

# Spotsylvania County Planning Commission

---

---

Holbert Building Board Room, 9104 Courthouse Road, Spotsylvania VA 22553

**MINUTES:** October 3, 2018

**Call to Order:** Mr. Newhouse called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Members Present:**

Richard Thompson	Courtland
Howard Smith	Livingston
Mary Lee Carter	Lee Hill
Gregg Newhouse	Chancellor
Jennifer Maddox	Berkeley
C. Travis Bullock	Battlefield

**Members Absent:** Michael Medina Salem

**Staff Present:**

- Paulette Mann, Planning Commission Secretary
- B. Leon Hughes, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning
- Kimberly Pomatto, CZA, Planner III
- Alexandra Spaulding, Senior Assistant County Attorney
- Jacob Pastwik, AICP, Planner III
- Ben Loveday, Director of Utilities & Public Works

---

---

**Announcements:** Mr. Hughes informed the Commission of two upcoming community meetings. Also, he advised of an offer by the Crucible applicant to provide tours if PC members are interested in attending a tour.

## **Review & Approval of minutes:**

**Motion and vote:** Ms. Carter made a motion, seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the minutes of September 5, 2018. The motion passed 6-0.

**Motion and vote:** Mr. Thompson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the REVISED minutes of August 15, 2018. The motion passed 5-0-1, with Ms. Carter abstaining.

**Unfinished Business:** None

## **Public Hearing(s):**

**R18-0007 Jean Masten Kelly and Joyce A. Taylor (B-Farms Development, LLC) (Ordinance No. RO18-0007):** Request a rezoning of approximately 2.69 acres from Residential 1 (R-1) to Residential 8 (R-8) with proffers to allow for a maximum of 21 single-family attached units known as Regency Crossing Townhomes. The property is located on the east side of Five Mile Road Extended (Route 675) approximately 550 feet north of the Plank Road (Route 3) and Five Mile Road Extended (Rt 675) intersection. A portion of the property is located within the Primary Development Boundary. The property is identified for Commercial development on the

Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan. Tax parcel 12-A-69J. Courtland Voting District.

Ms. Pomatto presented the case. The applicant's request is to rezone approximately 2.69 acres from Residential 1 (R-1) to Residential 8 (R-8) to allow for 21 single family attached units at a density of 7.8 units per acre. A portion of the project area is located outside the Primary Development Boundary which is area where public water and sewer will be provided. Properties within the limits of the Primary Development Boundary are intended to develop with higher residential densities and more intensive non-residential uses than outside of the boundary. As per Comprehensive Plan policy, if a project outside the Primary Development Boundary is able to connect to public water and sewer consistent with the Utilities Code, a Comprehensive Plan amendment is not required. Due to favorable topographic conditions, the project is able to connect to public water and provide gravity sewer to the serve the development; therefore a Comprehensive Plan amendment is not necessary. As identified in the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map, the project site is surrounded with a commercial and high density residential land use designations. The future land use designations in this area are generally reflective of existing zoning, proximity to the Route 3 commercial corridor and development within the immediate area. Considering the land use patterns, zoning, and location, the Comprehensive Plan would be supportive of either high density residential or commercial type development in this location. The applicant hosted a community meeting on April 12, 2018 and concerns were raised primarily related to the number of units, a perceived inconsistency with the adjacent Regency Park Villas development, noise and additional traffic. The applicant has attempted to address those concerns with the scale of the proposed buildings, enhanced landscaping and fencing identified on the Generalized Development Plan and described below.

The proposed development will have one point of access from Five Mile Road Extended which will extend into the site as a private road. The proposed 21 townhome units are within three (3) buildings which will be three (3) stories in height except for units 13-21 which will be a two (2) story building. The two (2) story buildings are located on the northern portion of the property to maintain a more consistent scale to Regency Park Villas which are 1 ½ stories. All units will have a garage and individual driveways for parking and 10 additional parking spaces are provided on site for overflow guest parking. Approximately 1.4 acres of open space will be provided in addition to a tot lot for the development. The open space provided is more than double what is required by Code and includes a significant amount of existing vegetation to be preserved. A 10' buffer will be provided along the property line between the proposed development and Regency Park Villas. As noted on the GDP, the 10' buffer will consist of existing vegetation and be supplemented with evergreen plantings, specifically one 8' evergreen planted every 5' within this buffer. Additionally, a 6' solid brown vinyl fence will be installed along the property line between the proposed development and Regency Park Villas, and lots 13 through 21 will have 6' privacy fences in the rear yards. The landscaping and fencing provided is an effort to address those concerns raised at the community meeting by the adjacent Regency Park Villas residents. Street trees are provided along the property's Five Mile Road Extended frontage and supplemental evergreen plantings are provided to complete a solid screen of vegetation between the proposed residential use and the adjacent commercial uses to the south. As noted, the development will be served by public water and sewer and facilities will be

provided on site to address stormwater management needs. These details will be finalized at the site plan review stage.

Regency Crossing will be a market rate project identified by the applicant's narrative with an average unit sales price of \$300,000. The applicant's Fiscal Impact Analysis estimates assessed values of \$292,678 for the three story single family attached units and \$247,227 for the two story models. The applicant provided a Fiscal Impact Analysis (FIA) which asserts Regency Crossing will generate \$25,374 annually at full build out. Staff completed a separate analysis utilizing the County's model with an assumed assessed value of \$244,520 (average of all townhouses located within the newer, comparable Lakeside and Lafayette Crossing developments). The County model projects a negative fiscal impact of \$33,836. Solely residential projects that may be considered affordable or more accessible to the median income buyer often result in a projected negative fiscal impact considering projected tax generation versus service demand costs.

The applicant has provided a proffer statement dated August 6, 2018 for the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors' consideration. Staff evaluated the proffers according to the parameters established in VA Code Section 15.2-2303.4, consistency with Comprehensive Plan Levels of Service and identified projects within the County's FY 2019 – FY 2023 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP).

The applicant commits to develop the property in conformance with the Generalized Development Plan (GDP) last revised August 6, 2018. Minor modifications may be made in order to address engineering/design requirements to fulfill Federal, State, and local requirements.

*Staff is supportive of the language as proposed as this is an "onsite proffer" which addresses the impacts within the boundaries of the property to be developed.*

The applicant commits the property shall be developed for no more than 21 single family attached units and shall not be developed for any secondary uses allowed under the R-8 District.

*Staff is supportive of the language as proposed as this is an "onsite proffer" which addresses the impacts within the boundaries of the property to be developed.*

The applicant will encumber the property with a declaration of conditions and covenants, restrictions and easements and establish a homeowner's association. The homeowner's association will be responsible for the maintenance of all fencing, landscaping, amenities, stormwater management facilities and common areas. The covenants shall also place limitations on the number and size of dogs permitted to reside in the development. No more than two 30 pounds or less dogs are permitted per unit and no dogs will be allowed to be left outside while the unit is unoccupied.

*The language related to the dog limitations is the applicant's attempt to address concerns raised at the community meeting. Neighboring owners expressed concerns that dogs would be left outside and bark while their owners were at work or elsewhere creating a nuisance. Enforcement of the covenants and restrictions will be the responsibility of the homeowner's association. Staff is supportive of the language as*

*proposed as this is an “onsite proffer” which addresses the impacts within the boundaries of the property to be developed.*

Approximately 1.4 acres of the property will be owned and maintained by the homeowner’s association as open space.

*The applicant is providing more than double the required amount of open space thereby preserving existing vegetation and natural buffers to the adjacent development. The retention of open space is consistent with Comprehensive Plan goals related to preservation natural and historic resources. Staff is supportive of the language as proposed as this is an “onsite proffer” which addresses the impacts within the boundaries of the property to be developed.*

The applicant commits to install and construct a tot lot in the general location shown on the GDP.

*Staff is supportive of the language as proposed as this is an “onsite proffer” which addresses the impacts within the boundaries of the property to be developed.*

The applicant has committed to pay a total cash contribution of \$3,238 (\$154.19 per unit) in order to mitigate the project’s impact on Public Safety and Parks and Recreation. Additionally, the cash proffer will be adjusted annually to reflect any increase or decrease for the preceding year in the Consumer Price Index.

*A cash contribution is an “offsite proffer” which is a proffer addressing an impact outside the boundaries of the property to be developed. The applicant may mitigate the development’s impacts on public facilities via a cash contribution if the facility meets the definition of “public facility” as defined in the Virginia Code and if the development impacts capacity and levels of service and if the development will receive a material benefit from the proffer made.*

*The Regency Crossing project will generate additional demands on Public Safety and there is a capacity shortage at F&R Station 6 which will serve this development. A Fire Training & Logistics Center is identified in the CIP that will serve the County as a whole and for which a capacity need exists. In order to determine the impact of the Regency Crossing project, staff calculated the County’s population inclusive of the projected project population in order to determine the per capita costs associated with the Fire Training & Logistics Center project. The applicant has proffered to contribute \$75.95 per capita for public safety which is reasonable and legally acceptable based on staff’s analysis.*

*Additionally, the Regency Crossing project will have an impact on Parks and Recreation facilities for which capacity needs exist as identified by Level of Service Standards in the Public Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan and for which there are capital projects identified in the CIP. These facilities include the Marshall Center Auditorium Upgrades, Ni River Park, Belmont - Passive Park and the*

*Livingston Community Center. In order to determine the impact of the Regency Crossing project on Parks and Recreation that is specifically attributable to the new residential development, staff calculated the County's population inclusive of the projected population in order to determine the per capita costs associated with this public facility. Staff calculated the project's expected impact based on current capacity of the Parks and Recreation facilities and the Level of Service Standards identified in the County's Comprehensive Plan. The applicant has proffered to contribute \$85.95 per capita for Parks and Recreation which is reasonable and legally acceptable based on staff's analysis.*

The applicant commits to provide the same architectural features as are on the front façade for the exterior walls of the units on Lots 1 through 7.

*The orientation of the units on Lots 1 through 7 is such that the side and rear sides of the units will be visible to the public from Five Mile Road Extended. The addition of architectural features on the side and rear walls of these units is an aesthetic enhancement to the development. Staff is supportive of the language as proposed as this is an "onsite proffer" which addresses the impacts within the boundaries of the property to be developed.*

Ms. Pomatto discussed the transportation analysis. The Regency Crossing development will have one point of access on Five Mile Road Extended, which currently carries 1,233 average daily trips and operates at a Level of Service (LoS) B. The development will generate approximately 122 additional daily trips with 11 additional peak hour trips, which is not significant enough to degrade the level of service for Five Mile Road Extended by itself. Taking into account background traffic, a development known as Barley Woods is currently under construction which will include 123 age-restricted attached and detached units. Additionally, on the north side of Regency Park Villas is commercially zoned property with 84,000 square feet of approved office space currently not constructed. The traffic generated by the approved Barley Woods development and the approved Regency Park office development will degrade the peak hour level of service from a LoS B to a LoS C. It should be noted that a proffer to construct a road connection between Five Mile Road Extended and Single Oak Road was accepted with the Regency Park rezoning approved in 2001. Construction of the road must be completed no later than the completion of the third office building (approximately 24,000 sf). The proffered connector road is expected to offset a degradation of levels of service created by the office use on Five Mile Road Extended once constructed.

Ms. Pomatto discussed the following findings:

In Favor:

- A. The Regency Crossing development is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan with respect to land use, public facilities and historic and natural resources goals and policies. The proposal is consistent with the surrounding high density residential development and countywide housing diversification goals envisioned by the high density residential land use designation.

- B. The proposal limits impacts to the surrounding area with appropriately scaled buildings; landscaping, architectural features and fencing which will create an aesthetically enhanced development that will make it compatible with existing land uses. The development is providing more than double the required amount of open space thereby preserving existing vegetation and natural buffers to the adjacent development.
- C. The applicant has proffered cash contributions in order to mitigate capital facility impacts which are specifically attributable to the project and which are legally acceptable by the Board per the parameters established by VA Code Section 15.2-2303.4.

Against:

- A. The County's model projects a negative fiscal impact of \$33,836. However, solely residential projects that may be considered affordable or more accessible to the median income buyer often result in a projected negative fiscal impact considering projected tax generation versus service demand costs.

Based on the proposal's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, the findings in favor noted above and the applicant's proffered commitments to address concerns raised by the community, staff recommends approval of the rezoning request with the proffered conditions dated August 6, 2018.

*Mr. Newhouse opened the public hearing.*

Mr. Thompson inquired if the proposal will cost the taxpayers \$33,836.

Ms. Pomatto stated yes. However, the proposal is considered affordable residential housing and typically that type of housing does cost the taxpayers.

Ms. Carter inquired further about the negative cost.

Ms. Pomatto stated that the breakeven number for development is approximately \$369,000, where the tax revenue offsets the costs of services. She reminded them that the development proposal is providing more affordable housing.

Applicant, Charlie Payne: He displayed a PowerPoint briefing the proposal. He stated that what is not taken into account in the County's model is the personal property and money that is spent by the residents in the county. He also stated that R-8 doesn't require a buffer but they are going above and beyond by the plantings and fencing they are providing.

*Speaking in favor or opposition:*

Larry Lycett, 6258 Autumn Leaf: He stated that the development directly impacts him. He stated that he recommends it be developed as commercial because the units will likely end up as

rentals. He also raised concerns about the impact on county services.

Andrea Strohmer, 6238 Autumn Leaf: She stated that at first she was against the proposal but Mr. Garrison has been a stand up developer and has addressed and corrected all of the concerns raised at the community meeting.

Geoff Bamford, 6294 Autumn Leaf: He stated that he will look right across his property at this development and he is 100% behind the proposed project. He believes the townhomes to be an excellent improvement and it is a very well thought out development. Mr. Garrison has made changes and improvements as a result of comments from the neighbors.

Gordon Grimsley, He stated that he has no idea how these units will fit on this property and it will look like the slums of New York.

*Mr. Newhouse closed the public hearing.*

Mr. Payne stated that he respects the opinion of the neighbors and that Mr. Garrison has worked very hard to make this a better project based on comments received from the neighbors. He stated that this is a very good infill development for this property.

Mr. Smith inquired if there is data about whether rentals are more of a strain on services than homeowners.

Mr. Payne stated that these properties will not be rentals at the price point. He stated that it wouldn't be good for them either to go as rentals.

Ms. Carter inquired about the buffering again.

Mr. Payne stated that they wanted to buffer noise from Route 3 and under R-8; there is no requirement for buffering. They will be keeping the tree line, planting additional trees and providing two fences. We've also written in the covenants the requirements for dog sizes. He also advised that they will be maintaining 52% open space.

Mr. Thompson applauded the applicant for the measures he's taken to address the neighbors' concerns but stated he couldn't support the proposal because of the cost to the taxpayers.

**Motion and vote:** Mr. Thompson made a motion to deny the rezoning. The motion was not seconded and therefore failed.

**Motion and vote:** Mr. Newhouse made a motion, seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the rezoning with proffers. The motion passed 5-1 with Mr. Thompson voting no and Mr. Medina absent.

**Worksession(s):**

**Comprehensive Plan Work Session – Solid Waste**

Mr. Pastwik presented the worksession. He discussed solid waste collection and disposal and proposed amendments:

- Expand upon details of services offered
- Update references to applicable studies and plans
- Update collection and recycling data to current figures
- Enhance accessibility to complementary resources and information
- Update landfill capacity reporting
- Acknowledge service area covered within level of service criteria and any observed areas outside the standard
- Update short and long term goals for the upcoming planning period

Mr. Pastwik then discussed Solid Waste Generation and Capacity:

- The County Code specifies that only waste that is both discarded and collected within the County limits may be disposed of at the County's Livingston landfill
- Livingston Landfill estimated remaining capacity exceeds 50 years (65-70 years)
- Waste stream increase from 40,000 tons annually to 128,000 tons between 2013 and present day
- Compost tonnage has also increased from 23,000 tons to 30,000 tons annually
- Population growth, increased economic activity, and shift of local commercial hauling away from other disposal sites to the County landfill have contributed to increase volumes.
- County manages 13 convenience centers from household waste and recycling collection .5 mile level of service radius for each generally covers the entire County.

Mr. Pastwik discussed Recycling next:

- County recycling rate estimates range from 31% to 42% and are above State mandated 25%.
- Single stream recycling containers are available at each convenience site.
- Single stream recycling includes mixed paper, plastics, cardboard, aluminum, and glass. In addition to single stream containers, the County also offers opportunities to recycle metal, used motor oil, antifreeze, batteries, appliances, and brush and yard waste.
- The County offers household hazardous waste collection twice a year for residential disposal of chemicals, toxic wastes, or hazardous liquid materials. This collection effort is accomplished through third party contract services.

Mr. Pastwik discussed the revised short term goals:

- Adopt a strategy that enables solid waste staff to effectively identify residents of Spotsylvania County using convenience sites for residential use.
- Adopt a policy that restricts commercial disposal to a select number of disposal sites.
- Update tipping fees and disposal of select items with current market rates.

- Evaluate strategies to make brush and yard waste recycling operations sustainable, in cooperation with the County's composting facility.
- Continue to implement goals of the Solid Waste Management Plan that is incorporated by reference within the Comprehensive Plan.
- Enhance data collection on expected refuse and recycling collections resulting from private commercial establishments.

Finally, Mr. Pastwik discussed the Revised Long Term Goals:

- Review and update the 2015 Solid Waste Management Plan consistent with the Code of Virginia
- Update applicable Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan upon completion of the 2020 Solid Waste Management Plan update considering any future needs, opportunities, or recommendations that apply.
- Monitor recycling industry trends and market on an international and national level. Update educational recycling programs as the industry grows and changes, and continue to build partnerships with commercial recycling businesses.
- Continue developing sustainable solutions for biosolids, yard waste and brush recycling.
- Evaluate the benefits of managing the solid waste division as an enterprise fund.

There was discussion about whether it was good to have more refuse going to our landfills.

Mr. Loveday explained that they become more self-sustaining.

There was discussion about increasing tipping fees as we increase in population and have more economic development.

Mr. Loveday explained that we receive no waste from outside the County and that tip rates let businesses take care of themselves. Some waste is shipped to Richmond or King George and it goes wherever the tipping fee is the lowest.

Mr. Newhouse stated that as he travels around to the different landfills and convenience centers, the attendants are very accommodating, they are well run, and clean.

Ms. Carter inquired about commercial disposal companies.

Mr. Loveday stated that County Waste, for example, has two local transfer stations and they dispose in Spotsylvania. He explained to Ms. Carter that they are under the very same guidelines as the County and are regulated by DEQ.

Ms. Carter inquired about the disposal of old tires.

Mr. Loveday explained that tires are collected and stacked into large semi trucks to be recycled or reused. He stated that it costs \$15-\$20K per year to manage tires.

Ms. Carter inquired about quantity.

Mr. Loveday stated that they use the honor system and only 6 tires per day can be disposed of but it is difficult to separate commercial tire disposal vs. homeowner/citizen tire disposal.

### **Worksession – Mixed-Use Zoning District**

Mr. Hughes presented the worksession. The Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission have expressed interest in reviewing the Mixed Use Zoning District for potential amendments. Staff has reviewed the code against the Code of Virginia and found that Mixed Use is specifically defined in the Code of Virginia to include two or more uses. The language in the current code is not clear that a Mixed Use project shall have at least two types of uses, so that will require an amendment.

Mr. Hughes explained the purpose and intent of the district and that it is intended to be a flexible approach to development, to include infill and redevelopment, by allowing a variety of interrelated and compatible commercial, office, residential, civic, recreational, and entertainment uses in a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood setting based on, but not limited to the following principles:

- Connectivity of road networks, including new local streets with existing local streets;
- Connected pedestrian networks and ped-friendly road design;
- Reduced front and side yard building setbacks;
- Mixed-use neighborhoods, including mixed housing types; &
- Respects the character of adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Hughes discussed the mixed use intensities for all five sub-districts. He also discussed the following development standards:

- Building Types
- Lot Area and Width
- Building Setbacks & Heights
- Build to Zone
- Open Space

He discussed that the Board of Supervisors may approve alternatives and that the ordinance also defines:

- Parking
- Street Types & Blocks
- Uses & Special Uses

Mr. Hughes discussed that the Mixed Use Zoning District was adopted on September 25, 2012.

The following are approved Mixed Use Developments:

- Spotsylvania Courthouse Village
- Crossroads Station
- New Post
- Southpoint Landing
- Jackson Village
- Alexander's Crossing
- Roseland
- Palmers Creek

Staff also has on MU project currently under review and that is 2600 Acqua, which is a mixed use proposal with apartments and commercial with no phasing commitment.

Mr. Smith expressed frustration with there being no commitment to occupy the commercial components of mixed use. The buildings tend to be built, with no tenants and then sit vacant.

Mr. Hughes stated that most of the projects have triggers for the commercial component to be built later but they do not have to be occupied.

Mr. Smith inquired if we can impose that the commercial components be occupied by tenants before moving forward.

Mr. Hughes stated that he is unaware whether that can be imposed.

Mr. Smith stated that with the commercial sitting empty we don't get any sales tax or revenue.

Mr. Thompson stated the the building on the parcel raises the real estate value, therefore the County is getting higher taxes from the improvement.

Mr. Hughes stated that is correct.

Mr. Thompson stated that developers need to stop coming back and asking to build the commercial later. Two components of mixed use should be mandatory and built as originally proposed, whether occupied or unoccupied.

Mr. Smith stated that he doesn't like to see the commercial sitting vacant.

Mr. Hughes stated that there are the following concerns with the mixed use zoning designation:

- Consistency with the Code of Va.
- Limited or no Commitment to Commercial Development
- No Density Limitations
- Limited detail on GDPs

- Ambiguous Language
- Alternatives to MU

The Code of Virginia defines mixed use as property that incorporates two or more different uses, and may include a variety of housing types, within a single development. To be more consistent with the Code of Virginia, the County would need to amend the MU Code to make clear that two or more different uses are required in the district. He also discussed density requirements and that the current MU district has no density limit and implementing a requirement will reduce units.

Mr. Hughes also discussed the limited detail on GDPs and that currently there are allowances for Land Bay level of detail and a conceptual street network. If increased detail were required, we would receive preliminary plat level of detail with pattern books meeting ordinance requirements. There is also a need for language clarity by updating the purpose and intent and make clear districts must have two types of uses. Also needing clarity are text amendments to clean up provisions that are open to interpretation and limit the ability for alternative standards to be approved.

While preparing for the worksession, staff reviewed other mixed use/TND examples in the following counties:

- Hanover
- Stafford
- King George

Mr. Hughes stated that when he contacted King George, he was told that they used Courthouse Village as a model. He stated that Hanover doesn't have one project approved using their MU ordinance. He advised that Stafford's ordinance is extremely difficult to use and that King George just adopted one but it is limited in scope and only used in the Courthouse District.

Staff has observed that the MU product is market driven and allows flexibility in proffers to move uses in land bays and timing is uncertain with commercial uses. There is limited detail in the GDPs, developers are forgoing other zoning districts because of minimum open space requirements permitted in MU. Provisions are needed to ensure appropriate scale when adjacent to residential uses and the district should have a minimum acreage requirement. Finally, definitions need to be added for clarity.

There was a question raised about density calculations.

Mr. Hughes stated there is no cap and allows 18 units per acre.

Mr. Newhouse stated that he likes that the MU ordinance provides flexibility to developers and allows people to work where they live without having to get into a vehicle. He stated that he's less inclined to endorse more restrictive language. He stated that he does struggle with phasing and how that occurs. He stated that it will be very interesting when this goes to public hearing.

Ms. Maddox stated that she likes the vision of mixed use but we need to be careful because of

the commercial componenet and what the new commercial is going to look like since so many are now buying online. She stated that the commercial is coming very slowly and we need to find a middle gorund.

Mr. Thompson stated that it is not mixed use if only one type of housing is built.

Ms. Maddox stated that she would like to see some data on where it's gone right and where it's gone wrong and how long the commercial is sitting before an OP is issued.

Ms. Carter agreed.

Mr. Hughes stated that there isn't a lot of data out there because these types of developments take a long time to develop. He discussed the development on West Broad in Richmond and how that is just now coming to fruition and it was approved in 1998.

**New Business - None**

**Public Comment:**

Russ Mueller, Speaking on behalf of the Concerned Citizens: He stated that he demands that the conditions that he submitted to planning staff and the commission be required. He discussed the probability of Fawn Lake selling sPower additional land for an expansion of what is already proposed. He has concerns about wells, water quality, health and welfare. He stated that you cannot believe a word that the sPower says. He wants to know when action will take place and that this will be a liability to the county.

Michael O'Bier, Livingston District: He stated that Spotsylvania County residents will no longer be able to live here and that they may as well throw the Counties heritage right out the window.

**Adjournment:**

**Motion and vote:** Mr. Smith made a motion, seconded by Ms. Carter to adjourn. The motion passed 6-0.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:50 p.m.

*Paulette Mann* \_\_\_\_\_

Paulette Mann

October 17, 2018 \_\_\_\_\_

Date