

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD
IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING,
DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 16TH DAY OF JANUARY, 1985
AT 7:30 P.M.

PRESENT: M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #3
A.S. CLAY, JR., VICE-CHAIRMAN	ELECTION DISTRICT #4
G.S. BENNETT, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #1
H.L. CLAY, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR.	ELECTION DISTRICT #2
T.O. RAINEY, III	ASS'T. COUNTY ATTORNEY
B.M. HEATH	SHERIFF

IN RE: MINUTES

Mr. Robertson pointed out under the item concerning the Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, number 2, that Rt. 1301 should be Rt. 1310.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the January 2, 1985 meeting were approved as presented with the one change as referenced by Mr. Robertson.

IN RE: TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Treasurer was authorized to make the following transfers:

1. \$24,525.39 from the General Fund to the Water & Sewer Fund.
2. \$100,000 from the General Fund to the County Construction Fund.
3. \$200 from the General Fund to the Law Library Fund.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Mr. Robertson requested a report as to why radio repair was being taken to Comm-Tronics when the County has a maintenance contract with Superior Communications. He asked for a report at a later date.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following claims be approved and the funds appropriated for same:

General Fund checks-numbering 85-1 through 85-100 amounting to \$131,700.06; Radio Fund-checks numbering RADIO-85-1 thru RADIO-85-4 in the amount of \$17,487.34; History Book check #HB-85-1 in the amount of \$4.69; County Construction Fund-check #CCF-85-1 in the amount of \$6,297.00; Water & Sewer Fund-check #W&S-85-1 in the amount of \$24,525.39; Library Fund-check #LF-85-1 in the amount of \$370.32.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF 100% BID DOCUMENT FOR ROOF REPLACEMENTS--
THREE COUNTY BUILDINGS

Wendy Quesenberry, Admin. Assistant, presented the final bid document for the roof replacements for three county buildings, Circuit Court Clerk's Office, Social Services Building and the East-side Elementary School. She briefly reviewed 2 minor changes made since the 98% document was presented.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the 100% bid document on roof replacements for three county buildings was approved as presented.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR PUBLIC AUCTION

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following items were approved for sale at public auction:

IBM Selectric Typewriter, Serial #9385256; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #3N1638380; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #93P394179P; Remington Rand adding Machine, #99N1806000; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #96-498116; Remington Rand Adding Machine, #99N1214672; Burroughs Cash Register, #A855637; Remington Typewriter, #SPP-2-51351-J; Victor Adding Machine, #1368-360C; Remington Electric Typewriter; Victor 1800 Printing Calculator, #4294-027; Royal Typewriter, #Z-1110; Burroughs F1500 Bookkeeping Machine, #F1433C; Sharp Compet QS-2169 Electric Printing Calculators, Nos. 91024755, 91024765, 91128762; Remington Typewriter, Electric 25; Metal Ballot Box; 10 Wooden Chairs; 7 Desk Chairs w/ wheels; 1 Stuffed Chair w/ Wheels; 5 drawer flat filing trays (2); Two Drawer Index Card Filing Box; (5) five drawer filing cabinets; Diebold's Filing Safe; Victor Adding Machine, #8319171; Unicom Adding Machine, #206554; Victor Adding Machine, #3685891; Ricomac Adding Machine, #28905; Manual Adding Machine, #156449

Scrap Items - Electric Dryer, Cissell, #3432; Washing Machine; Commercial stove; (2) Solid Wood Doors; Four door wooden cabinet; voting partitions; (3) Desks, 3 drawers on each side; (1) wooden desk, 3 drawers on one side; 1 wooden table; 1 wooden storage cabinet, 1 metal storage cabinet; 3 round light fixture covers; 6 screen doors; 1 dryer rack.

IN RE: STREETLIGHTS--CHESTNUT GARDENS

The County Administrator presented a petition from 25 residents of the new section of Chestnut Gardens requesting streetlights along Rt. 601. He stated he had reviewed the area with a representative from Vepco and their recommendation is that three streetlights are needed.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", three streetlights were approved along Rt. 601 for the new portion of Chestnut Gardens.

IN RE: REPORT ON VEHICLES--ANIMAL WARDEN & BUILDING INSPECTOR

The County Administrator advised the Board that he was having the Animal Warden's truck checked out and was postponing bidding out a new truck at this time. He stated the repairs on the Building Inspector's car are being reviewed and he should have a report at the next meeting.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 7:43 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 7:55 P.M.

IN RE: FARMER'S HOME ADMINISTRATION--UPDATE ON ACTIVITIES

Mrs. Gladys Holland, County Supervisor, Farmer's Home Administration in Petersburg, appeared before the Board to give a brief update on the activities of her agency involving Dinwiddie County. She added that FMHA wanted to be of service to the County, and she would be back towards the middle of the year to update the Board again.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--REZONING APPLICATION P-84-4--CARL BOGESE ASSOCIATES

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Section 21, Parcel 109A containing approximately 20 ± acres by changing the district classification from Business, General B-2 to Residential

General R-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the application and supporting material with the Board which included the Planning Commission recommendations. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on December 12, 1984 and because of a technical error held another public hearing on January 9, 1985. At the December 12, 1984 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions and the vote was 6-1. At their January 9, 1985 meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions and the vote was 5-0. Mr. Scheid then read the attached conditions:

1. a minimum buffer strip of 50' be established around the property except where the property abuts the commercial property located along Route 1;
2. the main access road to the R-2 property will have 2 exit lanes, 1 entrance lane, and a 20' median strip between the entrance/exit lanes as shown on the proposed development plan. Also, a deceleration lane would be provided;
3. additional right-of-way along U.S. Route 1 be dedicated to the County for future widening of Route 1;
4. limit density of rezoned property to a maximum of 6 dwelling units per gross acre. A gross acre to be defined as the land available for development prior to dedication of land for roads, utilities, etc.
5. a recreational access to the A.P. Hill Historical Landmark will be provided to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Jay DeBoer, Attorney, was present to represent the applicant, Carl R. Bogese & Associates. Mr. Bogese was also present in support of his application. Mr. DeBoer addressed the following points as summarized below:

1. The proposal is for R-2 zoning with a commercial front, which will provide service and convenience. Dinwiddie County is growing and there is a demand for housing in Dinwiddie, especially for singles, young couples and teachers. R-2 does allow apartments and apartments are housing and are needed.
2. Shopping will be provided in the front and all are in favor of commercial development. Dinwiddie County favors economic growth but is a little different in that the County wants the growth controlled.
3. This parcel of land is in Land Use and is not providing that much income. If developed, it would provide more income. If people move in, personal property taxes will increase along with the real estate enhancement. The County will receive sales tax, business licenses and more people to share in the cost of water and sewer.
4. The conditions were freely agreed to--the 50 foot buffer zone, the density of housing to 6 per acre. Six per acre is pretty sparse.
5. The rezoning request has been called spot zoning. However, it is reasonably compatible and is a logical area for growth on U.S. 1. The County is not in a position for a 26 acre shopping center. There is other comparable zoning the area. The immediate abutting property owners are 310 feet away.

Mr. Lon Henley, Henley Design Group, then described the type of housing being proposed. Names suggested for the development are Sentry Woods and A.P. Hill Plaza.

Mr. H. Clay asked if any market research had been done to indicate the need for apartments in Dinwiddie County. Mr. DeBoer stated there had been no formal research. The need for development is based on a lot of experience as well as contacts in the market. It's called a planned unit development.

Mr. H. Clay then asked what type of construction would be used. Mr. Henley stated it would be wood frame, some brick siding, shingle roof--a conventional residential structure.

Mr. H. Clay asked what the square footage of a unit would be. Mr. Henley stated it would be one bedroom, 600, 800 or 900 sq. ft., depending on the market needs.

Mr. H. Clay asked when would the market research be done. Mr. DeBoer stated the investment of funds for that is based on the Board's decision tonight.

Mr. H. Clay asked if any 3-bedroom units are being considered. Mr. DeBoer stated he would guess 75% of the development would be one bedroom.

Mr. H. Clay stated that he had seen no reference to single family dwelling areas. Mr. DeBoer stated that the parcel of land divides into 3 pieces, a commercial front, the next half of 8 acres and then 12 acres in the back. The commercial front is expensive to build. The next development would be 8 acres with multi-family dwellings and green areas left as another buffer. The back 12 acres would be for single family dwellings, in a more isolated area further away from the road. Mr. H. Clay asked if the developers are willing to commit to single family dwellings in the back. Mr. DeBoer answered no, but it was certainly a viable alternative.

Mr. H. Clay then stated if the property is rezoned to R-2, they could develop it all into apartments. Mr. DeBoer stated yes, it could be 120 units on a 22 acre tract of land but the limit of 6 per acre is not profitable.

Mr. Larry Diehl, Attorney, was present to represent the opposition to this rezoning. A number of landowners in the area were also present in opposition.

Mr. Diehl provided a copy of his "statement in opposition" along with petitions consisting of over 100 landowners, adjacent to or near the subject parcel, opposing the rezoning to be made a part of the minutes.

Mr. Diehl then touched briefly on the major points of his statement. He added that the Board is dealing with legal standards of evidence of rezoning a parcel of land. The parcel has been in its present zoning for some time without a change. In order to change the zoning, they need standards of evidence showing a substantial change in the area. This has not been shown, only a general need. He felt the Board would be giving a blank check for a market survey which may result in a change of plans. He added that he did not see any recreational facilities on the plans. If the proposal was intended to be for family dwellings, how can 75% be one bedroom.

The main points of his statement of opposition are as follows:

1. The rezoning application is opposed by the almost unanimous opposition of surrounding property owners and citizens of Dinwiddie County in the general vicinity of the said property.

2. No rezoning, without any restrictions whatsoever, should be approved prior to proper studies of the impacts on the County first being performed in sufficient detail.

3. An approval of the request as presented would leave the County powerless over the future development of this land as R-2 should ownership change or the purpose of the apartments change after approval.

4. The proposed project is a threat to surrounding land owners in that the values of said surrounding properties would be decreased, based upon similar property values depreciating in other housing developments which have been built by Bogese Associates in other geographical areas.

5. The approval of the proposed project would violate both the spirit and specific provisions of the County's comprehensive land use plan.

6. The approval of the proposed project would constitute spot zoning in violation of both local and state ordinances and law in regards to rezoning approval.

7. Any approval of the proposed rezoning with conditional zoning restrictions would be void for failure to comply with Sec. .5.1-491.2 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as Amended.

In conclusion, Mr. Diehl stated he didn't feel the County should give the company a blank check at this point. Not that housing is wrong, but there is a middle ground--R-1, to still allow single family units. He added certainly the rezoning could be tabled for more facts.

Mr. John Talmage, an adjacent landowner, also spoke in opposition. His main concerns were that the entire property would be developed into apartments, increased burden on the County as well as the fire department and Sheriff's personnel. He felt the property is most suitable for R-1 zoning.

Mr. DeBoer gave his rebuttal and closing remarks. Mr. Bennett stated that there are houses closer than 310 feet. Mr. DeBoer agreed, the Blick property.

The Chairman thanked the two lawyers for their clarity. Mr. Edsell Long also spoke in opposition.

Mr. Robertson stated that he wanted to comment on some of the statements made. He felt the Sheriff's Department could handle the situation. The newly elected Sheriff has carried out his promises with the support of the Board. He also stated the fire department had capable volunteers that give alot of their time and have been supported by the Board with new equipment. He continued stating that it had been said that if the Board did not change the zoning, they were not progressive. He stated this Board has worked hard and done a great deal to bring industry into the County and he felt the County is progressing.

Mr. Robertson stated he was elected to serve the citizens of Dinwiddie County and represent the Rohoic District. Mr. Robertson moved that rezoning application P-84-4 of Carl Bogese & Associates be denied. Mr. H. Clay seconded the motion.

Mr. Bennett stated he felt this particular area is a good location for apartments. The Planning Commission held two public hearings and he felt they put forth an outstanding effort. He added that he felt the County is progressive in locating industry and at some point would need apartments, which they could fill at this time. There is R-2 zoning in the area. It has been suggested that the property is more ideal than the land on Lewis Road. He suggested maybe Mr. Bogese would like to approach that property owner. Personally, Mr. Bennett felt the subject property under consideration tonight is better.

He stated that vandalism can come with single family dwellings as well as the same type of people that occupy apartments. He added that he had voted that it was a good decision rather than represent 100 people.

Mr. H. Clay stated he wrestled long and hard with his decision. He came originally with the feeling there was some need

for apartments but had heard nothing positive tonight about need. He did not feel it was the worst location in Dinwiddie County. He thought there was an indication that an area for single family development was set aside but the developer made no commitment tonight. They might see all the development as apartments. Defending the Namozine VFD and the Sheriff's Department was not a factor in his decision. He felt they can handle the job. Mr. H. Clay concluded stating he felt R-1 or R-1A would be more appropriate.

Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Bennett voting "nay", rezoning application P-84-4 of Carl Bogese and Associates was denied.

Mr. Hargrave added that as a Supervisor, when he considers a rezoning he looks at what can be done in the present zoning as it exists. He stated he did not doubt the sincerity of the developer but was a bit disappointed to hear the developer was closed minded to any other consideration. He felt it could be designed so that R-2 is on part of the property, then R-1A could surround it as a buffer. Then it would behoove the developer to develop and maintain the center to enhance the R-1 surrounding.

Mr. Talmage stated he apologized if he offended the Sheriff's Department and fire department. He was only thinking about the extra burden.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 9:22 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 9:26 P.M.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-84-6

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 15-30. Drawing, paragraph (a) of the Dinwiddie County subdivision ordinance.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the amendment and recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their December 12, 1984 meeting.

Mr. Scheid stated the amendment was brought up by the Water Authority, because they ran into a problem with dedication of utility easements at a subdivision.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA, that Section 15-30, paragraph (a), Owner's consent and dedication statement, of the Dinwiddie County Subdivision Ordinance be amended by adding the words shown in brackets:

a. Owner's consent and dedication statement.

Know all men by these presents, that the subdivision of land as shown on this plat, containing ___ acres, more or less, and designated ___ Subdivision, situated in the ___ District, in the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, is with the free consent and in accordance with the desires of the undersigned owners thereof; that all streets, (utility easements, and drainage easements) shown on said plat are hereby dedicated to the public use, and that all lots within the subdivision are subject to certain restrictions, reservations, stipulations and covenants as contained in a writing executed by the undersigned, under the date of _____, 19___, and recorded in the Clerk's Office of Dinwiddie County, in deed book___, page _____. The said ___ acres of land hereby subdivided having been conveyed to _____ by _____ by deed dated _____, 19___, and of record in the

Clerk's Office of the circuit court of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, in deed book___, at page___. Given our hands this___day of___, 19__.

Signature _____

Signature _____

In all other respects said ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-84-7

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 15-36, paragraph (a) of the Dinwiddie County Subdivision Ordinance entitled dedication of land for public use.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the material and the recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their December 12, 1984 meeting.

Mr. Scheid stated that part of the amendment could be handled administratively with a separate document. As it now stands, when a developer provides a bond and records a plat for a subdivision, there is no time frame set out for him to make improvements, i.e. finishing roads.

Mr. Hargrave questioned whether they could adopt an ordinance with an administrative policy in a separate agreement. The Ass't County Attorney stated he had no problem with it. That way, the time limit could be changed administratively.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. H. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie, Virginia that section 15-36 entitled Dedication of Land for Public Use, paragraph (a) shall be amended by adding the following (that which is underlined) to the end of the paragraph:

(a)and conditioned upon the maintenance of such road until such time as it is accepted into the State Highway System. In addition to the above, the owner or developer shall enter into an agreement with the County, and/or the Authority, said agreement provided to the owner or developer by the County and/or Authority, in which the owner or developer shall commit himself to a period of time during which improvements shall be completed.

In all other respects said subdivision ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-85-1

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to hold a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend a portion of Sec. 17-1 of the County Code by deleting the definition of dwelling, single-family mobile home, and dwelling, multiple-family and adding definition for dwelling, single-family dwelling, mobile home and dwelling, multiple-family.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the material and reviewed the action of the Planning Commission wherein they recommended approval at their January 9, 1985 meeting. Mr. Scheid stated the current definitions are confusing and he was recommending the definition used by the State.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors, Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the County Zoning Ordinance be amended by deleting the following definitions from Section 17-1:

Dwelling, single-family. A structure arranged or designed to be occupied by one family, the structure having only one dwelling unit.

Mobile home. A mobile home is a single-family dwelling designed for transportation, after fabrication, on streets and highways on its own wheels or on flatbed or other trailers and arriving at the site where it is to be occupied as a dwelling complete and ready for occupancy, except for minor and incidental unpacking and assembly operation, location on jacks or permanent foundations, connection to utilities and the like.

Dwelling, multiple-family. A structure arranged or designed to be occupied by more than one family.

In its stead, the following definitions shall be added to Section 17-1:

Dwelling, mobile home. A structure, transportable in one or more sections, which, in the traveling mode, is eight body feet or more in width or forty body feet or more in length, or, when erected on site, is 320 or more square feet. It is built on a permanent chassis and designed to be used as a dwelling unit with or without a permanent foundation when connected to the required utilities. The mobile home includes the plumbing, heating, air conditioning, and electrical systems.

Dwelling, single-family. A structure, other than a mobile home dwelling or travel trailer, arranged or designed to be occupied by one family, the structure having only one dwelling unit.

Dwelling, multiple-family. A structure arranged or designed to be occupied by more than one family and containing two or more dwelling units.

In all other respects said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-85-2

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend Sec. 17-11 and Sec. 17-18 of the Dinwiddie County Code by adding mobile home as a permitted use.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, reviewed the material and the recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their January 9, 1985 meeting. Mr. Scheid stated this was a housekeeping item.

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. A. Clay, seconded by Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye"

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the County Zoning Ordinance be amended by adding mobile home as a permitted use to Section 17-11 and Section

17-18 as follows:

Section 17-11

(25) Mobile home.

Section 17-18

(46) Mobile home.

In all other respects said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING--AMENDMENT A-85-3

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on Wednesday, December 26, 1984 and Wednesday, January 2, 1985 for the Board of Supervisors to conduct a public hearing to consider for adoption an ordinance to amend the county code by adding the definition of gross acre to Sec. 17-1 and establishing a maximum density for dwelling units per gross acre in Article VII, Residential, General, District R-2.

Mr. W.C. Scheid, Director of Planning, presented the material and the recommendation of the Planning Commission. They recommended approval at their January 9, 1985 meeting.

Mr. Scheid pointed out that there is no density factor in the present R-2 zoning, only a limit on units per square foot. He arrived at 6 through the Urban Land Institute which recommends 6 as a median figure. The gross acre was chosen because it is easier to calculate.

Mr. Hargrave asked how they could limit the area of the density requirement. Mr. Scheid stated it couldn't be limited with this amendment. There could be 600 units on a 10 acre tract.

Mr. Hargrave suggested Mr. Scheid pursue it a little further by adding verbiage such as "no one acre shall have any more than..., or no two to three acres shall exceed....."

No one appeared in support nor opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the zoning ordinance be amended as follows:

1. Add the following definition to Section 17-1:

Acre, Gross. The area available for development before acreage is dedicated for such things as roads, open spaces, and other public uses.

2. Add a new section to Article VII.

Section 17-50A. Maximum Density.

In residential district R-2, a maximum density of six (6) dwelling units per gross acre shall be permitted.

In all other respects said Zoning Ordinance is hereby reordained.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr.

Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", pursuant to Sec. 2.1-344(6) of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, the Board moved into Executive Session at 10:00 P.M. to discuss legal matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 10:51 P.M.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. H. Clay, seconded by Mr. A. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting was adjourned at 10:52 P.M.


M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

ATTEST: 
W.C. KNOTT