

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY HELD AT THE AGRICULTURAL BUILDING OF SAID COUNTY ON THE 5TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 1973 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT: M. I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN ELECTION DISTRICT #4  
S. E. WINN, VICE CHAIRMAN ELECTION DISTRICT #1  
R. H. RUNDLE ELECTION DISTRICT #2  
G. A. CROWDER ELECTION DISTRICT #3  
T. H. TUNSTALL ELECTION DISTRICT #5  
  
C. L. MITCHELL SHERIFF  
J. F. ANDREWS COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Crowder, all members voting "aye", the minutes of the August 1st meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mr. F. E. Jones presented his report for the month of August 1973.

IN RE: ESCROW AGREEMENT - BANK OF SOUTHSIDE VIRGINIA ROHOIC

Upon motion of Mr. Crowder, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Hargrave, voting "aye", the following resolution was adopted:

RESOLVED that, the agreement dated the eighth day of August 1973, between the Treasurer for the County of Dinwiddie, Virginia, the County Treasurer of said County as Depositor, the Bank of Southside Virginia Rohoic-Dinwiddie County Office as Depository, and First and Merchants National Bank of Richmond, Virginia as Escrow Agent, is approved; and that the Chairman is authorized to execute and deliver the agreement on behalf of this Board.

FURTHER RESOLVED that, First and Merchants National Bank of Richmond, Virginia, as Escrow Agent under the aforesaid agreement, is authorized, in carrying out any of the provisions of said agreement, to act upon written instructions signed by any two members of this Board.

IN RE: COMMISSIONER OF THE REVENUE

Mr. R. W. Bridgman gave a brief recap of the status of the Board of Equalization. It was his understanding that they had finished conducting their open meetings and were now in the process of studying the assessments made throughout the County.

IN RE: DOG WARDEN

Mr. A. W. Chappell presented his report for the month of August 1973.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the following two claims were approved:

John E. Harrison, Route 1, Box 175, Petersburg, Virginia 28 chickens, \$28.00. Carl S. Gregory, Route 3, Box 557, Petersburg, Virginia, one Rabbit - \$1.50.

IN RE: CONTRACT - PETERSBURG GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mrs. King B. Talley presented to the Board a contract with Petersburg General Hospital for State and Local Hospitalization, contract price per day \$60.35.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by JMr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Chairman was authorized to sign this contract on behalf of Dinwiddie County.

IN RE: SUPERINTENDENT SCHOOLS

Mr. T. W. Newsom told the Board schools opened on September 4th with very little difficulty, and the student enrollment was running a little behind projection.

He stated that at the School Board meeting next Tuesday afternoon, September 11th, some representatives from the State Board of Education were to be out to discuss the vocational school situation. All the Board members asked to be reminded by letter of this meeting. Mr. Newsom stated he would do so.

Mr. Newsom indicated that the open house for the new school located on U. S. Route 1, South, would be held the latter part of September or the first of October.

IN RE: DIRECTOR DINWIDDIE COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Dr. J. G. McNiel presented to the Board of Supervisors Mr. Tom Quarry, Director Alcoholism Services, 9 Marshall Street, Petersburg, Virginia. Mr. Quarry gave the Board a brief description of the services that his unit rendered to this area.

IN RE: PAYMENT OF SALARIES & CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Crowder voting "aye", it is ordered by the Board that the accounts against the following funds for the month of August 1973, be issued payable out of the respective accounts. General Fund - Checks numbering 73-1133 through 73-1277 amounting to \$40,854.38. Dog Fund - Checks numbering D-73-68 through D-73-76 amounting to \$892.50.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-2 MR. CHARLES W. HARRISON

At the August 1st meeting, the Board of Supervisors heard Mr. Harrison's request to have land parcel 31A as shown on Section 9 of the Zoning Map of Dinwiddie County containing .79 acres, located in Rhoic District, on Route 600, rezoned from Residential R-1 to Business B-1. In addition, they heard the opposition to this rezoning request.

The Board decided that since Mr. Gerald Crowder, in who's district this property lies, was absent, they would postpone the decision on this rezoning request until the September 5th meeting.

Mr. Rundle moved that this rezoning request be denied. There was no second. The vote was as follows: Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Rundle "aye", Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Crowder, "nay", Mr. Rundle's motion to deny this request was defeated.

ON RE: DECISION ON REGIONAL LIBRARY

At the June 20th meeting, Mr. Chamberlain of the State Library and Mr. Robert A. Whitesides, Librarian for the City of Hopewell appeared before the Board and presented a 10 year regional library plan for the City of Hopewell and the Counties of Prince George and Dinwiddie. At that time the Board indicated to those two gentlemen they would like additional time to study this matter before they gave them a decision, but there was one big problem and that was no money was budgeted for a regional library in the 1973-74 budget for Dinwiddie County.

Mr. Tunstall, Chairman of the County Library Committee stated that in the past session of the General Assembly, a law was passed enabling the local governing bodies to place a public library in a school. Mr. Tunstall further stated he would like additional time to study this law and its effects before he rendered a decision. Mr. Hargrave made it perfectly clear to the Board that some decision must be given to Prince George as their participation in the regional library was contingent upon Dinwiddie County's participation. The supervisors expressed concern over the fact that it was not known to what degree the library service would be used. It was suggested that some type of survey be taken through the school system to determine the interest in a public library. After much discussion and upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, all members voting "aye", Mr. Tunstall and his library committee were given the following instructions:

1. Review the feasibility and cost of the proposed regional library.
2. Review the feasibility and cost of locating the public library with the high school library.
3. This committee make a recommendation on one of the two alternatives.

The Chairman, Mr. Hargrave declared a 5 minute recess. When Mr. Hargrave reconvened the meeting he declared that at this time the Board of Supervisors was in joint session with the Planning Commission. The following members of the Planning Commission were present: Vice Chairman, P. A. Glass, Jr., Mrs. Romona Leetch, Mr. J. O. Lee, Mr. Danny McKenney, Mr. Joe Lyle and Mr. Rundle, who is the Board of Supervisor's member on the Planning Commission.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING - SHOPPING DISTRICT B-3 ORDINANCE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index, on August 23rd and 30th for the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission to meet in joint session to consider an ordinance to amend the zoning ordinance as contained in the Dinwiddie County Code by the addition of an article establishing provisions for a shopping center district - District B-3 and setting forth requirements related thereto.

The County Administrator presented to the Board of Supervisors an ordinance drafted by he and the Director of Planning for the Crater Planning District Commission, Mr. Dennis K. Morris. For nearly two hours, this ordinance was discussed and rediscussed, with one change being made and that was in Section 17-67F - Sign Limitations. This change was made to accommodate the Pierce Bros., owners of Pierce Development Co., who had already started a shopping center at the Intersection of Route 226 and U. S. Route 1.

Mr. Hargrave called upon Mr. Glass to poll his group for a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Upon motion duly made and carried, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended to the Board of Supervisors that the shopping center district - District B-3 ordinance be adopted.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, that the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended, be further amended by the addition of Article IX (a), Shopping Center, District B-3, to read as follows:

ARTICLE IX (a). SHOPPING CENTER, DISTRICT B-3

Sec. 17-67 (a). Composition: Purposes

Shopping Center, District B-3 is designed to permit the development of attractive and efficient retail shopping facilities of integrated design in appropriate locations to serve residential neighborhoods. Recognizing that it is not possible or desirable to attempt to precisely outline Shopping Center Districts on vacant land prior to population growth and related residential development and/or construction of major thoroughfares, which together are prerequisites of well-planned properly located modern shopping center developments, the following procedures and requirements are established for the development of a Shopping Center, District B-3.

Sec. 17-67 (b). Permitted Uses

In shopping center district B-3, the uses permitted shall include retail commercial and service establishments serving the needs of the market area including those uses ordinarily accepted as shopping center uses.

Sec. 17-67 (c). Ownership

In order that the purpose of the shopping center district B-3 shall be realized, the land and the buildings and appurtenant facilities shall be in a single ownership, or under management or supervision of a central authority. Any transfer of land within the district resulting in ownership within the district by one or more parties after an application has been filed shall not alter the applicability of the regulations contained herein.

Sec. 17-67 (d). Dimensional Requirements

1. The minimum site area shall be three (3) acres.
2. The minimum distance from any street right-of-way to any building shall be thirty-five (35) feet.
3. The minimum distance from other property lines to any building shall be twenty-five (25) feet, for any building under thirty-five (35) feet in height.
4. For buildings over thirty-five (35) feet in height, the minimum distance from other property lines to any such buildings shall be twenty-five (25) feet, plus one (1) foot for each additional foot of building height over thirty-five (35) feet.

Sec. 17-67 (e). Utility Requirements

All buildings developed in the shopping center district, B-3 shall be served wherever practicable by underground utilities.

Sec. 17-67 (f). Sign Limitations

One sign not exceeding eighty (80) square feet in area and thirty-five (35) feet in height and announcing only the name and/or the location of the shopping center shall be permitted. All individual business signs within the shopping center shall be attached to, or made integral with, the principal building. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the governing body may, in the ordinance rezoning the property, permit one additional sign to serve either or both of the foregoing purposes, which sign need not be attached to building, but which shall conform to the size and height limitations set forth above. The Zoning Administrator must approve the size of each individual business sign within the shopping center.

Sec. 17-67 (g). Off-Street Parking and Loading

1. Off-street parking spaces shall be provided in the ratio of at least one (1) parking space for each two hundred (200) square feet of floor area in the shopping center.
2. Off-street loading space shall be provided with area, location, and design appropriate to the needs of the shopping center. In the process of loading or unloading, no truck shall block the passage of other vehicles or extend into any public or private drive or street used for traffic circulation. No space designated as required off-street parking area for the general public shall be used as an off-street loading space.

Sec. 17-67 (h). Screening and Landscaping

1. Landscaping or other devices shall be used to screen surrounding residential districts from open service, storage, and loading operations within the shopping center.

2. Any part of the shopping center area not used for buildings or other structures, parking, loading, pedestrian walks, accessways shall be landscaped with grass, trees, or shrubs.

Sec. 17-67 (i). Procedure for Establishing a Shopping Center District

1. Before submitting an application for a Shopping Center District, an applicant at his option may confer with the Planning Commission to obtain information and guidance before entering into binding commitments or incurring substantial expense in the preparation of plans, surveys, and other data.

2. Applications for a Shopping Center District shall be submitted as for other amendments under Section 17-8 of the Code of the County. Material submitted with the application or on subsequent request by the Planning Commission shall include all plans, maps, studies, and reports which may reasonably be required to make the determinations called for in the particular case, with sufficient copies for necessary referrals and records. More specifically, all of the following shall be required.

Development Plan

The Development Plan shall be clearly drawn to a scale and shall show the following:

1. The proposed location and size of structures, indicating tenant types (uses) and total square feet in buildings.

2. The proposed size, location, and use of other portions of the tract, including landscaped, parking, loading, service, maintenance, and other areas or spaces.

3. The proposed provision of water, sanitary sewer, and surface drainage facilities, including engineering feasibility studies or other evidence of reasonableness.

4. The proposed traffic circulation pattern, including access drives, parking arrangement, pedestrian walks and safety areas, and the relationship to existing and proposed external streets and traffic patterns with evidence of reasonableness.

5. Potential population and area to be served by the proposed shopping center.

6. Evidence that the applicant has sufficient control over the land to effectuate the proposed Development Plan. Evidence of control includes property rights and the engineering feasibility data which may be necessary and the economic feasibility studies (market analysis or other data justifying the proposed development).

The Planning Commission and/or the Board of Supervisors may establish additional requirements, and in special cases, may waive a particular requirement if, in their opinion, the inclusion of that requirement is not essential to a proper decision on the project.

Final plans and reports approved shall be binding on the applicant and any successors in interest so long as B-3 zoning applies.

The shopping center may be built in stages in accordance with a construction timing schedule approved by the Board of Supervisors. If there is not substantial compliance with the approved schedule, the Board of Supervisors may, after expiration of a period of three (3) years from the date of final approval, void the approval.

Upon termination of an approval, the Planning Commission

shall review the circumstances and recommend to the Board of Supervisors that:

1. B-3 zoning for the entire area be continued with revised time limits, and the remainder rezoned to an appropriate category;
2. B-3 zoning be continued for part of the area with revised time limits, and the remainder rezoned to an appropriate category;
3. The entire area be rezoned from B-3 to an appropriate category. Such recommendation shall include proposals for appropriate action in respect to any legal instruments involved in the case.

An extension of the time limit or modification of the approved Development Plan may be approved if the Board of Supervisors finds that such extension or modification is not in conflict with the public interest.

If required by the Board of Supervisors, a surety bond shall be filed for, or deposited in escrow with the County, a sum sufficient to insure completion of special requirements as may be imposed by the Board of Supervisors.

IN RE: OFF STREET PARKING ORDINANCE

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 23rd and 30th for the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission to meet in joint session to consider an ordinance to amend and reordain the definition of Off Street Parking Area, as contained in Section 17-1 of the Zoning Ordinance.

After a brief discussion, and upon motion duly made and carried the Planning Commission recommended to the Board of Supervisors that this ordinance be adopted.

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Crowder, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye",

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF DINWIDDIE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, that the definition of "off-street parking area" as contained in Section 17-1 of the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended, be amended by the deletion of said definition as it presently exists and the substitution of the following definition, and in all other respects Section 17-1 is reordained:

Off-street parking area. An All-weather surfaced area provided for vehicular parking outside the dedicated street right-of-way having an area of not less than one hundred and eighty (180) square feet, exclusive of driveways, permanently reserved for the temporary storage of one automobile and connected with a street or alley by an all-weather surfaced driveway which affords satisfactory ingress and egress for automobiles.

Mr. Crowder asked the Chairman to be excused from the meeting because he felt ill. Mr. Hargrave declared a 5 minute recess.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-9 MR. W. W. HOWARD

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 23rd and 30th for the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County to conduct a public hearing on the rezoning request of Mr. W. W. Howard, Dinwiddie, Virginia to have land parcel 52B as shown on Section 45 of the Zoning Map of Dinwiddie County, containing 9.91 acres located in Rowanty District on Route 703 rezoned from Residential R-1 to Agricultural A-2. No one appeared in favor of this rezoning request, no one appeared in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, all members voting "aye", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the said map of said County adopted as part of the zoning ordinance of Dinwiddie County Code on April 1, 1970, be amended in that the classification of the tract composed of parcel 52B as shown on Section 45 of the zoning map be and the same is hereby changed from Residential R-1 to Agricultural A-2.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-10 MR. RUDOLPH L. HOTZ

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 23rd and 30th for the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors to hold a public hearing to consider the rezoning application of Mr. Rudolph L. Hotz, 1533 Flank Road, Petersburg, Virginia, to have portion of land parcel 21 and 21A as shown on Section 23 of the Zoning Map of Dinwiddie County, containing approximately 17 acres located in Rohoic District just off of Route 608 Johnson Road, rezoned from Agricultural A-2 to Residential R-2.

No one spoke in favor of this rezoning application, no one spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Winn, all members voting "aye", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the said map of said County adopted as part of the Zoning Ordinance of Dinwiddie County Code on April , 1970, be amended in that the classification of the tract composed of a portion of parcels 21 and 21A, as shown on Section 23 of the Zoning map be and the same is hereby changed from Agricultural A-2 to Residential R-2.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-11 CURTIS C. GENTRY

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 23rd and 30th for the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors to hold a public hearing to consider the rezoning request of Mr. Curtis C. Gentry, Route 4, Box 356, Petersburg, Virginia to have land parcel 26 as shown on Section 20 of the Zoning Map of Dinwiddie County containing 7 acres located in Rohoic District on Route 226, rezoned from Residential R-1 to Business B-2.

No one spoke in favor of this rezoning and no one spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, voting "aye", Mr. Hargrave "nay", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County that the said map of said County adopted as part of the Zoning Ordinance of Dinwiddie County Code on April 1, 1970, be amended in that the classification of the tract composed of parcel 26 and shown on Section 20 of said zoning map, be and the same is hereby changed from Residential R-1 to Business B-2.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-12 MR. B. C. MEDLOCK

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 23rd and 30th for Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors to hold a public hearing to consider the rezoning request of Mr. B. C. Medlock, P. O. Box 974, McKenney, Virginia, to have a portion of land parcel 33 as shown on Section 91 of the Zoning Map of Dinwiddie County, containing 2.59 acres located in Sapony District on Route 654, rezoned from Agricultural A-2 to Residential R-1.

No one spoke in favor of this rezoning request, no one spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, all members voting "aye", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, that the said map of said County adopted as part of the Zoning Ordinance of the Dinwiddie County Code, on April 1, 1970, be amended in that the classification of the tract composed of parcel 33 as shown on Section 91 of said Zoning Map be and the same is hereby changed from Agricultural A-2 to Residential R-1.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-73-13 BANK OF VIRGINIA CENTRAL

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 23rd and 30th for the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors to hold a public hearing to consider the rezoning request of the Bank of Virginia Central, Dinwiddie, Virginia to have land parcel (3) 11B, 11C, 11D and 12 as shown on Section 57A of the Zoning Map of Dinwiddie County containing 0.71 acres located in Rowanty District on U. S. Route 1 and State Route 1402 rezoned from Residential R-1 to Business B-2.

No one spoke in favor of this rezoning request, no one spoke in opposition.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Rundle, all members present voting "aye", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the said map of said County adopted as part of the zoning ordinance of Dinwiddie County Code on April 1, 1970, be amended in that the classification of the tract composed of parcels (3) 11B, 11C, 11D and 12 as shown on Section 57A of said Zoning Map be and the same is hereby changed from Residential R-1 to Business B2.

IN RE: ADOPTION OF STATE WIDE BUILDING CODE, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 1973

This being the time and place as advertised in the Progress-Index on August 23rd and 30th for the Dinwiddie County Board of Supervisors to consider for adoption and ordinance to amend and reordain Chapter 6 of the Dinwiddie County Code pertaining to building regulations by providing for the Adoption of the Virginia Uniform State Wide Building Code and providing for a building inspection department and retention of the existing fee schedule to bring the County in conformity with the state regulations.

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, all members voting "aye", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that Chapter 6, "BUILDING REGULATIONS," of the Dinwiddie County Code, as adopted April 1, 1970, and as heretofore amended, be further amended as follows, and be it reordained:

(a) All Sections of Chapter 6, "Building Regulations" are repealed and deleted.

(b) The following provisions shall be added to and shall constitute Chapter 6, "Building Regulations":

Sec. 6-1. Adoption of Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code. There is hereby adopted by reference, the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code, which is effective September 1, 1973. The provisions of same are adopted and shall control all matters concerning the construction, alteration, addition, repair, removal, demolition, use location, occupancy and maintenance of all buildings, and all other functions which pertain to the installation of systems vital to all buildings and structures and their service equipment as defined by the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code, and shall apply to existing and proposed buildings or structures in the County.



Sec. 6-2. Building Inspection Department.

There is hereby established a building inspection department whose responsibility it is to enforce the provisions of the Virginia uniform Statewide Building Code as stated in Article 1, Section 9 of the Uniform Statewide Building Code. The cost of enforcement may be defrayed through the levying of fees by the locality as provided in Section 36-105 of the Code of Virginia. The department shall have a building official or inspector who shall be appointed by the Board of Supervisors. The building official or inspector shall be responsible for the organization and daily operation of the department, and shall be under the administrative control of the County Administrator.

Sec. 6-3. Fee Schedules. No permit to begin work for new construction or other building operation shall be issued until the fees prescribed hereby have been paid, nor shall an amendment to a permit be approved until the additional fee, if any, due to an increase in the estimated cost of the construction or other building operations shall have been paid. No fee shall be charged for building and plumbing permits for the construction or alteration of farm outbuildings located on a bona fide farm and used in connection with farming operations which cost less than ten thousand dollars. No fee shall be charged for electrical permits for the construction or alteration of farm outbuildings located on a bona fide farm and used in connection with farming operations which cost less than two thousand dollars.

(a) For a permit for the construction or alteration of a building or structure, the fee shall be at the rate of one dollar and fifty cents per thousand dollars of the estimated cost up to twenty thousand dollars; plus one dollar per thousand dollars of the estimated cost in excess of twenty thousand dollars up to one hundred thousand dollars plus fifty cents per thousand dollars of the estimated cost in excess of one hundred thousand dollars; but not less than two dollars in any case; provided, that no fee shall be required when the estimated cost does not exceed one hundred dollars.

(b) For a permit for the removal of a building or structure from one lot to another, the fee shall be at the rate of one dollar per thousand dollars of the estimated value of the building or structure in its completed condition after removal.

(c) For a permit for the removal of a building or structure to a new location within the same lot, the fee shall be at the rate of one dollar per thousand dollars of the estimated cost of moving, of new foundations and of work necessary to put the building or structure in usable condition in its new location.

(d) For a permit for the demolition of a building or structure the fee shall be at the rate of three dollars for each ten feet in the height of such building or structure plus one per cent additional for each foot of frontage of the building or structure in excess of fifty feet.

(e) For a permit to install, alter or modify a heating system, an air conditioning system or a combination heating and air conditioning system, in any building or structure, the fee shall be one dollar and fifty cents per room; provided, that the minimum fee shall be five dollars for buildings of five thousand square feet of floor space or less, and fifteen dollars for buildings of more than five thousand square feet of floor space, provided, further, that no charge shall be made for bathrooms, closets or unheated or unairconditioned rooms or floor space.

(f) Electrical fees:

1. For light outlets:

From 1 to 10 outlets, inclusive-----	\$1.00.
11 to 15 outlets, inclusive-----	\$1.50.
16 to 25 outlets, inclusive-----	\$2.00.
26 to 50 outlets, inclusive-----	\$3.00.
51 to 250 outlets, inclusive-----	\$5.00.
251 and all over-----	10.00

2. For fixture outlets:

From 1 to 5 sockets, inclusive-----	.50.
6 to 10 sockets, inclusive-----	.75.
11 to 25 sockets, inclusive-----	\$1.00.
26 to 50 sockets, inclusive-----	\$1.50.
51 to 100 sockets, inclusive-----	\$2.00.
101 to 200 sockets, inclusive-----	\$3.00.
3. Electric ranges-----	\$2.00.
4. Electric heat (per room)-----	\$1.50.
5. Water heaters-----	\$1.00.
6. Connecting neon signs-----	\$1.00.
7. Oil furnaces-----	\$1.00.
8. Connecting air conditionings-----	\$1.00.

9. Water pumps -----	\$1.00.
10. Electric dryers-----	\$2.00.
11. Meter base-----	\$3.00.
12. Exhaust fans-----	\$1.00.

13. Apparatus not mentioned above. Charges for electrical apparatus not mentioned above shall be according to number of amperes in rated output, as follows:

Change over-----	\$3.00.
Temporary service-----	\$1.00.
Up to and including 5 amperes-----	.75.
Over 5 amperes and not exceeding 10-----	\$1.50.
Over 10 amperes and not exceeding 15-----	\$2.25.

Over 15 amperes and not exceeding  
50-----\$3.75.

All over 50 amperes----- 5.00.

14. The minimum fee for an electrical permit  
shall be----- 3.00.

(g) Plumbing fees:

For each permit requiring inspection, a minimum fee of two dollars, plus, for each fixture, drain or connection requiring a trap, an additional fee of one dollar and fifty cents.

(h) Definition of "estimated cost."

The term "estimated cost" as used in this chapter means the reasonable value of all services, labor, materials and use of scaffolding and other appliances or devices entering into and necessary to the prosecution and completion of the work ready for occupancy; provided, that the cost of grading, painting, decorating or other work that is merely for embellishment or not necessary for the safe and lawful use of the building or structure, is not deemed a part of such estimated cost.

IN RE: DESIGNATION OF 1973-74 REVENUE SHARING FUNDS

Upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Winn, Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the \$383,711.00 to be received by the County of Dinwiddie from the office of Revenue Sharing for the fiscal year 1973-74, was designated to be used for multi-purpose and general government.

IN RE: COMMITTEE TO RECOMMEND ARCHITECT FOR COURTHOUSE AND/OR NEW OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. Hargrave appointed himself as chairman, Frank Jones the treasurer and the county administrator to a committee to screen architects and to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the retention of a particular firm to assist the County in the designing of its new office building and/or restoration of the courthouse.

IN RE: DR. R. R. BUTTERWORTH APPOINTED TO PLANNING COMMISSION

Upon motion of Mr. Tunstall, seconded by Mr. Rundle, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave, Mr. Winn voting "aye", Dr. R. R. Butterworth was appointed to the Planning Commission of Dinwiddie County effective September 6, 1973 to fill the unexpired term of Mr. P. A. Glass, Jr., who resigned. Dr. Butterworth's term of office will expire December 31, 1974.

IN RE: PUBLIC HEARINGS TO RESTRICT TRAFFIC ON ROUTE 603

Mr. Rundle read the following portion of a letter he had received from the Commonwealth's Attorney. "Under Virginia Code Section 46.1-171.2, the State Highway Commission in response to a formal request by the Board of Supervisors may prohibit or restrict the use by through traffic of any part of a secondary highway, if a reasonable alternate route is provided, by any truck, truck and trailer or semi-trailer combination except a pickup or panel truck. The formal request by the Board of Supervisors can only be made after the Board has held a public hearing after due notice."

"Therefore, if the Board wishes to consider making such a request in reference to a particular secondary road, it should adopt a resolution authorizing the advertisement of and the holding of a public hearing relative to the request as it relates to the specific road."

Mr. Rundle stated he would very much like to have the Board conduct public hearings so that Route 603 West may be restricted to through trucks. Particularly those trucks operating out of the rock quarry on Route 226.

Therefore upon motion of Mr. Rundle, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, all members voting "aye", the County Administrator was authorized to advertise in the Progress-Index, date, time and location for the public hearings to be held by the Board of Supervisors to consider restricting through traffic on Route 603 West.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION - P- 73-2 CHARLES W. HARRISON

The Commonwealth's Attorney brought to the attention of the Chairman of the Board, that the decision rendered by the Board of Supervisors in regard to the Harrison rezoning had neither been denied nor approved. The motion made by Mr. Rundle was for denial and this motion was defeated. Since no subsequent motion was made, no action had been taken by the Board.

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Winn, Mr. Tunstall, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", Mr. Rundle "nay", be it ordained by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, that the said map of said county adopted as part of the zoning ordinance of the Dinwiddie County Code on April 1, 1970, be amended in that the classification of the tract composed of parcel 31A as shown on Section 9 of said Zoning Map, be and the same is hereby changed from Residential R-1 to Business B-1.


IN RE: R. O. MAYES - HOG FARM

The decision scheduled for Mr. R. O. Mayes' conditional use permit to operate a hog farm was scheduled for this meeting. The Commonwealth's Attorney ruled that the Board of Supervisors had no jurisdiction of Mr. Mayes' operation of his hog farm. Therefore the Board was not required to render a decision.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Winn, seconded by Mr. Rundle, Mr. Winn, Mr. Rundle, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 6:30 P.M.

ATTEST:

  
W.C. KNOTT

  
MILTON I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN