



MINUTES
JOINT MEETING BETWEEN THE
BEDFORD COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AND THE
BEDFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
BEDFORD COUNTY ADMINISTRATION OFFICE
AND BEDFORD SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY CENTER
FEBRUARY 11, 2013

5:00 P.M. WORK SESSION (Bedford County Administration Office)

- a.** Discussion regarding Regional Library

6:00 P.M. – Dinner and Annual Report with the Extension Office – Main Floor Meeting Room

The Board will reconvene at the Bedford Science and Technology Center for the Regular Meeting

7:30 P.M. WELCOME (Bedford Science and Technology Center)

- a.** Moment of Silence
b. Pledge of Allegiance

(1) JOINT MEETING WITH THE PLANNING COMMISSION

(2) PUBLIC HEARING

- a.** Bedford County Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances (*Ordinance #O 0213-020*)

(3) UPCOMING MEETINGS

- February 25 – Regular Meeting at 7:30 P.M. (Work session at 5:00 P.M.)
- March 4 – Budget Work Session at 5:00 P.M.
- March 11 – Regular Meeting at 7:30 P.M. (Work session at 5:00 P.M.)
- March 18 – Budget Work Session at 5:00 P.M.
- March 21 – Budget Work Session at 5:00 P.M. (Thursday)
- March 25 – Regular Meeting at 7:30 P.M. (Work session at 5:00 P.M.)

5:00 P.M. – WORK SESSION

Board of Supervisors: Steve Arrington, Chairman – District 5; John Sharp, Vice-Chairman, District 4; Bill Thomasson, District 1; Curry Martin, District 2; Roger Cheek, District 3; Annie Pollard, District 6; Tammy Parker, District 7

Staff Present: Frank Rogers, Carl Boggess, Mike Brown, Mike Harmony and Brigitte Petersen

Chairman Arrington called the work session to order and then turned the meeting over to Mr. Frank Rogers, Interim County Administrator. Mr. Rogers stated that the purpose of the work session was to hear more from Peggy Bias, Library Director, and Bob White, Region 2000, regarding implementing a regional library system.

Ms. Bias introduced Mary Jo Krufka and Lib Walker, who serve on the Library Board. Ms. Bias told the Supervisors she would be retiring as of June 30, 2013. Coincidentally, the Library Director for Lynchburg is retiring that same day, which brought up the subject of hiring a Joint Interim Director who would lead both libraries for 18 to 24 months while this discussion proceeds. At the end of that time, the group should have a report ready for the Board, who can then determine if a permanent director can be hired.

Chairman Arrington congratulated Ms. Bias on her retirement and asked Mr. White to catch the Board up on other the developments with regard to regionalism.

Mr. White briefly summarized the steps that have been taken so far to develop the regional library concept. He said that at this point all the research they have done indicates that it would make sense to continue examining the regional library format. They are now in the process of compiling a cost benefit analysis, and expect to have it complete by May 2013 and report back with the findings to Bedford, Lynchburg and Campbell. If the localities agree to continue after reviewing the cost benefit analysis, going through the steps of regionalizing the system will take 18 to 24 months.

Mr. White said the problem for the City and the County is hiring a new Director, who may only be working as the Executive Director of Lynchburg or Bedford for a short amount of time before the library systems are regionalized. A temporary Interim Director could come on to help assist in the process of regionalization; however, if the localities decide to not regionalize, this person could assist the localities in hiring a permanent Director. This suggestion doesn't presuppose anything, and buys time to continue regionalization deliberations and analysis.

Chairman Arrington asked the Board if anyone had questions for Ms. Bias or Mr. White.

In response to a question from Supervisor Martin, Ms. Bias stated she did not have an assistant director; she delegates as needed to her librarians. An Interim Director would be sought by placing an advertisement in the Library Press, and hopefully be from within Virginia. One Interim Director would serve both Bedford and Lynchburg, which would result in a cost savings since only one person would be hired for both positions.

Supervisor Pollard said she does not support a regional library; it takes too much control away from local citizens. She feels the libraries are going to change drastically over the next few years as everything becomes digital instead of paper, and you can already borrow books from other libraries without regionalization. She said she has heard from her constituents and she cannot support regionalization.

Supervisor Sharp asked if Bedford and Lynchburg would share equally in the cost of the salary for the Interim Director; Ms. Bias responded in the affirmative. The ongoing study does not cost the County anything.

Supervisor Martin asked who would be responsible for paying the employment benefits of the Interim Director once their job was eliminated. Ms. Bias said this is one of the issues that will be studied.

Mr. Rogers asked Ms. Bias how they envisioned the recruitment process for this position. Ms. Bias said the Library Board would conduct the interviewing; naturally whatever process Lynchburg normally uses would be incorporated into that. Mr. White said they anticipate there will be a memorandum of understanding between Lynchburg and Bedford outlining the specifics with regard to representation, etc.

Chairman Arrington asked what the challenges to a regionalized library system? Mr. White said the most difficult challenge will be with different leaderships and workforces merging; just like in corporations, different libraries have different styles and informal ways of doing things.

In response to a question from Supervisor Pollard as to whether some libraries may need to close due to lack of use, Ms. Bias said people are using libraries in a different way than in previous years. While it is true that many people download books to e-readers now, the libraries are still being used, not only for books but for access to computers and wifi, assistance with using their e-readers, scanning services, community meetings, etc. The digital revolution has changed how libraries are used, but has not eliminated the need for them. Supervisor Pollard said that being regionalized would not help with the services Ms. Bias just listed, as none of these are things that would be transported and shared. Ms. Bias agreed, but said that because of the digitization of books, etc., subscription vendors for these services only work with the larger regionalized systems. Mr. White commented that he did not envision any scenario where Bedford would give up ownership of its libraries; rather, regionalization would apply to the programs and operations within those libraries. Supervisor Pollard asked what would happen if the

County needed to close a library; Ms. Bias said the Board would have as much voice for that in a regional system as it does now.

Supervisor Sharp asked if there would be local Directors in addition to the Regional Director, or if they would not be necessary. Ms. Bias responded they would not be necessary. He asked if the rest of the library employees in a regional system would be on a regional pay scale, or would Bedford maintain its autonomy to pay Bedford wages and benefits. Ms. Bias responded it would be best to have a regional pay scale, but she has worked in regional systems previously where each County had its own pay scale and benefit package. It would depend on how the contract is set up.

There followed a brief discussion between the Board, Mr. Rogers, Ms. Bias and Mr. White regarding the various models that could be used when establishing which portions of this project would be regionalized and which would remain strictly under the purview of the locality.

Supervisor Sharp asked what the downside would be to staying independent of a regionalized system. Ms. Bias said that Bedford libraries would struggle to keep up with developing technology.

Supervisor Thomasson said expanding broadband will enable more people to have access to the very same services provided by the libraries, making them obsolete. Ms. Bias responded that in cities where broadband is readily available, they are finding that the libraries are just as heavily used as ever; books are just one part of what the libraries provide.

Mr. Rogers said libraries are facilities throughout our community. As Bedford being a large area with a dynamic population, the libraries frequently act as community centers for a variety of programs (such as child reading and job training). This serves the community and brings our citizens together, making the libraries both a resource and an asset for the County. It keeps the community together instead of falling into a society of isolation, where everyone connects to the world through a broadband connection.

Ms. Bias said that as the push for e-government grows, the need for the libraries to provide free access to government services will increase, as many people will not be able to afford (will even have access to) broadband in their homes.

Chairman Arrington reiterated that the Board's interest in a regionalized system begins and ends with cost savings. He confirmed that Mr. White and Ms. Bias will be back in May with a cost benefit analysis, and asked if they had had similar meeting already with Lynchburg and Campbell. Mr. White said they have spoken with Lynchburg due to the Interim Director issue, but they have not yet spoken with Campbell.

Chairman Arrington polled the Board for direction on developing a contract for hiring a temporary Interim Director for Bedford and Lynchburg libraries. The Board consented 5-2 in favor of developing an Interim Director contract.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

The Board moved into the Main Floor meeting at 6:05 p.m. for dinner and an update from the Extension Office.

7:30 P.M. – BOARD MEETING

Board of Supervisors: Steve Arrington, Chairman – District 5; John Sharp, Vice-Chairman, District 4; Bill Thomasson, District 1; Curry Martin, District 2; Roger Cheek, District 3; Annie Pollard, District 6; Tammy Parker, District 7

Planning Commission: Lewis Huff, District 1; Jeff Burdett, District 2; Steve Wilkerson , **District 3**; Fredric Fralick, District 4; Tommy Scott, District 5; Derrick W. Noell, District 6; Jerry Craig, District 7

Staff Present:

Frank Rogers, Carl Boguess, Tim Wilson, Mary Zirkle, Janet Daniels, Brad Robinson, Mark Jordon, Bill Hoy and Brigitte Petersen

Chairman Arrington welcomed those in attendance to the meeting, and stated that the purpose of this evenings meeting was to hold a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and receive public comment of proposed text changes to the County’s zoning ordinance and sub-division ordinance. No action will be taken on these amendments this evening. Tonight’s public hearing will be all about receiving citizen comments on the proposed changes. He acknowledged there were many changes and expressed his hope that everyone has had an opportunity to read over them.

He asked Chairman Wilkerson to call the Planning Commission to order, and then set forth the rules for the meeting. Registration to speak will be taken by County staff and will be submitted on the registration form provided. The order of speakers is determined on a first-to-register, first-to-speak basis, with each speaker allotted three minutes. Individuals are not allowed to yield their time to another speaker. Decorum will be maintained; this includes common courtesy from staff, the audience and the Board. Statements which are demeaning or inappropriate shall be ruled out of order. All comments are to be directed to the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission. Speakers may leave written statements of their comments with the clerk. Additional written comments will be accepted through the close of business on February 18, 2013. Due to the nature of this public hearing, Chairman Arrington asked that everyone in attendance be polite, be courteous, be mindful of the time allotted to speak and be respectful of each other and the Boards. Profane or obscene behavior or outbursts that attempt to

penetrate others boundaries will be seen an uncivil, ruled out of order and will not be tolerated. Chairman Arrington then opened the public hearing on the advertised zoning and subdivision text ordinance changes; he asked for a moment of silence, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Jackie Davis addressed the Board with a prayer.

Roland Dooley thanked the Board for making what he feels are positive changes in the ordinance.

Don Gardner said he was very happy to see several items in the ordinance that benefit agriculture, such as cluster development and smaller lot sizes (provided that the number of lots on any given tract of land is not increased). Dr. Gardner said he is not happy with the idea of agricultural subdivisions; he said this is not necessary if cluster development is also allowed. The more we develop our agricultural, the less land we will have available for Bedford to remain viable in agriculture.

Steven Saunders said he was speaking to support the Board's zoning changes – he said it was about time we have these changes.

John Moisa said he had read the entire document, and there was no part of it where he didn't see a lot of care and consideration for what this County needs. He stated that the Board has taken a "lot of shots" in the local media and various groups, which he feels have been unfair. He said each and every one of the Supervisors is doing a fantastic job and he appreciated their work.

George Williams said Mr. Moisa said exactly what he wanted to say, and thanked the Board for doing a fantastic job.

David Lowry stated that when he received a letter from the County in October 2011 that was a notice of Zoning Ordinance Amendments, he felt it might impact his Ag. Preserve property. The next day he went to the County and found out that in fact the Zoning proposal opened up every single acre in the Ag. Zoning districts to development.

He said the legally required Public Hearing was the largest turnout in County history, and the subsequent lawsuit filed in Jan 2012 forced the Board of Supervisors to withdraw the proposal in November 2012. He has continued to ask where are the impact studies, what is the financial impact, what is going to happen to our farms, what will be the impact on our Schools, but has received no answer. The Board of Supervisors has submitted a new proposal which is the subject of this hearing. Mr. Lowry said his proposal turns out be even more of a threat to our Ag. Lands. His own research indicates both the AP and AR Ag. Parcels are exposed to further sub-division and development by the Zoning Amendment Proposal. Mr. Lowry states there is insufficient time in these 3 minutes to present all the underlying details.

He summarized by asking that the Zoning Ordinance Amendments be withdrawn and to allow planning and economic professionals to develop Zoning Ordinance Amendments that meet

the need of Bedford County citizens and not developers. If the Board is so sure this proposal is what the citizens want put it on November's ballot and allow The Citizens to have the final say. (Please note – the speaker had written comments which have been made part of the record.)

James Williams said he owns 35 acres, which were zoned agricultural. He needed money and wanted to sell off some of his land, but ended up selling off more than he wanted to because the zoning requirement for a lot was 3 acres. He ended up having to sell 6 acres instead of 2. He said when these acres were in "land use" they were valued and taxed at \$200 per acre; when they were sold, they were valued at \$30,000 per acre, so the County made a lot of revenue (taxes) from that sale. He supports the Board of Supervisors and what they're doing.

Geraldine Reynolds (withdrawn)

Larry Reynolds said he wanted to show his support for the Board and the Planning Commission, as well as the proposed changes to the zoning ordinance. He said the changes affect his family directly. He said it's been as fair as it can get and he thanks the Boards for the effort they've put into it.

John Lane said the second proposal for zoning amendments seems to be more expansive and encourage greater subdivision than the first proposal; as a result, his objections to the second proposal are similar to his objections to the first proposal. His objections are based on threats to the water table, as the USGS has already indicated problems. He asked the Board to sign a pledge that states none of the Supervisors would personally profit from the zoning changes. He also shared documentation with the Board and the County attorney regarding his research on various other problems with the proposed changes. He said he endorsed everything Mr. Lowry just said; Mr. Lowry has done hundreds of hours of analysis.

Chairman Arrington said he purposely waited until several strong opposing viewpoints were voiced in this public hearing before asking Mr. Frank Rogers, Interim County Administrator, to give an overview of the zoning changes and bring clarity to the meeting.

Mr. Rogers offered the following key elements:

- Within the agricultural districts, the proposed ordinance incorporates the mandated requirements for cluster development
- The current ordinance allows for 5 divisions in the AP District and 10 in the AR District. The parent parcel basis used for calculating the number of permissible divisions in AP and AR districts is not changing. While the proposed ordinance would allow for that same number of traditional divisions, it proposes reducing the minimum lot size to 1 acre lots in both districts.

- The current ordinance excludes agricultural subdivisions from the calculation of maximum number of lots allowed; the proposed ordinance would include these subdivisions in the total.
- Similarly, any family subdivisions over 10 would be included when calculating maximum number of lots allowed.

Mr. Rogers commented that, as noted in the staff report, there are many variables which determine or influence the subdivision opportunity of individual parcels; attempting to quantify what those increases will be is speculative at best.

- The ordinance also proposes the inclusion of a general store use; it further proposes to allow accessory apartments in the Agricultural Village District.
- In the residential districts, the proposed ordinance will allow accessory structures up to a maximum height of 35'.
- In the commercial and industrial districts, the proposed ordinance increases the maximum allowable height of principle structures in the C2 District. In cases where such a structure is zoned R1 or R2, the maximum height is restricted to 45' unless additional setback requirements are met.
- The proposed ordinance allows a maximum height of 125' for structures in the I2 (higher intensity industrial district).
- The proposed ordinance also combines the new automobile dealership and used automobile dealership into a single use category titled "Automobile Dealership"
- With regard to corridor overlay regulations, the proposed ordinance retains the corridor overlay district provisions addressing forestry operations, certain prohibited uses, signage and parking.
- Other proposed changes include enacting new screening, landscaping and buffer yard regulations; allowing property owners to apply for amendments to either the text regulations for either maps or the zoning ordinance; taking the number of unrelated persons in a family unit that meets the definition of family to four; increasing the maximum size allowed for home occupations; allowing an employee for home occupation uses; rescinding the prohibition on firearms sales in home occupations; rescinding on the limit on the number of students for weekly lessons; increasing the time allowed for the replacement or repair of damaged non-conforming signs to 2 years; and allowing private access easements within the in subdivision ordinance for minor subdivision in the AP and AR Districts serving no more than five units.

John Briscoe said he has spoken on this subject before and he is in favor of loosening up as much excess restriction as possible and allowing as many people in the County to do with their property as they chose. The proposed changes being proposed are not major and the opposition to these changes is not well balanced. A number of people will benefit from these changes, as well as the County at large. He said he and many others in the audience support the Board and thanked them for their work.

Bonnie Rideout said she has studied the Bedford County regulations concerning development going back 50 years to 1963. She summarized rules that in the past protected farm land; the current proposals to limit agricultural subdivisions not only calls into question the issue of down-zoning, but provides a clear restriction to the long-time rights of farmers within the County. Everyone with property affected by this proposed change should have been notified by letter that their rights were being restricted. The inconsistencies between the current zoning and the subdivision ordinances are further complicated by the newly proposed amendments to the ordinances by the Board of Supervisors. She said the current laws need to be understood before they are changed.

Maggie Liell said the County's Comprehensive Plan states that before these types of zoning changes can be made, scientific impact studies be made to demonstrate the soundness and saneness to our laws. She asked how much these changes will cost with regard to Fire & Rescue, schools, police, etc. Taxpayers will have to absorb these hidden costs. The Board has failed to have these studies performed and hasn't even visited the County's development office to check existing records to gather information. This shows total disrespect for previous board members who have served. She said one cannot open agricultural lands to private roads as proposed on one hand and then claim to be preserving land on the other hand. This is an illogical thought process and an outright deception to the public.

Rick Boyer (withdrawn)

W. P. Johnson, Jr. thanked the Board and Commission for their time and work on this major undertaking for the County. He appreciates their efforts and supports what they are trying to do; he feels it's a step in the right direction.

Stephen Stevick said his concerns this evening are focused on the process and manner in which the Board has chosen to advance these changes to the proposal. When the first version of the zoning proposal was introduced, public input was limited and notification for workshops was short. It was put on a fast track with the minimum time allowed for the Planning Commission and the public to review the changes. Understandably, there was public outrage and the proposal was allowed to expire. Now, rather than being heartened by the public interest in this policy, once again public dialogue and input was limited. This does not compare favorably to the process employed by the Planning Commission to renew Bedford's zoning ordinance. The Commission reached out across all the districts and gave opportunities to have an exchange. He asked the Board to reconsider its approach they have chosen and chose instead

to open the process to workshops and discussion held throughout the County to make this effort more collaborative; encourage, not discourage, public input.

Ricky Wilkerson thanked the Board for what they were doing; he asked them to govern with common sense, leaving greed and politics out of it. He said the Board is doing an excellent job.

Jerry Waters said he felt compelled to address the Board after learning of the lawsuit that has been filed against the County. If the County is being sued, then he as a taxpayer is also being sued; he said it doesn't make sense for the citizens of the County to be suing themselves. He said there is a more prudent way to voice concerns. He said conservation and preservation seem to be the main concerns of the Comprehensive Plan; responsible growth and job creation should also be a large part of the Plan and has been lacking to some degree. He said major changes were made to the zoning laws in 1998 that some may not have liked but accepted, as they felt the Board was doing the best it could for the County. Change happens, citizens are out of work and the Board has seen the need for amendments to the ordinance. He feels this will start us on a forward path to economic recovery and responsible growth, and give farmers the flexibility to do what is best for their land. He feels the Board is doing the best it can for the County. If you disagree with how the Supervisors are running the County, there is no need for lawsuits – just don't vote for them.

Jeff Powers spoke for the Agricultural Economic Development Advisory Board, they appreciate the work the Board has put into the ordinances. His Board worked with the both the Supervisors and the Commission to try to protect the farmland so valuable to the County. He said they are concerned about the subdivision part and hopes they can work together to work out a plan so the County isn't overdeveloped.

Tom DeWitt said he was pleasantly surprised at the support shown for the Board this evening. He appreciates what they are doing and thanked them for being pro-business, while preserving land.

Greg Modzelewski said that if the Board feels this zoning proposal is a growth pilot, then prove it by reducing the tax rate by one penny. As far as the changes being proposed, he said we don't really know if we have enough ground water to support as many homes on one acre. No one knows the answer to that, and we don't need to add more e-coli to the water than we already have. Mr. Modzelewski also voiced his concerns regarding private access easements and setbacks and lot coverage for 1 acre. He asked that they leave the 3-acre minimum, no private access easements and do a model to show what will happen is they build on these lots.

Jeff Perkins said he was attending this evening to represent his 20 employees (of Boxley) who reside in Bedford County. He supports the proposed changes to the zoning ordinance and encouraged the Board in favor of changing the ordinance (especially industrial use and corridor overlay restrictions). The changes will bring business growth and bring high-paying jobs to the residents. He commended the

Board and the Planning Commission for taking a proactive approach to entice businesses to Bedford by removing un-needed regulations. Boxley is proud to be a partner with Bedford County.

Kevin Mele said he opposes the proposed zoning changes as they do not reflect any forethought or adequate consideration for effects both intended or unintended. Changes in the 1990s were made when a genuine consensus had been reached between the forces for development and agricultural preservation. He said private roads are a scourge that ultimately pass on expenses to taxpayers. The current ordinance has served the County well; he asked the Board to consider all the ramifications that can result from the proposed zoning, including the sale of firearms in residential neighborhoods. He said that if the Board passes these amendments, the voters will remember when it's time to hire or fire Supervisors.

David Reynolds (withdrawn)

Craig Hall (withdrawn)

Jeff Giles voiced his favor for selling firearms in residential neighborhoods, which is still governed by the ATF.

Don Slusher said the changes will provide emergency financial relief when they need it (selling smaller lots). He said in 42 years of speaking to Board on these issues, he feels this Board is on the right track. He encouraged them to keep it up.

Pamela Willoghby she said the most important thing is to protect agriculture and our farms for future generations. You can't get the land back once it's developed. She said instead of selling land for money, it can be put in conservation easements – it's not difficult and you can sell your tax credits so that for the next 10 years you have an income, and enables you to leave your land to your children. She asked the Board to keep preserving the farms.

Jody Lyons thanked the Commission and the Board for their work on this proposal. He said they've done a splendid job; as a realtor, he knows what a draw the low tax rate is. He thanked the Board for keeping taxes low.

Polly Lyons said she supported the Board's zoning proposals. She said Bedford is encouraging growth and helping businesses expand, and she appreciates everything they are doing.

Paul Piper (withdrawn)

Rodney Chrisman spoke in favor of the zoning amendments. He said property rights are a sacred part of the western legal tradition and are what brought people to this country. Lately, these rights have been steadily eroded to the point where they are not recognizable today, usually through zoning, which he compared to government-sanctioned banditry. He commended the Board and Commission for their efforts, and thanked and encouraged them to seek other ways to return property rights to owners.

Jason Kennedy (withdrawn)

George Aznavorian spoke in favor of the zoning changes and commended the Board and the Planning Commission for bring these changes forward. He said the media attacks against the Board are shameful – he said if people want to make a difference, they need to take time to be part of the solution. He thanked the Board and said he appreciates what they do.

Robert Haynes said he found the zoning changes encouraging, but he asked that the signage restriction in the overlay districts be changed. He said they are very restrictive, and asked the Board consider revisions to both on and off- premise signs.

Edmund Coffey said in 2004 the citizen survey revealed 90% of the public saw education as a prime concern; 88% saw preserving farmland, the environment and scenery as secondary concerns. He said the zoning proposal drastically destroys the AP and AR districts. Cluster development is a good thing, but family subdivisions need to be included in that. We need to focus on the water tables – if land is developed, the developer should be responsible for drilling for the neighbors within a mile at 200 feet deeper. Sustainable farming and small businesses need our focus, as these are what sustain the community, not big corporations. He said we also need to look at bringing in alternative fuel development. He asked the Board to keep future generations in mind and be willing to listen.

Doug Rideout voiced his concerns over why these proposals are really being proposed. The claims that there are too many restrictions on individual land use are employing a typical corporate mantra that makes a great sound bite which, when combined with ideological beliefs can become a convincing case. He contends that the real driving force behind these changes are big businesses looking for consumers to sell to at the expense of the farmers. He said these actions will result in higher taxation, pollution and the death of independent farms. He said the foundation of democracy rested on the independence of the agrarian lifestyle, and the fundamentals of democracy are at stake on this issue. He said the proposed amendments are not representative of democracy, they are tyranny.

Greg Markham said he was not in favor of the proposed amendments. He said he has been told the amendments are meant to reduce restrictions on property owners, to allow them greater freedom, to remove the impediments of government and rebalance such unfair facts that a developer can stack houses on lots less than 1/8 of an acre, while next door the farmer can't put his child in anything smaller than 1.5 or 3.0 acres. He said that these are wonderful sentiments, but people may not be aware of the consequences. He said the Board has the responsibility to become educated on such issues. He said the Board has given no good feedback, or analysis of the consequences. There can be no meaningful discussion when the public is totally uninformed. Good legislation is a piece of artwork, delicately balancing very conflicting needs; good zoning is the only effective means left to keep taxes in check. Bedford City can no longer survive due to the lack of agricultural land to tax. He said the Comprehensive Plan was due for revision in 2012 and the Board failed to carry out that

requirement. This action alone should have higher priority than zoning amendments at this time. He asked that the Board extensively study the current proposals to be able to understand and explain the positive and negative consequences to their constituency. He closed by asking that, rather than the Board campaigning for their vision, to give the public the facts and learn from the public's vision. (Please note – the speaker had written comments which have been made part of the record.)

Tommy Foster spoke to the issue of sustainability and the central vision of the County. He said his family has been on their land for 107 years, doing roughly the same things and basically just subsisting. He said there is nothing undignified or wrong about that, and it's a decent way to live. He would encourage a discussion on longevity living on the land. As side notes, he is concerned about how reabsorbing the City of Bedford will affect the whole County, the 125' building height (seems excessive) and small stores. We need better laws, but not necessarily fewer laws.

Josiah Tillett expressed his appreciation to the Board for their commendable pursuit of policies which more closely reflect the proper roll of government, which is to preserve the rights of individuals to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. He said he supported the loosening of zoning restrictions as it promotes opportunity and preservation of property rights.

Nate Boyer thanked the Board and the Commission for their work and voiced his support for smaller lot sizes. He said relaxed zoning restrictions enable farmers to make money on their property. Finally, keeping the County business friendly is a good way to keep taxes down.

William Wray said the water table is extremely low on his property, and said the County needs to keep the 3-acre restriction on lot sizes. He said he has not seen anything that defines how close cluster developments can be to each other or information on the setbacks, and would like the Board to provide information on that. He asked what people will be able to do if their wells dry up and their neighbor has a septic field right next door.

Shannon Simmons said he supports the zoning changes being proposed by the Board. There are too many restrictions on citizens that need to be able to be diversified. He thanked the Board and stated he appreciated them for loosening the restrictions.

Kevin Santmyer submitted an email on behalf of another citizen who could not attend the meeting, and then spoke to his own concerns regarding the zoning proposals. He said a cost benefit analysis needs to be done before changes are made; we need to know the impact on schools and infrastructure, etc. He said proceeding without these tools is a crude way to conduct business. The information is needed to determine whether the people of the County support this proposal or not.

James Hamrick stated he has recently decided to move his business to his house. The zoning proposals will assist him in making the transition, and he thanked the Board for the changes.

Ruby Dooley thanked the Planning Commission for their many hours they've put into this issue. She thanked the Supervisors for what they've done so far. However, a lot more study needs to be done on every page before the Board accepts it. She said lots of the contents need to be clarified, especially with regard to the water table. She asked to hear from the Board on how she can sell 285 acres with the restrictions currently proposed. She said the farm is her bank, and she is depending on it for future funds. She also said economic development and the PSA is draining the taxpayers and asked the Board to do something about it.

Chairman Arrington closed the public hearing and thanked everyone in attendance for their comments, consideration and cordial behavior during the meeting.

Chairman Wilkerson called for a motion to adjourn the Planning Commission, which was moved and seconded; motion passed by acclamation.

Chairman Arrington called for a motion to adjourn, which was answered by Vice-Chairman Sharp; motion passed by acclamation at 9:18 p.m.

Chairman