

Town of Colonial Beach Planning Commission Minutes

Date: April 07, 2011 – Town Center, 22 Washington Avenue

Time: 4:30 P.M.

Present: Cynthia Misicka - Chairperson
Ed Grant
Margaret McMullen
David H. Coombes
Desiree Urquhart
Kent Rodeheaver (arrived at 4:35 P.M.)

Absent: Maureen Holt

Also Present: Val Foulds, Town Manager
Gary Mitchell, Director of Building and Zoning
Andrea Erard, Town Attorney

CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

Ms. Misicka called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M. Ms. Holt was absent from the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MARCH 03, 2011 MEETING.

Mr. Grant moved to approve the minutes and Ms. Urquhart seconded the motion. There was general agreement to approve the minutes from the March 03, 2011 meeting.

Ms. Mc Mullen: Aye, Mr. Grant: Aye, Mr. Coombes: Aye, Ms. Urquhart: Aye, Ms. Misicka: Aye

PUBLIC COMMENT ON PLANNING COMMISSION MATTERS.

There was no public comment.

OLD BUSINESS

-DISCUSSION ON DRAFT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN (CIP)

Ms. Misicka stated that Capital Improvements Plan was the next item on the agenda. She stated that she had asked Staff to provide the Commission with a copy of the section of the Comprehensive Plan that addresses this. She stated that she thought this would be useful for the Commission to refer to.

Ms. Misicka stated that she asked Mr. Mitchell to compare it with what he had done so that they could see what was included and not included in the draft CIP.

Mr. Mitchell stated that there were some changes from last year's CIP. He said one of the most notable was the grant money for the beach replenishment, the jet truck for the public works department and a pending grant for water and sewer replacement of lines. He stated that the population now exceeds 3,500 and the Virginia Department of Transportation will be turning the roads over to the Town. He stated that the amount of funding by VDOT has not been determined as of yet. He stated that this particular line item is shown to be determined.

Mr. Mitchell reviewed the recommended Capital Improvement Program projects out of the Comprehensive Plan and stated that the first four projects would somewhat be addressed by the Community Development Block Grant.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the paving of gravel roads in Riverside Meadows might still be funded with some money from VDOT.

Mr. Mitchell said that the other items including gateway enhancements along Rt. 205, Removal of cement pier and pilings, Rt. 205 intersection improvements, shoreline stabilization and storm water management is in a long list of things to do. Mr. Mitchell stated that he is still working on trying to get grant money for storm water management.

Mr. Mitchell stated that they have been working off and on regarding design guidelines and Zoning Text amendments.

Mr. Mitchell stated that regarding the golf cart path and bicycle trails the ISTEA grants from VDOT were no longer available. He stated that currently there is no funding at the state level so that is on hold right now in terms of getting transportation enhancement grants.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the cultural and recreational opportunities fall under the parks and recreational category in the CIP. He stated that most of these are addressed there.

Mr. Mitchell stated that with the new Municipal Center Phase 1 the environmental study had been done for this. The water and sewer systems improvements are in the process of getting grants.

Mr. Mitchell stated that many of these things are covered in this document but there may be some holes.

Ms. Misicka stated she would like to see each Planning Commission Member take a turn and state their questions and comments.

Ms. Urquhart inquired about the first four items under Cultural and Recreational opportunities, she asked if they would fall under programming in the CIP.

Mr. Mitchell stated that yes they may fall under programming. He stated the multi-use path should go under parks and playgrounds as well as the boat ramp. He said that the community center and pier

could be categorized as parks depending on how you define it. He said they do have some holes and do not specifically say a community center.

Ms. Urquhart stated that she was having problems with the math on the CIP spreadsheet. She stated that under Public Works, replace water lines the project cost is a million dollars to be expended in 2011 but then there is 200,000 in 2015. She said she does not understand this.

Mr. Mitchell said this is all granted funded.

Ms. Urquhart said the math does not work. She said the total for all the fiscal years comes to \$187,500 but the project cost says \$170,000. She said that if it is just a math error then she doesn't need to know but otherwise she is looking for a note.

Ms. Urquhart said the next one is under parks and recreation, beach replenishment she inquired about the \$50,000 in FY2015.

Mr. Mitchell said in that particular issue it is partially the grant. He said the \$50,000 is out there with the impression that they would get a grant in the future. Mr. Mitchell stated they should probably add that under the total project...

Ms. Urquhart stated that the worksheet needed to add up. She said that this brings her to the note itself and how it correlates to the line item. Ms. Urquhart expressed that she did not understand the math.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the army corp was giving them \$100,000 and then they have to come up with a match. He stated that \$15,000 of that \$100,000 will be in kind and they only have to come up with \$85,000 in cash.

Ms. Misicka asked Mr. Rodeheaver if he has any questions or comments.

Mr. Rodeheaver stated that the older CIP was a little more specific in some areas. He said that there are certain things that they want to see done and the question being how specific should they be with this. He said there are some things he would like to see in this for example bicycle and golf cart paths.

Ms. Misicka asked Mr. Grant if he has any questions or comments.

Mr. Grant stated he has one question under Public Works, road maintenance and construction. He asked if the only contribution was from VDOT.

Ms. Foulds responded that the Town will have to come up with some money for this VDOT will not support it all.

Ms. Misicka asked Ms. McMullen if she has any questions or comments.

Ms. McMullen stated that if they do not redo this document and have it correspond with the Comprehensive Plan then this is a lost opportunity. She stated that she agreed with the comment regarding the lack of specificity.

Ms. McMullen stated that she sees on this form a Town Government building with no specificity. Technology with no specificity, road maintenance and construction where, what and when? She stated that they have breakwaters listed and that may correspond with Beach stabilization and replenishment.

Ms. McMullen stated that she did not understand what the definition of programming was.

Ms. McMullen asked if they had not recently replaced the Police Department vehicles in the not so distant past.

Ms. McMullen stated that she could not accept these numbers as realistic. She said that would be for Town Council to decide this. But it would be up to them to decide are they doing their job giving this to Council with the most clear and comprehensive Capital Improvement Plan which they may do as they wish.

Mr. Coombes said he had a couple of things. He asked Mr. Mitchell in the funding sources what does GF mean.

Mr. Mitchell responded General Fund appropriations.

Mr. Coombes stated that the thing he noted in the funding sources is that every item is checked. He asked if it was appropriate to check every item or should they make some decisions.

Mr. Mitchell stated that it was done the same as last year and the Commission had instructed him to check all boxes.

Mr. Coombes said a little more thought should go into this and after all that they went through with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Coombes stated that he would like to see a comprehensive document that incorporates the items from the Comprehensive Plan where it is appropriate into here. He stated that he does not think that people should have to go from one document to the other. He said that what is in the Comprehensive Plan needs to be put in here under the broad categories.

Mr. Coombes stated that all the funding sources being checked says to him that the Commission and Staff have not taken the time to figure out where the appropriate funding sources may be.

Mr. Coombes asked what the term programming means under Parks and Recreation.

Mr. Mitchell stated it would be classes that make pottery or sewing classes or soccer camp.

Mr. Coombes said that programming sounds like you have IT people messing around and developing some kind of software for Parks and Recreation. He suggested it maybe say something like “offer programs” to make it clear.

Mr. Coombes reiterated that he really is hung up on having one comprehensive document that incorporates everything.

Ms. Misicka stated that she would like to add her own comments and then summarize what they have been talking about.

Ms. Misicka said that first off she would like to clarify and have Gary clarify that this is not a Town budget. A capital improvements program is prioritization of what the Town wants to do in the coming years. She asked if this was right.

Mr. Mitchell stated yes it was.

Ms. Misicka said that it pulls the amounts from the Town budget and puts them into categories.

Mr. Mitchell corrected her in saying that it does not pull amounts from the Town budget but rather pulls amounts that would be anticipated costs in order to do these projects.

Ms. Misicka asked if the CIP is totally independent in that it does not look to or match the moneys in the town budget.

Ms. Foulds stated yes at this time that is correct.

Ms. Misicka said so this is a wish list.

Ms. Erard stated yes.

Ms. Misicka said she personally does not see anything wrong with that. She said this is what it may cost to get things done and if we have money great and if we don't let's go try and find it. But at least we know this is what we want and this is what it is going to cost us.

Ms. Erard said it is the frame work to get money from proffers.

Ms. Misicka stated that she remembers a discussion regarding the funding sources issue last year when they reviewed it. She said it is her recollection that we did not want to be in a position where they did not X a box and because of that would be unable to use that funding source. She asked if there is a down side to including all the funding sources.

Mr. Mitchell said if they include all of it then they have the ultimate flexibility. If you exclude something then you have to go back and revisit this document.

Ms. Erard stated it would just be better to have everything in there.

Ms. Misicka stated the only other comment she has is what they pulled from the Comprehensive Plan is recommended CIP projects based on the work that Land Studio did and their assessment after the community work groups about the big items. There are time frames for each appropriate project and to keep in mind that this is their 2011 CIP. Some of these projects like boardwalk beach improvements is 3-5 years a midrange time frame. She stated that some of these are 0-3 years and some are 5-10 years. All of these things cannot happen at once. She said that she concurs that the most likely way to get things done is to be as specific as they can.

Ms. Misicka stated that the issues she sees up for discussion is how specific do they want to be, do they want to be more realistic about the availability of funding, do they want to be more specific about possible funding sources and there seems to be a consensus that they would like to see the draft CIP match up with the recommended CIP projects in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Coombes said in terms of funding he would recommend that they not get bogged down with that at all. He stated that this is a plan and it will change every year and many things will not get done. He said that the only time he can remember when he was on Council dealing with the CIP was when it was presented to them. Mr. Coombes said that he feels that Mr. Mitchell and Ms. Foulds have put in here their best guess of funding amounts. He stated that he does not think it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to identify other than what they have here for sources of funds. He said that is a Town Council's responsibility and a Town Manager's responsibility.

Ms. Misicka asked Mr. Coombes if what he was saying was that they should not concern themselves with the actual availability but limit ourselves to what the projective costs are going to be.

Mr. Coombes stated absolutely, otherwise they will get bogged down and never get this done and it is not their purview anyway.

Ms. Misicka asked how everybody felt about the need to match what is in the CIP to the Town's budget. She stated Mr. Coombes views were to keep it separate.

Ms. Misicka asked Mr. Rodeheaver.

Mr. Rodeheaver said that she threw him a curve ball.

Mr. Rodeheaver stated he would like to address what Mr. Coombes stated about identifying funding. He said he felt they should go with whatever the Virginia Code states for the CIP. He stated that it asked for recommended sources for funding and that was why they put in all the columns.

Mr. Rodeheaver stated that with the time frames, he is not sure how it is set up but maybe Ms. Erard could speak on this. He said he thought they did it this way because they could tell what is most

important. He said they need to keep this information so that they can prioritize this and that he thought this was also required to be in the CIP.

Ms. Erard stated yes this is required.

Ms. McMullen stated yes she thought that if you funded it first that it was a higher priority. She said that they just need to massage it a bit.

Mr. Rodeheaver stated that the new Draft CIP is missing this information.

Ms. McMullen asked Mr. Mitchell if under programming that money is for salaries.

Mr. Mitchell stated that it would include the salaries, facilities and supplies for the recreational programs.

Ms. McMullen questioned whether these were capital expenditures. She stated that if Council decided to hire people for programs then that would be a budgeting item.

Ms. Urquhart said that she has two comments. She stated that the draft CIP in its format does address the time frames that are listed in the Comprehensive Plan. She said it does give columns with each fiscal year. She stated that she is okay with the set up with the draft CIP to handle the time frames. She stated that one of the things she would recommend if possible is in the funding sources could they put percentages reflecting how much of the money would go towards loans or grants, general funds or what percentage would go to proffers. She said that this to her gives a better sense of what funding source it would come from the most.

Ms. McMullen stated that she could see removing the last four columns and putting in a footnote. Then using those columns to show expenditures for beyond FY2015.

Mr. Coombes stated that he has never seen a CIP beyond five years. He said that you would be getting out there so far that you would not be able to justify any of that at all.

Mr. Coombes asked to speak regarding Ms. Misicka's curve ball question. He stated that in his years on Council he has not seen a CIP item listed in the budget other than maybe beach replenishment. He stated that they should not try and compare this with the budget. He said they just can't do it. He said that is going a step too far. He said they should identify the items and then give a best judgment estimate on what it is going to cost for the next five years and then indicating a funding source is basically what the state statute requires.

Ms. Erard said yes.

Mr. Coombes stated that quite frankly very few items from the CIP have ever come to fruition.

Ms. Misicka stated she wanted to clarify that she does not think they should be comparing to the budget. She said it is her view that every single funding source should be Xed. She stated that she apologized if that was misunderstood. She said that it did however come up as an issue from one or more of the Commission Members.

Mr. Grant stated he agrees with Mr. Coombes. He said when they did the Comprehensive Plan several items were referred to grants. He said they had discussion about hiring a grant writer to address these items. He stated that was one of the sources that they had.

Ms. Misicka said she would like to clarify regarding the time frame. She stated that Ms. Erard shared with her the State Code as far as CIPs go. She stated it is very cursory. She said it is simply a matter of prioritizing, listing projects based on the Comprehensive Plan for no more than a four or five year period.

Ms. Erard stated that they could go beyond five years but the focus is to stay within the five.

Ms. Misicka explains to the audience the language regarding time frames in Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Misicka states that something listed 5-10 years out should probably not even be listed on this years.

Ms. McMullen stated that she thinks this is an option. She said to her it would help to be able to look at the big picture. She said maybe this would be something where they do not include an amount in but it would at least help them see what they have to tackle in the future.

Ms. Misicka stated it was just her suggestion to not include these.

Ms. McMullen suggested maybe making an addendum for those things.

Ms. Misicka asked Ms. Erard if they were permitted to list items beyond 2015 without any financial information.

Ms. Erard stated yes they could but they are better off if they do list financial information.

Ms. Misicka asked if they have a project that they did not want to fund for five years could they put dashes for the first four years.

Ms. Erard stated yes they could.

Ms. Misicka asked if there was anybody sitting on the Commission right now that feels that they should match the CIP with the Town's budget.

NO COMMISSION MEMBERS VOTED TO MATCH THE CIP WITH THE TOWN'S BUDGET.

Ms. Urquhart inquired about whether the CIP had back up spread sheets. Staff stated they thought that was a very old CIP.

Ms. Misicka asked the Commission in regards to how specific do they wish to be. Do they all agree that the draft CIP be revised to more specifically refer to the projects listed in the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. McMullen inquired about getting more specific showing linear feet and so forth.

Ms. Urquhart stated this is what she was referring to when she mentioned back up spreadsheets. She said this would show them the intimate details.

Mr. Coombes said he would just like to ask the basic question. Why is the Commission needing to know number of rocks and the number of feet in breakwaters. He said they know they need breakwaters in certain locations. He stated as Ms. Urquhart said Staff should have the information when they put this thing together. He said the Commission should not be that specific with this stuff. He stated if they need the information then they can go to Staff and ask for it. He said it is going too far and creating a workload on Staff. He said when the grant comes to fruition then that is when the document is put together.

Ms. Misicka stated that she thinks it would be helpful for Staff and Ms. Erard to explain the goal of the CIP.

Ms. Erard said the CIP is to be used as a planning document for public facilities and improvements that will incur in the future. Also specifically it is used to collect cash proffers as it is a guideline as to where that money is designated. In most localities the CIP is a wish list.

Ms. Misicka asked if in terms if they are not specific enough here. Like for instance they do not list golf cart paths across 205. What can happen if they do not specify it?

Ms. Erard stated that if they have golf cart paths in there but it does not say across Rt. 205 they still can do it.

Ms. Misicka asked what if they just have a line item that says transportation.

Ms. Erard stated that there are some instances where it would need to be identified in the CIP and would prevent you from using cash proffers towards that. But it is also something you can come back and amend if you needed to.

Ms. Urquhart stated that the CIP should match up to the CIP section of the Comprehensive Plan. That is as specific as it should be.

Mr. Coombes stated he agreed. He stated that there is no way that this group or the Council or anybody can put everything in here that might need to be in here. He asked Ms. Erard if there is something that they need to do that is not listed in here does it preclude them from doing it.

Ms. Erard stated no and even then they may still be able to add it.

Mr. Coombes stated this is a best guess estimate. He said he agrees with Ms. Urquhart that they should not go any further than matching this document with the Comprehensive Plan. He stated the other stuff is too specific for this type of document.

Mr. Rodeheaver stated that he feels they do need a long term beyond the five years. He said that there may be many things that they need to think about for the future. He suggested listing the major things that may happen in the future.

Ms. McMullen stated that she agrees and disagrees with the specificity. She stated there are so many ways they could do it. She stated she feels uncomfortable approving something and sending it to Council that just says Vehicles \$50,000. She asked if that is one vehicle or two vehicles. She said there are some things that they should have some sort of basis for. She asked under community development where are those vehicles going to be used for.

Mr. Coombes stated they are not in the management business and he views this as a function of the Town Manager. He stated that what the vehicles are used for is a management decision and they have no business getting involved with that.

Ms. Misicka stated the only other thing she sees that they need to discuss is whether they wish to leave the funding sources as Loan, Grant, GF APP and Proffer or as Mr. Coombes suggested early getting more specific.

Mr. Coombes stated that after hearing Ms. Erard state it is best to leave them all checked he did not have a problem with that.

Ms. Misicka asked if anybody would like to make a motion in revising the CIP.

Ms. McMullen stated that she would like to make a motion having had this discussion which was very helpful and take all of these ideas to heart and draft a revised CIP for the next meeting.

Mr. Mitchell asked the Commission to be specific in what they want because they have gone through a whole range of things.

Mr. Grant stated that he would like to see the Planning Commission stick to their responsibilities which is to basically create a wish list and send it to the Town Council and not go above and beyond their responsibilities.

Ms. Misicka asked for a second to Ms. McMullen's motion.

Mr. Rodeheaver seconded the motion.

Mr. Coombes stated that he would like to amend the motion by adding the specificity to it as Ms. Urquhart has indicated and as he has indicated. Staff should then take this and marry it with the Comprehensive Plan CIP items and bring it back to them.

Ms. Urquhart stated that she would like that amendment to also include the corrections to the math.

Ms. Misicka stated that this should not be complicated. She said she thinks what she is hearing from everybody here is that they would like Staff to revise the draft CIP to include the items in the Comprehensive Plan. She asked for all in favor to say AYE.

There were six AYES and no NAYS There was general agreement to approve the motion.

NEW BUSINESS

- Discussion on proposed text amendments to the zoning ordinance regarding public facilities set - backs.

Mr. Mitchell stated that this text amendment came out of discussion that he had with the Public Works Director. He stated that the discussion was regarding the fact that there are many public facilities that we have around Town that do not respect zoning setbacks. He stated that they decided on the best fix to this problem would be to add some language to Article 18, Miscellaneous section of the zoning ordinance which would state that *any public facility constructed within the Town of Colonial Beach should be exempt from the setback for street frontage requirements provided that the facility is no closer than three feet from a public right of way.*

Mr. Mitchell stated that it would not be allowed to sit right on the edge of the road. He stated that this would address many of the situations they already have and those that may occur in the future.

Mr. Mitchell said this would also allow them to add a definition for public facility in the Zoning Ordinance.

Any improvement and the associated land area which is owned and/or controlled by the Town of Colonial Beach. Use of the facility is provided for under the direct authority of the Town of Colonial Beach. The facility is used exclusively for public use and benefit. Examples of such facilities may include but are not limited to the following: water/sewer pumps, lines, meters, and similar equipment, streets, sidewalks, drainage structures, administrative offices, police station, meeting rooms and similar facilities.

Mr. Misicka stated she would start taking comments from the Commission Members.

Mr. Rodeheaver stated that the word “no” was missing with the way Mr. Mitchell read it.

Mr. Mitchell stated okay.

Mr. Grant said he did not have questions at this time.

Ms. McMullen said she did not have questions at this time.

Mr. Coombes asked where did the three feet come from.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the three feet is a minimum setback for an accessory structure. He said these things are certainly not a principal structure. So that is where he got that number from.

Mr. Mitchell stated they could make it five feet or ten feet.

Mr. Mitchell explained that the rationale was that with three feet it would sit enough off the road that it would not be a problem.

Ms. Urquhart stated her comment was the same as Mr. Rodeheaver’s comment.

Ms. Misicka stated that she just has a few language changes. She stated that in section 18-6 on page 18-2 she would like it to read *any public facility within the Town of Colonial Beach shall be exempt from setback and street frontage requirements* and then add language that says *provided for in section...*

Mr. Mitchell said he would do that.

Ms. Misicka asked that the language in the proposed definition read; *Use of the facility is provided for under the direct authority of the Town of Colonial Beach.*

Ms. Misicka asked if any Commission Member objected to these changes. There was no objection.

Ms. Misicka asked the Commission to vote on the authorization for advertisement for Public Hearing.

THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT FROM ALL MEMBERS TO ADVERTISE FOR PUBLIC HEARING.

- **Discussion of proposed text amendments to the Zoning Ordinance per the Comprehensive Plan.**

Mr. Mitchell stated that in the Comprehensive Plan it talks about revising Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances. He said that they have already done the Subdivision Ordinance and it is on its way to the Town Council. He stated that what he was proposing here was going through the Zoning Ordinance and making it consistent with Town Code or State Law. He said there may be some holes in some of the ordinances that need to be fixed.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he had an example in here where he picked the R-1 district and made updates to it. He stated that one of the issues that happened here 10 -20 years ago was that somebody issued a permit for an accessory structure to be built on a lot without a primary structure and this is considered a violation. He said however if you look under permitted uses you will see accessory structure listed so technically this may not be a violation. He stated that accessory structure should be listed under accessory uses and they currently do not have an accessory use category in that particular district. He said that then you have family day homes and group homes and the state code basically says that you have to permit these as a matter of right in a residential district. So this needs to be updated.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the general assembly in 2009 required that a locally allow for what is called a family health care structure as an accessory use in a residential district. He stated this is not in our zoning ordinance.

Mr. Mitchell stated that the other thing was he had added a table on the second page. He stated this table replaces all the verbiage basically in the existing ordinance from sections 4-4, 4-5, 4-6, 4-7, 4-8, 4-9, 4-10, 4-11. He stated it is easier to administer and easy for someone to see what they can and cannot do.

Mr. Mitchell asked the Commission if this is the way they would like to go or would they like to go back to a standard text. He stated he was really just looking for the Commission's input.

Ms. Misicka stated that before they discuss this she just wanted to make it clear that they were not looking to adopt the changes in this ordinance. They were simply just discussing this process and this was a sample.

Mr. Mitchell stated yes to this. He said what they could do was take one district at a time and look at it and make sure everybody is comfortable with it.

Mr. Grant stated he had no questions.

Ms. McMullen stated that she felt this approach was the way to go.

Mr. Coombes said he was fine with this approach.

Ms. Urquhart said she was totally fine with this approach.

Mr. Rodeheaver stated after having gone through the Comprehensive Plan twice in the last couple of years. He stated that he is not too enthused about doing it. He asked where does this stand in the priority list of things to do in the Planning Office.

Mr. Mitchell stated that he thought this was one of the first or second things to do that is listed in the Comprehensive Plan. He said that they had already done the subdivision ordinance.

Ms. McMullen stated that she thought what he was saying is something that was done prior to some of the Commissioners being on the Commission. She stated they had gone through this but what Mr. Mitchell was suggesting was doing it in a more readable fashion.

Mr. Rodeheaver asked Mr. Mitchell where does it stand in his priority list.

Mr. Mitchell stated that it would be in the top three to five things that need addressed.

Ms. Misicka stated that she would just like to add her comment. She said that in the Comprehensive Plan after the CIP pages there are pages which include action items. These action items are found on page 520-522 and one of the things is to revise the Zoning Ordinance to be in coordination with this plan. She stated that she knows it was just recently done but she does not think they updated in light of the new Comprehensive Plan. She said it would be terrible if the Comprehensive Plan was just updated and it was not reflected in the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Misicka stated that Mr. Rodeheaver does raise a good point in what are their priorities.

Ms. Urquhart stated that as she has learned in the classes of CPVEA that it is important that they continually revisit the ordinances and make sure they match up with a new Comprehensive Plan. She stated it is their role to do this as Planning Commissioners.

Mr. Rodeheaver expressed how that they have been very diligent in doing this. He stated that he gets tired of doing things over and over again when he knows they have other priorities.

Ms. Misicka stated that Staff would like permission that they can proceed with the revision process at the next meeting in May. Ms. Misicka asked for all those in favor.

THERE WERE 6 AYES AND 1 NAY with Mr. Rodeheaver voting Nay.

The Commission gave approval to Staff to begin the revision process next month to make the ordinances consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and State Code changes.

- **Ms. Misicka's handout regarding topics of discussion** .

Ms. Misicka stated that she had given everybody a handout on some topics of discussion that she would like to begin talking about at next month's meeting. She said that she would possibly like to get through the first three at next month's meeting.

1. Parliamentary rules of order governing commission meetings

- Consider the informal procedures for small boards recommended in *Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* (RONR), (10th edition), p. 470-471

2. Agenda setting and adoption by the commission

- Consider increased commissioner input into agenda items
- Consider adoption of the agenda as the commission's first order of business at each meeting per RONR (10th ed.) p. 360-363

3. Substance of commission minutes

- Consider revising minutes to record what was done at meetings rather than what was said per RONR (10th ed.), p. 451

Ms. Misicka stated that she felt that the Commission Members were a very diverse, committed and intelligent group of people. She said that she felt they could work well together and that she wanted them to strive to do the very best that they can do. She said that she felt by reviewing these topics they may be able to figure out a more efficient way and effective way to do things. She stated that one of the most important ways they could do this was by reviewing how they run their meetings. She stated that the Roberts rule of order was almost a 700 page text and she felt there may be easier way to do things. Also they should discuss how the agenda is set and how do they want the minutes to look like. Ms. Misicka stated she would put some information and materials in their packets for next month regarding these topics.

Ms. Misicka stated the next thing she would like discuss at the May meeting was what Mr. Rodeheaver had brought up earlier which was a priority list for 2011. She said they were already a few months into the year. She stated that she was not at the meeting last month but did see a copy of the 2010 Annual report and they had gotten a lot done. She stated she would just like them to review what did they say they were going to get done that they did not get done and if they left something out did they want to put this as a priority for 2011. She requested that they take a look at the action items in the Comprehensive Plan and decide what is important for them to get done this year.

Ms. Foulds stated that she had one thing. She stated that a couple of months ago one of the Commissioner's had requested a list of items that would be impacted once they hit the population of 3,500. She stated that this evening she brought for the Commission a copy of the disclosure statement and the code that tells who is to complete it. She asked that they read it at their convenience.

Ms. Misicka stated that she plans on attending the Planning Commission Certification class in Roanoke this year being held in June and August. She stated for those Commissioners who are interested and do not currently have this training there is another course being held in Richmond in September and December.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Misicka adjourned the meeting at 5:55 P.M.

Cynthia Misicka, Chairperson

