

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

The following table includes all the written and oral comments received on Chapter 3 of the Draft Comprehensive Plan. This includes comments of Planning Commission members at the Public Hearing held on August 18, 2005. For each item the County Planning Staff has provided a comment and recommendation for the Planning Commission to address at the September 15, 2005 review of this Chapter. The references are all to the August 18 draft.

COMMENTS ON CHAPTER 3

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|--|---|----|
| General | There are a number of areas that we will spend a lot of time discussing in the future – better to identify and discuss now. Highways, Villages, Waterfront Condo’s and businesses, Cockrell Creek development, and how we treat historic and archeological sites need all to be established in chapter 3. | Agree – and the Plan addresses all these issues. | |
| Introduction Pg 3:1 | I would add an introductory paragraph that would go something like this: “It is crucial that Northumberland County take the opportunity of this review and updating of its Comprehensive Plan and corresponding ordinances to provide for the well planned expansion of land use. The beauty, heritage and rural character that attracted hundreds of retirees and business people and their families over the past 50-plus years is sure to continue to attract even more in the near future. The purpose of this Land Use Plan is to establish the policies, standards and priorities which, along with timely changes to County ordinances, will set the stage for the use of the land, water and other resources so vital to the future of this County.” | Agree – Intro paragraph similar to that recommended was added | |
| B.1.a. (1) Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:4 | (d) - “that their property remains largely undeveloped” is not correct. A conservation easement locks in the property owner’s wishes. If they wish to develop all or part of it, or to specify restrictions such as lot size, that is guaranteed in perpetuity. Better wording would be “that usage of their property according to their wished is guaranteed in | Agree to change | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|---|---|----|
| | perpetuity” or something like that. | | |
| B.1.a. (1) Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:4 | The agriculture areas should be protected from uncontrolled subdivisions | Agree, a new policy statement has been added to address this issue. Section has been rewritten | |
| B.1.a. (1) Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:4 | Forested areas should be protected, recommend consider incentives to keep farmland and forested areas intact. Use existing programs for farmland protection grants. | Agree, a new policy statement has been added to address this issue. Further: Land Use Tax incentives are currently in place in the County. | |
| B.1.a. (1) Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:4 | The county needs to create an incentive plan designed to preserve farmland, waterfront and off-water tracts alike, while protecting the individual property rights of its residents. I think it's a great idea to preserve the rural character of the county, and believe incentives will work better than stiff regulations. Not too many years ago, new regulations were enacted to protect the Bay that actually accelerated growth in the area due to the immediate development of many waterfront farms. If you were here during that time, you realize that most of these farms would not have been developed for twenty years or more, possible never. But as we now know first hand, the public fears regulation. | Agree, a new policy statement has been added to address this issue | |
| B.1.a. (1) Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:4 | Add “e.” Return farmlands to forests: Rather than contributing to pollution, forests actually cleanse the shallow aquifer of excess nutrients and minimize pollution to the bay. Tax incentives for returning farmed land to forest should be implemented. | Agree, add to the list. | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands | - Delete (2) and (3). We do not want raising of animals on a large scale in the County. It creates few jobs, it stinks | Item 2 and 3 have been revised. The “Right-to-Farm Act” provides some limits on | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|---|---|----|
| Pg 3:4 | and it causes massive pollution. The County should state this policy in the Comprehensive Plan and Ordinances and ensure that any such operations be treated as Special Exceptions. | regulation in this area. | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:5 | <p>(5) In Chapter 3 of the 1996 Plan (page 3:3), Policies for Rural Uplands, recognizes the prominence of forestland in the county, comprising about half the acreage. Forestland and the sound management of all natural resources is critical to sustain the health and productivity of Virginia’s rural landscape. Bullet (5) under “Policies for the Rural Uplands” is destructive to the future health and productivity of our resources.</p> <p>Selective cutting is destructive to our natural resources; other common names used to describe this practice include high-grading or diameter-limit cutting. The end result of this type of treatment is destructive because it removes the largest diameter, best-formed, genetically superior, and healthiest trees, leaving the poorest trees to continue growing. It would be comparable to breeding your weakest livestock and sending the healthiest to slaughter. In nature the strongest prevail not the weakest.</p> <p>Clearcutting is actually good for the regeneration of most of our trees. Tulip poplar, oaks, and pines are very dependent on sunlight to regrow. When forestland is clearcut the soil is warmed, stimulating the germination of dormant and/or ripe seeds. The strongest prevail within each species, growing tall and straight. The only way to sunlight is straight up in a clearcut. In select cuts, there is less germination of viable seeds, and saplings have to crook and bend to find light.</p> | This sentence will be revised to favor clear cutting over selective cutting as recommended. | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|--|---|----|
| | Implementing sound forest management is a stable means a county government can grow economically and spend less in services. Trees need no schools, waste facilities, or rescue services, only an occasional road every 50 years. | | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:5 | I believe forest practices should be left to the Virginia Department of Forestry. They deal with forestry from a scientific basis, not from the wishes of a few individuals. I am involved in the land and timber business and have timbered many parcels throughout the Northern Neck and Middle Peninsula. I have found that many times when you drive by a select cut tract after the harvest is complete; it's difficult to notice the difference. More often than not, a select cut tract looks 100% better than a clear cut tract. Select cutting also leaves many more trees to slow run off. Thanks for your time and consideration. | We received a letter from the Department of Forestry that states: "Selective cutting is destructive to our natural resources; " Their letter addresses the issues you raise. We have modified the former version of the Comp Plan in accordance with the Department of Forestry recommendations. | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:5 | b. (3) - Remove the reference to 3/4 acre and require all lots to be at least one acre in size. | Section has been rewritten | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:5 | I think the plan's suggestion of a 1 acre average with the smallest size allowable of 3/4 is a bit too conservative. In areas away from the water (the uplands), I think 1 1/2 acre average with a minimum size of 1 acre is more reasonable. | Section has been rewritten | |
| Pg. 3:5 – 3:9 | Move the minimum lot size to 2 acres to reduce the impact of growth on aquifer replenishment. | Section has been rewritten | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:5 | . I believe cluster housing should be encouraged, especially in and near towns. The minimum lot size under a townhouse/condo development in a town should be very small, where lots outside the town would obviously need to be larger. (You may want to consider the zoning guidelines of other | This section has been rewritten and generally follows this recommendation. The Comp Plan is intended to set policy and direction for Northumberland County. The | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|---|---|----|
| | local towns, such as Kilmarnock and Tappahannock.) | zoning guidelines used by other Counties will be reviewed at the time the Board of Supervisors reviews the current zoning ordinances. (Cluster housing is not addressed in the Lancaster County Comp Plan.) | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:6 | b. (5) -refers to “minimum frontage.” Should this restriction be outlined in the Plan? | “minimum frontage” refers to existing zoning ordinance requirements. | |
| B.1. Policies for Rural Uplands Pg 3:6 | b.(6) - “groundwater runoff” is confusing. Groundwater moves below the land surface whereas runoff moves across the land surface. You probably mean just runoff | Agree | |
| B.2. Policies for the Rural Low Shelf Pg.3:7 | -Where “generally” is deleted, I think it should remain. The policies are not exactly the same, as noted by the exceptions that follow. | Agree | |
| B.2. Policies for the Rural Low Shelf Pg.3:7 | -(b) “riparian buffers” should be defined somewhere in the plan, or reference made to the list of definitions | Add the qualifier: “as required by the Chesapeake Bay Act.” | |
| B.2 Policies for Rural Low Shelf Pg 3:7 | [Comment: Aren't subsections (d) and (g) at cross purposes? The contradiction may be corrected by stating something like "large water users should develop water supply plans that minimize adverse effects on the artesian aquifers."] | Two different types of users were envisioned and there has been some clarification. Water Supply Plans are currently required by DEQ for large users.. | |
| Pg.3:7 | (e) Large scale commercial raising of animals is prohibited, or delete. | (e) has been rewritten. | |
| B.2. Policies for the Rural Low Shelf Pg.3:7 | (g): use of the words “should” and “shall” should be standardized throughout the Plan. I prefer “should” since this is a plan, and “shall” for the ordinances. | Agree | |
| Pg. 3:7 | (h) delete 3/4 acre | Section has been rewritten | |
| B.3. Policies for | Use of county shoreline of 556 miles must be planned and | Agree, this recommendation to be | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|--|--|----|
| Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | used judiciously. Currently about 55 % (306 miles) is forest and shrub/scrub, 34 % (189 miles) is residential, 8% (44 miles) is agriculture and grass, and a little over 2% (11 miles) is commercial/industrial. The remaining 1% is various small uses. | incorporated into the introduction of B.3. | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | -Middle of page, Add “generally” :.....Area are <i>generally</i> the same.....” | agree | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | Other issues in this section we should address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage smaller lot sizes of 1 acre or less, to conserve land for resources. | . Section has been rewritten | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | Encourage community wells and septic in reserve areas away from the water, to reduce environmental impact and increase economic and functional efficiency. | Addressed in Chapter 5 | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | Discourage haphazard development throughout the county and focus growth next to existing populations, to conserve the land. | Agree, part of the rationale for Villages. | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | Although waterfront condominiums can be an attractive living arrangement for some, they threaten bay water quality and the rural waterfront scenery of Northumberland County. “Condo’s” in every cove and on every point will not enhance the county. <i>Condominiums must be constrained to structures that architecturally fit with their surroundings, do not exceed county height restrictions, fit within density restrictions in terms of both dwelling per acre as defined on page 9,e and per linear frontage (TBD).</i> | The part of the recommendation in italics will be added to the list of policies. | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|---|--|----|
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | No more than 2 miles of county waterfront should be allowed to become condo. (approximately 1% of current waterfront residence frontage) | This recommendation can not be reasonably implemented. Other criteria must be used to keep condo development consistent with the vision of the County. | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | <p><i>Further Allocation of Shoreline</i></p> <p>We should expect residential and commercial waterfront to continue to expand as forest and farm properties are developed. However, to retain the character of the County and protect the Bay, we should plan to maintain forest and agriculture (now 63%) at greater than 50% in perpetuity. This does allow another 13 % (72 miles) of development. At least 1 mile of this additional development should include planned county development of parks and overlooks.</p> | The goals have merit but this recommendation can not be reasonably implemented. Other criteria must be used to keep development consistent with the rural vision of the County | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | Another possible consideration includes establishing a mid-bay research center to develop new strains of oysters, resolve crab population declines, maintain scientific data on status of the bay menhaden population, and improve health of all bay finfish. As in the Gloucester area, this sort of center would spin off new businesses in keeping with our watermen’s heritage. (Note: this comment was included with Reedville and Cockrell’s Creek comments.) | <p>This type of item is covered in Chapter 4. The EDC and Chamber of Commerce should be pursuing this concept.</p> <p>Item B.3 (g) on page 3:9 also addresses this recommendation.</p> | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | (d) Now, I think one of the hottest topics we may face is going to involve minimum lot size in subdivision. I think the plan’s suggestion of a 1 acre average with the smallest size allowable of 3/4 is a bit too conservative. In areas away from the water (the uplands), I think 1 ½ acre average with a minimum size of 1 acre is more reasonable. In waterfront | Section has been rewritten | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|---|--|----|
| | <p>developments, I think a 2 acre average with a 1 3/4 acre minimum size is more appropriate. I think, however, the previous designations would be appropriate only in traditional subdividing. Clustering is highly desirable to protect the ecology and in any development of a certain size, a clustering could be allowed so that the average per dwelling unit could be reduced lower than in the traditional subdivision (to perhaps a 1 or a 3/4 acre average) provided that the rest of the acreage were maintained in greenspace (hopefully wooded land and gardens or agriculture) with some sort of conservation easement on it. This could even be a sliding scale in average units per acre with a larger tract allowing an even smaller average size per unit (perhaps 1/2 acre average) in return for preserving much more open space.</p> | | |
| <p>B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8</p> | <p>(d) I firmly believe we need to encourage the development of specialized condominiums (or a condominium/medical facility development on the order of a Westminster Canterbury) to provide housing for our aging population which is now living in large homes on the waterfront they will not be able to continue to maintain. I know this type of development would require at least 30 acres, maybe more, but I am open to reasonable limits in looking to include this exception in our plan. It would be a good use of the land and provide a service to the community. I am not saying that the only clustering allowed should be for senior condos, just that I see that as our most critical need.</p> | <p>An item will be added to the list of policies addressing condominium development.</p> <p>Item has been addressed to encourage larger lot sizes - Section has been rewritten</p> | |
| <p>B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8</p> | <p>Other than the exception for clustering, I think the larger lots sizes are necessary for the environment, especially near the water, be it inland water or the Bay and its tributaries.</p> | <p>. Section has been rewritten</p> | |
| <p>B.3. Policies for</p> | <p>The Plan should mandate that all future development should</p> | <p>Agree, this item will be added as a new item</p> | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|---|---|----|
| Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:8 | be tied into public sewage and water, if there is an existing system. | B.3.(h) on page 3:9 | |
| B.3. Pg 3:8 | Waterfront property should have a minimum shoreline of 200ft | Disagree without some solid rationale. Do not understand why a limitation is beneficial or necessary. | |
| B.3.(d) Pg 3:8 | Comment A: Minimum acreage for lots should be 2 acres, not the ¾ or 1 acre as in the current plan Comment B: delete ¾ acre | Item has been addressed in a re-write of the section | |
| B.3.(d) Pg 3:8 | Minimum acreage for lots should be larger in Shoreline Conservation Areas especially if engineered septic systems are installed because of the potential for catastrophic failure. | Has been rewritten. | |
| B.3. Pg. 3.8 | The reason such changes (Water and Sewage, shoreline and lot size above) are required lies in the problem of the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay and the imperative necessity to do everything possible to contribute to the improvement of this situation. | Water and Sewage are addressed in Chapter 5. Lot size in Note 1. Shoreline length needs some rationale. | |
| B.3. Pg. 3.8 | As the development within Northumberland County continues to grow, we cannot endlessly add septic systems to the impaired and fragile ecology of our shorelines. More stringent restrictions on waterfront population density would be a positive step in limiting increased pollution. | Population density is addressed by controlling lot size and multiple unit dwellings per B.3.(e) on page 3:9 | |
| B.3. Policies for Shoreline Conservation Area Pg 3:9 | - “shall be enforced” not “should be enforced” | See “shall” vs “should” discussion above with regards to pg 3:7 comment. | |
| | | | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General | <i>Village Plans</i> Each Village Plan should place emphasis on improved village | These thoughts will be incorporated into a revised introduction to the Villages Section B.4 page 3:9 | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|--|---|----|
| | <p>infrastructure. Improved traffic flow, parking, inter-village bus transportation, roads, walkways, bike paths, parks, community recreation facilities, sewage, public restrooms, fire protection, internet availability, and other infrastructure that encourages village development must be part of each village plan. East and West streets with trees and sidewalks and pathways are part of the required infrastructure.</p> | | |
| <p>B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9</p> | <p>Zero-frontage buildings in the villages, with municipal or rear property parking should be encouraged. This means village zoning that brings village shops forward to sit uniformly along a sidewalk (with uniform set-back) next to the road. Callao is currently a mixture of setbacks, and looks like a disaster area as a result.</p> | <p>The concept of Traditional Neighborhood Development, which includes this concept is referenced in B.4.a (9)</p> | |
| <p>B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9</p> | <p>The county and citizens should plant trees on a regular basis, so that in 20 years, the character and feel of each village is maintained or improved.</p> | <p>Agree, this concept should be included in Chapter 4. with the discussion on parks. A landscaping ordinance should be considered.</p> | |
| <p>B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9</p> | <p>Our County is the only one on the Northern Neck without designated Industrial Parks or equivalent areas. Does this mean there is no interest in such a development?</p> | <p>Policies regarding Industrial Parks have been added to this section since they should be contiguous to village commercial hubs or support areas.</p> | |
| <p>B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General</p> | <p>Much of the (Comp) Plan revolves around the creation of the villages and their service areas. While I laud this concept, I feel that the village concept is already going adrift with this revision of the plan.</p> <p>First, since the last plan, we have created two new villages, Lilian and Village. The most radical addition is Lilian, of course, which lies right between Reedville and Burgess and may tend to promote sprawl on Rt. 360. I am concerned about the creation of new villages so early in our development</p> | <p>The village concept has been revisited and the concept clarified. Three villages are now designated to include commercial hubs and the remainder is residential support areas.</p> | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|---|--|----|
| | <p>planning, the first revision of the plan, but I am also concerned about the “support areas” which lead into the villages. Already the support areas are expanding into commercial hubs. Four times in the last year, there have been applications for rezoning land currently A-1 to the B-1 designation in the support area in Burgess on Rt. 200. In three out of four applications, the re-zoning was granted with potentially disastrous results. Rather than concentrating commercial activity in the hub in Burgess, the rezoning of the support areas has allowed the commercial property to be strung out along Rt. 200 greatly increasing the potential commercial hub and promoting sprawl. With very little additional rezoning, all of Rt. 200 from Rt. 360 down to Bobby’s Marine will be zoned commercial B-1 and there will be very if any residences left in that strip.</p> | | |
| <p>B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General</p> | <p>Further, because the balance in all of the village support areas is very delicate between business and residential and can be easily tipped to an entirely commercial zone, dependant on the type of business or businesses locating there, I suggest that all re-zoning for business development in the support areas be by conditional use only until a new zoning district which addresses the mix can be enacted. Without this type of “moratorium” in the support areas, it is likely several of them will evolve into sprawling commercial hub areas in the near future given the high concentration of B-1 zoning within them now and the trend in re-zoning to B-1 which we have seen over the past two years. Once a new zoning district is created which addresses this problem, I recommend that the conditional use only recommendation be withdrawn and any re-zoning proceed in accordance with the new district created to protect a residential/small business district.</p> | <p>This is a Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors issue. The Comprehensive Plan is a basis for establishing policy and guidelines for making zoning decisions.</p> | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|--|---|----|
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General | The actions of the Planning Commission and the Board over the past two years have failed to anticipate the sprawl they are engendering. Under our current zoning regulations, this can only be stopped by confining properties designated B-1 to the designated commercial hubs and allowing other businesses outside of the hubs themselves only by conditional use. | This is a Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors issue. Proposed changes to the zoning regulations need to be made. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General | Northumberland needs to significantly increase its sales tax revenue from local village retail businesses. Rather than invest in development of an Industrial Park somewhere in the county, it would be prudent to pre-plan one-way bypass alternatives for at least Callao and Heathsville to open up land for village expansion and ease future traffic bottlenecks. | By Passes were addressed on Chapter 4 and are beyond the current planning horizon. Potential locations should be considered and recommended policies have been added.. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General | Incentives, via a revision of the current state and county supported “enterprise Zones” must be re-focused on areas where village shop development is desired. | Incentives are independent on the location of the Enterprise Zone. The Enterprise Zones are intended to be redefined once the village boundaries are approved. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General | Key blocks of land for public access and parking should be identified and plans for acquisition and development initiated. | The current plan is for businesses to be responsible for sufficient parking in the villages. Public access and parking is not needed in the foreseeable future. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General | Both core business and support areas should be designated for each village in the current plan to provide a point of departure for zoning decisions. | This is the village concept. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 | Persons who own parcels in areas identified as Village Commercial Hubs and Support Areas should be notified that they are so classified so they can respond. | The purpose of the series of public hearings and notices in the papers is to make all aware that potential changes from the 1996 | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|--|--|----|
| General | | plan are being considered. Affected persons are notified in person by letter when a specific zoning change is being considered. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 | The “Support Areas” need to be defined. | The Zoning Ordinance should be updated and an appropriate Zoning Classification, to address Support Areas will be developed. This process shall be discussed in the Plan. The Plan now includes an updated generic definition of the Support Areas and their purpose. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:9 General | While nurturing village shop business via incentives and infrastructure, these businesses must be protected against the encroachment of “big box stores” by setting maximum restriction on store size like has been done in other communities. Northumberland should encourage growth of malls and large department stores – in other counties. | Generally agree. This concept is discussed in the Village policies | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:10 | (4) Turning my attention to the “enterprise zones”, I need to note that they are not permanent. They are also not located, in most part, where we want them. I would suggest that the plan include a provision to re-evaluate the location of the enterprise zones and charge the Economic Development Commission with contacting the state to find out when and how we can change them to properties better suited and within the Village concept we are mapping out. This is especially true for Callao, Lottsburg, and Heathsville. | Enterprise Zones have been removed from the Future Land Use maps. At present the identified Enterprise Zones undermine our village concept and attempts to control sprawl along the major arteries. The size and location of Enterprise Zones will be re-evaluated after the BOS approves the basic land use maps for the villages. | |
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:10 | Persons whose property is identified as within an Enterprise Zone or planned to be within one should be contacted to enable them to respond. | The recommendation will be considered as part of the process when the size and location of the Enterprise Zones are re-evaluated. | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----|
| B.4.a Policies for Villages Pg.3:10 | (5) Very important that this be kept in the Plan. | Agree | |
| B.4.a. Policies for Villages Pg.3:10 | (7)[Comment: I would recommend striking this statement. The record shows that the history of water supply is one of cycles of excess and shortages. First, there is plenty of water. Then, development of the region brings on a shortage. Then, public/private parties use technology to increase the water supply. Again, there is plenty of water, and the cycle begins anew. History also demonstrates that a growing economy and advances in technology act to produce answers to problems that seem initially to be beyond solution. 30-50 years is a long time. Besides, we should think of resources like water not as physical resources (measured in gallons, tons, or cubic meters) but as an economic resource--one whose ultimate availability depends the price we are willing or able to pay.] | This sentence will be deleted. | |
| B.4.a. Policies for Villages Pg.3:10 | In the section dealing with the villages (specifically p. 3:17, 3:20, 3:22, and 3:25), I suggest that each sentence referring to a reservoir be rewritten along the following lines: "Develop plans for a sustainable water supply THAT INCLUDES a reservoir developed on such and such creek." This retains a focus on reservoirs but makes clear that they are only one element of a water supply plan. | Agree | |
| B.4.b. Callao Pg.3:12 | Where Callao is referred to in several places as the commercial gateway to the County from the west, this should be expanded to reflect “north” and west. | Agree | |
| B.4.d. Heathsville Pg. | Mention the Extension Service and Marine Police? | Agree | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|----|
| 3:17 | | | |
| B.4.d. Heathsville Pg. 3:17 | I would suggest, however, that if any support area were going to be increased, it would make sense to increase the support area east of Heathsville. With the Food Lion on that side of town and the huge enterprise zone designated there, any increase in support areas would reasonably go there. In addition, an increase in business activity in the county seat makes sense and would help support a sewer and water system as well as a fire department which is much needed there. | The Heathsville Commercial Hub area and Support Areas have been re-evaluated and re-defined with these thoughts in mind. | |
| B.4.e. Burgess Pg. 3:19 | Calling Burgess a “gateway village” is a stretch. North Kilmarnock? Maybe Callao qualifies on land and Reedville as a Bay-port. | Agree, will re-categorize Burgess. | |
| B.4.e. Burgess Pg. 3:19 | First, I oppose including the property south of Lampkintown Road in the support area for the village of Burgess. Although a great deal of that area is already zoned, B-1, any future re-zoning to B-1 would be discouraged and the mixed nature of residential and business interests would remain. Given the rash of re-zoning requests in that area over the past year and our current lack of a zoning district to promote the mix of residential and small business interests, by including the portion of the highway down to Bobby’s Marine in the support area for the current plan revision, I believe it will all eventually become B-1 and there will be no more “support area” - which is defined as a mixture of residential; and small businesses. As a result, I foresee at least one or two strip shopping centers there and no room left for houses and yards. At least until we have some new zoning districts which might allow for the mix the plan is encouraging, I think the support area should be cut off at Lampkintown Road. | The Enterprise Zones, Commercial Hubs and Support Areas have been re-evaluated with these thoughts in mind. | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---------------------------|--|--|----|
| B.4.e. Burgess Pg.3:19 | At the end of the first paragraph, delete “The variety of businesses.....” so that the last sentence ends “...any small town currently includes:” | We would prefer to address the businesses in Burgess. | |
| B.4.e. Burgess Pg.3:19 | -in the list of businesses, add “tire repair”, “boat repair” | Agree | |
| B.4.e. Burgess Pg.3:19 | Turning to the description of the individual villages, I would like to see some comment added which strengthens the proposal I made earlier, limiting the support area in Burgess. The addition of the storage buildings on the west side of Rt. 200 just south of the intersection brings the “commercial” aspects of the village outside of its hub. I think the language needs to emphasize that the support area leaving Burgess should retain its rural village atmosphere and residential interests should not be overlooked. In addition, the large enterprise zones around Burgess to the north and south of Rt. 360 might be appropriate for an “industrial park” especially since neither of them border directly on Rt. 360 and Rt. 200. They could be developed “out of sight” and away from residential neighborhoods which border directly on the highways. Although they would require a road into them, they could be an economic boost to the Burgess area without the sprawl created by their bordering the highway. They bring to mind the industrial park just south of Gloucester on Rt. 17... you don’t even know its there except for the one sign on the highway next to its attractive entrance. Since I think we have a great need for an industrial park in the county, I think this would be an excellent way of promoting the economic development of Burgess if it was coupled with limitation of the support areas bordering on the major highways. | <p>The Enterprise Zones, Commercial Hubs and Support Areas have been re-evaluated with these thoughts in mind.</p> <p>Text will be included for Burgess as recommended.</p> <p>Enterprise Zones and Industrial Parks are now discussed in B.4.a Policies for Villages.</p> | |
| B.4.f. | In the first paragraph, Wicomico Church now has just one | Correction made | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--------------------------------|--|---|----|
| Wicomico Church Pg.3:22 | convenience store, and it has two marine repair services. Also, the new community center should be mentioned, and we have a post office. | | |
| B.4.f. Wicomico Church Pg.3:22 | -(1) add after “Great Wicomico River”: “and north of Kilmarnock.” | Agree | |
| B.4.g. Reedville Pg.3:24 | As far as Reedville goes, I think the plan totally fails to address the needs of redevelopment of Cockrell’s Creek. Most of the area lies outside of the village of Reedville, but I think this description is the appropriate place to address the dilapidation of areas of Cockrell’s Creek and the need for redevelopment of the area. This area begs for incentives encouraging developers to replace the collapsing skeletons of the past with something new and wonderful for the village of Reedville and the communities of Fairport and Fleeton. Most probably, the area will be amenable to some sort of residential re-development but marinas are not out of the question, nor are condominiums or cluster development which would both mitigate the current conditions. It will take a lot of money to do this and I think our plan needs to consider how we can rejuvenate these areas and make them assets to the community rather than eyesores and areas of potential danger to navigation. | Agree – will add appropriate wording. Land around Cockrell’s Creek has been re-designated as a Support Area to encourage development as proposed. | |
| B.4.g. Reedville Pg.3:24 | <p><i>Cockrell Creek Harbor</i></p> <p>Arguably the county’s most valuable resource is the harbor represented by Cockrell creek. Few counties in the country, much less the state, have a deep-water harbor with the potential of the Reedville area. Development of this resource must consider value to the county and its citizens, as well as</p> | Agree, we need to address this. Land around Cockrell’s Creek has been re-designated as a Support Area to encourage development as proposed. | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|--|--|----|
| | <p>the downside potential for further disruption and pollution of the bay.</p> <p>Omega Protein has been a good neighbor and, hopefully will continue to fish, provide high value omega-3 oil for human health and provide value to the community.</p> | | |
| B.4.g. Reedville Pg.3:24 | In the first (2), add “and hotel and marina development.” | Agree | |
| B.4.g. Reedville Pg.3:24 | <p>We must look hard and with discrimination at other alternatives to make sure that they are congruent with county objectives and the desires of its people. For instance, what are the real plus and minus values of a Ferry? Is it subsidized pass-through economics with little value to the county, or a major boost to our growing tourist trade? Although previous studies have seemed to indicate economic infeasibility, it appears now that we will have to decide again based on value to the county and citizens. We should not let the Federal Government make this decision for us. The plan must identify the Ferry decision as a significant unresolved community issue. A “Ferry” referendum to provide community input should be planned to help guide future decisions.</p> | <p>The comment raises good questions. This topic is more appropriate in Chapter 4. The proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan are neutral concerning a possibility of a ferry.</p> | |
| B.4.h. North Kilmarnock Pg. 3:27 | Add: “major gateway to the County from the south.” | Agree | |
| B.4.i. Lilian Pg. 3:29 | <p>Turning my attention to Lilian, I do not feel that it is a good idea to condone the development of another village on the Rt. 360 corridor. Although the zoning in the area has mostly been changed to B-1, I do not think that calls for the plan to condone development of a true “commercial hub”. Right</p> | <p>Agree, Lilian should be shown only as a “Support Area” without a Commercial Hub.</p> | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|----|
| | <p>now, the businesses located there are small businesses which could be located in R-1 under conditional use application. They are the type which we would expect to arise under a new zoning district to be created for the support areas. Therefore, rather than define Lilian as a commercial hub, if it has to get village designation at all, I think the entire area should be defined as a support area and any further designation of B-1 should be discouraged. I really think of Lilian more in line with the country stores and convenience store outlined in Section c of the description of the Rural Uplands. Even though the businesses there are not convenience stores, they are also not major commercial operations or strip shopping centers - they are local small businesses. I therefore suggest that any future re-zoning in Lilian before the zoning districts are revised should be only conditional use and that re-zoning to B-1 should be strictly avoided so as to discourage more intense commercial development. If Lilian is treated otherwise, we are likely to end up with another commercial hub which will lead to more support areas which will eventually stretch closer to Reedville and Burgess and promote sprawl along the entire corridor.</p> | | |
| | <p>..... change the designation of the Lilian Village to “support area” rather than planning for the rise of new extended commercial hubs. We may not be able to avoid it at this point, but our plan should discourage sprawl as much as we can rather than encourage it.</p> | <p>Agree to delete Commercial Hub from Lilian.</p> | |
| <p>B.4.i. Lilian Pg. 3:29</p> | <p>Change “Heathsville” to “Reedville.”</p> | <p>Mistake Corrected</p> | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|--|--|----|
| B.5. Policies for Special Areas Pg. 3:33 | (A).Historic and Archeological Resources (b) “the next” or “a future” Comprehensive Plan? | The intent was to add it to <u>this</u> version of the Plan if the effort is completed. This activity was in the last Comp Plan and no survey was accomplished. | |
| B.5. Policies for Special Areas (A).Historic and Archeological Resources Pg. 3:33 | Add a new section (c): Northumberland has more than its share of significant historic sites. All sites identified by the Historic Society should, under the new plan, be protected by requiring a 1000 foot buffer against further development except that which is in context and specifically provided for by the Board of Supervisors and the Historic Society. | We agree that the County has a large number of historic sites and that some should be protected. The specific recommendation of a 1000 ft buffer appears impractical. | |
| B.5. Policies for Special Areas (B) Highway Corridor Overlay District. Pg 3:33 | Finally, the Corridor Protection Plan. I am very pleased with its provisions but I don't think it goes far enough. It only covers Rt. 200 and Rt. 360. We have several other highways in the county which, while not acting as thoroughfares, are major sources of traffic. Most of our population and most of the guests to our county go to the water and live and stay at the water. I would include a number of roads in this plan other than Rt. 200 and Rt. 360. The most important to protect first would be Rt. 201 to Heathsville and Rt. 202 from Callao into Westmoreland County. Although not the primary routes, these are highly traveled routes in our county. I can not speak for other supervisors, but in my district, I think that Remo Road and Bluff Point Road are also extremely highly traveled and should be protected by the policies. | Rt 201 and Rt 202 do not appear to have the problems associated with the main highways passing through the areas designated as villages. If village-type development occurs along Rt 201 or Rt 202, these should be considered for inclusion in the Corridor Protection Plan at that time. Remo Road and other feeders are not primary routes and therefore should not have the same restrictions which are intended to move traffic and also accommodate Villages. | |
| B.5. (B) Highway Corridor Overlay District Pg. 3:34 | (1) Second paragraph, the conflict as described is unclear. | Some rewording will be performed for clarification. | |
| B.5. (B) | Restrictions on Signage and Lighting should be County-wide, | Agree | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---|---|--|----|
| Highway Corridor Overlay District Pg. 3:36 | not just on the roads designated in the Overlay. | | |
| B.5. (B) Highway Corridor Overlay District | The proposed contents of the Highway Corridor Overlay District appear to be too detailed and too firm for the Comp Plan. They could cause problems in the ordinance-making process and require formal changes to the Comp Plan which could bog down the HCOD ordinance process. | Qualifications will be added so that the items listed are not so restrictive. | |
| B.5. (B) Highway Corridor Overlay District Pg. 3:37 | (4)A part of the highway overlay should include words to protect against degradation of the Rt. 360 and Rt. 200 “Viewsapes.” Outside the villages, a 1000 foot highway protection area should provide a green vista -- forests, farmhouses and crops, should be presented to the visitor along the highway in a manner similar to today. We must resist billboards and garish signs, bright lights and strip malls within the protection area. Forests and farms are what we are and what visitors expect to see. Trees and shrubs shall be used to screen and enhance the 1000 foot vista. | Viewsheds are addressed in 5.(B).3.b on page 3:37. The Viewshed paragraph will be modified to recommend consideration of a protection area. Signs and lights are intended to be addressed on a county-wide basis. | |
| B.5.(C) Reservoir Areas Pg. 3:38 | I continue to press for a water supply plan for the County that emphasizes diverse water sources and delivery. While I applaud the inclusion of reservoirs in the new comprehensive plan in order to relieve future pressure on the artesian aquifers, I fear that the County will be simply trading one single water source (artesian aquifers) for another (reservoirs). I urge County officials to develop a plan that is based on a diversity of water sources, one that includes elements such as 1) a county or inter-county reservoir system, 2) tapping the very deep aquifers (which may require the desalinization of the extracted groundwater), 3) development of the surficial aquifer for domestic uses (the water is | We agree, however this chapter addresses Future Land Use only. Chapter 5 addressed water quantity and many of these concepts are included therein as recommended by the public input. | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|---|---|----|
| | <p>renewable), 4) desalinization of surface water, 5) inter-basin transfer of water, 6) recycling of waste water, 7) rainwater harvesting, and 8) water conservation measures (both voluntary and legislated). The wisdom of this plan lies in the fact that the County does not rely on a single, finite (at least in capacity) source of water. Whereas each source is capable of supplying only a portion of the total amount of water required by the County, taken together they yield a productive system that is not vulnerable to the failure or impairment of just one source.</p> | | |
| <p>B.5.(C) Reservoir Areas Pg. 3:38</p> | <p>- 1. It is dangerous to speculate about how long the artesian groundwater will last. It might be better to say “Artesian aquifer groundwater is a finite resource. Problems will likely become.....” There are people out there who, for various reasons, believe that the resources will last longer than is concluded from the scientific evidence.</p> <p>-</p> | <p>Agree some qualification is in order.</p> | |
| <p>B.5.(C) 1. Pg. 3:38</p> | <p>I suggest: "The continued reliance of groundwater drawn from the artesian aquifers will lead to the impairment the aquifer system by mid-century and to the eventual loss of the aquifers as a productive source of water."</p> | <p>Agree, section has been reworded</p> | |
| <p>B.5.(C) 2.</p> | <p>[Comment: First, the bald-faced value judgment that reservoirs "are the most desirable sources of water. . . . "is open to considerable criticism. Who says so? It is well known that surface impoundments have numerous deficiencies, both engineering, environmental, and economic. It is not my intention to enumerate these deficiencies here</p> | <p>Agree. Changes will be made to the text along the lines recommended.</p> | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|--|--|---|----|
| | <p>(many sources document them), but only to state that it is not wise policy at this time to make reservoirs the centerpiece of water supply plan. They constitute just one element of a good plan. (Certainly, it makes great sense to protect or acquire the property needed for these reservoirs as soon as possible,) Second, although we groundwater techies speak carelessly of an artesian aquifer "collapsing," the term probably doesn't apply strictly to the situation faced by the aquifers beneath the Northern Neck. An explanation for this phenomenon is too long to go into here, but suffice it to say that the actual impairment of the aquifer and its eventual loss of capacity is much more complex than the term "collapse" implies. I suggest that you delete the phrase "when the aquifer collapses."]</p> | | |
| <p>C. How to Use the Land Plan Pg 3:40</p> | <p><i>Unanticipated Land Usage</i></p> <p>As with all plans there are many unknowns that lie in the future. It must be clearly established that all land and shoreline uses not defined in zoning regulations must be brought to a public hearing and vote by the then presiding Board of Supervisors.</p> | <p>The current process requires a public hearing and vote by the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors when new uses are proposed for a zoning category.</p> | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Public Comments – Chapter 3
Through 3 September 2005

| SECTION | COMMENT/INPUT | STAFF COMMENT | PC |
|---------|---------------|---------------|----|
| | | | |
| | | | |