

VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DINWIDDIE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HELD IN THE BOARD MEETING ROOM OF THE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING, DINWIDDIE, VIRGINIA ON THE 3RD DAY OF DECEMBER, 1980 AT 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT: M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN ELECTION DISTRICT #3  
A.S. CLAY, VICE-CHAIRMAN ELECTION DISTRICT #4  
G.E. ROBERTSON, JR. ELECTION DISTRICT #2  
STEVE WEBER ELECTION DISTRICT #2

C.L. MITCHELL SHERIFF

ABSENT: G.S. BENNETT, JR. ELECTION DISTRICT #1  
L.G. ELDER COUNTY ATTORNEY

IN RE: MINUTES

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the minutes of the November 19, 1980 meeting were approved as presented.

IN RE: CLAIMS

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, 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:

General Fund checks--numbering 80-2335 thru 80-2432 amounting to \$1,161,359.38.

IN RE: TREASURER

Mrs. Margaret W. Lewis presented her report for the month of November, 1980.

IN RE: SHERIFF--REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Sheriff C.L. Mitchell appeared before the Board to request \$3,000 additional funds for the category of Parttime Dispatchers in his 1980-81 budget. He stated that he had already used 2/3 of his extra help funds which includes part-time dispatchers and parttime cook.

Mr. Weber asked the Sheriff how soon he would need these funds. The Sheriff told him in a couple of months.

Mr. Robertson suggested that since the whole communications picture was under study at this time that consideration of this request be postponed until the study was complete and recommendations made. Mr. Clay and Mr. Weber agreed that action on the request should be postponed.

Upon motion of Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the request for additional funding for parttime dispatchers was postponed.

IN RE: BLINDS FOR JAIL WINDOWS

Sheriff C.L. Mitchell presented a request for window shades to cover the prisoners' windows at the jail. He stated that on many occasions, the prisoners had been a nuisance to citizens because of the uncovered windows.

The Board agreed that this protection was needed and instructed the Sheriff to look into the costs of installing these shades to be considered at the next Budget session.

IN RE: BUILDING INSPECTOR

Mr. James L. Blaha presented his report for the month of November, 1980.

IN RE: ANIMAL WARDEN

Mr. L.A. Brooks, Jr. presented his report for the month of November, 1980.

IN RE: LIVESTOCK CLAIMS--R. CROWDER

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Robertson, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the livestock claim of Mr. R. Crowder for \$165 for 11 turkeys was postponed until the value of the turkeys (\$15 each) can be verified.

IN RE: FUEL PROGRAM--SOCIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Mrs. King B. Talley, Director, Department of Social Services, briefly reviewed the progress on the Fuel Program being administered by her department. She stated the program was simpler this year and was running very smoothly.

IN RE: SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

Dr. Richard Vaughn, Superintendent of Schools, appeared before the Board to review two construction projects, the School Bus Garage and the Sunnyside Elementary School. He stated the School Bus Garage was running on schedule and a preconstruction conference had been held the day before on the Sunnyside School.

IN RE: REZONING APPLICATION P-80-4--CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC HEARING

The public hearing on rezoning application P-80-4, Mr. William Patton, was continued until this meeting. The Director of Planning briefly reviewed the application. Mr. Herbert Williams gave a few opening remarks and was available to answer any questions.

Mr. William Patton appeared before the Board to present his application. Mr. Patton felt that sufficient information had not been presented at the Planning Commission meeting. He presented several exhibits showing the master plan for the area and its relation to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan. He felt the best use for the area is residential. Mr. Patton stated that the lot sizes had been increased to 150 x 300 feet. A soils analysis was presented by Mr. Larry Madison, Soil Scientist.

Mr. Weber asked if Mr. Madison could guarantee that the systems installed on the proposed lots would not fail. Mr. Madison stated that all systems would eventually fail and that was the reason for requiring a back-up system. Mr. Williams asked Mr. Madison if in his professional opinion he thought the lots would function within the County's regulations. Mr. Madison stated they would.

Mr. Patton stated that "strip zoning" as it had been called could be good if the proper balance was kept. He showed pictures of the varieties of houses that would be built and the rehabilitation of two homes in existence.

In reference to industrial planning, Mr. Patton presented a letter from Mr. Ed Sweeny, President, ESE, Inc. and Mr. Dick Boisseau, Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation, stating there was a need for housing in the area. Statistical information on single family dwellings was presented in support of the need for housing. Mr. Patton further stated that the development of the proposed lots would benefit the County by an increase in taxes on the books. Other letters of support were presented from Mr. Robert Ragsdale, Mr. George

Robinson, Mr. B.Z. Clarke and Mr. E.P. Wilkinson.

Mr. Patton further discussed citizen concern over Rt. 615. He stated that Mr. C.B. Perry and Mr. B.C. Medlock of the VDH&T had stated that Rt. 615 would be eligible for paving if the road count were at least 50 and he felt residential development would cause a controlled increase in usage, not develop a speedway. Mr. Patton also stated that he had a petition signed by landowners along the road and users of the road supporting the rezoning application.

Mr. Weber stated he was concerned about the size of the lots and what the people were getting who would be buying them later. Mr. Patton stated he had expanded the size of the lots and there was sufficient room for on site wells and septic systems.

Mr. Weber asked Mr. Patton if he had considered A-R zoning. Mr. Patton stated he had discussed A-R zoning with Mr. Scheid but it would not be economically feasible.

Mr. Robertson asked about the type of houses that would be built. Mr. Patton stated they would be 1200-1400 sq. ft. He also stated that there would be covenants in the deeds restricting the size of the houses and the varieties.

Mr. Robertson stated that he was concerned about the increase in usage of the existing road that needs to be paved and the fact that there are no funds available to do the work within the next few years. He asked if Mr. Patton felt any obligation or desire to help the improvement of the road. Mr. Patton said he did not because it was already the responsibility of the State. Mr. Robertson stated that if the rezoning request were approved, he urged Mr. Patton to add a certain amount of funds toward improving the road. Mr. Patton stated that no matter whether the development was built or not, it would not help the road problems.

Mrs. Kellum stated that if the County wanted progress, they would have to approve some housing, and she asked for a little help for the citizens in that area.

Mr. Robertson asked the Director of Planning if the presentation given at this meeting would change the position taken by the Planning Commission. Mr. Scheid stated that there were several points to be considered. (1) Whatever is done would set a precedent for similar requests in the future. (2) The Comprehensive Land Use Plan would have to be changed or (3) If not, how will similar cases be handled in the future? (4) Why just rezone the road frontage property? Why not rezone the entire parcel, which would force improvement of the road? (5) If R-1 is the best use, would larger lots be desired which would provide less use of water and sewer. (6) A central water system might be required, rather than individual wells and septic system. Mr. Scheid further stated that Mr. Patton had felt the Planning Commission minutes were in error but when presented to the Planning Commission, they said the minutes were correct. He said he was now awaiting a decision from the County Attorney.

Mr. Weber asked if Mr. Patton would consider connecting to water now and sewer later if it was available. Mr. Patton stated economics would not allow him.

Sgt. Major Kellum appeared in support of the rezoning request. As a resident along Rt. 615 he said he desired the development so the area could benefit from better services from the utilities and the county. He further stated that a road count had not been put on the road. He said he had counted as high as 70 cars a day.

Mr. E.P. Wilkinson appeared in support of the rezoning request.

No one appeared in opposition.

Mr. Weber moved that the rezoning request, P-80-4, of William Patton be disapproved. Mr. Robertson seconded the motion stating that the request was not compatible with the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and he saw no reason to overrule the recommendation of the Planning Commission. However, he did have a desire to help the residents in the area. Mr. Weber stated that he did not feel it would help to have 500 more houses at this time. His main concern was with the small lots people would be buying later on.

Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Clay, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the rezoning application, P-80-4 of Mr. William A. Patton was disapproved.

IN RE: RECESS

The Chairman declared a short recess at 4:11 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 4:18 P.M.

IN RE: NAMOZINE VFD--DISCUSSION OF NEW TRUCK

Mr. Bill Queen of the Namozine VFD appeared before the Board to discuss the problems they are having with their 1964 tanker and to present three bids for a new tanker-pumper. He advised the Board that the 1964 pumper had a large hole in the tank and the pumping capacity is not large enough to handle the increased need in the area. Mr. Donald Porter also stated that the brakes on the truck were not adequate to carry the large amount of water. The original date of replacement of the truck was 1984.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the department had looked at retanking the truck. Mr. Porter said they had not because of the baffling that would have to be moved.

The department recommended the truck manufactured by Oren for \$87,959 which would be available by August, 1981.

Mr. Hargrave asked if the Department could get an estimate on retanking the truck until enough money has been set aside to buy a truck as originally scheduled. Mr. Porter stated an estimate could be gotten; however, he wondered what inflation would do to the cost of a new truck later on. He further stated that the brakes would need replacing along with other things due to the age of the truck. Mr. Clay stated that low mileage should not be as harmful on the brakes. Mr. Porter stated that his main concern was the safety of the vehicle. Mr. Robertson suggested that if the truck were retanked to consider a 1500 gallon tank rather than a 2,000 gallon for adequacy of the brakes. Mr. Weber agreed that a new truck was needed and a larger one. Mr. Porter stated that the department had talked with Mr. Ed Sweeny about fire protection for his new industrial needs which would require increased usage of a truck. Mr. Ben Hawkins stated that the truck being proposed was a diesel engine. He further stated that the moral of the department needed support to keep the interest alive.

Mr. Hargrave stated that the County could not do everything at one time; however, he agreed with upgrading the truck when the funds were available.

Mr. Robertson stated that if \$25,000 was being set aside each year, and delivery would be in August, then the Board would only be advancing the schedule by \$30,000. He stated he wanted to do everything he could for the fire departments and he was concerned about the safety of the truck. He

then asked if the department had checked into a trade-in value on the truck. They stated they had not. Mr. Robertson stated he would like to see the department members present a concrete method of disposing of the truck, to see if it could be traded in and to determine if it will run 10 more months in its present condition.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the Namozine VFD be instructed to obtain prices on retanking, rebraking, and trading in the 1964 tanker; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that action be postponed until the December 17, 1980 meeting.

IN RE: VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORTATION

Mr. B.C. Medlock, Assistant Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Highways and Transportation, appeared before the Board to answer any questions they might have:

1. In discussing Rt. 615, the Board agreed that it could not be blocked to through traffic. Mr. Medlock stated that the Highway Department would not continue to maintain the road any further than it was required to.

2. Mr. Robertson informed Mr. Medlock that all the traffic signs along Rt. 226 going to Rt. 460 had been knocked down and should be reinstalled.

3. Mr. Robertson asked that the Highway Department monitor the sweeping of the entrance road off Rt. 226 to Lone Star to see that it is kept clear of sand and debris obstructing traffic using the road.

4. Mr. Robertson stated that the signs on Glendale and DelKeith Roads needed replacing.

5. Mr. Robertson reminded Mr. Medlock about the two dead trees on Ferndale Road. Mr. Medlock said the property owner had been contacted about removal of the trees.

Mr. Weber asked that the holes be filled where bumps had been burned off U.S. #1.

6. The County Administrator presented a letter from the Highway Department concerning the environmental impact of the project on Route 600. The Board stated they endorsed the project and knew of no real opposition.

7. Mr. Medlock advised the Board that the Department was working with a surveyor to clear up the boundary lines on the Shands Road. Only two homes are occupied on that road at the present time.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. Weber offered Mr. Ralph Lewis to replace Mr. E.D. McKenney on the Planning Commission. Mr. Robertson offered Mrs. Inell Spencer Moody to replace Mrs. Ann Scarborough.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Ralph Lewis and Mrs. Inell Moody be appointed to the Planning Commission, terms expiring December 31, 1984.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENTS--APPOMATTOX BASIN INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that the following be reappointed to the Appomattox Basin Industrial Development Corporation, terms expiring December 31, 1981:

Mr. Jack DeBoer, Mr. Donald Williams, Mr. Lynwood Inge, Mr. L.C. Boisseau, Mr. W.C. Knott, Mr. W.E. Bolte.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--DISTRICT 19 MENTAL HEALTH & MENTAL RETARDATION SERVICES BOARD

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Kenneth Wright be reappointed to the District 19 Mental Health & Mental Retardation Services Board, term expiring December 31, 1983.

IN RE: APPOINTMENTS--TRANSPORTATION SAFETY COMMISSION

Mr. Robertson offered Mr. A.S. Clay to replace himself on the Transportation Safety Commission. Mr. Weber offered Mr. Gilbert Wood to replace Mr. E.D. McKenney. As the Sheriff's Department has two representatives on the Commission, it was suggested that Sheriff Mitchell be appointed as an Ex Officio member.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. A.S. Clay and Mr. Gilbert Wood be appointed to the Transportation Safety Commission, terms expiring December 31, 1981; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Roy Hodges, Mr. Wayne Gwaltney, Mr. George Soloe, and Mr. Bill Queen be reappointed to the Transportation Safety Commission, terms expiring December 31, 1981; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Sheriff Charles L. Mitchell be reappointed as an Ex Officio member.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--APPOMATTOX RIVER WATER AUTHORITY

Mr. Robertson nominated Dr. J. Darrell Rice to replace Mr. Robert Ritchie on the Appomattox River Water Authority, whose term expired November 21, 1980.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Dr. J. Darrell Rice be appointed to the Appomattox River Water Authority, term expiring November 21, 1984.

IN RE: REAPPOINTMENT--CPDC PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Dinwiddie County, Virginia that Mr. Granville Maitland be reappointed to the CPDC Planning & Development Advisory Council, term expiring

October 31, 1982.

IN RE: APPOINTMENT--CPDC COMMUNITY RESOURCES ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Board instructed the Director of Planning to suggest a replacement from the Planning Commission to the CPDC Community Resources Advisory Council to present to them for consideration.

IN RE: POSTPONEMENT OF WATER AUTHORITY APPOINTMENTS

Mr. Robertson stated that the Water Authority members could serve until reappointment and he felt they should remain until after the first of the year. Mr. Weber stated the appointments should be postponed until the litigation concerning the members is cleared. The County Administrator was instructed to ask the County Attorney to determine when these appointments could be made to present at the next meeting.

IN RE: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Upon motion of Mr. Clay, seconded by Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the Board moved into Executive Session at 5:40 P.M. to discuss legal and personnel matters. The meeting reconvened into Open Session at 6:14 p.m.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion of Mr. Weber, seconded by Mr. Clay, Mr. Weber, Mr. Clay, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Hargrave voting "aye", the meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

ATTEST:

  
W.C. KNOTT

  
M.I. HARGRAVE, JR., CHAIRMAN

