

At a regular meeting of the Southampton County Board of Supervisors held in the Board Room of the Southampton County Office Center at 26022 Administration Center Drive, Courtland, Virginia on December 19, 2005 at 8:30 AM.

SUPERVISORS PRESENT

Dallas O. Jones, Chairman (Drewryville)
Walter L. Young, Jr., Vice-Chairman (Franklin)
Walter D. "Walt" Brown, III (Newsoms)
Anita T. Felts (Jerusalem)
Carl J. Faison (Boykins-Branchville)
Ronald M. West (Berlin-Ivor)
Moses Wyche (Capron)

SUPERVISORS ABSENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

Michael W. Johnson, County Administrator (Clerk)
James A. Randolph, Assistant County Administrator
Julia G. Williams, Finance Director
Robert L. Barnett, Building Official/Zoning Administrator
Julien W. Johnson, Jr., Public Utilities Director
Richard E. Railey, Jr., County Attorney
Susan H. Wright, Administrative Secretary

Chairman Jones called the meeting to order, and after the *Pledge of Allegiance*, Supervisor Faison gave the invocation.

Chairman Jones sought approval of the minutes of the November 28, 2005 regular meeting. They were approved as recorded, as there were no additions or corrections.

Regarding highway matters, Chairman Jones recognized Mr. Joe Lomax, Residency Administrator of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Franklin Residency.

Mr. Michael Johnson, County Administrator, announced that included in the agenda for their reference was a copy of VDOT's latest quarterly report for the Franklin Residency Office.

Mr. Johnson advised that last year, the General Assembly amended Section 46.2-870 of the *Code of Virginia*, providing that the maximum speed limit on non-limited access portions of Route 58 could be increased to 60 mph, subsequent to completion of a traffic engineering study. It recently came to his attention that the Franklin and Courtland bypasses were currently being evaluated for speed limit increases. In light of the high accident rate between Courtland and Franklin, he had emailed Dennis Heuer, Hampton Roads District Administrator, placing the agency on notice that Southampton County intended to vigorously oppose and/or appeal any such speed limit increases.

Chairman Jones commented that the speed limit certainly did not need to be that high in that area.

Mr. Johnson advised that he, Supervisor West, and Jay Randolph, Assistant County Administrator, attended an informational meeting regarding the proposed new Route 460 on December 12 in Wakefield. The meeting was hosted by Isle of Wight County and included a number of state and local elected officials, VDOT representatives, and Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) members. Notwithstanding the fact that VDOT would release a Request for Proposals for construction and financing by February 15, 2006, this was expected to be a protracted process. Once proposals were received, VDOT's internal review process and contract negotiations were expected to take approximately 30 months. Thereafter, right-of-way acquisition and environmental permitting would take additional time, followed by a 4-5 year construction period. Therefore, even if funding were available today, which it was not, the new Route 460 would not be open to traffic until 2012-13 at best. Realistically, given the current status of transportation funding, it would likely be much longer than that.

Vice-Chairman Young asked Mr. Lomax if anyone had looked at the ditches on Sycamore Church Road? Mr. Lomax replied that he had spoken with his superintendents and they indicated that there was not much they could do because a lot of the ditches were off of their right-of-way.

However, he informed Vice-Chairman Young that he did not have any other meetings scheduled until later today so he would be glad to ride out there with him after this meeting and take a look at it. Vice-Chairman Young indicated that that would be fine.

Vice-Chairman Young informed that there were problems with water standing on Delaware Road. He got about 10 phone calls every time we got ½ inch of rain. He asked if that was off of their right-of-way? Mr. Lomax replied that they could ride out and take a look at that today as well.

Supervisor West asked if they had checked on the mailboxes on Route 614 and Route 635 as to whether or not they were placed too close to the road? Mr. Jerry Kee, Assistant Residency Administrator, replied that they were looking at that.

Supervisor West stated that the shoulders needed building up on Unity Road and One Mile Road. Mr. Lomax advised that he did not think there was much they could do but they would look into it.

Supervisory Wyche advised that he was still getting calls about Medicine Springs Road. They needed children-at-play signs and/or the speed limit lowered. They also needed some lights. Mr. Lomax indicated that they would take a look at the speed limit, but they did not provide lights on the secondary roads. As far as the children-at-play signs, he would need a resolution from the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Johnson indicated that he would take care of that.

Supervisor Brown asked if the projects listed on the schedule that the Board received from VDOT were projects that had been completed? Mr. Kee replied that the projects listed were ongoing. Supervisor Brown thanked them for providing the schedule.

Supervisor Brown asked about the section of Riverdale Road that he had requested to be revisited in terms of a speed study. Mr. Lomax advised that it did not warrant a speed limit reduction. However, they could possibly place some warning signs in that area.

Supervisor Brown advised that he still had concerns about leaning trees on Sandy Ridge Road and Statesville Road. Mr. Lomax indicated that they were working on those.

Regarding reports, various reports were received and provided in the agenda. They were Financial, Sheriff's Office, Animal Control, Communication Center Activity Report, Traffic Tickets, and Building Inspections, and New Housing Starts. Also Cooperative Extension, Treasurer's Report, Delinquent Tax Collection, EMS & Fire Department Activity, Public Safety Radio System, and Reassessment.

In regards to the reassessment report, Supervisor Brown asked what was the projected completion date for the reassessment? Mr. Johnson advised that they had indicated that notices would go out shortly after the New Year.

Moving to financial matters, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was the semiannual appropriations resolution for the second half of FY 2006 in the amount of \$20,341,123.

The semiannual appropriations resolution is as follows:

**At a meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County,
Virginia held in the Board of Supervisors Room on Monday,
December 19, 2005**

RESOLUTION

**BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County,
Virginia that the following appropriations be and hereby are made
from the Fund To the Fund indicated for the period July 1, 2005
through June 30, 2006 for the function and purpose indicated:**

**From the General Fund to the General
Operating Fund to be expended only
on order of the Board of Supervisors:**

11010	Board of Supervisors	51,937
12110	County Administration	138,069
12310	Commissioner of Revenue	106,726
12320	Board of Assessors	-
12410	Treasurer	101,072
12415	Delinquent Tax Collection	28,350
12430	Accounting	78,538
12510	Data Processing	99,183
12550	Insurance/County Code	51,623
13200	Registrar	61,509
21100	Circuit Court	30,504
21200	Combined District Courts	10,463
21300	Special Magistrates	719
21600	Clerk of the Circuit Court	56,318
21700	Sheriff - Bailiff	173,501
21750	Courthouse Security	25,741
22100	Commonwealth's Attorney	176,431
31200	Sheriff	683,737
31750	School Resource Officer	17,202
32200	Volunteer Fire Departments	-
32300	Volunteer Rescue Squads	-
32400	State Forestry Service	-
33100	Detention	1,139,052
33300	Probation	26,348
34000	Building Inspections	26,389
35100	Animal Control	38,850
35300	Medical Examiner	750
35500	Emergency Service/Civil Defense	-
41320	Street Lights	19,500
42300	Refuse Collection	181,060
42400	Refuse Disposal	545,117
43000	Buildings & Grounds	198,141
51100	Local Health Department	140,770
52000	Mental Health Services	-
53220	State/Local Hospitalization	-
53240	Sr Services of Southeastern	-
53500	Comprehensive Services Act	18,495
53600	STOP Organization	-
72000	Community Concert Series	-
72200	Rawls Museum Arts	-
72500	Historical Society	-
73200	Walter Cecil Rawls Library	91,938
81100	Planning/Zoning	98,606
81500	Economic Development	75,000
82400	Soil & Water Conservation District	-
83500	Cooperative Extension Service	27,394
91400	Non-Departmental Operating	84,310
	TOTAL	4,603,343

From the General Fund to the E-911
Fund to be expended only on order
of the Board of Supervisors:

December 19, 2005

31400	E-911	108,261
		<hr/>
	TOTAL	108,261

From the General Fund to the Water
& Sewer Fund to be expended only
on order of the Board of Supervisors:

89600	Enterprise Fund Water	254,190
89500	Enterprise Fund Sewer	425,087
89400	Enterprise Utility Extension	112,524
		<hr/>
	TOTAL	791,801

From the General Fund to the Building
Fund to be expended only on order of
the Board of Supervisors:

94000	Building Fund	318,171
		<hr/>
	TOTAL	318,171

From the General Fund to the School Operating
Fund to be expended only on order of the
Southampton County School Board:

61000	Instruction	7,934,030
62000	Administration	586,092
63000	Other Direction & Management	1,101,421
64000	Operation & Maintenance Services	1,299,205
68000	School Food Service	41,085
66000	Facilities	102,013
67000	Debt Service	995,500
260	Rental Textbook	-
265	Technology	103,000
400	At Risk 4-Year Olds	31,095
450	Early Reading Intervention	14,022
500	Chapter I	300,750
550	Title VIB Special Ed-Flow Through	257,596
600	Title VI Innovative Educ Program	11,097
650	Substance & Drug Prevention	10,235
800	Vocational Special Education	30,168
900	Pre-School Incentive	7,721
570	Sliver Grant	9,308
625	Title II-A Training and Recruitment	78,948
660	Community Service Grant	25,000
630	Title IID Ed Tech	8,028
		<hr/>
	TOTAL	12,946,314
		 12,946,314

From the General Fund to the School Operating Fund to be expended only on order of the Southampton County School Board:

65100	School Food Service	528,812
		528,812
	TOTAL	528,812

From the Virginia Public Assistance Fund to the Virginia Public Assistance Operating Fund to be expended only on order of the Social Services Board of Southampton County:

309	Welfare Administration (Eligibility)	312,853
310	Welfare Administration (Service)	236,414
311	Welfare Administration (Joint)	173,933
313	Benefit Programs	277,260
314	Welfare Administration (Energy)	9,830
319	Welfare Administration (VIEW)	34,131
		1,044,421
	TOTAL	1,044,421

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS	20,341,123
-----------------------------	-------------------

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Treasurer of Southampton County shall transfer to the accounts as indicated, the funds from time to time, as the need occurs and as funds become available.

A copy teste: _____, Clerk
 Michael W. Johnson

Southampton County Board of Supervisors
 12/19/05

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to adopt the semiannual appropriations resolution. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was a salary appropriations resolution in the amount of \$3,146,834 providing for salary adjustment for employees of constitutional officers, the electoral board, and visiting health nurse. As they may recall from budget deliberations last spring, effective December 1, 2005, the State Compensation Board approved 4.4% salary adjustments for employees of the Commissioner of the Revenue, Sheriff, Treasurer, Commonwealth’s Attorney, Clerk of the Court, and Electoral Board.

The salary appropriations resolution is as follows:

At a meeting of the Southampton County Board of Supervisors held in the Board of Supervisors Meeting Room, Courtland, Virginia, on Monday, December 19, 2005.

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia, that annual salaries of personnel be and hereby are fixed as indicated, effective December 1, 2005.

COMMISSIONER OF THE REVENUE

Harrup, John Robert	59,939
Carr, Amy B.	27,414
Everett, Jeannette S.	22,440

TREASURER

Britt, David K.	59,939
Griffin, Rhonda V.	26,222
Bunn, Frances H.	23,989
Horne, Rosemary B.	20,077

COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY

Cooke, Eric A.	106,222
Edwards, Steven W.	59,927
Randall, John T.	41,961
Pitts, Sharon F.	24,586
Rice, Joan P.	35,113

REGISTRAR/ELECTORAL BOARD

Davis, Leona W.	40,091
Felts, Julian A.	3,473
Felts, Robert M., Jr.	1,737
Sykes, Marie W.	1,737

HEALTH DEPT/SENIOR SERVICES

Bowden, Amy R.	41,906
----------------	--------

SHERIFF - BAILIFF

Busching, Robert W.	29,832
Darden, Michael L.	35,023
Davis, Benjamin G.	29,057
Neave, Robbie Lynn	29,057
Parker, Raymond K.	37,265
Ricks, Jimmie R.	43,546
Wyche, Josh A.	40,359

SHERIFF - LAW ENFORCEMENT

Francis, Vernie W., Jr.	75,672
Bailey, Douglas G.	35,380
Blythe, J. Michael	32,413
Carpenito, Suzette B.	35,150
Covington, James E., Jr.	48,669
Drewery, Gene H.	40,734
Francis, Kenneth W.	63,564
Gentry, Billy B.	52,029
Griffith, E. Greg	31,891
Griffith, Scott T.	28,535
Holland, William B.	35,644
Markham, Pamela L.	21,934
Mayfield, Joyce A.	21,934
Modlin, James F.	48,669

Prince, Lisa C.	21,934
Rose, Teresa G.	22,933
Smith, Jerry L.	23,500
Stutts, John B.	47,599
Turner, Mark B.	29,057
VACANT - Deputy	26,104
VACANT-Secretary	20,067
SHERIFF - DETENTION	
Aleshire, Jimmy L.	28,535
Armbruster, Becky K.	28,535
Barnes, Beverly A.	20,978
Bowden, Jonathan M.	32,608
Byrum, William C.	31,891
Clasp, Nina R.	28,535
Clouse, Michael A.	26,104
Cook, Loretta B.	20,067
Darden, Jonathan P.	28,535
Darden, Phillip G.	30,177
Davis, Waymon D.	28,535
Doyle, Scott A.	32,608
Dunn, Mary J.	26,104
Eaton, McCoy L.	28,535
Forren, Dwayne A.	29,176
Garriss, Marcia L.	32,413
Gray, James A.	28,535
Griggs, John W., Jr.	28,535
Harness, Robert D.	26,104
Harris, David L.	26,104
Jarratt, William G., Jr.	28,535
Kindred, Jerrel J.	28,535
Magette, John N.	32,413
Malcolm, Teresa L.	31,891
Morris, Richard T.	32,608
Necessary, Joni N.	28,535
Ottmers, Douglas N.	28,535
Parsons, Ernest L.	31,187
Patterson, Mark W.	28,535
Pearce, Robert B., Jr.	26,104
Skeete, Earl E.	28,535
Smith, Brenda S.	28,535
Stapleton, William D.	28,535
Stevens, Robert T.	28,535
Stivers, Wanda V.	40,734
Story, J. Kevin	28,535
Vance, Billy G.	28,535
Vick, Jim I., Jr.	28,535
Vinson, William C., Jr.	28,535
Watson, Stanley E.	30,500
Whitby, Jonathan K.	28,535
Wolfe, Michael R.	26,104
Woodard, Dennis M.	29,176

December 19, 2005

Joyner, Sheril J.	26,228
Ayers, Derek W. ON MILITARY LEAVE	28,535
VACANT - Deputy	26,104
VACANT - Deputy/Medical	25,651
VACANT - Deputy/Medical	25,651
VACANT - Cook	20,978
SHERIFF - COURT SECURITY	
VACANT-Deputy	26,104
SHERIFF - SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER	
Allmond, William E., III	26,104
SHERIFF - ANIMAL CONTROL	
Cooke, James T., Jr.	28,535
SHERIFF - E911	
Harness, Jennifer K.	21,934
Howell, Christie M.	21,934
Ledbetter, Deborah C.	21,934
TOTAL	
	\$3,146,834

A copy teste: _____

Michael W. Johnson, Clerk

Southampton County Board of Supervisors

12/19/2005

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to approve the salary appropriations resolution. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that bills in the amount of \$1,400,468.19 were received.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, that the bills in the amount of \$1,400,468.19 be paid with check numbers 73128 through 73605. All were in favor.

Moving forward to appointments, Mr. Johnson announced that as discussed last month, the respective terms of Ben Lee and V.S. Pittman II on the Industrial Development Authority would expire December 31, 2005. Both were eligible for reappointment and appointments were for a 4-year term.

Chairman Jones advised that he had talked to Mr. Lee and he was willing to continue to serve.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisors Brown and Wyche, to reappoint Ben Lee to the Industrial Development Authority. All were in favor.

Supervisor Wyche stated that he spoke to Mr. Pittman and he was willing to continue to serve.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by West, to reappoint V.S. Pittman II to the Industrial Development Authority. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that also held over from last month was the reappointment of M.L. Everett, Jr. to the South Centre Corridors Resource Conservation and Development Council. His term would expire December 31, 2005 and he was eligible for reappointment.

Chairman Jones indicated that he talked with Mr. Everett and he was willing to continue to serve.

Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to reappoint M.L. Everett, Jr. to the South Centre Corridors Resource Conservation and Development Council. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson informed that as further discussed last month, Vice-Chairman Young agreed to seek a successor for Mrs. Joy Collier, who recently resigned from the Blackwater Regional Library Board of Trustees. This appointment would be for the balance of Mrs. Collier's unexpired term, which would run through June 30, 2006. He noted that other current members of the Library Board of Trustees from Southampton County were Alice Joyner (Berlin-Ivor), Dorothy Harris (Jerusalem), Paige Sturdifen (Capron), and Mary Mason (Boykins).

Vice-Chairman Young advised that he was not yet ready to make an appointment. However, he had talked to a good prospect.

Mr. Johnson advised that as they were aware, the Advisory Board for the Franklin Business Incubator had invited the Board of Supervisors to appoint one of its members to serve as a liaison. The Advisory Board met on an as-needed basis, typically at 7:30 AM in the Business Incubator.

Chairman Jones advised that Supervisor Felts had indicated that she was willing to accept this appointment.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to appoint Supervisor Felts to the Franklin Business Incubator Board. All were in favor.

Finalizing appointments, Mr. Johnson reminded from last month that following a public hearing later this morning, the Board would consider adoption of an ordinance establishing procedures for the application and disposition of requests for equalization of real estate assessment. According to the ordinance, applications must be received by the Board of Equalization by March 15, 2006 and resolved no later than April 15, 2006. As a result, it was imperative that the Board of Equalization be appointed as soon as possible in order to properly advertise the application deadline and publish the dates of its hearings. Since the Board was actually court-appointed, the Board of Supervisors acted only in an advisory capacity. He advised that a resolution was included in the agenda for their consideration, which would offer recommendations to the Court. Also included in the agenda for their reference was a 2-page summary of activities of a board of equalization as well as a schedule from the 2000 proceedings. He noted that in 2000, the board met 15 times in a 30-day period averaging 6 hours per meeting.

The Supervisors' recommendations were as follows:

Chairman Jones –	Ben Lee
Vice-Chairman Young –	Walter Beale, III
Supervisor Brown –	Glenn Updike
Supervisor Faison –	Richard L. Francis
Supervisor Felts –	Ash Cutchin
Supervisor West –	Meredith Felts
Supervisor Wyche –	To be determined (Would let Mr. Johnson know today)

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Brown, to adopt the resolution. Supervisor West asked how could we adopt the resolution without Supervisor Wyche's recommendation? Attorney Railey advised that the Board could resolve to adopt the resolution with the understanding that the name of Supervisor Wyche's recommendation would be inserted into the resolution.¹ **All were in favor.**

The resolution which was adopted is as follows:

At a meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia, held in the Southampton County Office Center, Board of Supervisors' Meeting Room, 26022 Administration Center Drive, Courtland, Virginia on Monday, December 19, 2005 at 8:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Dallas O. Jones, Chairman
Walter L. Young, Jr., Vice-Chairman
Walter D. Brown, III
Carl J. Faison
Anita T. Felts
Ronald M. West
Moses Wyche

¹ See page 472

IN RE: Year 2006 Board of Equalization

Vice-Chairman Young moved that:

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 58.1-3252, *Code of Virginia*, Southampton County performed a general assessment of all real property within the county effective for the 2006 tax year, having not done so for a period of six years; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 58.1-3275 (i), *Code of Virginia*, the Southampton County Board of Supervisors contracted with Blue Ridge Mass Appraisal Company, LLC, a certified professional assessor, to perform such general reassessment and to serve in lieu of a Board of Assessors; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to § 51.1-3330, et seq., *Code of Virginia*, Southampton County will provide direct mail notification of the change in assessed value to all real property owners as shown by the land book of Southampton County and will further advise each such owner of certain dates to meet with Blue Ridge Mass Appraisal Company, LLC to discuss the reassessment; and

WHEREAS, § 58.1-3350, *Code of Virginia*, provides that aggrieved citizens may apply for relief from such assessment to the Southampton County Board of Equalization or directly to the Circuit Court of Southampton County; and

WHEREAS, § 58.1-3370, et. seq. *Code of Virginia*, requires the Circuit Court of Southampton County to appoint such Board of Equalization, composed of not less than three nor more than five members, who terms shall expire January 1, 2007.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Southampton County Board of Supervisors that the following persons are respectfully recommended to the Circuit Court of Southampton County for appointment to the Board of Equalization:

- (1) Walter Beale, III, Franklin District
- (2) Glenn Updike, Newsoms District
- (3) Meredith Felts, Berlin-Ivor District
- (4) Ben Lee, Drewryville District
- (5) Richard L. Francis, Boykins-Branchville District
- (6) Ash Cutchin, Jerusalem District
- (7) Ernest Claud, Capron District¹

any five of which may serve as active members at any one time, with the remaining two members reserved as alternates; and

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that compensation for such members shall be paid out of the county treasury at the rate of sixty dollars (\$60.00) per diem.

Seconded by Supervisor Brown.

Voting on the Item: YES – Chairman Jones
 Vice-Chairman Young
 Supervisor Brown
 Supervisor Faison
 Supervisor Felts
 Supervisor West
 Supervisor Wyche
 NO – None

A COPY TESTE:

Michael W. Johnson, Clerk
 Southampton County Board of Supervisors

¹ See page 471

Moving to organizational matters, Mr. Johnson announced that § 15.2-1416, *Code of Virginia*, required each Board of Supervisors to meet at a public place in January each year to organize itself by electing a Chairman and Vice-Chairman and setting the days, times, and places of regular meetings to be held during the ensuing months. The employee holiday schedule for the coming year was typically adopted at the organizational meeting as well. He advised that until 1999, the Board met on the first working day each year at 9:00 AM for this purpose. Since then, with the exception of those years following an election of new board members, organizational matters had been deferred until the regular January meeting. If they would prefer not to have a special meeting simply to resolve organizational matters, a motion was required to establish Monday, January 23, 2006 at 6:00 PM as the annual/organizational meeting. Otherwise, a motion would be required to establish the date and time for a special organizational meeting by the Board.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Young, to establish Monday, January 23, 2006 as the date for the 2006 Annual Meeting. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that since the Board chose to defer organizational matters until January 23, 2006, a motion was needed to establish and set aside the following two legal holidays that would take place prior to the organizational meeting:

- Friday, January 13, 2006 – Lee-Jackson Day; and
- Monday, January 16, 2006 – Martin Luther King, Jr. Day

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Felts, to fix and set aside Lee-Jackson Day and Martin Luther King, Jr. Day for county employees. All were in favor.

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that as they may recall, in each of the past two years, the Board of Supervisors had sponsored WHRO's Pioneer Awards Celebration. They had recently announced plans for the 2006 event which would be held on the evening of Saturday, February 4 at the Norfolk Waterside Marriott. This year's honorees were David and Susan Goode. Mr. Goode was chairman of Norfolk Southern Corporation and he and his wife, Susan, had been strong supporters of WHRO for many years. He advised that Jim Oliver, Portsmouth's City Manager, recently contacted him seeking the County's consideration of again sponsoring the event at the \$2,500 level, which included 6 tickets, free parking, a half-page program ad, and specific recognition by WHRO. As they were aware, WHRO provided K-12 Learning Services to 19 public school divisions, 14 independent schools, and home schools, representing 286,000 students and 25,000 educators in greater Hampton Roads. Counties/Cities served by WHRO included Accomack, Chesapeake, Franklin, Gloucester, Hampton, Isle of Wight, Matthews, Middlesex, Newport News, Norfolk, Northampton, Poquoson, Portsmouth, Southampton, Suffolk, Virginia Beach, West Point, Williamsburg, York, and Virginia's School For The Deaf And Blind. In addition, WHRO produced *Virginia Conversations*, a citizen engagement project that used public broadcasting programming, outreach and multimedia capabilities to inform and engage citizens about important public issues.

Supervisor Faison moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to sponsor the WHRO Pioneer Awards at the \$2,500 level. All were in favor.

Moving to the streetlight request, Mr. Johnson announced that we recently received a request from Mrs. Yvette Smith to evaluate Rosemont Road (Jerusalem District) at its intersection with the Lake Gaston pipeline for placement of a streetlight pursuant to the Board's adopted policy. Included in the agenda was a copy of the field report and recommendation of Mr. Jay Randolph, Assistant County Administrator. He concluded that placement of a light in that area was inconsistent with their adopted policy because it did not provide a significant lighting benefit to five or more residential entrances. Mr. Johnson noted that in his discussion with Mrs. Smith, she indicated a problem with chronic loitering in this area and was hopeful that a light may serve as a deterrent.

Supervisor West asked the Sheriff, who was in the audience, to try and increase patrol in that area.

Supervisor Felts thought that was a good idea.

Supervisor Brown pointed out that Mrs. Smith had indicated that this was adjacent to the Lake Gaston pipeline. This may be an indication of some problems that may be associated with the pipeline if it were used as a longitudinal park.

Proceeding to public hearings, Mr. Johnson announced that the first public hearing was being held to consider the following:

The private sale of four (4) separate parcels of property, comprising an aggregate total of approximately 25 acres, in the Southampton Business Park, Agri-Park Drive, Courtland, Virginia to two separate businesses or industries which, at this time, have made no public announcement of their interest in locating or expanding their facilities in Southampton County. The sale price of the aforesaid real estate is proposed to be discounted to \$4,350/acre subject to certain performance criteria related to private investment and job creation, within thirty months of conveyance.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing.

Mr. Jim Bradshaw addressed the Board. He stated that he was glad to hear that there were 2 prospects for the Business Park. He hoped they would consider extending water/sewer to the Turner Tract, because after this, there would not be much property left in the business park.

Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to authorize the sale of parcel(s) 1-4 as described above. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson announced that the second public hearing was being held to consider the following:

A proposed ordinance to establish procedures for the application and disposition of requests for equalization of real estate assessments.

The ordinance is as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR APPLICATION AND DISPOSITION OF REQUESTS FOR EQUALIZATION OF REAL ESTATE ASSESSMENTS BY THE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that pursuant to Section 58.1-3378 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, that the deadline for receipt of applications to the Southampton County Board of Equalization shall be ~~February~~ *March* 15, 2006, and the deadline for disposition of applications by the Board of Equalization shall be ~~March~~ *April* 15, 2006.

A copy teste: _____, Clerk
Southampton County Board of Supervisors
Adopted: ~~October 24, 2005~~ *December 19, 2005*

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing. No members of the public desired to speak. Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisors West and Wyche, to adopt the ordinance. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson announced that the third public hearing was being held to consider the following:

A proposed ordinance providing for the implementation of changes to the Personal Property Tax Relief Act of 1998 (PPTRA), affected by legislation adopted during the 2004 Special Session I and 2005 Regular Session of the General Assembly of Virginia.

The ordinance is as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO PROVIDE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2004-05 CHANGES TO THE PERSONAL PROPERTY TAX RELIEF ACT of 1998

WHEREAS the Personal Property Tax Relief Act of 1998, Va. Code §§ 51.1-3523 *et seq.* (“PPTRA”) has been substantially modified by the enactment of Chapter 1 of the Acts of Assembly, 2004 Special Session I (Senate Bill 5005), and the provisions of Item 503 of Chapter 951 of the 2005 Acts of Assembly (the 2005 revisions to the 2004-06 Appropriations Act, hereinafter cited as the “2005 Appropriations Act”); and

WHEREAS these legislative enactments require Southampton County to take affirmative steps to implement these changes, and to provide for the computation and allocation of relief provided pursuant to the PPTRA as revised; and

WHEREAS these legislative enactments provide for the appropriation to Southampton County, commencing in 2006, of a sum to be used exclusively for the provision of tax relief to owners of qualifying personal use vehicles that are subject to the personal property tax (“PPT”) on such vehicles, and provide the opportunity for Southampton County to fashion a program of tax relief that serves the best interests of its citizenry;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the Southampton County Board of Supervisors as follows:

§ 1. Purpose; Definitions; Relation to other Ordinances.

(a) The purpose of this Ordinance is to provide for the implementation of changes to PPTRA effected by legislation adopted during the 2004 Special Session I and 2005 Regular Session of the General Assembly of Virginia.

(b) Terms used in this Ordinance that have defined meaning set forth in PPTRA shall have the same meanings as set forth in Va. Code § 58.1-3523, as amended.

(c) To the extent that the provisions of this Ordinance conflict with any prior Ordinance or provision of the Southampton County Code, this Ordinance shall control.

§ 2. Method of Computing and Reflecting Tax Relief.

(a) For tax years commencing in 2006, Southampton County adopts the provisions of Item 503.E of the 2005 Appropriations Act, providing for the computation of tax relief as a specific dollar amount to be offset against the total taxes that would otherwise be due but for PPTRA and the reporting of such specific dollar relief on the tax bill.

(b) The Board of Supervisors shall by annual ordinance set the rate of tax relief at such a level that is anticipated fully to exhaust PPTRA relief funds provided to Southampton County by the Commonwealth. Any amount of PPTRA relief not used within the County’s fiscal year shall be carried forward and used to increase the funds available for personal property tax relief in the following fiscal year.

(c) Personal property tax bills shall set forth on their face the specific dollar amount of relief credited with respect to each qualifying vehicle, together with an explanation of the general manner in which relief is allocated.

§ 3. Allocation of Relief Among Taxpayers.

(a) Allocation of PPTRA relief shall be provided in accordance with the general provisions of this section, as implemented by the specific provisions of the County’s annual budget relating to PPTRA relief.

(b) Relief shall be allocated in such a manner as to eliminate personal property taxation of each qualifying vehicle with an assessed value of \$1000 or less.

(c) Relief with respect to qualifying vehicles with assessed values of more than \$1,000 shall be provided at a rate, annually fixed in the Southampton County budget and applied to the first \$20,000 in value of each such qualifying vehicle, that is estimated fully to use all available state PPTRA relief. The rate shall be established annually as part of the adopted budget of Southampton County. *[NOTE: this provides for a single rate of relief applicable to the first \$20,000 of vehicle value.]*

§ 4. Transitional Provisions.

(a) Pursuant to authority conferred in Item 503.D of the 2005 Appropriations Act, the Southampton County Treasurer is authorized to issue a supplemental personal property tax bill, in the amount of 100 percent of tax due without regard to any former entitlement to state PPTRA relief, plus applicable penalties and interest, to any taxpayer whose taxes with respect to a qualifying vehicle for tax year 2005 or any prior tax year remain unpaid on September 1, 2006, or such date as state funds for reimbursement of the state share of such bill have become unavailable, whichever earlier occurs.

(b) Penalty and interest with respect to bills issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be computed on the entire amount of tax owed. Interest shall be computed at the rate provided in Sec. 15-78 of the Southampton County Code, as amended, from the original due date of the tax.

This ordinance shall become effective at 12:01 a.m., December 20, 2005.

A copy teste: _____, Clerk
Southampton County Board of Supervisors
Adopted: December 19, 2005

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing. No members of the public desired to speak. Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to adopt the ordinance. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson announced that the fourth public hearing was being held to consider the following:

REZ 10052005 Application filed by Hampton Roads Development LLC, requesting a change in zoning classification from A-2, Agricultural to C-R1, Conditional Residential of approximately 26.37 acres. The purpose of the application is for twenty-six (26) single family residential lots, as conditioned. The subject property is located south of Clay Street (Route 58 Business) and west of Regency Lane. The property is further identified as Tax Map Numbers 78-36 and 78-40 and is located in the Franklin Magisterial District and Franklin Voting District.

(Note: Upon approval of the rezoning request, the owner's plans were to develop a subdivision known as Brandywine.)

Mr. Jay Randolph, Secretary of the Planning Commission and Assistant County Administrator, reported that subsequent to the Planning Commission's review of this application, the owner amended the application to provide twenty-four (24) single family residential lots instead of twenty-six (26) lots. Two (2) proposed residential lots had been removed and replaced with a neighborhood park around the existing pond. He informed that the front portion of the property was located within the corporate limits of the City of Franklin and was currently zoned for residential use. The applicant had proposed 34 lots within the city limits and 24 lots in Southampton County. Conditions offered as part of the zoning application included the installation of sidewalks and the construction of curb and gutter along the edge of the roadways. Also subsequent to the Planning Commission's review of this application, the owner amended the application to provide for additional proffers of crawl space foundations with brick skirting and the creation of a homeowner's association to maintain common areas and open space. He advised that this application did have some history, as a formal request had previously been made to the City of Franklin by Southampton County to utilize city services for the project. The Franklin City Council had adopted a resolution authorizing such extension of utilities with specific conditions. He stated that the Planning Commission held a public hearing on this application at its November 3, 2005 meeting and unanimously recommended denial.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing.

Supervisor Brown asked if this rezoning process was initiated prior to the 2-lot ordinance? Mr. Randolph replied yes. A preliminary sketch was presented over a year ago.

Supervisor Faison stated that he understood there were some concerns at the Planning Commission's public hearing regarding a road that would connect this subdivision, Brandywine, to Regency Estates Subdivision.

Supervisor Brown stated that he understood that the connecting road could be a gravel or grassy road to allow for a walking/biking trail and the passage of emergency vehicles.

Mr. Randolph advised that there were citizens, particularly residents of Regency Estates, present at the Planning Commission's public hearing who were opposed to a road, which was in the developer's plans for vehicle traffic, that would connect this Brandywine Subdivision to Regency

Estates. They indicated that they liked their neighborhood as it was and did not want any increased traffic that may occur if the two subdivisions were connected. The developer proposed to make the road a gravel or grassy road to be used for a walking/biking trail and to allow for the passage of emergency vehicles only.

Supervisor West stated that we had a sunset clause in place that he thought we should respect. He thought it was a good plan otherwise.

(Note: The Board adopted an ordinance on February 28, 2005 limiting the division of agricultural land to two further divisions. The ordinance contained a sunset clause in that the ordinance would expire one year from the date of adoption. This ordinance has often been referred to as a "two cut" ordinance or a "moratorium.")

Supervisor Brown stated that he respected Supervisor West's opinion, but he wanted to hear from the public first before he made a decision.

Mr. Jason Fowler of Courtland addressed the Board. He advised that he was in favor of the application. It was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the developer had proffered construction of curb and gutter along the edge of the roadways, which was not required by the County. It was his understanding that the two cut ordinance applied only to agricultural land. The developer was proposing to rezone to residential. He stated that the homes in this subdivision would be valued at \$300,000 or more, which would compensate for the cost of services that the County would have to provide.

Mr. Glenn Updike addressed the Board. He stated that he did not see how they could even consider this. It would be a slap in the face. As far as the proffer of the homeowner's association, we did not have anything in place to enforce homeowner's associations.

Mr. Jim Bradshaw addressed the Board. He advised that he was here to promote development around the City of Franklin and the towns. He distributed copies of certain sections of the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the Comprehensive Plan indicated, among other things, that we should encourage residential development around the towns and the City of Franklin. The proposed development met all of the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan and he encouraged them to follow the Comprehensive Plan and put growth where it was desired.

Mr. Hunter Darden addressed the Board. He stated that it bothered him to see the Board weakening. The Task Force had worked long and hard to come up with something to help control growth in this County and ensure that developers paid their way. He asked them to respect the Task Force and wait until new regulations were in place before they considered approving a rezoning such as this. He commented that he did not think real estate taxes generated from the houses in this proposed development would pay for the services the County would have to provide.

Mr. George Fiscella of Hampton Roads Development (owner/applicant/developer) addressed the Board. He stated that the subject had come up about the two cut ordinance. The ordinance was to prohibit the subdivision of agricultural land – it was not to prohibit rezoning. He advised that he presented preliminary plans to the County in October 2004. He had also requested that the County request a water/sewer extension from the City of Franklin for this project, and that was resolved in January 2005. He informed that he had worked with the Corp of Engineers and had resolved wetland delineation issues.

Mr. Gary Cross addressed the Board. He stated that he thought we should wait and try to get proffers. He agreed that the proposed development was in the right place. He was, however, concerned about the wetlands. He thought we should get some cash proffers to go along with the pretty curbing.

Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Supervisor West stated that Mr. Fiscella should hold on for 60 more days. People should respect their job.

Vice-Chairman Young advised that he had received a lot of calls and nobody was in favor of it.

Supervisor Faison advised that he was impressed with the work the developer had put in. However, he too thought we should wait.

Supervisors Felts and Wyche agreed that we should wait.

Supervisor Brown stated that this issue could not be about 24 new houses because there were 18 new houses in the County just in the month of November according to the New Housing Starts report included in the agenda. The Comprehensive Plan indicated that we wanted residential development to occur in this area. He was sick of piano-key development. We needed to put the development where we wanted it. We could not use the two cut ordinance as a means of negating rezoning.

Vice-Chairman Young made a motion to follow the Planning Commission’s recommendation and deny the rezoning request. Supervisor West seconded the motion.

There was some discussion by the Board that since the applicant had made amendments to the application subsequent to the Planning Commission’s review and public hearing, the Planning Commission should have the opportunity to review it again.

Vice-Chairman Young amended his original motion and made a motion instead to send the application back to the Planning Commission for review. Supervisor West seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson announced that the fifth public hearing was being held to consider the following:

ZO 09092005 Consideration of an ordinance to establish Article VIII, Rural Residential Zoning District-RR, in Chapter 18, Zoning, of the Southampton County Code. The purpose of the ordinance is to provide for limited and low-density development within agricultural areas, while being protective of the County’s rural character and preserving open space and productive farm and timberlands. The proposed district will not change any existing zoning classifications on individual parcels, but rather allow for an additional residential classification to be considered during rezoning applications.

The ordinance is as follows:

ARTICLE VII. RURAL RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, RR

Sec. 18-175. Purpose of the district.

This district is intended to provide for limited and low-density residential development within agricultural areas (as defined by the Comprehensive Plan) while being protective of the County’s rural character and preserving open space and productive farm and timberlands. In accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, residential development in the RR District will utilize either of three (3) options in designing residential subdivisions: Timed Approach Development, Sliding scale development or Cluster Development with density bonus. Selection of one of the three options commits the parent property to that option with regards to future development rights. A pre-application meeting with County staff is required to fully explain the development options to the applicant. In addition, residential development that occurs in these areas is encouraged to locate in the woodland areas and the least productive agricultural land where the conflicts between the residential uses and the farm uses can be minimized.

Sec. 18-176. Required zoning.

All proposed residential subdivisions* in areas designated for agricultural activities by the comprehensive plan, other than those expressly exempted in the Southampton County Subdivision Ordinance, shall require a rezoning classification to the rural residential zoning classification prior to final approval of the subdivision plat by the subdivision agent. (*Subdivision. The division or re-subdivision of a lot, tract, or parcel of land by any means into two (2) or more lots, tracts, or parcels or other divisions of land including changes in existing lot lines for the purpose, whether immediate or future, of lease, transfer of ownership or building or lot development and as further defined in the Southampton County Subdivision Ordinance.)

Sec. 18-177. Permitted uses.

In a rural residential district, RR, structures to be erected or land to be used shall be for one (1) or more of the following uses:

- (1) Detached single-family dwellings.

- (2) Modular homes, as herein defined.
- (3) Bed and breakfast inn, with a conditional use permit.
- (4) Churches and Sunday schools, rectories, parish houses, convents and monasteries, temples and synagogues and cemeteries accessory thereto.
- (5) Cemeteries not accessory to a church with a conditional use permit.
- (6) Convalescent homes, nursing homes or homes for the aged, and family care homes, with a conditional use permit.
- (7) Facilities and structures necessary for rendering public utility service, including poles, wires, transformers, telephone booths and the like for electrical power distribution or communication service, and underground pipelines or conduits for electrical, gas, sewer, or water service, but not including buildings, treatment plants, water storage tanks, pumping or regulator stations, major transmission lines, storage yards and substations which are permitted with a conditional use permit.
- (8) Home occupations, rural, as defined in Section 18.1 with a conditional use permit.
- (9) Hospital or clinic for humans with a conditional use permit.
- (10) Housing or dormitory facilities associated with schools, churches, and recognized nonprofit organizations, with a conditional use permit.
- (11) Nursery schools, kindergartens, child care centers, day nursery or child day care centers with a conditional use permit.
- (12) Private schools, colleges or universities with a conditional use permit.
- (13) Public or governmental buildings and uses, including schools, fire stations (volunteer or otherwise), parks, parkways, playgrounds and public boat landings except those which have been approved as a part of the subdivision plan, with a conditional use permit.
- (14) Radio or television transmission or receiving station or tower less than one hundred twenty-five (125) feet in height; tower more than one hundred twenty-five (125) feet in height with a conditional use permit.
- (15) Recreational uses or facilities, commercially operated or for a private membership, such as golf courses, country clubs, game courts, swimming pools, archery range, and fishing or boating lakes, or similar activities, and accessory facilities, including sale of food, beverages, bait, incidentals, supplies and equipment, with a conditional use permit.
- (16) Stable, private, for keeping of horses, ponies or other livestock for personal enjoyment and not as a business, provided that any building for keeping of animals shall be located at least one hundred (100) feet from any side or rear lot line, with a conditional use permit.
- (17) School bus passenger shelter without advertising.
- (17.1) Wireless communication facilities per section 18-427 of this chapter.
- (18) Yard sale or garage sale for disposal of used household items, provided such sales are not held more frequently than twice a year on the same lot, are not conducted for more than three (3) days, and include items assembled only from households in the immediate neighborhood.
- (19) Accessory buildings and uses, including but not limited to accessory private garages and other structures, swimming pools, accessory storage and accessory off-street parking and loading spaces and accessory non-illuminated or indirectly illuminated signs as follows:
 - a. A name plate or directional sign, limited in area to two (2) square feet, to identify the owner or occupant of a dwelling or building.
 - b. No trespassing or no hunting signs, without limitations on number or placement, limited in area to two (2) square feet.
 - c. A sign, limited in area to thirty-two (32) square feet for identification of a farm or estate or a subdivision or its occupants.
 - d. A sign, limited in area to thirty-two (32) square feet, for a church bulletin board or identification of permitted public or semi-public uses, wildlife reservations, recreational uses or clubs.
 - e. Temporary non-illuminated signs, limited in area to four (4) square feet, directing the way to premises which are for sale or rent.
 - f. A temporary, non-illuminated sign, limited in area to thirty-two (32) square feet, advertising real estate for sale or lease or announcing contemplated improvements of the real estate on which it is placed.
 - g. A temporary sign, limited in area to thirty-two (32) square feet, erected in connection with new construction work and displayed on the premises only during such time as the actual construction work is in progress.
 - h. Temporary signs at appropriate locations, on or off the premises, for direction of the traveling public, truck deliveries and employees to an activity or event, a church, school, historic place, subdivision or community, a construction site or excavation, airport or other center of employment or visitor center or recreational facility in an isolated area of the county, limited in area to thirty-two (32) square feet and subject to approval of location, design, and wording, by the administrator. This permitted sign is not intended as an ordinary advertising device.
 - i. Temporary non-illuminated paper signs.

Sec 18-178. Development Standards-Timed Approach

Under the timed approach option, a single (1) lot subdivision from the parent tract, subject to rezoning approval by the Board of Supervisors, shall not occur more than once every three (3) years. A title search will be required as part of the rezoning application in order to verify the compliance with the time standards stated above.

In addition to the requirement listed above, the following standards shall apply:

1. The minimum acreage for the parent property to qualify for application is 25 acres. The minimum lot size for any new lot created shall be forty thousand (40,000) square feet and the maximum lot size for any new lot created shall be five (5) acres, unless otherwise approved by the Board of Supervisors or required by the County Health Department.
2. Lots shall be located to maximize continued use of the residual parcel for agricultural and silvicultural purposes.
3. The first two lots shall be located on private shared driveways that serve no more than two residences, with no frontage on the public road unless specific conditions necessitate variations and are approved by the Board of Supervisors. These conditions may include driveway sight distances, topography of the site, wetlands, soils, floodplains/floodways, and significant natural, historical and archaeological features.
4. Residual property with an agricultural zoning designation may be transferred or combined with other adjacent property that contains a similar agricultural zoning designation.
5. Unless and until transferred or combined, residual property shall be maintained and remain the responsibility of the original property owner.

Sec 18-179 Development Standards-Sliding Scale

A. Under the sliding scale development provision, the base density of a tract of land twenty five (25) acres may be allowed one (1) division. One (1) additional lot or dwelling unit will be permitted for every additional forty (40) acres encompassed by the overall tract. For example, a tract consisting of between 105 acres and 145 acres will yield three (3) new lots plus the remainder lot for a total of (4) lots. Minimum permissible lot sizes shall be encouraged so as not to allow subdivision development which is land consumptive; however, each lot must meet the minimum lot requirements for the Rural Residential (RR) District.

B. In addition to the base density permitted above, the following standards shall be met:

6. The minimum lot size shall be forty thousand (40,000) square feet and the maximum lot size for any new lot created shall be five (5) acres, unless otherwise approved by the Board of Supervisors or required by the County Health Department.
7. Lots shall be located to maximize continued use of the residual parcel for agricultural and silvicultural purposes.
8. The first two lots shall be located on private shared driveways that serve no more than two residences, with no frontage on the public road unless specific conditions necessitate variations and are approved by the Board of Supervisors. These conditions may include driveway sight distances, topography of the site, wetlands, soils, floodplains/floodways, and significant natural, historical and archaeological features.
9. Residual property with an agricultural zoning designation may be transferred or combined with other adjacent property that contains a similar agricultural zoning designation.
10. Unless and until transferred or combined, residual property shall be maintained and remain the responsibility of the original property owner.

C. In determining the overall tract size provision, staff shall base the number of lots permitted on the following, listed in order from least to most binding:

1. On the parcel shown on the latest County Tax Maps with the acreage indicated in the Real Estate records of the Commissioner of Revenue's Office, excluding street or road rights-of-way.
2. On documents of record in the Office of the Clerk of the Court (which shall take precedent over the Tax Map information.)

Sec. 18-180. Development Standards-Cluster Development with Density Bonus.

A. General Description

Cluster development in the Rural Residential (RR) District is encouraged to protect rural character and to maintain productive farmland in farm use while permitting limited development in rural areas of the County. It is intended to encourage innovative and creative design of residential development; to preserve agricultural lands and enhance the rural atmosphere and visual character of the County, and, to encourage a more efficient use of land and services in order to reduce construction costs, reflect changes in the technology of land development and minimize maintenance costs of service delivery and utility systems.

The Cluster option is more suited for tracts which are adjacent to or near more urban-like areas; serving as transition areas between more urban-like development and agricultural lands. Clustering should help to reduce potential land use conflicts (buffering agricultural lands from residential cluster development), while

allowing appropriate development in areas of the County where development may be desired and likely to occur.

B. Applicability

The following provisions establish minimum performance standards associated with three (3) optional density increases which may be exercised by landowners in the RR District at the time of rezoning of the property.

The density options available shall be one (1) dwelling unit per ten (10) acres, but may be increased to one (1) dwelling unit per eight (8) acres or one (1) dwelling per five (5) acres, if certain development standards are met as conditions of density increase. These development standards are outlined in subsection (D).

C. General Standards

The following general standards shall apply to all cluster developments in the RR District:

1. The applicant shall have legal or equitable title to the property or shall otherwise have a legally documented financial interest in the real property, which is the subject of the application.
2. The proposed development shall contain a minimum of twenty five (25) contiguous acres located within the RR District.
3. All lots created through the act of subdivision shall be served by no more than one (1) point of access to an existing public road. The internal street serving the subdivision shall be constructed in accordance with the applicable minimum standards of and dedicated to the Virginia Department of Transportation.
4. In no case shall residential structures be located within one hundred (100) feet of an existing public road right-of-way. Fifty (50) feet of the one hundred (100) foot buffer yard between the lots and the public road right-of-way shall be landscaped to maintain or enhance the rural image or left in a natural setting.
5. Dedication of additional public road right-of-way adjacent to an existing public road for future widening when the highway level of service in the area necessitates widening shall be a condition of development at each of the three (3) optional densities contained in subsection (B) of this section.
6. The overall tract size as it relates to the maximum number of permitted lots and amount of preserved open space requirements shall not include land that has been determined to be unsuitable for residential development. If an environmental assessment is determined to be necessary to provide this information to an extent that satisfies the County, the information shall be provided by the applicant and/or owner.

D. Density Options

1. The base density of one (1) dwelling unit per ten (10) acres may be permitted provided:
 - a. Clustering at a density of one (1) dwelling unit per ten (10) acres so that no more than fifty percent (50%) of the total base site area is to be included in the subdivision, including lots, road right-of-way, and other required public improvements.
 - b. Fifty percent (50%) of the site shall be permanently established in open space including farm or forest use and restricted from further residential development.
 - c. The minimum lot shall be forty thousand (40,000) square feet and the maximum lot size shall be five (5) acres, provided the health department standards for use of on-site septic systems are met.
2. The base density may be increased to one (1) dwelling unit per eight (8) acres if the following conditions are met:
 - a. Clustering at a density of one (1) dwelling unit per eight (8) acres so that no more than forty percent (40%) of the base site area is included in the subdivision, including lots, road rights-of way and other required public improvements.
 - b. Sixty percent (60%) of the site shall be permanently established in open space including farm or forest use and is restricted from further residential development.
 - c. The minimum lot size shall be forty thousand (40,000) square feet and the maximum lot size shall be three and one-half (3.5) acres in size, provided the health department standards for on-site septic systems are met.
3. The base density may be increased to one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) acres provided:
 - a. Clustering at a density of one (1) dwelling unit per five (5) acres so that no more than thirty percent (30%) of the base site area is to be included in the subdivision, including lots, rights-of-way and other required public improvements.
 - b. Seventy percent (70%) of the site shall remain in open space including farm or forest use and restricted from further residential development.

E. Open Space Requirements

Regardless of which of the three (3) density options is exercised, the following standards shall apply to any open space which may be included within and made part of the cluster development and so designated on the subdivision plat:

1. All open spaces shall be preserved for their intended purpose. Open space is land that is not to be developed for residential purposes, but may be used to enhance or compliment adjoining land uses.
2. A maintenance and operations plan with appropriate surety considerations for open space use shall be prepared and submitted to the County as part of the review process.
3. There shall be established an association, corporation, trust, foundation or other entity to insure the satisfactory maintenance of any required open space.
4. When the development is to administer open space or other facilities through an association, corporation, trust or foundation, said organization shall conform to the following requirements:
 - a. The property owner or developer must establish the entity prior to the sale of any lots within the subdivision.
 - b. The entity shall manage all common and open spaces, and recreational and cultural facilities, shall provide for the maintenance, administration and operation of said land and improvements and any other land within the development and shall provide appropriate surety considerations to comply with said requirement.
 - c. The organization shall conform to the Condominium Act, Code of Virginia (1950), as amended.

The foregoing standards for open space shall not apply to any acreage of the original parent tract of land which is not included as part of the overall project application.

Sec. 18-181. Setback regulations.

Except as provided elsewhere in this chapter, structures shall be at least fifty (50) feet from any street right-of-way, except that where an addition is planned to an existing nonconforming structure, such an addition may extend or project into the required front yard provided such addition does not extend or project any closer to the street right-of-way than the original structure and provided that such addition does not exceed fifty (50) percent of the gross floor area of the existing structure, except that permitted signs may be erected up to ten (10) feet from the street right-of-way. On a U.S. highway structures other than signs shall be set back at least one hundred (100) feet from the street right-of-way and on a primary highway at least seventy-five (75) feet.

Sec. 18-182. Lot frontage.

State road frontage is not required, however, if it is provided, the minimum frontage shall be one hundred fifty (150) feet subject to the Board of Supervisors approval as outlined in the Section 18-178B(3) and Section 18-179C(3). In the event that the parcel does not contain state road frontage, a minimum twenty (20) foot ingress/egress easement consisting of an all weather surface shall be provided to serve the lot(s). If the easement serves more than three (3) lots, it shall be increased to fifty (50) feet, and the roadway must be of an all weather surface of a minimum twenty (20) feet in width.

Sec. 18-183. Minimum lot width.

Except as provided elsewhere in this chapter, the minimum lot width shall be one hundred fifty (150) feet.

Sec. 18-184. Yard regulations.

- (a) *Side.* The minimum side yard for each main structure in a RR district shall be fifteen (15) feet and the total width of the two (2) required side yards shall be at least thirty-five (35) feet.
- (b) *Rear.* Each main structure shall have a rear yard of thirty-five (35) feet or more.

Sec. 18-185. Height restrictions.

Buildings in an RR district may be erected up to thirty-five (35) feet in height; except, that:

- (1) The height limit of dwellings may be increased ten (10) feet and up to three (3) stories; provided, that there are two (2) side yards for each permitted use, each of which is fifteen (15) feet or more plus one (1) foot or more of side yard for each additional foot of building height over thirty-five (35) feet.
- (2) A public or semi-public building such as a school, church, library or hospital may be erected to a height of sixty (60) feet from grade; provided, that required front, side and rear yards shall be increased one (1) foot for each foot in height over thirty-five (35) feet.
- (3) Church spires, belfries, cupolas, monuments, water towers, chimneys, flues, flagpoles and television antennae and radio aerials less than one hundred twenty-five (125) feet in height, are exempt. Parapet walls may be up to four (4) feet above the height of the building on which the walls rest.
- (4) No accessory building which is within twenty (20) feet of any party lot line shall be more than one (1) story high. All accessory buildings shall be less than the main building in height and no accessory building shall be more than fifteen (15) feet in height.

Sec. 18-186. Special provisions for corner lots.

- (a) Of the two (2) sides of a corner lot in an RR district the front shall be deemed to be the shortest of the two (2) sides fronting on streets.
- (b) The side yard on the side facing the side street shall be thirty-five (35) feet or more for both main and accessory building.
- (c) Each corner lot shall have a minimum width at the setback line of one hundred twenty-five (125) feet.
- (d) Landscaping of corner lots shall be limited to plantings, fences or other landscaping features of no more than three (3) feet in height within the space between the setback line and the property line on the street side of the lot.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing.

Mr. S.V. Camp addressed the Board. He advised that he was a developer and a proponent of growth. If you looked at the 7 communities in this County, they were dead. They should make the developers show them their plans. He understood that they wanted to preserve the quality of the rural atmosphere. But if quality were built in the rural areas, they could have the best of both worlds. We needed to stop piano-key development. He liked winding roads and wooded lots. He developed a rural and wooded development known as Chesdin Landing in Chesterfield County, which was probably the most restrictive county in Virginia. They loved Chesterfield County and Chesterfield County loved them because of the real estate taxes the houses in Chesdin Landing generated. He stated that this Rural Residential document was the most restrictive thing he had ever read. He was particularly interested in the cluster development section. The ordinance was hard to read, but from what he understood, with the cluster development, if you had a 50-acre property, you were required to preserve at least half of it. That would leave you 25 acres. The ordinance stated that you could only have 1 house per 10 acres, so you would only get 2 houses. You would then have to subtract land for the building of roads, so you might not even get 2. The cost of building roads was about \$100 per lineal foot. You could not build 1,000 feet of road at that cost just to sell 2 lots. He advised that he would like to see the Comprehensive Plan updated and developed first before we looked at these ordinances. He would like to see this sent back to the Planning Commission. The cluster development section definitely needed tweaking. If you were going to have industry, you had to have affordable housing. He asked where the money was going to come from to run this County 5-10 years from now? We were going to die on the vine if we did not allow development. He would like to see them pass an ordinance where every developer had to come before the Planning Commission with their plans and show them what they wanted to do.

Mrs. Gail Phillips addressed the Board. She asked what were we voting on? Was it an actual district or what? Mr. Jay Randolph explained that we were voting on the creation of an additional residential zoning district known as Rural Residential (RR). This would be an additional rezoning classification that could be considered during rezoning application. This proposed district would not change any existing zoning classifications on individual parcels.

Supervisor Brown stated that it was important that the general populous understand the caveats. He had received numerous calls from people wanting to know how this would affect them.

Mr. Sam Banks addressed the Board. He asked if there were any exemptions for family members? Mr. Randolph replied yes. They would be discussed and explained in the next public hearing.

Mr. Hunter Darden addressed the Board. He commented that this would give adjoining landowners the right to know what their neighbors wanted to do.

Mr. Gary Cross addressed the Board. He stated that he was a farmer. We were not going to die on the vine if we did not allow development. The Task Force had worked hard and this was a good plan. However, he did not think Mr. Johnson and his staff had presented it very well to the public.

Mr. Glenn Updike addressed the Board. He advised that this was one of the few times he would encourage them to spend some money. They needed someone to get the facts and figures together. Where were the economic studies? There had never been any discussion on the impact of this. They needed to hire a good economic analyst. They were making big decisions without facts and an economic basis.

Vice-Chairman Young asked if this needed to go back to the Planning Commission? Mr. Camp made some good points.

Chairman Jones pointed out that we could make changes to it at any time. This was better than what we had.

Supervisor Faison stated that we heard some good comments. He appreciated that this was not in concrete.

Supervisor West advised that he thought they were doing the best for all citizens. We may, however, find that we need to adjust it.

Supervisor Felts commented that these were steps to control growth.

Supervisor Wyche remarked that the ordinance would give us something to start with.

Supervisor Brown stated that he had some unreadiness based on concerns of constituents. The general populous did not understand it. There were also risks associated with this ordinance. We needed to look at the economic impact and also revisit the cluster development section. He was ready to send this back to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Randolph advised that there were a number of pre-existing parcels throughout the County. We had to ask what we wanted the County to look like in 20 years. The sunset clause would expire on February 28, and with nothing to take its place, it would go back to the way it was. He stated that the cluster development section was strict because they did not want large development in agricultural areas. Through the Task Force process, it was actually debated whether to even have a cluster development option. He pointed out that with this Rural Residential District, there were provisions for exemptions, which was the subject of the next public hearing. He advised that regarding the fiscal impact, they had contracted with a consultant to present a proffer analysis, etc.

Supervisor Brown stated that again, the cluster development option needed to be revisited. There was a lot of unreadiness. He understood the ordinance but constituents did not, and he was speaking on behalf of them.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to adopt the ordinance.

Mr. Johnson, County Administrator, clarified that they could adopt the ordinance to become effective immediately, or if they preferred, to become effective March 1, 2006 at 12:01 AM so it would begin immediately following the expiration of the current ordinance.

Supervisor Brown stated that we needed to take care of the problems with this ordinance now.

Supervisor Faison stated that it was a good document, but since we had the time, perhaps we should go back and look at it.

Mr. Randolph advised that realistically, if they sent it back to the Planning Commission, they would not come back with a recommendation until March.

Vice-Chairman Young amended his motion to include that the ordinance would become effective March 1, 2006 at 12:01 AM. Supervisor West seconded the motion. Chairman Jones, Vice-Chairman Young, and Supervisors Faison, Felts, West, and Wyche voted in favor of the motion. Supervisor Brown voted in opposition to the motion. The vote was 6-1 in favor of the motion, thus the motion passed.

Supervisor Brown advised that he understood the ordinance and thought we needed it, but he voted against it due to the unreadiness.

Mr. Johnson announced that the sixth and final public hearing was being held to consider the following:

SO 11032005 Consideration of an ordinance amending Section 14-3, Exemptions to the Subdivision Ordinance, of the Southampton County Code. The purpose of the amendment is to provide exemptions to the Subdivision Ordinance for existing home sites, court ordered partitioning of estates, bona fide agricultural operations, lot line adjustments, and family member transfers. These exemptions may be subject to additional provisions as outlined in the ordinance.

The ordinance amendment is as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 14-3

Sec.14-3 Exemption from chapter

All subdivisions for residential purposes require a residential zoning classification except that the agent may permit the separation of a parcel from a tract of land without complying with this requirement or other requirements of this chapter as follows:

- 1) There is no conflict with the general meaning of this chapter.
- 2) The site of an existing dwelling and its accessory buildings, whether or not occupied and regardless of the condition of the structures, may be sold as a separate lot with minimum lot area of forty thousand (40,000) square feet, whether or not in a field or pasture, if an accessway of twenty (20) foot minimum width is provided to a public street or road.
- 3) The division or partitioning of land in an estate by court order among heirs of the original owner.
- 4) A bona fide division of a tract of agricultural land for agricultural purposes. Approval through this exemption will prohibit residential zoning applications from being initiated on such newly created lots for a minimum period of ten (10) years. A statement indicating that the lots are for agricultural purposes only and are subject to the above stated time limitation will be clearly noted on the recorded plat.
- 5) The straightening of property lines of adjoining parcels for the purposes of small adjustments in boundaries, provided that none of the original lots, portions of which are sold or exchanged, shall be reduced below the minimum lot area requirements and provided all other provisions of the zoning ordinance are met including Sections 18-178 (4) and 18-179 B (9).
- 6) A single division of land into parcels where such division is for the purpose of sale or gift to a member of the immediate family of the property owner, provided:
 - a) Only one (1) such division shall be allowed per family member;
 - b) Such division shall not be for the purpose of circumventing this Ordinance;
 - c) A member of the immediate family shall be defined as any person who is natural or legally defined off-spring, spouse, sibling, grandchild, grandparent, or parent of the owner;
 - d) Such division shall otherwise comply with applicable provisions of this Ordinance and the Southampton County Zoning Ordinance;
 - e) Plats for such lot or parcel divisions shall be noted for the purpose of sale or gift to an immediate family member, and shall include a note stating the name of the immediate family member who will receive such lot or parcel and their family relationship to the property owner. Such plat shall be approved by the agent prior to recordation.
 - f) Where new streets are required to serve any such division, the new street must be constructed in accordance with VDOT street standards.
 - g) No family divisions shall be transferred for a period of ten (10) years, except for the purpose of securing a construction loan and/or bona fide refinancing. During the ten (10) year period following the creation of lots by family division, no sale of any such lot shall be made and no residential structure on such lot shall be rented to any person other than the immediate family member as defined above unless such lots are subject to involuntary transfer such as by foreclosure, death, judicial sale, condemnation, bankruptcy, divorce or any circumstance deemed appropriate by the agent upon application.
 - h) Variances as approved by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Section 14-12.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing.

Mr. Randolph clarified for Supervisor Brown that with the family member exemptions, once you cut a lot, it would remain A-1 even if you built a house on it. But if you then wanted to sell it to someone outside of the immediate family, that person would have to rezone.

Mr. Randolph clarified for Mr. Sam Banks that a single division of land into parcels for the purpose of sale or gift to a member of the immediate family of the property owner was exempt. There were some stipulations including that only one division would be allowed per family member. Also, following the creation of lots by family division, no lot could be rented or sold to any person other than the immediate family for a period of ten years, unless the lots were subject to an involuntary transfer such as foreclosure, bankruptcy, divorce, etc.

Mr. John Riddick addressed the Board. He informed that some property had been left to he and his siblings. A couple siblings had passed away and he had bought their shares of the property, so he and the remaining siblings owned the property. He asked, if they wanted to divide the property into lots, could they do so? Mr. Richard Railey, County Attorney, advised that they would be exempt, but it was up to he and his siblings to agree on how they wanted to divide it.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to adopt the ordinance amendment with an effective date of March 1, 2006 at 12:01 AM. All were in favor.

The Board took a 5-minute recess.

Upon returning to open session, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda for their reference was correspondence from Virginia Beach Mayor Meyera Oberndorf indicating the City's willingness to cooperate with Southampton County, should it decide to pursue development of a longitudinal park along the Lake Gaston right-of-way. He advised that with use of the property seemingly resolved, he would recommend that the Board simply take this matter under advisement for the time being and allow project proponents an opportunity to work with adjacent property owners and other interested citizens in identifying the issues and concerns, as well as further exploring project details, design, and funding. He envisioned the project proponents assuming the lead role in facilitating community meetings, followed sometime next spring with an official public hearing, after which a final decision may be considered by the Board.

The Board agreed that they should take the matter under advisement for the time being.

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda for their consideration was a copy of the Southampton County Planning Commission's report regarding final plat approval for Regency Estates, Section 4. He noted that they may recall granting preliminary plat approval at their October 2004 regular session. He advised that as they were aware, the Regency Estates subdivision straddled the City of Franklin-Southampton County line. Section 4 included a total of thirty-seven (37) residential building lots, eighteen (18) of which were situated in Southampton County, each with a minimum of 20,000 square feet in area, acceptable standards in a Residential R-1 zoning district. The lots were proposed to be served with municipal water and sewer services by the City of Franklin. He stated that final approval was subject to the posting of certain sureties by the developer for unfinished improvements and payment of certain fees, including:

- 1) Surety in the amount of \$61,225 for hard-surfacing of roadways;
- 2) A maintenance bond for annual roadway maintenance in the amount of \$10,000;
- 3) A \$3,900 roadway maintenance fee;
- 4) Streetlight installation fees of \$1,109.07 and 5-year streetlight operational expenses of \$2,045.42; and
- 5) Plat review fees of \$100.

He advised that in accordance with § 15.2-2259 of the *Code of Virginia*, approval of subdivisions was classified as a *ministerial act*, meaning that the Board had no authority to exercise its discretion while reviewing the plats. The purpose of the subdivision plat review was only to insure that the proposed development complied with all existing ordinances. If a plan or plat was denied, the Board was required to specifically identify the requirement that was unsatisfied and explain what the applicant must do to satisfy it.

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to approve the final plat for Regency Estates, Section 4. All were in favor.

Regarding miscellaneous issues, Mr. Johnson announced that as directed in their closed session of November 28, they had agreed to terms with Johnnie and Jean Burchett for purchase of the Courtland Solid Waste Transfer Station on Meherrin Road for \$51,397.28. Closing was scheduled for December 30, 2005.

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Young, to direct the purchase of the Courtland Solid Waste Transfer Station for a lump sum of \$51,397.28 and further authorize the County Attorney to examine and approve title to the real estate to be conveyed and to prepare and execute the certificate of title to be affixed to the deed. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that he was contacted last month by representatives of Isle of Wight County regarding a proposed mutual aid agreement (MAA) for fire protection and emergency medical services between our two counties. He had forwarded the agreement to the Southampton County Fire and Rescue Association for their review and comment and anticipated a response following their December 13 Association meeting. He noted that a copy was included in the agenda for their preliminary review. Upon receipt of comments and a recommendation, he intended to place this matter on the January 2006 agenda for disposition.

He informed that included in the agenda for their reference were semiannual compensation reports for the Planning Commission and Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA). As they were aware, members of those two bodies were compensated a per diem of \$60 for each meeting attended. He noted that there were no applications for the BZA to consider in the first half of fiscal year 2006, and accordingly, no meetings scheduled.

Mr. Johnson reported that the following incoming correspondence was received:

- 1) From Lillian Clancy of Virginia Voters for Animal Welfare, email correspondence regarding animal euthanasia by injection (EBI);
- 2) From Richard E. Railey, Jr., copied correspondence to Creedle, Jones, and Alga, regarding the status of pending claims and suits for annual audit;
- 3) From Charter Communications, notice of price rate increases for expanded basic service, special basic service, 384 kb modem service and 3 mb modem service, all effective in January 2006;
- 4) From LeClair Ryan, a copy of a petition filed with the SCC by Level 3 Communications regarding their acquisition of WiTel Communications;
- 5) From NiSource, a copy of a recent SCC order for notice of public hearing regarding Columbia Natural Gas of Virginia Inc.'s petition to implement a cost hedging program;
- 6) From Steve Herbert, Suffolk City Manager, copied correspondence to the City Council regarding satisfactory resolution of recent Western Tidewater Health District employment issues;
- 7) From the Virginia Department of Health, Office of Drinking Water, a copy of a Notice of Violation to the Town of Capron for exceeding the primary maximum containment level for total coliform bacteria in September 2005; and
- 8) From Chairman and Mrs. Jones, a note of gratitude for expressions of sympathy following the recent passing of Chairman Jones' father.

He advised that outgoing correspondence and news articles of interest were also in the agenda.

In regards to incoming correspondence, Chairman Jones asked Mr. Johnson about the email received from Lillian Clancy in regards to Southampton County being one of eight jurisdictions in Virginia still using gas chambers rather than animal euthanasia by injection. Had anyone responded to her? Mr. Johnson advised that he had responded informing her that the Sheriff was the lawfully-appointed animal control warden in Southampton County. He gave her the Sheriff's contact information and encouraged her to contact him directly.

In regards to articles of interest, Supervisor West stated that he noticed the article about Blue Ridge Mass Appraisal requesting an extension to complete the assessment in Clarke County. (They had also requested an extension to complete the assessment in Southampton County.) Mr. Johnson advised that it was common practice for appraisal companies to request such extensions.

Supervisor Wyche advised that hunters had approached him about coyotes. There were a lot of coyotes in the area. Was there a bounty for coyotes? Mr. Johnson advised that there was a program, but he did not know any of the details. He would, however, research it and place it on the agenda next month.

Chairman Jones announced that it was necessary for the Board to conduct a closed meeting in accordance with the provisions set out in the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, for the following purpose:

Section 2.2-3711 (A) (5) Discussion concerning prospective industries where no previous announcement has been made of the business' or industry's interest in locating its facilities in the community;

Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to conduct a closed meeting for the purpose previously read.

Mr. Richard Railey, County Attorney, Mrs. Julia Williams, Finance Director, Mr. Jay Randolph, Assistant County Administrator, and Mr. Julien Johnson, Public Utilities Director, were also present in the closed meeting.

Upon returning to open session, **Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to adopt the following resolution:**

RESOLUTION OF CLOSED MEETING

WHEREAS, the Southampton County Board of Supervisors had convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712 (D) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Southampton County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed and considered by the Southampton County Board of Supervisors.

**Supervisors Voting Aye: Dallas O. Jones
Walter L. Young, Jr.
Carl J. Faison
Walter D. "Walt" Brown, III
Anita T. Felts
Ronald M. West
Moses Wyche**

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Faison asked, regarding the sureties for Regency Estates, Section 4, what kinds of proffers could we ask for? Mr. Johnson clarified that you could not ask for or require proffers – you could accept them.

Supervisor Wyche stated that he needed to know what to do about getting children-at-play signs and/or streetlights for Medicine Springs Road. Mr. Johnson advised that we could evaluate the area to see if it qualified for streetlights just based on his direction. As far as the children-at-play signs, he had a standard petition in which at least 5 heads of households in that area would need to sign. He would get that to him.

Supervisor Brown thanked the supervisors for all of their support during his first year on the Board and wished them all a Merry Christmas.

Chairman Jones thanked the supervisors for supporting him. He stated that he had to have their help and he appreciated it.

Chairman Jones mentioned that he had visited the Board of Supervisors Room at the new Greensville County Government Center. They had started putting portraits of their Board members on the wall and he thought that was very nice.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:42 AM.

Dallas O. Jones, Chairman

Michael W. Johnson, Clerk