet prior to them issuing their report.
- E. Savion/Wild Rose Solar Project:** The Special Use Permit application is forthcoming on the Savion/Wild Rose Solar project proposed for the Gladstone area of the County. Staff and Mr. Payne met with Savion staff and their legal team for an initial siting agreement discussion. They will be providing the County with a proposed agreement in the next 1-2 weeks for review by County staff, Mr. Payne, and preferably 2 Board members (ideally Chair Parr and South District Supervisor, Dr. Ligon). The full Board would then review a final draft of the siting agreement and authorize a public hearing on the document. Work on the siting agreement is anticipated to be done concurrently with the SUP application's progress through the Planning Commission to the Board; ideally culminating in concurrent public hearings held on each item.

Ms. McGarry explained that the public hearings would be held on the same night, but each one would have its own separate hearing.

- F. Transfer of Funds from NCBA:** The January 2024, NCBA approved transfer of funds to the County of \$300,000 has occurred. The funds have not yet been appropriated for use within the FY24 General Fund budget; however, they can be appropriated either for a specific purpose as directed by the Board or to the County's Non-recurring contingency. If not appropriated for use within the FY24 budget, these funds will become part of the General Fund balance (reserve).

Ms. McGarry also noted that the Board could pull the funds into the FY25 budget for something specific if they desired.

- G. Staff Reports:** Department and office reports for February/March have been provided.

Additionally, Ms. McGarry reported that the County received notice from VDOT that they are considering the turn lane improvement project on Route 29 northbound at the intersection with Route 653 (Oak Ridge Road). She indicated that the proposed project would improve capacity and enhance safety, by extending the existing right turn lane on Route 29 northbound, and realigning Oak Ridge Road at the intersection to improve sight distance and enhance the right turn movements. She reported that VDOT had issued a Notice of Willingness to Hold a Design Public Hearing on the project. She noted that if questions or concerns by the Board could not be satisfied, then they could request a public hearing.

Ms. McGarry reported that she had received a brief status update on the Heritage Center and the Health Department relocation from Ms. Burdette that morning. Ms. McGarry noted that the provided update stated that the Heritage Center had been able to close on their loan with Locust Bank (formerly BCC). She reported that Wall Construction had resumed construction on the renovation project. She noted that Wall Construction was working on a revised project schedule with a completion date of July 31, 2024. She also reported that VDH had been updated on the change in completion, which everyone seemed on board with. Ms. McGarry indicated that Ms. Burdette was having weekly meetings with VDH and the Department of General Services to provide real time updates and ensure that everyone is on the same page. She noted that

Ms. Burdette offered to present a more detailed update to the Board upon request.

Mr. Reed asked about the concurrent public hearings listed under item E. of Ms. McGarry's report. He asked if that meant the Board would hold a public hearing, both on the Special Use Permit (SUP) application, and the Siting agreement, as two (2) separate public hearings. Ms. McGarry noted that the goal was to have the two (2) separate public hearings on the same night. Mr. Reed asked about the Planning Commission. Ms. McGarry explained that the Planning Commission would have their own public hearing first, through the exact same public hearing process. She noted that the Planning Commission would not get the Siting Agreement as it was for the Board.

Mr. Parr asked if there were any dates in mind for when he and Dr. Ligon would be doing any work with on the Solar Project. Ms. McGarry indicated that there were no dates currently. She explained that the County would have the Siting Agreement in the next week or two, and as soon as it was in hand, staff would look at dates to discuss it with Mr. Parr and Dr. Ligon.

2. Board Reports

Dr. Ligon:

Dr. Ligon had no report.

Mr. Reed:

Mr. Reed had no report.

Mr. Rutherford:

Mr. Rutherford reported that he had learned that old VDOT easements were by-right right-of-ways that the Board of Supervisors around the time of Hurricane Camille, chose to quit doing maintenance on. He noted that there were five (5) to six (6) roads in his district alone, that were impacted by that. He indicated that it was difficult for those with property at the end of those roads because there was no road maintenance agreement, so there was no recourse for anyone to maintain the road. Mr. Rutherford noted that there was not much to report from the TJPDC meeting.

Mr. Harvey:

Mr. Harvey had no report.

Mr. Rutherford reported that Schuyler now had 5G cell service.

Dr. Ligon asked about the Jail Board meeting and upcoming votes on funding. Ms. McGarry reported that at the last jail board meeting, they voted to approve the interim financing for the jail renovation project. She indicated that the next jail board meeting was that Thursday, and they were going to consider adoption of the FY25 budget. Dr. Ligon asked what the County's financial responsibility was to the jail. Ms. McGarry noted that a small amount was in the County's FY25 budget for the interest only payment on the interim financing. She estimated that amount to be around \$38,000. Ms. McGarry indicated that the amount would increase to over a few hundred thousand dollars once they started paying the full principal and interest for the project.

Mr. Parr:

Mr. Parr reported that Social Services had five (5) new employees. He noted that the energy from that group coming in was great. He noted that a few of the new hires were young people and a few were native Nelsonians. He commented that Brad Burdette and Allison McGarry had done a great job recruiting and hiring those folks. He suggested that should the Board see either Mr. Burdette or Ms. Allison McGarry, that they make sure to let them know they had done a fantastic job. Mr. Parr indicated that the EMS Council had not yet met since the Board's last meeting.

B. Appointments

Ms. Spivey reported that they were advertising for the vacancies on the Ag and Forestal District Advisory Committee, as well as the Economic Development Authority (EDA), and the MACAA Board of Directors. She noted that they had not received any applications. She noted that they would see several expiring terms in the next few months for the EDA and Service Authority. She indicated that she would have those for the Board at next month's meeting. She noted the positions would be advertised. She indicated that there were people interested in serving again in their current positions.

Mr. Parr asked if any additional outreach had been for the Ag and Forestal position. He suggested reaching out to Farm Bureau. Ms. Spivey indicated that they could reach out, noting that was a good suggestion. Mr. Parr asked if EDA was appointed by district. Ms. Spivey reported that the EDA appointments were not by district, they were County-wide positions.

C. Correspondence

The Board had no correspondence to discuss.

D. Directives

The Board had no directives.

IX. ADJOURN AND CONTINUE – EVENING SESSION AT 7PM

At 4:17 p.m., Mr. Rutherford made a motion to adjourn and reconvene at 7:00 p.m. and Mr. Harvey seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the meeting adjourned.

**EVENING SESSION
7:00 P.M. – NELSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Parr called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., with five (5) Supervisors present to establish a quorum.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no persons wishing to speak under Public Comments.

III. 2042 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (R2024-31)

Ms. McGarry thanked Ms. Bishop and her staff for the excellent work that had been done over the past two years on the plan. She also thanked the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors for their hard work on the plan as well. She also thanked the public for their engagement throughout the process.

Ms. Bishop noted the process for the Comprehensive Plan update started with a tour of the County with the consultants. She reported that the community survey received over 900 responses. She noted that they met with stakeholder groups and focus groups, held work sessions and had various kinds of engagement during the process. She indicated that they were pleased with the level of turnout that they had from that.

Ms. Bishop presented the following:

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing for the Nelson 2042 Comprehensive Plan Update on January 31, 2024. At their regular meeting on February 28, the Planning Commission recommended approval (6-0) with several amendments. The Board of Supervisors held a public hearing on March 20, and will review Planning Commission’s recommendations along with comments received at the public hearings. A summary of recommendations is provided below.

PC Recommendations as presented by Berkley Group (Policy Related Amendments):

1. Remove Montebello from Rural Destination Land Use Category
 - Delete from Future Land Use Map
 - Delete Description on page 41
2. Add a Strategy to Land Use Chapter
 - Discourage the use of large-scale development in Montebello through zoning

Other PC Recommendations (Editorial Corrections):

3. Page 32, Table 3.1 – Check boxes for steep slopes and floodplain for Montebello
4. Page 149, Local Assets – Add Priest and Three Ridges Wilderness areas, and access to primitive recreation
5. Page 67 – Indicate that railway runs through the County but doesn’t currently serve its residents
6. Page 90, Housing Quality and Maintenance – remove “..., and 39% of homes are considered vacant. This is relatively high compared to the statewide vacancy rate of 11%.”
7. Page 171 – Tuckahoe Clubhouse “Serves as the community center for the Wintergreen area...”
8. Page 172 – Sentara does not offer dermatology

9. Glossary – definition of “easement” should be “conservation easement”

10. Add a definition for “by-right” to the Glossary (see #13 below)

Additional Recommendations Following Public Hearings:

11. Page 44, Core Concept – “Prioritize protection of rural landscape, moderate **small-scale villagestyle mixed use development**, restoration and connectivity, efficient and effective provision of community services, and improved quality of life.” (Note: There are definitions in the Glossary for ‘small-scale commercial development,’ small-scale multi-family residential development,’ ‘mixed use,’ and ‘traditional neighborhood development’ which includes ‘village-style’ development.)

12. Page 218, Glossary – “Small-Scale Multi-Family Residential: Housing options such as apartments, duplexes, triplexes, or townhomes that are developed in a way to have a small impact to the surrounding area in regard to such things as traffic volume, noise, lighting, **viewshed**, etc. Smallscale multi-family residential should be developed using the same amount of land coverage as a single-family dwelling.

Ms. Bishop noted that it was recommended to add viewshed as a review factor for Small-Scale Multi-Family Residential.

13. Proposed definition for “by-right” – “A use permitted or allowed in the district involved, without review by the governing body, and complies with the provisions of these zoning regulations and all other applicable local, state and federal ordinances and regulations.”

14. Pages 73-75, Table 4.1 and Map 4.8, Recommended Priority Transportation Projects – Add three additional projects including (1) Roundabout at Route 151 and Tanbark Drive, (2) Turn Lane Improvements at Route 151 and Rockfish School Lane, and (3) Turn Lane Improvement at Route 151 and Mill Lane. (These projects have been identified in the recently released Route 151 Corridor Study and are slated for this round of SmartScale applications.)

Ms. Bishop noted that the SmartScale applications had been presented to the Board earlier in the year. She explained that since the Route 151 Corridor Study had just recently been released, it was not incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that the three (3) SmartScale projects are what they would ask the Board to go ahead and approve that evening.

Mr. Parr commented on the list of recommendations and reference item number 7. He suggested removing “the” from the Wintergreen. page 1 - #7 remove "the" from the Wintergreen. Ms. Bishop agreed.

Mr. Rutherford referenced item number 13 regarding the proposed definition for by-right. He asked if they needed to quantify grandfathering for a use that was by-right at the time. Ms. Bishop noted that would not affect grandfathering status, it simply was to attach a definition with the concept. She explained that they had researched eight (8) to ten (10) localities in the area, and only two (2) had definitions for by-right. She noted that it was almost exactly word for word the proposed by-right definition recommended. Ms. Bishop indicated that they had pulled the definition from the Planners Dictionary, which was used by the American Planning Association.

Mr. Harvey had no comments to add.

Dr. Ligon had no comments to add.

Mr. Reed reiterated Ms. McGarry's comments, noting that without the comments from the public, and the work from everyone, the Comprehensive Plan would not be what it was.

Ms. Bishop commented on the difference between the Core Concept on page 44 and she asked if what was proposed with item number 11 was a better fit. She explained that it changed from “prioritize protection of rural landscape and moderate small village residential and commercial development.” She noted staff thought that “moderate small-scale mixed use development” was a little clearer. The Board was in agreement with the proposed change.

Mr. Rutherford read **Resolution 2024-31** and made a motion to approve the resolution with the attached authorized amendments. Mr. Reed seconded the motion.

Mr. Bishop noted on sixth “Whereas” of the resolution, it was not a joint hearing, rather just a public hearing. Mr. Rutherford amended his motion to approve the resolution as amended at the sixth Whereas

with the attached authorized amendments. Mr. Reed seconded the amended motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion unanimously (5-0) by roll call vote and the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLUTION R2024-31
NELSON COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
ADOPTION OF THE *NELSON 2042* COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

WHEREAS, Section 15.2.2223 of the Code of Virginia, as amended, requires that localities “prepare and recommend a comprehensive plan for the physical development of the territory within its jurisdiction” and review that plan every five years;

WHEREAS, consistent with the County’s ongoing obligation to review its Comprehensive Plan, the Nelson County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors reviewed the Comprehensive Plan for Nelson County; and

WHEREAS, the *Nelson 2042* Comprehensive Plan update draws on community input from outreach efforts including a public survey, community workshops and focus group meetings; and

WHEREAS, the Nelson County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors held a kick-off joint work session on May 31, 2022, to develop the draft Comprehensive Plan and met six times to draft the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, a public open house was held by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors on August 29, 2023, to present the draft amendments to the County’s Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 31, 2024, after notice in accordance with Section 15.2-2204 of the Code of Virginia, and heard citizen testimony regarding the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Code of Virginia § 15.2-2223, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed draft *Nelson 2042* Comprehensive Plan will provide a coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the territory which will, in accordance with present and probable future needs and resources, best promote the health, safety, morals, order, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare of the inhabitants.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that on this 09th day of April, 2024, that the Nelson County Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Code of Virginia § 15.2-2226, does hereby approve the *Nelson 2042* Comprehensive Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that upon adoption by the Board of Supervisors, the *Nelson 2042* Comprehensive Plan will supersede and replace, in their entirety, the previously adopted Comprehensive Plan of Nelson County, Virginia (adopted 2002).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors authorizes County staff to make non-substantive edits, including correction of punctuation, numbering, internal cross-references, citations to any statutes, and any related clerical-type changes to the text and exhibits as necessary to ensure internal consistency of the newly adopted Comprehensive Plan elements and, add language as may be necessary for clarification of information and correct any factual errors.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors authorizes County staff to include the attached authorized amendments to the draft Comprehensive Plan, *Nelson 2042*, as a result of the January 31, 2024 Planning Commission public hearing and the March 20, 2024 Board of Supervisors’ public hearing.

Authorized Amendments to the draft Comprehensive Plan, Nelson 2042

PC Recommendations as presented by Berkley Group (Policy Related Amendments):

1. Remove Montebello from Rural Destination Land Use Category
 - Delete from Future Land Use Map
 - Delete Description on page 41

2. Add a Strategy to Land Use Chapter
 - Discourage the use of large-scale development in Montebello through zoningOther PC Recommendations (Editorial Corrections):

3. Page 32, Table 3.1 – Check boxes for steep slopes and floodplain for Montebello

4. Page 149, Local Assets – Add Priest and Three Ridges Wilderness areas, and access to primitive recreation
5. Page 67 – Indicate that railway runs through the County but doesn't currently serve its residents
6. Page 90, Housing Quality and Maintenance – remove "..., and 39% of homes are considered vacant. This is relatively high compared to the statewide vacancy rate of 11%."
7. Page 171 – Tuckahoe Clubhouse "Serves as the community center for the Wintergreen area..."
8. Page 172 – Sentara does not offer dermatology
9. Glossary – definition of "easement" should be "conservation easement"
10. Add a definition for "by-right" to the Glossary (see #13 below)

Additional Recommendations Following Public Hearings:

11. Page 44, Core Concept – "Prioritize protection of rural landscape, moderate small-scale village-style mixed use development, restoration and connectivity, efficient and effective provision of community services, and improved quality of life." (Note: There are definitions in the Glossary for 'small-scale commercial development,' small-scale multi-family residential development,' 'mixed use,' and 'traditional neighborhood development' which includes 'village-style' development.)
12. Page 218, Glossary – "Small-Scale Multi-Family Residential: Housing options such as apartments, duplexes, triplexes, or townhomes that are developed in a way to have a small impact to the surrounding area in regard to such things as traffic volume, noise, lighting, viewshed, etc. Small-scale multi-family residential should be developed using the same amount of land coverage as a single-family dwelling.
13. Proposed definition for "by-right" – "A use permitted or allowed in the district involved, without review by the governing body, and complies with the provisions of these zoning regulations and all other applicable local, state and federal ordinances and regulations."
14. Pages 73-75, Table 4.1 and Map 4.8, Recommended Priority Transportation Projects – Add three additional projects including (1) Roundabout at Route 151 and Tanbark Drive, (2) Turn Lane Improvements at Route 151 and Rockfish School Lane, and (3) Turn Lane Improvement at Route 151 and Mill Lane. (These projects have been identified in the recently released Route 151 Corridor Study and are slated for this round of SmartScale applications.)

Mr. Parr thanked Ms. Bishop. Ms. Bishop thanked the Board and noted that future decision making should now be better guided. She reviewed next steps noting that they would send the resolution and amendments off to Berkley Group to allow them to complete the changes to the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that Berkley Group would provide the Diagnostic of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances to align with the Comprehensive Plan. She indicated that the Diagnostic would be circulated around and brought before the Board for review.

Mr. Rutherford thanked staff and the Berkley Group for their work.

Mr. Reed asked if the Planning Commission would get the first round of discussion on zoning before the proposal came before the Board. Ms. Bishop noted that Board would need to decide whether they wanted to continue to work with the Berkley Group, put out an RFP (Request for Proposals), or do the work internally. She indicated that they would be looking for a decision from the Board on that process.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS (AS PRESENTED)

The Board had no other business to discuss.

V. ADJOURN AND CONTINUE TO APRIL 11, 2024 AT 4 P.M. FOR A BUDGET WORK SESSION.

At 7:16 p.m., Mr. Reed made a motion to adjourn and continue the meeting to April 11, 2024 at 4 p.m. for a budget work session. Mr. Harvey seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Supervisors approved the motion by vote of acclamation and the meeting was adjourned.