

**CLARKE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TABLE OF CONTENTS
October 2019 Combined Meeting Packet**

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Pages</u>
	<u>October 1, 2019 Work Session</u>	
1	Meeting Agenda	1
4	Old Business Items	
4A	-- Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Update Project Progress Report	2
	<u>October 4, 2019 Business Meeting</u>	
1	Meeting Agenda	3
2	Approval of Minutes	4-18
2A	-- September 3, 2019 Work Session	4-8
2B	-- September 6, 2019 Business Meeting	9-18
3	<u>SUP-19-01/SP-19-01, Crown Castle</u>	19-20
10	<u>Continued Discussion, Economic Development Strategic Plan Five-Year Review</u>	21-23
	-- Cover Memo	21-22
	-- Draft Resolution	23



Clarke County Planning Commission

AGENDA – Work Session

Tuesday, October 1, 2019 – 3:00PM

Berryville/Clarke County Government Center– A/B Meeting Room

- 1. Approval of Work Session Agenda**
- 2. Review of Agenda Items for October 4, 2019 Business Meeting**
- 3. New Business Items**
- 4. Old Business Items**
 - A. Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance Update Project – Joint Workshops and Project Status
- 5. Other Business**
- 6. Adjourn**

**ZONING AND SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE UPDATE PROJECT
PROGRESS REPORT (SEPTEMBER 2019)**

Work Plan Items Completed to Date:

- Step 1 – Adopt Work Plan, Project Policies and Timeline
- Step 2 – Discuss and Provide Formal Direction on Policy Issues
- Step 3 – Approve Framework for Draft Ordinances.

Work Plan Items in Process:

- Step 4 -- Present Draft Ordinance Text by Chapter and by Subject. The County Attorney is currently reviewing Version #2 of the Subdivision Ordinance and will be undertaking a more detailed review of Version #3 of the Zoning Ordinance. It is unlikely due to workload that legal reviews will be completed by Staff's targeted date of **Friday, September 27** to send revised Version #4 of the Ordinances to the Commission and Board for discussion at the joint workshops beginning in October.

The Ordinances Committee held three workshops (August 22, August 29, and September 6). It is anticipated that we will provide updated drafts to the Commission and Board no later than the first week of October while the County Attorney continues the legal review. The Ordinances Committee will meet again on **Friday, October 4** for a status update and to discuss the upcoming joint workshops.

- Staff also continues to work on draft Version #1 of the Guidance Manual. Workload issues have prevented us from having the draft completed in time for the Ordinances Committee to review at their recent workshops. Staff will continue to work towards completing Version #1 in time for the initial joint workshop on October 17.

Joint Planning Commission-Board of Supervisors Workshop Schedule

- **Meeting #1 – Thursday, October 17 at 6:30PM**
- **Meeting #2 – Friday, November 1 at 9:30AM or immediately following the Commission's Business Meeting**
- **Meeting #3 – Thursday, November 14 at 6:30PM**
- **Meeting #4 – Friday, December 6 at 9:30AM or immediately following the Commission's Business Meeting**



Clarke County Planning Commission

AGENDA – Business Meeting

Friday, October 4, 2019 – 9:00AM

Berryville/Clarke County Government Center – Main Meeting Room

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes
 - A. September 3, 2019 Work Session
 - B. September 6, 2019 Business Meeting

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING

3. **SUP-19-01/SP-19-01, Crown Castle.** Request approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) and Site Plan to construct a new 185-foot Class 4 Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) that would replace an existing 84-foot monopole per §3-A-2-a-3-r of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is located on the west side of Mt. Carmel Road (Rt. 606) approximately 450 feet from its intersection with U.S. 50/17 (John Mosby Highway), Tax Map #39-A-74, is 84.55 acres in size, and is zoned Forestal-Open Space-Conservation (FOC).

Board/Committee Reports

4. Board of Supervisors (Mary Daniel)
5. Board of Septic & Well Appeals (George Ohrstrom, II)
6. Board of Zoning Appeals (Anne Caldwell)
7. Historic Preservation Commission (Doug Kruhm)
8. Conservation Easement Authority (George Ohrstrom, II)
9. Broadband Implementation Committee (Mary Daniel)

Other Business

10. Continued Discussion, Economic Development Strategic Plan Five-Year Review

Adjourn

UPCOMING MEETINGS:
Ordinances Committee Meeting -- Friday, October 4 (immediately following Commission Business Meeting)
Joint Work Session with Board of Supervisors – Ordinance Update Project Thursday, October 17 (6:30PM)
Commission Work Session Tuesday, October 29 (3:00PM)
Commission Business Meeting Friday, November 1, 2019 (9:00AM)
Joint Work Session with Board of Supervisors – Ordinance Update Project Friday, November 1 (immediately following Commission Business Meeting)



**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES -- DRAFT
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 3, 2019**

A work session of the Planning Commission of Clarke County, Virginia, was held at the Berryville/Clarke County Government Center, Berryville, Virginia, on Tuesday, September 3, 2019.

ATTENDANCE

Present George L. Ohrstrom, II (Chair); Randy Buckley (Vice-Chair); Robina Bouffault; Anne Caldwell; Mary Daniel; Bob Glover; Scott Kreider; Doug Kruhm; Frank Lee; Gwendolyn Malone; and Pete Maynard.

Staff Present: Brandon Stidham, Planning Director; Ryan Fincham, Senior Planner/Zoning Administrator; Debbie Bean, Recording Secretary.

Others Present: Cathy Kuehner (Public Information Director) & Len Capelli (Economic Development Director).

CALLED TO ORDER

Mr. Stidham called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm. He asked the Commission if they wanted to add anything to the Agenda. Chair Ohrstrom stated that he forgot to add the discussion on the Economic Development Strategic Plan to the Agenda and he apologized for the mistake. Mr. Stidham stated that we can add the item under "New Business Items".

APPROVAL OF WORK SESSION AGENDA

Members approved the work session agenda by concensus with the addition of discussion of the Economic Strategic Plan.

**REVIEW OF AGENDA ITEMS FOR SEPTEMBER 6, 2019 BUSINESS MEETING
SUP-19-01 / SP-19-01, Crown Castle**

Mr. Fincham reviewed the updates that have occurred since the July Planning Commission meeting. He said that the Applicant has responded to the comments from George Condyles (County Telecom Consultant) and Brian Lichty (County Emergency Services Director). He said that the Applicant has also been working with VDOT to satisfy their requirements and they have updated the site plan numerous times in response to those comments. He said that VDOT is the only remaining agency with outstanding issues at this time. He stated that he has contacted Bobby Boyce (VDOT) and he advised verbally that the remaining VDOT revisions are minor and he anticipates approval once those revisions are reviewed. He said that the public hearing has been advertised. He said that the applicant did apply for a setback variance with the Board of Zoning

Appeals and the public hearing has been scheduled for September 10, 2019. He stated that the fall zone is 92 feet and there is 61.5 feet from the property line where the cemetery lot is and that is what the variance is for. He said the Applicant provided a response letter on July 10, 2019 which was forwarded to Mr. Condyles. He stated that Staff discussed the response letter with Mr. Condyles by phone and he advised that he would be present at the September 6, 2019 Planning Commission meeting for any needed clarifications and to answer questions. He said that Mr. Condyles did send Staff a check list with 15 comments. He said that the comments were items that are in compliance with the exception of one which in the opinion of Mr. Condyles is outstanding. He said the outstanding issue is the identification of co-locatable existing structures. He said he is questioning why Crown Castle is not co-locating on the American Tower monopole. He said Mr. Condyles will be at the meeting on Friday to answer questions from the Commisison.

Commissioner Caldwell stated that she has done some research on Crown Castle. She said that on the internet she found that this company is a tower building company. She said they really have no interest in anything but building towers. She said that recently Sprint and T-Mobile have merged and she believes they are getting rid of some of their assets or leases. She said in her opinion Crown Castle does not care a thing about co-locating on a tower. She said this is a point that she thinks we should consider. She stated that they are a huge company and have bought multiple businesses recently. Commissioner Bouffault stated she thinks that Sprint/T-Mobile, merger which is Shentel Mobile, has about an 80 foot tower right across from Blandy and she has heard they want to increase the height of that tower. She said they want it to go up in height so they can provide a lot more coverage without having to build a new tower. Mr. Fincham stated that Crown Castle towers are in Clarke County, he said in looking through files the name Crown Castle has shown up many different times. Chair Ohrstrom asked if he is correct that the tower will provide broadband access. Mr. Stidham said it will provide additional real estate for WISPS and whether it will be at an elevation that will be beneficial to the WISPS he does not know. Commissioner Kruhm asked for clarification on whether more than one tower can be put up on this site. Mr. Stidham stated they started out with two in close proximity to each other and Verizon moved up on the ridge line so they could get a higher elevation. He said Crown Castle is replacing the existing pole within the same compound and taking advantage of the higher height restrictions.

Mr. Fincham stated that back in August a representative from American Tower contacted him asking what is date of the next Planning Commission Meeting. He said that they own the tower across the road and according to George Condyles there is probably back door communications going on. He said that Mr. Condyles is anxious to see if American Tower will be attending the meeting on Friday.

Mr. Fincham stated that the last update from Bobby Boyce with Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) was August 12th. Mr. Boyce's letter indicated that a culvert will be required for the proposed entrance and details of the design must be provided. He also stated that a turnaround area onsite to keep vehicles from backing into Route 606 must be provided. Mr. Fincham stated that the Applicant submitted those revisions electronically on August 21st. He said that Staff has contacted Bobby Boyce and he has advised verbally that the remaining VDOT revisions are minor and anticipates approval once those revisions are able to be reviewed.

He said he wants to mention that since they are removing a tower and building a tower there will be entrance upgrades so there will be some land disturbance but it will be under the threshold of 10,000 square feet therefore the Building Department will handle that.

Mr. Fincham stated in regard to landscaping he anticipated a comment from the Commission to the type of plants that are suggested. Commissioner Caldwell said that instead of Leyland Cypress which is prone to disease, change it to Green Arborvitae and instead of Foster Holly which deer like, use American Holly, which deer stay away from. The Commission agreed to recommend changing the landscaping plants as suggested. He stated that Brian Lichty (Emergency Management) stated that the Applicant provide a Knox box for possible expansion to the Clarke County Public Safety System. He also said that they require all users to abide by the FCC Best Practices Guide. He said that the Applicant stated in writing that they would abide by these recommendations. He stated that the Applicant did estimate the cost of removal but the Zoning Ordinance requires that a removal bond equal to the cost of the removal of the WCF, all the WCF fence and footers, underground cables, support buildings plus 25% is required prior to approval and that the bond remain in effect for the life of the WCF. He said that Sara Brown with Crown Castle is working on the removal bond and anticipates having it completed very soon. Mr. Stidham said he has a comment on the removal bond. He said the new legislation states you can only require removal bonds imposing the same requirement as on other commercial structures.

Mr. Fincham stated that the next item is the analysis of the 19 criteria for the Special Use Review Criteria which he said he will go over at the Business Meeting if the Commission agrees to this. The Commission agreed to hear the 19 criteria at the Business meeting. He said the next item is the Special Use Permit Conditions. He said that the Special Use Permit (SUP) is issued for the subject property of a Class 4 Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) solely by the Applicant, Crown Castle. The SUP shall not be transferable to any other person or entity without approval of the Board of Supervisors as an amendment to the approved SUP conditions. He stated that the Applicant and property owner shall sign the list of adopted conditions to indicate receipt of the conditions and the intention to comply fully with the conditions for the life of the Special Use Permit. He stated that a signed copy of the conditions shall be provided to the Planning Department Staff within 30 days of the Applicant's and Owner's receipt of the adopted conditions. He said that Staff and other County officials shall have access to the property with 24 hour notice to the Applicant in order to conduct periodic compliance inspections of the facility and the subject property throughout the life of the permit. He said that there will be 3 features that shall be properly maintained throughout the life of the project. He stated that the property entrance shall be maintained consistent with VDOT regulations. He said that the access for emergency service and law enforcement shall be permitted. He stated that the security fencing shall be maintained throughout the life of the project. He stated the Applicant shall obtain all required permits from VDOT and complete all required improvements to the property entrance prior to issuance of a building certificate of occupancy. He stated that the Applicant shall provide copies of all applicable State and Federal permits to Staff prior to issuance of a building certificate of occupancy.

Mr. Fincham stated that Staff recommends that the Commission conduct the advertised public hearing and provide a formal recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on the application. He said that Staff recommends approval with conditions contingent upon final VDOT written approval

of the site plan, the posting of the required removal bond, and a variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Commissioner Caldwell suggested that since the Planning Commission Business meeting is September 6th and the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting is scheduled for September 10th it might be reasonable to not load up approval of the SUP with a lot of conditions but to wait for the variance hearing. Mr. Stidham stated that the new state code says the process has to be completed in 150 days. He said that this request if deferred will take us to December. He said that this would be the only deferral we could use. He said that we could request that the Applicant to request a deferral in writing at the Business Meeting which means the Applicant is doing it voluntarily to extend the time line.

Boundary Line Adjustment BLA-19-06
Maureen Albrecht / Rebecca and Curtis Fockler

Mr. Fincham stated that the Applicant is requesting a Boundary Line Adjustment for the property identified as Tax Map #3-A-3C and #4-A-2A located on Old Charles Town Road. He said that Lot 3-A-3C is currently 3.9750 acres with an addition of 0.5000 acres from Tax Map #4-A-2A the adjusted area will be 4.4750 acres. He said that Tax Map #4-A-2A is currently 53.2272 acres and is being adjusted by 0.500 acres less making the total acreage 52.7272 acres. He said that the Clarke County Subdivision Ordinance states that a Boundary Line Adjustment where a residential lot (less than 20 acres in size) is increased in size and an agricultural lot (20 acres in size or larger) is decreased in size are not permitted for 3 exceptions. He said that one exception states that upon application, the Commission may permit Boundary Line Adjustments exceeding the area limitations (3 acres). He stated that a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) score was calculated for the agricultural Lot (Tax Map #4-A-2) proposed to be decreased in size. He said the score was 67.58. He said the properties between 40 and 129.99 acres in size the LESA rating shall be 68% or more to be designated as Important Farmland. He stated that the agricultural land is considered low quality. He stated that Staff has reviewed the site and the half acre adjustment area is minimal, is not used for agriculture, and physically is not suited for agriculture. He said that Staff recommends approval of a Boundary Line Adjustment for the properties identified as Tax Map #3-A-3C and #4-A-2A.

NEW BUSINESS ITEMS

Discussion, Economic Development Strategic Plan Five-Year Review

Commissioner Bouffault stated that at the August 19th Comprehensive Plan Committee Meeting, Mr. Stidham had provided us information that he was going to table this item until he completed the Ordinance project. She said that would be fine but she was concerned because that is not the impression I had nor was it of Len Capelli. She said she went back through minutes and found what the Board of Supervisors said and she wanted to pass it out to the Commission. She said this will give us some direction on what we are going to do. She said that in the Board of Supervisors packet from May 7, 2018 you will see what was done. She said they had a discussion concerning the Strategic Plan Matrix and what they needed to do. She stated that on the second page on the top paragraph it states “in subsequent discussion, the Board concurred on tasking review and recommendation of the Economic Development Strategic Plan to the Economic Development

Advisory Committee (EDAC) and the Industrial Development Authority (IDA). Final recommendation from these bodies presented to the Planning Commission for its consideration”. She stated that this was done 15 months ago. She said she thinks what this is meant to be was their final recommendation, not for the old plan but for the new five year plan. Chair Ohrstrom stated that the work is fine, he was just wondering because he had lunch with some people on the IDA and they said that they had not had time to go over this yet and he thought we should have their buy in before moving forward. Commissioner Bouffault asked who told him that. Chair Ohrstrom said that William Waite and Turner Kobayashi told him that have not had a chance to see it and they would like to weigh in on it. Mr. Capelli said that Mr. Kobaysahi is not on the IDA he is on the Berryville Main Street Board. She said that in June 2019 she received an email asking for comments on the plan they were jointly doing and it was sent out to everyone and she was the only person that responded to it. She said that there is a revision in the paperwork she handed out that was done on May 15, 2019 and the EDAC, IDA and the Director of Economic Development of Tourism was present at this meeting and as far as they are concerned it is approved. She said her concern is that Mr. Stidham has a tremendous amount of work and she would like to see this off our plates. She said that everyone has had a chance to look at the plan. She would like to get it on the Friday Agenda to set public hearing then have the hearing at the next PC meeting which would take us into October. She stated that if all goes well we give our blessing to it and then pass it to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Stidham stated that all of the component plans have been updated and two new ones have been corrected. He said that the Planning Commission is the keeper of the Comprehensive Plan and all of the implementing component plans. He stated that it is up to the Commission as a group on how you want to deal with these plans. He said that on Friday he will provide copies of the information from Mr. Capelli and they have the information from Commissioner Bouffault for the Commission to review. He said there will be nothing required to do in September and what we are shooting for is October.

Other Business Items

Mr. Stidham stated that on the Agenda for Friday we are adding the Strategic Plan Five Year Review as a new item using the same wording from the Work Session Agenda.

Mr. Stidham said that the Ordinances Committee has already had two of their work session meetings. He stated that the Ordinances Committee is going to be meeting again after the Planning Commission Business meeting on Friday and they will have one more potential meeting. Mr. Stidham asked if there were any more questions.

Commissioner Kreider said that he wanted someone to explain to him about the government emails we are supposed to be getting. Chair Ohrstrom stated that is a very good point. Mr. Stidham stated that information will be coming from County Administration.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07 p.m.

George L. Ohrstrom, (Chair)

Debbie Bean, Recording Secretary

Clarke County



PLANNING COMMISSION - DRAFT BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES FRIDAY SEPTEMBER 6, 2019

A Business Meeting of the Planning Commission of Clarke County, Virginia, was held at the Berryville/Clarke County Government Center, Berryville, Virginia, on Friday, September 6, 2019.

Attendance

Present: Randy Buckley (Vice-Chair); Robina Bouffault; Anne Caldwell; Mary Daniel; Bob Glover; Scott Kreider; Doug Kruhm; Frank Lee; Gwendolyn Malone; and Pete Maynard

Absent: George L. Ohrstrom, II.

Others: Cathy Kuehner (Public Information Director); George Condyles (County Telecom Consultant); Tracy Themak (representing Crown Castle).

Staff Present: Brandon Stidham, Planning Director; Ryan Fincham, Senior Planner/Zoning Administrator and Debbie Bean, Recording Secretary

Called to Order

Chair Ohrstrom called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Approval of Agenda

The Commission voted to approve the revised agenda.

Yes: Bouffault (moved), Buckley, Caldwell, Daniel, Glover, Kreider (seconded), Kruhm, Lee, Malone and Maynard

No: No one

Absent: Ohrstrom

Approval of Minutes

The Commission voted to approve the Planning Commission Work Session Meeting minutes of July 9, 2019.

Yes: Bouffault (seconded), Buckley, Caldwell (moved), Daniel, Glover, Kreider, Kruhm, Lee, Malone and Maynard

No: No one

Absent: Ohrstrom

The Commission voted to approve the Planning Commission Business Meeting minutes of July 7, 2019.

Yes: Bouffault (seconded), Buckley, Caldwell (moved), Daniel, Glover, Kreider, Lee, Malone, and Maynard

No: No one

Absent: Ohrstrom
Abstained: Kruhm

Public Hearing Item

SUP-19-01/SP-19-01, Crown Castle. Request approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) and Site Plan to construct a new 185-foot Class 4 Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) that would replace an existing 84-foot monopole per §3-A-2-a-3-r of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is located on the west side of Mt. Carmel Road (Rt. 606) approximately 450 feet from its intersection with U.S. 50/17 (John Mosby Highway), Tax Map #39-A-74, is 84.55 acres in size, and is zoned Forestal-Open Space-Conservation (FOC).

Mr. Fincham explained that Crown Castle (Applicant) is requesting to construct a new 185' monopole, Class 4 Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) on a portion of the subject property. He said that the Applicant obtained a lease on a portion of the subject property containing the easement and compound area. He stated that the lease grants the ability for Crown Castle to construct towers, install equipment, etc., through a Wireless Communication Easement and Assignment Agreement. He said that the proposed Tower will replace the existing 84 foot monopole. He said that the proposed facility is designed to accommodate AT&T antennas at a centerline height of 181' and T-Mobile antennas at a centerline height of 171'. He stated that the facility will be accessed by the existing entrance shown on the site plan. He said that the parking area will be the gravel easement which serves only the compound. He said that there are no water supplies or sewage disposal systems existing or proposed. He stated that a landscaping plan is provided satisfying the perimeter buffer requirements for a WCF. He said that the Applicant has responded to the comments from George Condyles (County Telecom Consultant) and Brian Lichty (County Emergency Services Director). He said that the Applicant provided a response letter on July 10, 2019 which was forwarded to Mr. Condyles. He stated that Staff discussed the response letter with Mr. Condyles by phone and he is present today to answer questions from the Commission.

He said that the Applicant has also been working with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to satisfy their requirements. He said that the revisions required by VDOT are minor and they anticipate approval once those revisions are reviewed. He stated that the Applicant did apply for a setback variance with the Board of Zoning Appeals and the public hearing is scheduled for September, 10, 2019. He said that the fall zone is 92 feet and there is 61.5 feet from the property line where the cemetery lot is and that is what the variance is for. He stated that the height limit of a tower stops at 199 feet. Mr. Stidham said this is due to the fact that we prohibit towers that have to have lights on them.

Mr. Fincham stated that this proposal will not cause undue adverse effects on neighboring properties. He stated that this proposal will not cause an undue adverse effect on wildlife and plant habitats. He said that no karst plan is necessary and an Erosion and Sediment plan is not needed. He stated that the tower will not cause undue air pollution. He said that security fencing will be provided for the life of the tower. He said that Staff recommends approval for this proposal with conditions contingent upon final VDOT written approval of the site plan, the posting of the required removal bond and a variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals. After discussion with Staff and the Commission, Vice Chair Buckley opened the public hearing.

Tracy Themak, (Donohue & Stearns, PLC), zoning council for Crown Castle, stated that the primary purpose today is to answer any additional questions the Commission might have. She said that with her today are representatives from Crown Castle site acquisition, construction, and engineers for AT&T and they can answer the more technical questions. She said she is going to give a brief power point as Mr. Fincham basically covered everything in his power point. She said we are proposing a replacement monopole for the existing stealth flagpole that was approved in 2003. She stated that the Applicant at that time was Omni Point and T-Mobile which were located on the original tower. She said the need is driven by T-Mobile and AT&T needing more height on the monopole to improve service in the area. She stated that AT&T will be the lead antenna and then T-Mobile. She said as soon as the new monopole is in place and AT&T & T-Mobile have migrated to the tower the old tower will be removed. She stated that they plan to put up a 185 foot monopole with two carriers and their upgraded equipment on the monopole. She said that this is clearly demand driven to meet the needs of the subscribers in Clarke County. She stated that this would be the minimum height necessary to be able to do this for both carriers. She said that in terms of optimal space and landlord approval and in terms of mitigating any additional disturbance to this parcel, this is the best area for the monopole. She stated that they are currently planning to be at the Board of Supervisors meeting later this month and then again at the October meeting. She said that Mr. Fincham stated that variance needs to be approved through the Board of Zoning Appeals which needs to be done before moving forward. She stated that she just learned that the VDOT bond and removal bond will be provided by Crown Castle later next week. She said that Mr. Fincham basically explained everything in his presentation. She showed where the proposed monopole will be located and said that the old tower will be removed. She stated that the monopole needs to be vertical and have two carriers with updated equipment in order to meet the needs of the customers in Clarke County. She showed photos where the tower will be visible and where it will not be visible. She provided hard copies for the Commission to review. She said that when Staff was presenting she noticed two things she would like to address. She stated the first item is on the American Tower facility that is located about a thousand feet to the southeast and primarily the reason that AT&T and T-Mobile are not on that one is a private business arrangement between AT&T, T-Mobile and Crown. She said that they have existing lease agreements with Crown and not American Tower. She stated that the reason they have the existing lease agreements is because the structure where American Tower has co-location opportunities is not at a height that would achieve effective propagation or Crown would have gone there. She said that Crown does not have the opportunity to interfere with that. They have a pole and they can bump it up and give these two carriers the heights that are required to maintain the service and what is currently being provided in the County and future service. She said that the second item is that Commissioner Caldwell brought up the photographs of the other site and she did not get to put them in the presentation because it is not what we are proposing now. She said she did not want to keep the photos in the presentation showing the higher tower but she does have hard copies of the pictures and will hand them out to the Commission. She said that we do have members of our team available today to answer any questions. She stated that is all she has for her presentation.

Commissioner Maynard had a question in regard to the pictures of the proposed future tower extension from our July Planning Commission Business meeting packet on pages 79 and 80. He said on page 79 there are pictures of a tower and a caption that states "Future Tower Extension (10% of current proposed height) with future co-location antenna array." He said this is for a 203'-6" monopole tower.

He stated that he would like verification on the ability of your company to add that extension, is it a by-right extension and are you allowed to do that and are you allowed to put lights on the tower as a by-right.

Ms. Themak stated that the company is allowed by-right to increase the monopole 10% increase or 20 feet whichever is higher. She stated that in a jurisdiction like Clarke County where we have a maximum height of 199' and a prohibition on lit towers we could come up to 199'. She said that Crown is going to come here and invest the money and install this tower at 185' today she said the money is not justifying another 10 or 15 foot height increase on the tower.

Commissioner Bouffault asked if it would be technically feasible to go to 199' with a third carrier. Ms. Themak stated that with AT&T here and the top centerline is 181' she believes it would because there is a 10 foot separation between the centerline rings so they could squeeze one more in it at the top.

Commissioner Glover asked where the dead zones are now for AT&T and T-Mobile on Route 50. Ms. Themak said that we did not provide those in the application. She said she could speak generally to that but recently there was Virginia legislation passed that stated providers do not have to provide their maps or demonstrate need in the area. She said that there is a need here and Crown, AT&T and T-Mobile do not invest the funds and if there is a need we go on customer complaints and 911 for emergency services. Commissioner Glover asked if someone could speak at all about the dead zones just for personal use. She said that we do not live in the jurisdiction so we do not have the information. Commissioner Glover said he just wants to know where the dead zones are now for AT&T and T-Mobile around Route 50 and Route 606. She said she can speak generally but legally we have not submitted those materials because they are not part of the application. Commissioner Glover stated that the customers that are complaining are the customers that are commuting. He said that his next question which he believes you will not be able to answer is how many homeowners will benefit from the proposed tower. Ms. Themak said this information is not part of the application and the commuters working and living in the area and the emergency services depend on carriers like AT&T and T-Mobile to keep the towers current. She stated that we have agreed to leave space on the tower for emergency services and that is all in the interest of maintaining services for Clarke County. Commissioner Glover stated that he is confused because Ms. Themak said there is demand and he said we still do not know how much demand there is for the local folks. He said that Ms. Themak cannot speak about this so he will let it go.

The Engineer for AT&T stated that we have a need for this site. He said from this proposed site it is 2.6 miles to the east and 5 to 6 miles in other directions. He said that there is a big area which we do not cover well. He said that there are spots that we miss especially on Route 50 straight through to Route 602 and Route 606. He stated that to the northwest there is a Blue Ridge Wildlife Center and that is an area we are trying to improve.

Commissioner Caldwell said that she understands that Crown Castle is primarily dealing with cell phones and part of your application mentions the possibility that the County could help to expand broadband access through location on your tower. She stated that this is usually provided by local WISPs and the question is that obviously Crown Castle owns many towers throughout the country so

what percentage of our rural towers have WISPs co-located on them. Ms. Themak stated that she does not know the answer to that question but she will find out and get back to her.

Fred Tavenner, property owner in the area, stated that the existing tower does not provide good service to an area that is about 900 feet. He said a picture was presented showing the new tower was visible going down Route 50 and on another picture it showed that the tower was not visible. He asked if the tower has to be visible in order to get service. Commissioner Bouffault stated that cellular does not have to be in direct line of sight in order to get service. She said that WISPs have to be in direct line of sight for service. Mr. Tavenner said that there is an existing tower that looks like a Christmas tree so AT&T and T-Mobile could use the existing tower instead of having additional towers all over the county. Commissioner Bouffault said that the existing tower belongs to Verizon and they have indicated that they are not willing to share the tower with a competitor. She said that this is truly a business decision that they have made. She stated that Crown Castle is keeping AT&T and T-Mobile happy by providing this proposed new tower.

Chris Collins, property owner in the area, stated that he heard it said that it is not going to be a problem and you will not see it and it will not be a visual disturbance. He said that this is not true. He stated that he drives up and down that road a couple times a day and see it every time he drives by. He said the proposed tower is going to be twice the height of the existing tower. He stated that it is going to be very intrusive and it will look like Loudoun County. He stated that it will impede the view shed. He said make no mistake about it this is a money making proposition. He stated that people want to build that tower to make money and this is the easiest way to do it. He said that there is an existing site here and lets bend the regulations and increase our profitability quickly. He asked how far they have gone to explore other alternatives. He asked if there has been a lot of research on this proposed tower. He said he would like to know. He stated that he gets 4G service and he guesses he picked the right carrier and I am lucky because I am sure a lot of commuters get a dead zone. He said that he has always liked Clarke County for holding the line and taking their time to make the right decision for everyone. He stated that he would like the Commission to take the view shed into consideration.

Steve Tavenner, property owner near the proposed new tower. He asked if for some reason in the future someone wants to go beyond the current 199' foot limit on the tower would they be able to have a light on top of it. Vice Chair Buckley stated that the County has an ordinance that bans lights and it states when a tower reaches 200 feet or more there is a requirement for a light on the top. Mr. Tavenner was concerned if a light was allowed it would shine on his property. He said that he likes the way the existing tower looks and its very well done. He said that he has Sprint service and this tower will not help him at all. He said he does not understand why these companies cannot consolidate some of their equipment and add more companies to use the same tower.

Fred Tavenner asked if it would be possible to do this tower like the existing tower. Mr. Stidham said that he has seen examples elsewhere of using the stealth tree approach and in this particular location it would probably stick out even worse because they work best when they blend in with surrounding foliage and it would have a significant portion of the tower above the tree tops.

George Condyles (County Telecom Consultant, President of the Atlantic Group) stated that he is the County Consultant and has been for a number of years. He stated that his purpose in reviewing these

applications is to make sure you have an objective and unbiased opinion of facts of what the application says. He said that the Applicant has submitted all of their technical data that they are required to by law and that includes the local, Federal and State requirements, FCC, Commonwealth of Virginia and Clarke County. He stated as far as ownership goes the existing tower (Christmas tree) is owned by American Tower and in the world of tower and tower leasing there are various competitors. He said that SBA is one, American Tower, Crown Castle and these are large nationwide providers of infrastructure and in addition to that they own fiber optic cable and these companies are into it heavy and deep and they are traded on the New York Stock Exchange. He said that across the street there is a stealth tower which we call the Christmas tree and it still has not been answered on why they cannot build over there. He stated that what he has heard is that from a business stand point it's competition and all of that is true. He said that all of these carriers have what is called a master lease agreement with every facility provider. He stated that if one of the providers see a location they want to go on the first thing they do is see who has a tower in that area. He said that the only question he has is why one of these providers cannot go to where the American Christmas tree is located. He said this would be more advantageous to go there as it is on higher ground and the slot is available at the 80 foot position. He said that in the spirit of trying to position these towers with branches, camouflage, etc. and doing this to 180 foot structure it will look very bad. He said that camouflage only hides up to about 125 feet without looking really bad. He said that the reality is we want to save the community and if you want it to stay this way it can cost the county thousands of dollars. He said that as far as the variance goes he does not see a problem with it at all. He said that the application has merit and you should consider it.

Commissioner Lee stated that he wants to say something about the procedure of the Planning Commission in giving conditional approval to the proposed Special Use Permit/Site Plan before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) has the public hearing and the opportunity to vote on the variance. He stated that the BZA is a separate body from the Planning Commission and he thinks it is premature for the Planning Commission to move forward in giving conditional approval on this request until such time that the BZA has the Public Hearing on the variance.

Vice Chair Buckley asked Mr. Stidham to clarify the timeline to defer.

Mr. Stidham stated that as we talked at the Work Session the recent changes in the General Assembly level have limited the overall time frame for review of cell towers to 150 days which would terminate around mid-December. He said that given how the months have fallen since the application was filed that allows for essentially one deferral for a one month period which would end the 150 day review clock. He stated if the Planning Commission would defer to the October meeting action would need to be taken in October in order to get it on the Board of Supervisors schedule to set public hearing at the Board October meeting for their November meeting. He said if the Planning Commission is considering a deferral to next month he always recommends continuing the public hearing so it can remain open and that also saves on advertising costs because if you close it and then reopen it we would need to re-advertise again and it would still give the public time to come back and speak again. Mr. Stidham stated that if the Applicant were to accept and take on the burden of deferral and provide that acceptance in writing that would stop the review clock. He stated that the General Assembly also gives the ability for the Applicant to voluntarily agree to a time extension of that 150 day period so it might be worth asking the Applicant's agent if that was something they would consider.

Vice Chair Buckley asked Ms. Themak if this is something they would consider. She said that she is curious given that Crown Castle will not be able to act on the Special Use Permit or Site Plan without BZA approval. She asked if this were to be acted upon today and the BZA were to deny the variance on September 10th then this would be null and void.

The Commission voted to defer action and continue the public hearing until the October Planning Commission meeting.

Yes: Bouffault, Buckley, Caldwell, Daniel, Glover (seconded), Kreider (moved), Kruhm, Lee, Malone, and Maynard

No: No one

Absent: Ohrstrom

Boundary Line Adjustment

Approval of a boundary line adjustment for the properties identified as Tax Map #3-A-3C and 4-A-2A, located off Old Charles Town Road in the Russell Election District zoned Agricultural Open-Space Conservation (AOC).

Mr. Fincham stated that the Zoning Administrator normally approves boundary line adjustments but in cases where the proposed boundary line adjustment would exceed area limitations the Planning Commission is the approval authority for the purpose of allowing such area limitations to be exceeded. He said that Staff has reviewed the site and the half acre adjustment area is minimal and is not used for agriculture and is not suited for agriculture. He said that Tax Map #3-A-3C is currently at 3.975 acres and after the adjustment it will be 4.475 acres. He stated that Tax Map #4-A-2A is currently at 53.2272 acres and after the adjustment it will be 52.2272 acres. He said that the total area in the boundary line adjustment is 57.2022 acres which remains the same and 0.500 acres were adjusted. He said that a LESA score was calculated on the agricultural lot Tax Map #4-A-2A and the score was 67.58 was is considered low quality. He stated that there are no issues pertaining to the existing well and onsite sewage systems. He said that the Health Department approval and signature of the plat will be required. He said that a karst plan/resistivity test is not required for the existing septic system. After discussion with Staff and the Commission, Chair Ohrstrom called for a motion.

The Planning Commission voted to approve this request

Yes: Bouffault (moved), Buckley, Caldwell, Daniel, Glover, Kreider (seconded), Kruhm, Lee, Malone and Maynard

No: No one

Absent: Ohrstrom

Board/Committee Reports

Board of Supervisors (Mary Daniel)

Commissioner Daniel stated that last week the entire Board of Supervisors were overwhelmed with the concerns about Loudoun County and the Town of Hillsboro are thinking about closing Route 9. She said that the Board is all over this and are going to have a work session g dedicated to this issue on Tuesday. She said that in her opinion it is a tremendous safety issue. She said we are waiting for our safety audit on Route 7. She said that the census is coming up and they are hoping to be able to do most of it on line. She stated that a traffic study report is being done for the Town of Berryville and we will probably get the

results back for the October Board meeting. She said we have several citizen positions available and you can find the information on line.

Board of Septic & Well Appeals (George Ohrstrom, II)

No Report.

Board of Zoning Appeals (Anne Caldwell)

Commissioner Caldwell said there is a public hearing meeting scheduled for September 10, 2019 at 9:30 a.m. for a variance request from Crown Castle.

Historic Preservation Commission (Doug Kruhm)

Commissioner Kruhm said that there is a public hearing meeting scheduled for September 18, 2019.

Conservation Easement Authority (George Ohrstrom, II)

Vice Chair Buckley stated that Alison Teetor, George Ohrstrom and myself recently attended a celebration of the 100th Conservation Easement partially funded by the Virginia Farmland Preservation Fund. He said that Alison and two other PDR Managers were recognized by Governor Northam and the Secretary of Agriculture for their work in farmland preservation and he said that he thinks it was a really well deserved recognition. He stated that it was a very nice event and George was one of the speakers. He said that we have also submitted a grant application to the Virginia Land Conservation Fund to leverage some matching Federal funds for an easement on a portion of Smithfield Farm and have three other easement applications pending.

Broadband Implementation Committee (Mary Daniel)

No meeting recently.

Other Business

Mr. Stidham stated as we discussed at the work session on Tuesday, everyone should have a copy of the document that you have not had a chance to review. He said this is the original submission from Len Capelli containing the recommendations of the Economic Development Advisory Committee and the Industrial Development Authority (IDA). He said that it is dated May 15th and we received it sometime in June. He said that this has been presented to us as those two bodies recommendations on revising the Economic Development Strategic Plan. He said that you already have the information from Commissioner Bouffault and her draft that she has provided at the work session as well and we talked about taking this month and picking it up back in October and as a reminder the five year review resolution needs to be adopted by the Planning Commission by October 21st which is the anniversary date of the adoption of the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Commissioner Bouffault said she wants to make some comments. She stated that the Comprehensive Plan Committee met on August 19th and it was discussed and decided to take what you are now receiving today to the rest of the Commissioners. She said that Mr. Stidham was talking about the final recommendation of the EDAC and IDA that they were passing on to us. She said that she worked with Len Capelli on the 22nd and we incorporated the main part of it and the only thing we could find was the fact that they had separated as per the 2014 Plan they separated the Economic Development from the agencies such as the Commissioner of the Revenue and any of the elected agencies, she said we consolidated that with the view that this is such a tiny county the communication between all of us

needs to be much closer than if we were to be a large city or a big county where you have very different buildings and so we are all in the same building. She said what is obvious is we really did not have a discussion concerning the draft you received from us on the 26th. She said she did send it out to EDAC and IDA on the 26th so if they had any comments that they wanted to post a recommendation to make changes we could but we did not receive anything back from them. She said she would like for this draft plan to be discussed at the October Work Session and if we can agree on it, we could adopt it for public hearing. She asked Mr. Stidham if it does have to go through a public

Mr. Stidham stated if you are going to amend the Comprehensive Plan or any other component plans it requires public hearings for both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

She said that we could set a public hearing at our level for October. She said that we need a new plan and it is neat and tidy and everybody has had a chance to read it. She stated that last year the Board of Supervisors wanted this plan updated. She said she would argue that it is probably the most important implementing plan that we have right now. She said we need to increase our tax revenues and that is the basis why we need to have this plan approved. She stated she wants to get this off our plate and Mr. Stidham's plate and move it on to the Board of Supervisors before the end of the year if possible.

Vice Chair Buckley asked Mr. Stidham if we need to take any action on this resolution.

Mr. Stidham said he does not think we need to take any action today. He stated we can continue to add this item to the October regular meeting agenda which would enable us to discuss it at the work session. He said that he wants to apologize on behalf of all county Staff as to the confusion of this process. He said that the excerpt from the Board minutes from May that was handed out on Tuesday does clearly state that the Board has delegated the update to the Strategic Plan to the EDAC and the IDA and that was dated back from Spring of 2018. He said that for whatever reason that directive was never communicated to the Planning Staff. He stated that as he described on Tuesday he met with Mr. Capelli in January of this year to talk about the need for this five year resolution to be adopted and he was not told at that point that the Strategic Plan was being rewritten. He said he was aware that the Board was working with Mr. Capelli and associated groups on EDAC priorities but at no point was it communicated across departments that this Strategic Plan was being revised and that I should expect the Planning Commission to receive a revised Strategic Plan for consideration. He said had we been made aware of this that early on he would have talked about process and procedure. He stated that the fact that we have a Comprehensive Plan update coming up soon that contains an objective with our big picture strategies for Economic Development used to inform the update of the Strategic Plan, and that the process would be to work through these priorities with the Comprehensive Plan update and decide what to do with the Strategic Plan. He said that the outcome of the Comprehensive Plan could take away the strategy to maintain a Strategic Plan as a component plan that we detach that and make it a free standing document that can be worked on by the Economic Development and the Board independently of the Comprehensive Plan. He said we would have to work with Mr. Capelli and County Administration on any modifications and changes. He said that since Staff was not involved with the creation of this we would guide you through the Public Hearing process and make sure all those requirements are filed. He said that his concern right now remains and is making sure that some sort of resolution is adopted in October that reflects if we want to do work or not do work on the current Economic Development Strategic Plan and if that is a resolution to have a Public Hearing to amend either this document or some other version of the document that satisfies my check box.

Commissioner Bouffault asked to comment. She stated we cannot disassociate from the Comprehensive Plan. She said that the Comprehensive Plan shall consider strategies to provide broadband, infrastructure to the future needs of the residents and businesses in our locality. She said that we do have the right to amend the plan at any time according to the Code of Virginia if it is deemed sufficient.

Vice Chair Buckley stated that he wants this to go on the October Agenda if everyone agrees.

Mr. Stidham said that any time you are working on a Comprehensive Plan or implementing other component plans it is prescribed that you do a careful and a deliberate consideration and we added language in the Comprehensive Plan when we updated it to be sure that piece mill amendments are not done. He said he agrees with Commissioner Bouffault that our current plan says almost nothing about broadband and one of the major things we should do is create an objective on broadband in our Comprehensive Plan and that is where it would have the most punch.

Vice Chair Buckley said he thinks we are all in agreement that we need to discuss this. He said to please be prepared and we will discuss it in October. He asked for a motion to adjourn.

On motion by Commissioner Caldwell and seconded by Commissioner Kruhm the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Randy Buckley, Vice Chair

Debbie Bean, Recording Secretary

SPECIAL USE PERMIT / SITE PLAN (SUP-19-01/SP-19-01)

Crown Castle

**October 4, 2019 Planning Commission Meeting – CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING
SUPPLEMENTARY STAFF REPORT #1 – Department of Planning**

The purpose of this staff report is to provide information to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to assist them in reviewing this proposed land use request. It may be useful to members of the general public interested in this request.

Case Summary

Applicant:

Crown Castle (Lease Owner)

Property Owner:

Edward Vankeuren

Location:

- Near 653 Mount Carmel Road
- Tax Map #39-A-74
- Millwood Election District (Anne Caldwell and Bob Glover); Terri Catlett (Board of Supervisors)

Parcel Size/Project Area: 84.55 acres / 45’ by 55’ compound area for special use

Request:

Request approval of a Special Use Permit (SUP) and Site Plan to construct a new 185-foot Class 4 Wireless Communication Facility (WCF) that would replace an existing 84-foot monopole per §3-A-2-a-3-r of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is located on the west side of Mt. Carmel Road (Rt. 606) approximately 450 feet from its intersection with U.S. 50/17 (John Mosby Highway), Tax Map #39-A-74, is 84.55 acres in size, and is zoned Forestal-Open Space-Conservation (FOC).

Case Update:

At the September 6 meeting, the Planning Commission voted 10-0-1 (Ohrstrom absent) to defer action and continue the Public Hearing to the Commission’s October 4, 2019 Business Meeting. In discussing the motion to defer, Commissioners had concerns with acting on the application while the applicant has a pending variance request before the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). The variance to the side yard setback from the adjacent cemetery lot is required in order for the proposed WCF to be constructed in the location depicted on the site plan.

The BZA reviewed the applicant’s variance request at their meeting on September 10, 2019 and voted to deny the request. The motion to deny the request was based upon the applicant’s failure to meet the following criteria for approval of a variance:

1. That the strict application of the ordinance terms would unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property.
2. That the granting of the variance would not be substantially detrimental to adjacent properties as well as nearby properties in the proximity of the proposed WCF site.

Another issue that arose at the Public Hearing involved the owners of the subject property, Edward and Brenda Vankeuren. Ms. Vankeuren spoke during the Public Hearing and indicated that Crown Castle representatives have not discussed this application with her or her husband, and that the first they heard of the application was from the adjoining property owner mailing for the variance request. She also stated that they leased the WCF site to T-Mobile and later sold the lease rights to Crown Castle but did not sell the property to them.

The special use permit and site plan application and the related variance application were all signed by Crown Castle as the lease owner but not by the Vankeurens as property owners. Crown Castle provided Staff with a copy of an agreement stating that they have the right to construct towers on the subject property at the WCF site. Based on this document, Staff did not require these two applications to be signed by the Vankeurens.

These two issues – the denial of the variance request and whether the property owners are required to sign the special use/site plan and/or variance applications – require legal review before Staff can provide a recommendation on this request. The County Attorney is currently reviewing these issues and will be discussing the ownership issue with the applicant’s agent, however this review will not be completed by Staff’s September 27 deadline to distribute the Commission meeting packets. At this point, Staff is holding any recommendation on this request until the County Attorney has completed his review of these issues. We expect to be able to provide additional information and potentially a recommendation by the Commission’s October 1 work session.

History:

January & May 2019	Pre-Application meeting held with Planning Staff.
May 2019	Special Use Permit and Site Plan Applications filed by the applicant determined to be incomplete per Ordinance.
June 7, 2019	Complete Special Use Permit and Site Plan Applications filed by the applicant.
July 12, 2019	Placed on the Commission’s meeting agenda to Set Public Hearing for the September 6, 2019 Commission meeting.
September, 6, 2019	The Commission deferred action and continued the public hearing to the October 4, 2019 meeting.
October 4, 2019	Placed on the Commission’s meeting agenda for continued Public Hearing



Clarke County Planning Department

101 Chalmers Court, Suite B

Berryville, Virginia 22611

(540) 955-5132

www.clarkecounty.gov

TO: Planning Commission members

FROM: Brandon Stidham, Planning Director

RE: Continued Discussion, Economic Development Strategic Plan Five-Year Review

DATE: September 27, 2019

Item 10 on the October 4, 2019 Business Meeting agenda is the continued discussion of the Economic Development Strategic Plan Five-Year Review.

To recap this item, Code of Virginia §15.2-2230 requires that at least once every five years, a locality's planning commission shall review the comprehensive plan "to determine whether it is advisable to amend the plan." Language was included in the Comprehensive Plan and component plans that have been recently updated to ensure that these plans are reviewed for potential updates on a five-year schedule. At the Commission's January 4 meeting, resolutions were adopted to initiate the reviews of the Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plan, both of which had five-year adoption date anniversaries on March 18, 2019. With the five-year anniversary of the Economic Development Strategic Plan adoption occurring on October 21, 2019, the Commission will need to adopt a similar resolution at the October 4, 2019 Business Meeting.

As a matter of process, review and update of the Comprehensive Plan should take place prior to the review and update of the component plans including the Economic Development Strategic Plan. The Comprehensive Plan's goals, objectives, and policies serve as the basis for development of the topic-specific component plans. Several of the Comprehensive Plan's Objectives in Chapter II are tied directly to individual component plans:

- Objective 1 (Agriculture) – Agricultural Land Plan
- Objective 2 (Mountain Resources) – Mountain Land Plan
- Objective 4 (Historic Resources) – Historic Resources Plan
- Objective 6 (Outdoor Resources) – Recreation Plan
- Objective 8 (Village Plans – Millwood, Pine Grove, White Post) – Village Plan (to be developed)
- Objective 9 (Designated Growth Areas for Development) – Berryville Area Plan, Waterloo Area Plan, Double Tollgate Area Plan
- Objective 10 (Economic Development) – Economic Development Strategic Plan
- Objective 12 (Transportation) – Transportation Plan

Staff recommends that prior to conducting the formal review of the component plans, the Comprehensive Plan should be reviewed and updated to ensure that its guidance is current and accurately informs the review processes for each component plan. To emphasize this point, Staff has provided a revised resolution for the Commission's consideration. The resolution proposes to initiate review of the Economic Development Strategic Plan and contains language indicating that such review shall take place after the review and adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. Any changes to Objective #10 and other pertinent sections of the Comprehensive Plan would then provide the policy direction for review of the Economic Development Strategic Plan. The work product provided by the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) and the Industrial Development Authority (IDA) would also be used both in the review of Comprehensive Plan Objective #10 and the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached resolution at the October 4, 2019 Business Meeting to ensure timely compliance with Code of Virginia §15.2-2230. Please let me know if you have any questions in advance of the meeting.

**RESOLUTION TO INITIATE REVIEW
OF THE CLARKE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIC PLAN**

WHEREAS, the Clarke County Economic Development Strategic Plan was adopted on October 21, 2014, and

WHEREAS, Code of Virginia §15.2-2230 requires that at least once every five years, a locality's planning commission shall review the comprehensive plan "to determine whether it is advisable to amend the plan," and

WHEREAS, the Economic Development Strategic Plan is an implementing component plan of the 2013 Clarke County Comprehensive Plan, and

WHEREAS, Objective #10 (Economic Development) of the 2013 Comprehensive Plan provided policy direction for the creation of the Economic Development Strategic Plan in 2014, and

WHEREAS, October 21, 2019 will mark the five-year anniversary of the Economic Development Strategic Plan's adoption date,

AND WHEREAS, on May 15, 2019, the following two documents were provided by the Director of Economic Development and Tourism containing work product from the Economic Development Advisory Committee (EDAC) and the Industrial Development Authority (IDA) on the current Economic Development Strategic Plan:

- EDAC, IDA Priorities for 2019 Economic Development Strategic Plan
- Priorities/Recommendations Selected from Plan Adopted by the Board of Supervisors on October 21, 2014 by the EDAC, IDA, and Director of Economic Development and Tourism.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Clarke County Planning Commission, in response to work product produced by the EDAC, IDA, and Director of Economic Development and Tourism, has determined that it is necessary to conduct a review and update of the Economic Development Strategic Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that revisions to Objective #10 and any other pertinent revisions to the Comprehensive Plan shall provide policy direction for the review of the Economic Development Strategic Plan, which shall take place following adoption of the revised Comprehensive Plan.

Adopted this **[INSERT DATE]**.