

Public Comment Summary
LU-0002-2014
8491 Richmond Road

This attachment provides verbatim public comments for the specified land use designation change application collected through Community Workshops, postcards, emails, the Comprehensive Plan hotline and online input surveys.

1. Increase PSA on all 3 L.U. applications. (Community Workshop)
2. To James City County Planning Dept. :

We are responding to a notice we received from you dated May 16, 2014. It has come to our attention that an adjacent parcel of land located at 8491 Richmond Road is being considered for a zoning change and also for a realignment of the PSA area. This, no doubt will help James City County to reach its goals for the 2035 James City County Comprehensive Plan. In light of these developments we would like to have the same consideration given to our property which is located at 8399 Richmond Road, Williamsburg, Va. We own approximately 16 acres of wooded land and we share a common property boundary line. The shared boundary line is located on the south west corner of the property located at 8491 Richmond Road. We have owned this parcel of land for over 4 months and are at a loss as to why we are just receiving any notification of possible zoning and PSA changes. As we both know this would have an obvious impact on our property. I would hope that you will strongly consider changing our property's zoning and making PSA changes to reflect the changes made at 8491 Richmond Road. We would also like to express our support for the changes that the county, the property owners who are requesting the change, and those who want to see the Williamsburg area move forward into the future. If we can be of further support please don't hesitate to contact us. Your truly, *Anthony Jones – President of AAA Plumbing Co., Inc. P. O. Box 438 Lightfoot, Va., 23090 757-244-7664*
(Staff note: this property is currently inside the PSA and designated General Industry.)

3. These are my thoughts on the GSAs for the 2014 comprehensive plan update. My comments will be on the area from Toano west to the Anderson corner area. This area is currently developing and most likely will continue to do so. My vision would be to tie the subdivisions into Toano via sidewalks and bike paths. On the East side of Toano this has already been done to great effect. This could help Toano become more economically robust. There are two historic properties in this area, Hickory Neck Church 1743 and White Hall Tavern 1805. There are two large tracks of land Hankins Farm and the Taylor Farm. Both most likely will develop over the next decade. Two smaller tracks the Ware and Branscome properties will do the same. I am not opposed to the rezoning request of the Taylor Farm to mixed use. I do think as this area continues to develop sensitivity to the historic sites and the rural heritage of this area should be reflected in the development standards. I think the Anderson corner area should also include Fenwick hills, and Michael point in the concepts of tying together the area via walking and biking. The speed limit should be reduced to 45 mph from the current 55 mph. *Bert Geddy, Toano. (Email)*

From: Randy Taylor [randy@toanocontractors.com]

Sent: Monday, December 08, 2014 12:54 PM

To: George Drummond; Richard Krapf; Robin Bledsoe; Chris Basic; Tim OConnor; John Wright; Heath Richardson

Cc: chris@toanocontractors.com

Subject: 8491 Richmond Rd - Land Use Designation

Planning Commission Members,

My name is Randy Taylor. I reside at 3920 Bournemouth Bend, in the Wellington subdivision, Stonehouse District. I am one of the family members that own the property at 8491 Richmond Rd. Toano.

First I would like to give you a brief history of the property and my family. The land was purchased by my grandparents, Stewart and Lonell Taylor in 1951. Stewart and Lonell had 5 children, Cliff, Barbara, Ray, Bill, and Beverly. All of the children made their homes in James City County. Barbara and Cliff lived within a couple miles of the property while, Ray, Bill, and Beverly built houses on the edges of the property. My grandfather, Stewart, raised livestock and crops on the property along with his son Ray until he passed away in 1997. Stewart also served on the Board of Supervisors in James City County for 26 years. Ray continued to raise crops on the property until his passing in 2001. After Ray's passing, Cliff who had since retired from BASF, continued the farming of the property. Cliff passed away in March of 2007, followed by my father, Bill, in November of 2007. Cliff was the last of the family members to pursue farming as a career. Since the passing of Cliff the farmland has been leased to other farmers from New Kent County.

While my brother, Chris Taylor, and I own and operate Toano Contractors, we have also decided in the last 6 months to try our hand at raising a few head of cattle. At this time we have 8 head of cattle on a small portion of the property. The bulk of the farmland is still leased to another farmer. While one day the cattle operation could grow into something more, right now it is just a hobby. It should also be known that while the entire property is 217 acres only 130 acres of the property is farmland. The rest of the property is either wooded, pond, or swamp. The land covered in trees is that way because it is either steep sloped or swamp/RPA. That being the case this property is not large enough to sustain a farmer on its own. A farmer must lease upwards of a 1000 acres to make a living solely on farming.

We have asked JCC to expand the PSA line to encompass the entire property. As you know the current PSA line cuts through the property including 45 acres of the road frontage of the property in the PSA while leaving the remainder in Rural Lands. We feel that the property should never have been cut by the PSA line. The PSA line should follow the property line as it does for the properties surrounding 8491 Richmond Rd. JCC Staff has recommended approval of the PSA expansion, yet recommended the entire property be designated as Rural Economic Support(RES). While we agree with the PSA expansion to encompass the entire property, we do not feel that the Rural Economic Support designation is the right choice for this property. We feel that the entire property should be designated Economic Opportunity(EO) or retain the current Mixed Use(MU) portion as is and designate the rest of the property Community Commercial(CC).

The EO designation fits this property for the following reasons:

1. It would remove the Low Density Residential land use currently on a portion of the property. We believe there is enough housing in the area and more would be a drain on the school system and county utilities.
2. It would have the potential to increase the non-residential tax base and create jobs.
3. The property is at a strategic location. It is located at the major intersection of Rte. 60 and Rte. 30, both four lane highways and approximately a mile from I64 interchange 227.

4. A designation of EO would allow the landowner and JCC to work together to create a master plan for the property.

Another choice we would like the commission and staff to consider is leaving the portion of the property currently designated MU and changing the remainder of the property to Community Commercial(CC). The following is the rationale behind this request:

Leave the current portion MU

1. The property currently designated MU corresponds to the surrounding property. If you look at the current land use map it coincides with the properties across Rte. 60 and the property to the North.
2. The property is at a strategic location. It is located at the major intersection of Rte. 60 and Rte. 30, both four lane highways and approximately a mile from I64 interchange 227.
3. Staff has stated that there is an abundance of vacant MU property nearby and that this property is not needed as MU. However I did not see where staff recommended changing the land use designation on the two parcels adjacent to this property which are owned by JCC and currently designated MU.

Change the remainder of the property to CC

1. Allow general business but have a low impact on the nearby developments.
2. Potential for increased non-residential tax base.
3. Allow a transition from General Industry(GI) to the south to low density residential to the north.
4. Provide services and jobs needed by current and proposed surrounding residential areas.
5. The north and west boundaries of the property have natural buffer to protect the adjacent Rural Lands(RL). There is a swamp that runs along the entire property line between the property and all adjacent RL as well as the railroad to the southwest which creates an added buffer for the property along Forge Road.

We appreciate your consideration on this matter. Please let it be known that we do not have any plans for development of this property at this time. However, we would like to have a land use designation in place that would best serve our family and James City County in the years to come.

If any Commission or Staff members would like to further discuss this matter, I would be glad to. Please contact me at 757-342-7602.

Respectfully,

Randolph W. Taylor, V.P.

Toano Contractors, Inc.

8589 Richmond Rd.

Toano, Va. 23168

randy@toanocontractors.com

(O) 757-566-0097

(F) 757-566-8874

STATEMENT BY LINDA RICE
FEBRUARY 19, 2015
PLANNING COMMISSION WORKING GROUP
LAND USE APPLICATION – LU-0002-2014, 8491 RICHMOND ROAD and LU-0006-2014

Members of the Planning Commission Working Group:

As a follow up to my comments on November 15, 2015, I am submitting the following comments as an individual homeowner. I understand that you have deferred action on the Land Use applications of Taylor and Hazelwood which involve an expansion of the PSA. I understand that you are awaiting a report from the DEQ with regard to the groundwater (GW) permit which they will issue specifying the amount of GW which will be allowed for withdrawal.

Here are several reasons for requesting that you **oppose** further PSA expansion until the county and its citizens determine if we can make the long term financial and environmental commitment required for access, purchase, and infrastructure costs related to expanding water needs. Aquifers are finite and the county cannot ignore the demands that other localities and industrial users will place on these same GW sources.

- **DEQ Permit Restrictions:** Virginia's Department of Environmental Quality issued James City a permit to withdraw up to 8.8 million gallons a day from one of two underground aquifers. The county uses an average of 5.4 million gallons daily. James City's next permit is likely to permit no more than 4 million gallons a day. That estimate of water usage of course does not account for the water needs required by expanding the PSA in the upper county by over 340 acres or the construction of at least 15,000 homes already approved throughout the county.
- **Reliance on City of Newport News:** James City must rely on other sources of water, since all of the surface freshwater sources in the county – Little Creek and Diascund reservoir – are owned by Newport News Waterworks. The Board of Supervisors signed an agreement in 2008 that would allow the county to buy water from Newport News. With it came a second payment of \$25 million, but with inflation, the cost will now be about \$33 million. James City County relies on GW for its water more than any other Virginia county.
- **Cost of Access and Purchase:** With the additional payment, the county would access up to 5 million gallons per day. James City would still buy the water at a daily rate of \$1.22 per 1,000 gallons. Accessing the entire 5 million gallons would cost \$6,100 a day, or more than \$2.2 million a year.
- **Cost of Infrastructure Construction and Maintenance:** Buying additional water requires millions of dollars worth of infrastructure improvements. It will require \$4.5

million if James City buys just 2 million gallons a day, and between \$16 million and \$18 million if the county buys the full 5 million gallons.

LU-0002-2014 and LU-0006-2014 will have major implications if they are approved. I ask that you, as members of the Planning Commission Working Group join me and other members of the Community in recommending denial to the full Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors of these land use applications.

Respectfully Submitted:

Linda Rice

2394 Forge Road

Toano

NOTE: Some of my comments are extracted from the VA Gazette Editorial on Feb 3, 2015.