

Minutes
Jefferson County Planning Commission
July 9, 2013

The Jefferson County Planning Commission met on July 9, 2013, with the following Commission members present: Paul Taylor, President, Daniel Hayes, Vice President; Steve Stolipher, Walt Pellish, J.P. Phillips, Wade Louthan, and Gary Phalen. Staff members present included Jennifer Brockman, Director of Planning and Zoning; Seth Rivard, County Planner; Jonathan Saunders, County Engineer; Stephanie Grove, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney; and Alexandra Beaulieu, Planning Clerk.

Staff members Joe Kent, Land Development Inspector, and Roger Goodwin, Chief County Engineer were present for the first half of the meeting which included both public hearings.

Planning Commission members Darlene Truman and Gene Taylor were absent with notification.

Mr. P. Taylor called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

1. Re-Approval of the minutes for the May 14, 2013 meeting as amended.

Mr. Hayes motioned to approve the amended minutes. Mr. Stolipher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes from the June 11, 2013 and June 25, 2013 meetings.

Mr. Pellish motioned to approve the minutes from the June 11, 2013 meeting. Mr. Hayes seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Hayes motioned to approve the minutes from the June 25, 2013 meeting. Mr. Phalen seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

3. Citizen Communications (hereinafter known as CC). None.

4. Request for postponement. None.

5. Site Plan Public Hearing: Morgan's Grove Market PC File #S12-06.

Mr. Phalen recused himself from the meeting at 7:04 PM due to the fact that Mr. Peter Corum is his son-in-law.

Mr. Rivard provided a staff report which confirmed the applicant had met the conditions set forth by the Planning Commission at the June 11, 2013 meeting. He recommended the Planning Commission approve the Morgan's Grove Market Site Plan with conditions. The proposed conditions included:

- The Department of Highways permit number is submitted.
- Easements shall be recorded by the instrument of a deed and exhibit plat or Final Plat.

Mr. Taylor invited the applicant to speak.

Mr. Fred Blackmer represented Morgan's Grove Market. He stated that he supported the proposed recommendations.

Mr. Taylor opened the floor for public comment.

Mr. Joe Spurgess stated he lived across from the MGM site at 49 Shepherd Lane. He stated he had concerns related to the progress of the building leading to further development such as warehouses or a strip mall.

Ms. Ann Spurgess inquired as to what happened with the results from the well testing. She stated she was aware the wells had been tested but that, to her knowledge, the results had never been made public.

Mr. Taylor stated that Mr. and Mrs. Spurgess were the only two who had signed up to speak. Mr. Hayes motioned to close public comment. Mr. Stolipher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Blackmer stated that he would make sure the well test results were submitted to the Planning and Zoning Department staff.

Ms. Brockman stated that it was an oversight from staff and that staff would follow up on the submission of well test results. She stated upon receipt of the test results, the information would be available to the public.

Mr. Hayes stated that he would like clarification as to whether or not the well test results would have a bearing on how the Planning Commission would proceed with the current site plan approval request.

Ms. Brockman stated that it would not.

Mr. Stolipher motioned to approve the site plan with the conditions set forth by staff.

Mr. Pellish seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Phalen re-entered the room at 7:13 PM.

6. Public Hearing: Proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance and Text Amendments to the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations and to amend such other articles, sections, subsections, and provisions of the regulations as necessary to implement and maintain consistency with the foregoing amendments.

Mr. Rivard introduced consultants Eric Genga and Teresa Sparacino of Delta Development Group.

Ms. Sparacino gave a power point presentation reviewing the Chesapeake Bay Watershed implementation of Stormwater Management in Jefferson County. She stated that in 2000 the Chesapeake Bay Agreement was signed by the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Chesapeake Bay Commission. She stated that voluntary tributary strategies were developed to reduce pollutants to the Cap Load Allocation with the understanding that if unsuccessful, the EPA would establish Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirements.

Ms. Sparacino stated that it was recognized that goals were not being met which lead to President Obama issuing an executive order that expanded the federal commitment to the bay region. She stated that the order allowed the EPA to establish TMDL pollution limits to restore water quality within the Chesapeake Bay Watershed and also gave the EPA enforcement authority if the states missed established goals.

Ms. Sparacino stated that by 2010, the Phase I Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP) became part of the Chesapeake Bay TMDL. She stated that contingency actions and other strategies were being used to achieve the TMDL.

Ms. Sparacino reviewed the impacts of the WIP on Jefferson County. She stated that Jefferson County had not been categorized as an MS-4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer

Systems) Community. She stated that the County agreed to improve water quality in the County on a voluntary basis. She stated that the County analyzed MS-4 requirements to incorporate into the proposed new ordinance which will require the community's cooperation in improving water quality within Jefferson County.

Ms. Sparacino stated that the goals for the Stormwater Management Ordinance included limiting the post-construction runoff rates to equal or less than pre-development runoff rates; reducing nonpoint source pollution, nutrients, and sediment; flexible Best Management Practices (BMP) requirements and Low Impact Design (LID) criteria; limit the amount of total land disturbance; divert upslope water around disturbed areas of the site; limit the exposure of disturbed areas to the shortest duration possible; and address the vast areas of Karst geology and specify BMP criteria.

Ms. Sparacino reviewed the publications Delta Development utilized as a foundation for the new ordinance which included: West Virginia Phase II Watershed Implementation Plan, Model Stormwater Management Ordinance developed for the Eastern Panhandle of West Virginia; U.S. EPA Chesapeake Bay TMDL Executive Summary; and the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) permit program requirements.

Ms. Sparacino reviewed the six Low Impact Development Design Practices. She stated that the six practices include:

- **Conservation Designs** – Reduce amount of impervious surface.
- **Infiltration Practices** – Designed to capture and infiltrate runoff.
- **Runoff Conveyance Systems** – used to route excess runoff through and off the site.
- **Filtration** – used to treat runoff by filtering it through media (primarily sand) that are designed to capture pollutants through the processes of physical filtration.
- **Bioretention Practices** – used to manage the first 1 inch of rainfall using both infiltration and filtration designs as well as reducing pollutant loads to meet target TMDLs.
- **Low Impact Landscaping** – selection and distribution of plants must be carefully planned when designing a functional landscape.

Mr. Genga reviewed key points from the Stormwater Management Ordinance. He stated that the proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance is primarily comprised of requirements enforced within the current Subdivision and Land Development Regulations and that the biggest change would be the creation of a standalone document. He stated that the proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance would include the addition of Quality Control Criteria, which would need to be met when:

- Minor Site Developments requiring a Limited Site Plan.
- Rural Site Plans.
- Any Site Development requiring Full Site Plan.
- Major residential or commercial subdivision requiring a Preliminary Plan.
- Rural Site Plans involving the Development of 5,000 sq. ft. or more of impervious surface, or resulting in more than one acre of land disturbance.
- Any site Development requiring a Full Site Plan.
- Any Major residential or commercial subdivision requiring a Preliminary Plat.

Mr. Genga stated that Delta Development worked with Jefferson County to ensure the criteria lined up with the existing requirements within the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Pellish requested a definition of the term MS4.

Mr. Genga stated that MS4's are the communities or counties defined by DEP that have to meet specific criteria for stormwater management. He stated that designation depended on population and density criteria which are calculated through the census evaluation every 3 - 5 years. He stated that Jefferson County did not meet MS4 criteria during the most recent census; however, the proposed ordinance had been written to include the current standards for MS4 communities so that if Jefferson County were to meet MS4 criteria in the next census, there would be minimal changes required.

Mr. Pellish asked what was meant by slide number four (4) entitled "Chesapeake Bay 2008". He inquired as to which goals were not being met and what measurements were used to determine that these goals were not being met.

Mr. Genga stated that the primary pollutant components were phosphorus, sediment, and nitrogen. He stated that tests were conducted by the DEP and the EPA to measure the pollutant levels within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, examining the pollutant levels. He stated that during the pollution tests, it was determined that nitrogen levels were not being reduced.

Mr. Pellish inquired whether specific tests were conducted in Jefferson County.

Mr. Genga stated he could not confirm whether testing had been conducted in Jefferson County.

Mr. Taylor opened the floor for public comment.

Ms. Kristen Stolipher with Gordon and Associates submitted written comments for the record. She stated the ordinance should be simplified and noted Article I.D.1 could be simplified by stating who is exempt rather than including everyone who must comply. She stated that it should be clearly noted that projects submitted for review prior to the effective date of the proposed ordinance would be reviewed under the existing regulations. Ms. Stolipher suggested that the draft ordinance numbering system match the numbering system used in the Subdivision Regulations and the Zoning Ordinance to achieve uniformity and avoid duplication of section numbers for reference purposes. She recommended that Delta Development come back with a revised draft that would address the comments provided.

Mr. Mike Wiley with Beallair Homes stated he was representing the Eastern Panhandle Homebuilders Association and the Jefferson County Citizens for Economic Preservation. He agreed with Ms. Stolipher's comments and submitted written comments for the record. He inquired as to why staff was spending time and money to develop a new ordinance as opposed to utilizing Berkeley County's Ordinance and modifying to reflect Jefferson County's standards. He noted that several provisions within the draft ordinance were unrelated to Stormwater Management and should remain within the Zoning Ordinance and/or the Subdivision Regulations. He referenced page two (2) Article 1.A of the draft Stormwater Management Ordinance and noted that standards establishing setbacks and lot sizes should be excluded from the Stormwater Management Ordinance and left within the Subdivision Regulations and/or Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Hayes motioned to close public comment. Mr. Stolipher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Taylor requested Ms. Brockman provide guidance on the next steps in the approval process.

Ms. Brockman stated that staff recommended the proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance go before the Planning Commission because of the amendments that would be made to the Subdivision and Land Development Regulations as the result of the creation of a new document. She stated that the Planning Commission would have a larger role in the amendments to the Subdivision Regulations than they would in the creation of the Stormwater Management Ordinance. Ms. Brockman stated the Planning Commission would need to motion for the Subdivision Regulations amendments to go before the County Commission.

Mr. Rivard reviewed the staff memo from the agenda packet. He noted that the proposed changes to the amended 2008 Subdivision and Land Development Regulations included:

The removal of Stormwater Management Standards from the 2008 Subdivision and Land Development Regulations which would be moved to the proposed stand-alone Stormwater Management Ordinance.

The addition of references to the proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance which would direct the reader to the Stormwater Management Ordinance for design standards.

The proposed amendment to the Rural Site Plan Standards would reduce the gravel depth in parking and drive aisles from 9 inches to 6 inches.

Mr. Rivard stated that a few minor edits not related to the Stormwater Management Ordinance had been proposed. He stated that the proposed minor edits included:

The 2008 Subdivision Regulations requires a traffic study when a certain threshold is met. The proposed amendment would eliminate the need for a traffic study when roadway improvements are requested by the WVDOT.

Any redline revisions be completed in red ink, whether by hand in red color or in an electronic format in red color.

To allow for administrative approval of trail easements to be substituted for installation of sidewalks in locations where a pedestrian/bike easement may be more appropriate than the installation of sidewalks.

Mr. Hayes requested that staff review and compile comments for a future meeting.

Ms. Brockman stated that it would be beneficial for engineering staff to respond based on their involvement in the development of the Stormwater Management Ordinance.

Mr. Pellish stated that it would be beneficial to extend the review time to allow public comments to be submitted.

Mr. Hayes motioned to keep the proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance open for review to allow the public to submit additional comments. Mr. Pellish seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Brockman clarified that the motion was to have staff compile public comments related to the proposed Stormwater Management Ordinance which would be reviewed during the August 13, 2013 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Rivard stated that the Planning Commission could review comments during the August 13, 2013 meeting and then forward to the County Commission for a public hearing on September 19, 2013.

The referenced Power Point document as presented by Delta Development Group is available for review in the office of the Departments of Planning and Zoning.

Additionally, the written comments submitted by Ms. Kristen Stolipher and Mr. Mike Wiley are available for review in the office of the Departments of Planning and Zoning.

7. Discussion and possible recommendation regarding the proposed text amendments to the following sections of the Zoning and Land Development Ordinance: 2.2, 4.10, 5.7, 5.8, 8.5, 9.5, 10.5, 11.1, and 12.2. Review comments compiled from the June 11, 2013 Public Hearing.

Ms. Brockman reviewed each proposed amendment along with the comments received during the June 11, 2013 Public Hearing.

1. Sections 2.2, 5.7, and 8.5: Farm Breweries, Wineries and Distilleries.

Staff recommended the following: Buildings located on the premises may exceed the 20,000 square footage limit provided that the total building area dedicated to the use (farm brewery, farm winery, or farm distillery) does not exceed to total permitted square footage. This limit applies to the use of space for distilling, bottling, sales, administrative offices, and customer area, and does not apply to a barn, greenhouse, or similar structure that is directly related to agricultural production.

Mr. Hayes requested the language define structures included in the square footage requirements, rather than listing everything that may be excluded, which would simplify the current language.

Ms. Brockman reviewed Section 8.5E which included guidelines for the production of alcohol on a farm. She stated staff recommended removing the guidelines for use of out-of-state ingredients as that standard is enforced at the state level. She stated that in order for a brewery to actually be a farm brewery rather than an industrial operation, there must be some significant connection to crops grown on the farm. Ms. Brockman noted that staff recommended the requirement for use of raw ingredients grown on site be 25%.

Mr. Hayes requested additional research be conducted to determine industry standards for inclusion of raw ingredients in regards to farm breweries.

2. Section 9.5: Deck Setbacks for Townhome Developments.

Ms. Brockman stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals requested an amendment to this section as the result of several variance requests that were being routinely approved. She stated that the amendment would reduce the rear setback of a deck for a townhouse to 10 feet if the adjacent property located to the rear of the subject lot is a dedicated easement or common area and is not a lot that includes a

residence. She stated that staff also recommended amending the section to include the Residential Growth District in addition to the Residential-Light Industrial-Commercial District.

Ms. Brockman noted that comments received stated that the amendment should clarify that reduced setbacks are also permitted for stairs associated with decks, as well as concrete slabs (i.e. patios).

3. Section 10.5: Receptions and Events in Rural Areas.

Ms. Brockman stated that a number of requests to allow the use of barns or other existing historical or agricultural structures for receptions and events had been received. She stated that staff recommended establishing two categories of reception/event facilities to set criteria to allow some events to be processed administratively:

- a) Reception/Event Facility, Small (allow administratively): a facility for the hosting of events such as weddings of up to 100 attendees, at a frequency of no more than one event per month. The land use is subject to the requirements for a Cottage Industry in this ordinance, with the exception of limitations on trips per day and the number of nonresident employees permitted.
- b) Reception/Event Facility (allow by Special Exception): a facility for the hosting of events such as weddings.

Ms. Brockman stated that comments received noted that it may be appropriate to require traffic control for temporary uses such as events and receptions. Ms. Brockman stated that staff proposed for events exceeding 300 persons, the applicant would be required to provide a traffic control plan.

Ms. Brockman stated that a WVDOH entrance permit for the site may be required.

Mr. Stolipher stated that a WVDOH entrance permit should not be required for simplicity and based on the determination that events would only occur once maybe twice annually. He noted that language should be included to state that a site plan is not required. He stated that a note should be included that a sketch or map is required.

Ms. Brockman noted that a threshold to determine at which point the facility may become a business.

Ms. Brockman stated that a comment received requested that use of structures be contingent on compliance with applicable building code requirements. She noted that staff determined the Zoning Ordinance is not the appropriate tool for enforcement of the Building Code. She stated that applicants should be notified that improvements may be required.

4. Section 10.5: Secondary Dwelling Units for Agricultural Purposes.

Ms. Brockman reviewed the current language in the draft ordinance:

Detached accessory dwelling units for agricultural purposes, such as units for occupancy by farmworkers or caretakers. Such units may be approved based on the Board's evaluation of the size of the subject property, adequacy of vehicular access to the property, impact on adjacent properties, and compatibility with the neighborhood.

She stated that comments requested allowing requests to process administratively within certain size requirements.

Mr. Hayes inquired as to why there were two definitions for accessory agricultural dwelling units.

Ms. Brockman stated that the definitions may need to be further defined to distinguish one being processed administratively and one processed by the Board. She stated that the purpose of establishing guidelines was to prevent construction of rental units and establish that the use be restricted to agricultural purposes.

Mr. Stolipher stated that he proposed having requests processed administratively. He proposed defining an Accessory Agricultural Dwelling Unit to 1,000 *heated* square feet or less of gross floor area. He stated that the language should restrict administrative approvals to one unit, and that requests for additional units would need to be processed through the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Ms. Brockman stated that staff recommended requiring a minimum lot area of at least 10 acres for use of a secondary dwelling unit for agricultural purposes. She stated that language could be added to note that lots over 10 acres could go before the Board of Zoning Appeals to request additional units.

5. Section 11.1: Parking for Seasonal or Temporary Uses.

Ms. Brockman reviewed the current language of the draft ordinance:

Upon request, on a case by case basis, the Zoning Administrator may administratively waive parking requirements for seasonal or temporary uses, agricultural uses, events, or other types of uses that do not require parking on a regular basis.

She stated that comments received requested the amendment clarify what standard of the ordinance is being waived. She stated that staff recommended amending the language as follows:

Upon request, on a case by case basis, the Zoning Administrator may administratively *wave permanent off-street automobile parking and loading* requirements for seasonal or temporary uses...

Ms. Brockman stated the next step would be for staff to incorporate public comments and staff recommendations into the Zoning Ordinance for the Planning Commission to review and possibly forward to the County Commission. She stated that a formal motion was not needed and requested confirmation from the Planning Commissioners to move forward as proposed.

Mr. Taylor confirmed that all of the Planning Commissioners were in agreement to have staff incorporate public comments and staff recommendations into the Zoning Ordinance for review at the next meeting.

Mr. Taylor called for a break at 8:45 PM.

Mr. Taylor called to resume the meeting at 8:50 PM.

8. Discussion and possible recommendation regarding the County Commission Motion requesting Planning Commission action related to a proposed draft amendment to the Residential-Light Industrial-Commercial Zone and the Commercial-Industrial Zone.

Mr. Pellish motioned to reject recommendation from the County Commission for a proposed amendment to the Residential – Light Industrial - Commercial and Commercial - Industrial zoning districts.

Mr. Philips seconded the motion.

Mr. Pellish stated that the request was an attempt to stop business development in Jefferson County. He stated that the amendment would suggest that any business development would require a CUP and may incur legal issues.

Mr. Hayes requested that Mr. Pellish withdraw his motion on account that negative action was not required. He recommended submitting a letter to the County Commission with notification that the Planning Commission rejected their motion.

Mr. Pellish withdrew his motion.

Ms. Brockman inquired if the Planning Commissioners would like department staff to draft a letter on their behalf.

Mr. Hayes responded that he would like department staff to draft a letter on behalf of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Phillips and Mr. Stolipher agreed with Mr. Hayes.

Mr. Hayes stated that the letter should note that the proposed text amendments regarding the creation of new commercial and industrial zoning categories would achieve similar goals as intended with the request for an amendment to the existing commercial zones.

Mr. Hayes motioned to have staff draft a letter stating that the Planning Commission rejected the County Commission's request to amend existing commercial and industrial zoning categories.

Mr. Pellish seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

9. Discussion and possible recommendation regarding proposed text amendments to the Zoning and Land Development Ordinance regarding the creation of new commercial and industrial zoning categories and related amendments.

Ms. Brockman reviewed Appendix C.

Mr. Pellish motioned to send the proposed text amendments regarding the creation of new commercial and industrial zoning categories to the County Commission.

Mr. Stolipher seconded the motion.

Mr. Hayes inquired as to whether there had been any revisions to the proposed amendments since the June 11, 2013 meeting.

Ms. Brockman stated that Appendix C had been revised to include the revisions requested by the Planning Commissioners and that there had been some minor revisions based on the comments received during the public hearing.

Mr. Hayes inquired what the previous Planning Commission members did when the amendments had been initially proposed.

Mr. Pellish stated that the previous County Commission voted to table the proposal while the Comprehensive Plan was being written. He stated that had the proposal not been tabled, the Morgan's Grove Market project would not have reached 2 years in the approval process. Mr. Pellish stated that implementing the proposed amendments would alleviate a majority of concern and confusion encountered during the site plan approval process.

Ms. Brockman stated that the memo related to this agenda item included the changes made to the proposed amendments in response to the comments received from members of the public as well as County Commission members. She read from the memo, "One of the most significant changes [would be] to the proposed location criteria [related to] the language specifying where in the County each district would be appropriate. As a result of feedback that the intended use of the districts should be clearly linked to the Comprehensive Plan, staff [recommended] deleting the detailed location criteria (proposed previously) and [replaced] it with language that specified that each of the new zoning categories would be intended for use on properties: in the Growth Area as shown in the most recently adopted Comprehensive Plan, if the plan does not include a future land use map; or in locations where the appropriate land use category is designated on the future land use map (and related text) in the most recently adopted Comprehensive Plan."

Mr. Hayes inquired what would happen next if the proposed amendments were sent back to the County Commission. He asked for clarification as to whether the County Commission could pick up where they left off in the process to re-visit the proposal or if the process would start at the beginning and require time for the County Commission to review and for a public hearing to be held..

Ms. Grove responded that she did not believe another Public Hearing would be required. She stated that the County Commission could re-visit the proposal at the current phase within the process.

Mr. Hayes amended his motion to include that the County Commission re-visit the proposal where it currently stands in the process.

Mr. Stolipher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

10. Reports from Legal Counsel and legal advice to Planning Commission.

Active Litigation:

- Far Away Farms

Ms. Grove stated that Ms. Linda Gutsell submitted a request for copies of documents related to the FAF case including minutes and audio/video recordings from meetings between 2009 and 2013.

- Cedar Meadows Airpark

Ms. Grove stated that Mr. Groh had provided in the agenda packet a copy of a response he filed requesting a motion to dismiss the case involving Cedar Meadows Airpark on

account that the petitioner failed to serve all adverse parties, a requirement under West Virginia Code §8A-9-2 which requires notice to all adverse parties to sustain an appeal.

11. Director's Report.

Ms. Brockman noted that the location for the scheduled Governor's Blue Ribbon Highways Commission public meeting had changed to the Comfort Suites in Kearneysville. She stated that the date had not changed and would still take place on July 11, 2013 with two meeting times: 4:00 – 5:30 PM and 5:30 - 7:00 PM.

Ms. Brockman reviewed the 4th Quarter report and requested the Planning Commissioners review and approve for submission to the County Commission. She noted that if approved, the report would also meet the state's requirement for an annual report from the Planning Commission.

Mr. Hayes motioned to approve the report for submission to the County Commission. Mr. Stolipher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

Ms. Brockman reviewed upcoming meeting dates and noted that a special called meeting had been scheduled for July 23, 2013 in response to the submission of three waiver applications from Gordon and Associates on behalf of the US Coast Guard.

12. Planning Commission Exchange and Liaison Reports:

- County Commission – Mr. Pellish: no update.
- Health Department – No update/no liaison.
- Public Service District – No update/no liaison.
- Parks and Recreation – In Mr. Gene Taylor's absence, Ms. Brockman reported on the most recent P&R meeting. She stated that the proposed Hite Road project has been making progress. She reported that a construction crew had been hired and that they planned to begin grading this Fall. She reported that the proposed Amphitheatre project had been delayed, but was intended to pick up again at a later date.
- Jefferson County Development Authority – Mr. Stolipher reported that the proposed building project for the US Coast Guard would be an asset to Jefferson County and stated that the new business is projected to create 150 new jobs.

Ms. Brockman inquired if any of the members had attended the Agricultural Development Authority Meeting.

Mr. Pellish reported he had attended the meeting. He stated that it was discussed that Jefferson County may become a distribution center for food products within the entire state of West Virginia. He stated that 340 North would need to be expanded in order to accommodate the proposed distribution center. He added that expansion of 340 North would also serve as a disaster evacuation route from Washington, D.C..

- Water Advisory Committee – No update/no liaison.
- Planning Commission Exchange – None.

13. President's Report. None.

14. Actionable Correspondence. None.

15. Non-Actionable Correspondence.

Minutes

Jefferson County Planning Commission

July 9, 2013

Page 12 of 12

- Letter from Stephanie C. Boylan dated June 20, 2013 RE: Rezoning Request #Z12-02.

16. Signing of approved Motions from previous Planning Commission meetings. None.

Mr. Hayes motioned to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 PM. Mr. Stolipher seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.