

**Town of Farmville Planning Commission
Work Session
Town Council Chamber of the Town Hall
116 North Main Street, Farmville, VA 23901
Wednesday, January 25, 2023**

Planning Commission Members Present: Chairperson Cameron Patterson, Vice-Chair Jayne Johnson, Dr. John Miller, Patrick Crute, and Abigail O'Connor.

Virtual Participation: Rhett Weiss

Planning Commission Members Absent: Secretary Jerry Davenport

Staff Present: Director of Community Development Lee Pambid, GIS Analyst/Grants Manager Ashley Atkins- Austin, and Administrative Assistant II Michelle Watkins

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Patterson called the Planning Commission work session to order at 7:03 PM. No official business or voting was conducted. The work session was for discussion purposes only. Commissioner Rhett Weiss joined the meeting virtually.

Chairperson Patterson noted that the agenda had been distributed and, on a consensus, the floor was opened for the Planned Unit Development discussion.

Discussion-Planned Unit Developments (PUD's)

On June 10, 2020, after several months of input and deliberation, the Town of Farmville adopted new zoning and subdivision ordinances (Chapter 29 of the Farmville Town Code) and a comprehensive plan. With this new ordinance came the understanding that it would require occasional amendment to address situations as they arise. Since adoption, Staff has fielded multiple development inquiries that include potential and desirable elements that are not currently enabled. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinance allows flexibility in a development's layout, functionality, and density.

A Planned Unit Development District is a zoning district a developer would apply for as a rezoning from a standard zoning district such as R-1 to "PUD". They would propose a design that may deviate from the requirements of the zoning ordinance. The PUD rezoning application would list and propose certain design standards and a layout, and proffers would be appropriate to discuss, as well. As a rezoning case, this would involve Planning Commission and Town Council public hearings. There will also be other site plan hearings and subdivision hearings required.

Mr. Pambid introduced relevant information about the Planned Unit Developments. Staff previously sent out materials including an example PUD ordinance from the city of Lexington, staff reports, and a slide deck along with draft notes from the public engagement session held on January 12, 2023. There was a presentation of a future timeline for the PUD schedule and desired outcome of the PUD process.

Dr. Miller requested clarification of the Bulk Regulations. Mr. Pambid stated that bulk regulations are essentially defined as dimensions that are hard coded into the ordinance. Dr. Miller also wanted to clarify what districts and specific use would be designated under the PUD. Mr. Pambid referred to the Comprehensive Plan and provided some examples.

Ms. O'Connor asked how PUDs and UDAs (Urban Development Area) work together and why not

prioritize focus on the current items in the Comprehensive Plan instead of branching out into a whole new area. Mr. Pambid stated that UDAs is a VDOT process. Even though it is related, it's not administered by the local government. UDAs are not a land use regulation and is regulated from a state level process. He noted that UDAs are almost akin to a local overlay. He offered to provide more information on the topic. Ms. O'Connor was concerned about Farmville's downtown area being affected.

Chairperson Patterson asked Mr. Pambid to brief on the density bonuses based on the information provided by staff. Mr. Pambid mentioned that density bonuses are one of the more powerful incentives for developers especially in larger localities. Farmville does not currently have density bonuses in the ordinance, but it is referenced in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Crute requested clarity on density bonus in relation to a structural concept. Mr. Pambid shared that there is typically a multiplier or ratio that is applied. It's not a subjective decision, it is always associated with some sort of measurable ratio. Mr. Crute wanted to verify the origin of the ratios. Mr. Pambid stated the ratio would come from a variety of sources such as industry standard, comparisons, and academic studies. Mr. Crute asked were density bonuses generally tied to the character of developments or a separate list of criteria. Mr. Pambid stated the incentives could be tied to whatever the locality wants to incentivize. Mr. Crute stated that the density bonus is not tied to zoning but to future land use that could be amended. He questioned why it was tied to minimum acreage and density. He expressed that Farmville is unique in a lot of ways that it has current or former agricultural areas which are low density uses. Mr. Pambid stated that it is the discretion of Planning Commission and Town Council what is enabled. Mr. Crute thinks that the conversation and potential map causes a lot of confusion because the map is predicated on assumptions of items that has not obtained yet. He recommended the public hearing be delayed allowing more time for advertisement and public participation.

Ms. O'Connor received clarification on an abandonment scenario she shared, where a developer is approved for a PUD but does not implement his approved plan before selling the property. Does the new property owner have to follow plans that were approved before purchasing the property. Mr. Pambid stated that approved rezoning and conditions would be applicable to the new owner and the new developer would have to comply with the master plan. If they do not want to implement the master plan, then they would have to go through the PUD application process again.

Mr. Weiss shared his thoughts on more rooftops equaling more revenue. His concern is that PUDs may potentially be a net loss to the Town or to any municipality. He shared that he is very much a proponent of the concept of PUD's, but if used incorrectly, it could put a community in Fiscal distress. There would be a lot of expenses and not the commercial tax base to go with it. Certain use of the PUD could potentially create excessive expense for the Town by having to provide school, social, fire, utility, workforce, and police services. He advised that a balanced approach is needed when using the PUD. His thoughts were to build a fiscal impact analysis into the PUD ordinance, and potentially require a fiscal or economic impact analysis from the developer so the Town understands what the impact would be in terms of services and the cost of services. He mentioned that Doug Stanley shared that Prince Edward County currently has a PUD and that it is basically underutilized and has not achieved its potential. Mr. Weiss suggested that the Town mirrors or synchronize with the County to prevent doing something oblivious to what the County has in its zoning ordinance about PUD. He questioned whether the track record for surrounding cities implementing PUDs be researched and reviewed.

Chairperson Patterson clarified the fiscal and economic impact analysis concept with Mr. Weiss.

He then opened the floor for public participation. Ms. Watkins reported there was no one signed up to speak. Dr. Miller shared his regard for the notion of a fiscal impact analysis but noted that some of the design considerations or benefits of a PUD may not be able to be perfectly quantified. Mr. Weiss stated that he had the more straight forward statistical version of the scope of study in mind.

Chairperson Patterson opened the floor for comment on future meeting dates to further discuss PUDs. Ms. O'Connor and Ms. Jayne Johnson suggested deference of the meeting date to allow more time to advertise to the public, perhaps including a notice in the water bill that goes out to the citizens. Mr. Crute suggested the meeting be scheduled the first week of March to allow more time for advertising. Dr. Miller mentioned that he feels that February 9, 2023, was sufficient time to proceed with the meeting. He also mentioned that the Lead on the PUD discussion, Mr. Pambid will only be available for the next couple of weeks and he would like to capitalize on his expertise. He is also respectful towards the outcome of the consensus. Ms. Johnson expressed her concern about how the discussion would be affected if Mr. Pambid's lead was no longer available. Mr. Weiss expressed he feels that the public input outweighs the departure of Mr. Pambid.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further discussion, Chairperson Patterson adjourned the meeting at 8:29 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Michelle D. Watkins, Administrative Assistant II

Cameron Patterson, Chairperson

Jerry Davenport, Secretary