



AGENDA

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE CITIZENS WORKING GROUP

Wednesday, July 9, 2025

5:00 PM CALL TO ORDER (Village Building - Conference Room)

1. Call to Order
2. Review of minutes from July 18, 2025, regular meeting
3. Continued Discussions:
 - a. Conservations Subdivisions
 - b. Community Land Trust (CLT)
4. Other Business
5. Adjourn



VIRGINIA: AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CITIZEN WORKGROUP HELD IN THE VILLAGE BUILDING CONFERENCE ROOM, 3910 OLD BUCKINGHAM ROAD IN POWHATAN COUNTY, VIRGINIA ON JUNE 18, 2025

1. Call to Order

Chairman Timberlake called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

2. Review of Minutes from Jan 30, 2025 (subcommittee), February 14, 2025(subcommittee), April 8, 2025, April 15, 2025, May 14, 2025(subcommittee), and May 20, 2025 (subcommittee), meetings.

Chairman Timberlake asked for any changes to the minutes. Several clerical changes were brought to the floor. Mr. Webb noted all the changes and said they would be fixed for the final version to be signed. Mr. Rissmeyer made a motion to accept all meetings minutes as amended. Mr. Reilly seconded.

**VOTE 10-0
Motion PASSED**

3. Presentation and Discussion of Housing and Residential Options Subcommittee recommendations. Show the proposed changes to the Future Land use Maps

- Mr. Reilly reviewed the interactive map as it currently stands after the subcommittee meetings completed their work.
- Mr. Melton relayed to the group why he voted against the final results from the subcommittee regarding the 245 acres in the area of RT 60/RT 13 and the Rocky Ford Rd corner.
- Mr. Rissmeyer commented that the Tax Map 39-71 parcel was the piece that was discussed at great length by the subcommittee and caused the most concern.
- Mr. Anderson questioned if that 245 acre piece addressed any of the housing issues they were asked to look into.
- Mr. Melton replied that it did not.

- The intersection of RT 60 and RT 13 was discussed and the need for resolving those.
- Mr. Rissmeyer commented how that parcel meets the walkability requirements for communities they were looking to create.
- Chairman Timberlake stated he felt if you connect the Village area to RT 60 would lose the appealability or feel of the “village area”.
- Mr. Melton asked if a collector road was proposed to connect RT 60 to the courthouse area that went through the 245acre parcels, wouldn’t that be considered walkable and a better option than using RT 13.
- Mr. Anderson asked if the proposed 245 acre area was in the utility district for water and sewer.
- Chairman Timberlake answered that it was in the utility district and had some stubbed out work done already with one of the parcels containing a fire hydrant.
- Mr. Rissmeyer made a motion to approve the 245 acre parcels being included as presented. Mr. Reilly seconded.

VOTE 9-1

Motion PASSED

- Mr. Melton opposed for the reasons stated previously and that he feels its shortsighted and he is not in support of it.
- Mr. Webb asked for clarification from a planning standpoint if some type of connection road for this 245 acre area being discussed should be proposed to be added to a thoroughfare plane. The group agreed it most definitely should. Chairman Timberlake commented that there is already a signal plan proffered on the RT 60 side but it needed to align somehow to Rocky Ford Rd on the RT 13 end to avoid having dual traffic signals proposed.
- Mr. Rissmeyer suggested recommending the Board update the Thoroughfare Plan and if asked by the Board of Supervisors, the Citizen Work Group could make suggestions for the Thoroughfare Plan based on discussions during the Economic Development and Housing discussions.
- Mr. Melton commented as part of the report given by Mr. Webb to the Board of Supervisors, that a statement similar to “the village expansion future land use map as part of the citizen working group recommended that there be some study and work done so that there would be a thoroughfare plan to move traffic in the general area of such and the 245 acre area if future development takes place” as he does not feel the

CWG should get into the specifics which should be left up to the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission.

- Discussion moved to the eastern end of the county to 109 acres in the Carter Gallier/Page Rd/RT 60 area.
- Mr. Reilly stated 2/3 of the area is zoned Gateway Business and 1/3 A-10. New land-use designation would become Economic Opportunity.
- Mr. Melton questioned if the group had previously discussed no housing in EO.
- Mr. Webb stated that would be good discussion to have maybe a 70/30 split of housing allowed in Gateway Business.
- Mr. Melton stated that currently no housing is allowed in Gateway Business.
- Mr. Rissmeyer referred to notes from earlier meetings in reference to the 109 acre area which stated area was designated for Economic Opportunity with potential for residential and mixed-use development, but no vote was taken just discussion.
- Chairman Timberlake stated this 109 acres they were proposing as Economic opportunity would have housing options and not to confuse it with the current Gateway Business designation. It was two different discussions being confused.
- Mr. Rissmeyer referred to meeting minutes which stated ‘ 6-0 vote, Mr. Shust made a motion to designate the area inside the service boundary to Economic Opportunity with the amendments in the EO in the Comprehensive Plan to remove the acreage requirement and to revise the required Master Plan to be required UDD zoning. Mr. Rissmeyer seconded the motion. Vote 6-0’
- Discussion on UDD designation and if it was the purpose of the CWG to dictate the details of such or just make suggestions for the Board and Planning Commission to work on the details.
- Mr. Anderson asked if the 109 acres being discussed were to be added to the EO designation then that would allow for housing possibilities to be included and how would those occupants of those houses get to work? Down Page Rd, Luckstone Rd or possibly Carter Gallier which is not signalized?
- Mr. Rissmeyer stated the idea was to make the 109 EO instead of Gateway Business which would open up 1/3 to housing to balance the opportunity for the landowner if they controlled more than one parcel.
- Mr. Melton asked if there a land use designation for anything like the description type of economic opportunity issues established at this point.
- Mr. Reilly stated the Economic opportunity is established and an active language with the areas in the 711 Village area and the Page Rd Data Center area as being the only remaining areas.

- Mr. Anderson asked if the 2 areas discussed in the meeting were the only 2 areas the subcommittee was recommending as EO to the full committee.
- Discussion continued about Economic Opportunity designation and if that included mixed use, limited residential per the Comp Plan.
- Mr. Bradbury stated he was concerned about the parcels to the east and the north and that they were not included. Currently they are mixed use so could be transitioned easily and the sewer and water district should have included them based on the natural flow of water.
- Mr. Reilly explained this was discussed at great length by the subcommittee and the consensus was the focus was on the current parcels included in the service district verses speculating if the service district was extended in the future.
- Mr. Rissmeyer stated these three parcels were the ones the subcommittee couldn't agree on. The conflicting opinion was that the people on Page Rd who have large lot residential do not want economic opportunity right up to their side yard line. So these three, a 10 parcels provide a buffer in the future land use plan between the existing subdivisions on Page Rd and the 109 acres for Economic Opportunity replacing the ones that haven't been developed successfully in the county. In the future, water sewer district could be extended, the Economic Opportunity future land use could be amended, and expanded into those three, A-10, parcels later.
- Mr Bradbury questioned based on the amount of water that is flushed by the County since it is not used, why would those parcels be included in the water/sewer district as a solution.
- Chairman Timberlake stated he was fine including or not, but based on the current district which they were not asked to make suggestions on moving, unless a developer wanted to pay for studies to improve all the items the group is making assumptions about with the water/sewer then they had to make suggestions based on the current district as is.
- Discussion continued about the water/sewer district as it stands currently and what commercial property was included that might be outside of the district and why.

Mr. Bradbury made a motion to include the 3 parcels to the north and east of the proposed 109 acres to be included with the 109 acres. Mr. Melton seconded.

Discussion continued on the pros and cons of adding the 3 parcels.

VOTE 3-7
Motion FAILED

Mr. Rissmeyer made a motion to approve the 109 parcels as originally proposed based on subcommittee recommendation. Mr. Donati, Sr seconded.

VOTE 7-3
Motion PASSED

4. Appointment of writing subcommittee to produce a draft of CWG's report covering the following Strategic Plan Priorities:

- a. Priority 2: Economic Prosperity
 - b. Priority 3: Housing and Residential Options
- Chairman Timberlake went over the high-level draft report started by Mr. Webb. He suggested a subcommittee to assist Mr. Webb in diving deeper into the details.
 - Mr. Webb suggested giving him a week or so to consolidate the information presented so far into a more detailed version of the draft and then having a subcommittee look it over and build on it from there.
 - Mr. Melton stated he didn't think the entire report should be up to Mr. Webb to handle himself and that a subcommittee should be involved.
 - Mr. Rissmeyer offered to volunteer to work with Mr. Webb.
 - Chairman Timberlake let the group know that Mr. Shust asked to be part of the report editing group, although he was not able to attend the current meeting, he expressed interest in that to the Chairman previously. The suggested editing group is Mr. Webb, Mr. Rissmeyer and Mr. Shust.
 - Discussion continued on the process the group would use for the editing and to track changes suggested by the entire group to the editing group.
 - Chairman Timberlake and the entire CWG agreed on the process and the editing group to be Mr. Webb, Mr. Rissmeyer and Mr. Shust with Ms. Salerno added when the Economic Development portion was ready to be edited.
 - Mr. Melton asked if a deadline should be set.
 - Chairman Timberlake stated it was next on the agenda for discussion.

5. Establishment of Meeting Dates for:

- a. Review writing subcommittee's draft on Priority 2: Economic Prosperity
- b. Review writing subcommittee's draft on Priority 3: Housing and Residential options

- Discussion on dates to have all recommendations from the entire group about the due date timeline as follows:
 - All comments from the entire group need to be to the editing group by July 2.
 - The editing group will have a draft ready and sent to the CWG by July 22.
 - The entire CWG will meet on July 29th at 5PM to discuss.

6. Additional Items to be addressed to include conservation subdivision recommendations, potential establishment of UDD zoning district, Community Land Trust (CLTs) (or other items not listed; these items could also be addressed in writing subcommittee meetings, see agenda item #

- Mr. Webb began the discussion on UDD zoning district explaining what it is and where this would be an acceptable zoning district.
- Mr. Rissmeyer commented on the confusion in the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Code regarding the Village.
- Mr. Reilly stated he put together a collection of permitted uses and conditional uses of the 6 zoning districts and explained the handout.
- Mr. Webb explained his idea for the UDD would be for the developer to know upfront what the intended use would be for a parcel.
- Mr. Reilly suggested a thought process about using land use designations to apply specific zoning codes to parcels.
- Discussion continued on the different possibilities for the UDD designation.
- Mr. Webb suggested including the UDD in the final report to the Board of Supervisors and a possibility for residential/commercial mixed-use or residential development as needing to be explored further.

Mr. Rissmeyer made a motion explore the possibility that we recommend that the planning commission explore, the possibility of establishing a designation for master plan development and to replace the six plan development zoning designations to simplify things. Mr. Melton seconded.

VOTE 10-0

Motion PASSED

- Mr. Webb gave an overview of the cluster housing as an affordable option.
- Mr. Reilly stated that he opposes cluster housing anywhere other than the areas that have the services to support that type of development but not for the entire county.
- Mr. Webb stated that it is already allowed throughout the county through a CUP.
- The group discussed the difference in manufactured home clusters and cluster housing that would be available in areas of the county with utilities available through a CUP.
- Chairman Timberlake went through the legal history of CUPs that aren't complying in the county.
- Mr. Reilly stated his opposition to allowing cluster developments, even through a CUP, throughout the county.
- Chairman Timberlake stated he felt having designated areas on the Future Land Use Map for cluster housing as a permitted use that followed a pattern book instead of a CUP would be a better option.
- Discussion continued about allowing cluster housing in A-10 with a CUP verses within the utility service district as a zoned part of the Master Plan.

Mr. Rissmeyer motioned to incorporate clustered housing into designated growth areas, including Village and Economic Opportunity Future Land Use designations to help accomplish a broader diversity of housing. Mr. Donati, Sr. seconded.

- Mr. Melton asked Mr. Anderson to clarify if he was wanting to try this type of cluster housing in a larger expansion beyond the areas already identified.
- Mr. Anderson stated he would like to see an example tried somewhere but didn't feel they had enough pockets to try it.
- Discussion about various pockets of land around the county between all members took place.
- Chairman Timberlake called for the vote.

VOTE 10-0

Motion PASSED

Chairman Timberlake suggested scheduling another meeting to continue the discussion on Conservation Subdivisions and Community Land Trusts. Meeting was scheduled for July 9 at 5PM.

7. Other Business

8. Adjourn

First Sargeant Gregory made the motion to adjourn. Seconded by ????

VOTE 10-0

Motion PASSED

Meeting adjourned 8:00 PM

These minutes approved by motion and second at July 9, 2025 meeting of the
Comprehensive Plan Citizen Work Group.

Jamie Timberlake, Chairman
Comprehensive Plan Citizen Work Group

ATTEST:

Ligon Webb, Clerk
Comprehensive Plan Citizen Work Group



July 2, 2025

TO: Citizens Working Group (CWG)

FROM: Ligon Webb, Planning Director

RE: Discussion Items – Conservation Subdivisions and Community Land Trusts (CLTs)

The Citizens Working Group (CWG) will meet next week to continue evaluating key land use and housing strategies tied to Powhatan County's long-range goals. This meeting will focus on two distinct but important tools: **Conservation Subdivisions** and **Community Land Trusts (CLTs)**. This memo outlines background information and key decision points for group discussion and direction.

1. Conservation Subdivisions

Conservation subdivisions offer a voluntary alternative to conventional large-lot development in Powhatan's rural zoning districts. They are intended to preserve significant areas of open space while allowing clustered residential development on smaller lots.

Under Powhatan County's current ordinance:

- Conservation subdivisions are allowed in the A-10 (Agricultural), RR (Rural Residential), and R-C (Rural Conservation) zoning districts;
- The minimum parcel size to qualify is 50 acres;
- Conservation subdivisions are currently permitted by right, provided ordinance requirements are met;
- The by-right density bonus is:

- 20% if 50% of the gross acreage is placed into permanent conservation;
- 25% if 60% of the gross acreage is placed into permanent conservation;
- The minimum lot size within conservation subdivisions is 40,000 square feet (just under one acre);
- The conservation area may include land that is otherwise unbuildable under county ordinances (e.g., floodplains, wetlands, steep slopes).

As the CWG considers potential updates to the conservation subdivision framework, including draft proposals that would increase the available density bonus to 65% or 85%—the following issues should be reviewed and discussed:

Key Decision Points:

1. Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Requirement

Should all conservation subdivisions require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), regardless of the density bonus being pursued?

Requiring a CUP would increase public review and allow the County to apply site-specific conditions. However, it may discourage some landowners from using the conservation subdivision option.

2. Conservation Area Calculation

Should land located within county-designated Natural Conservation Areas (e.g., floodplains, wetlands, and steep slopes already restricted from development) be excluded from the acreage used to calculate the required conservation area?

This would prevent “double-counting” land already limited by ordinance and ensure true preservation.

3. Minimum Parcel Size

Should the minimum qualifying parcel size be increased from 50 acres to 100 acres to encourage use of this tool on larger tracts?

A higher threshold may promote more effective rural preservation and reduce the likelihood of cluster development on smaller rural lots.

4. Minimum Lot Size Within Subdivision

Should a new 2-acre minimum lot size be adopted for all individual lots within a conservation subdivision (replacing the current 40,000-square-foot minimum)?

This could help reinforce rural character and ensure compatibility with surrounding development patterns.

2. Community Land Trusts (CLTs)

Community Land Trusts (CLTs) are nonprofit entities that retain ownership of land while homes on that land are sold or leased to income-qualified households. The goal is to provide permanently affordable housing, preserve local land stewardship, and promote stable homeownership.

Currently, there is nothing in Powhatan County’s ordinances that prevents a private developer from donating lots to a CLT if they choose to do so. This means that CLTs can already be implemented without any special County action or enabling legislation.

By retaining ownership of the underlying lot, the CLT separates the cost of land from the cost of the home—substantially reducing the overall price and making the home more affordable to qualifying individuals. The land trust itself would be responsible for qualifying buyers based on income or other eligibility criteria, ensuring long-term affordability and stewardship.

As discussed by the CWG, CLTs may be most useful as a policy tool, **particularly in cases where rezonings or up-zonings are granted**. For example, the County could *encourage (but not require)* the dedication of one or more lots to a CLT to promote long-term affordability within developments.

The Planning Director sees CLTs as a concept that:

- Can be enabled through broad policy language in the updated Comprehensive Plan;
- Does not require the County to adopt new ordinances or take direct administrative action;
- Leaves flexibility for developers, nonprofits, or community organizations to initiate CLT arrangements voluntarily.

Discussion Topics:

1. Policy Direction

Should the Comprehensive Plan include a general policy statement supporting the use of Community Land Trusts as a voluntary tool to promote long-term housing affordability?

2. CLT Encouragement in Rezoning Cases

Should the CWG recommend language encouraging donation of lots to a CLT as part of rezonings that increase residential density (e.g., village expansions, up-zonings)?

3. County Involvement

Given that CLTs can function independently of County action, should the County maintain a hands-off approach, or explore future partnerships on a case-by-case basis?

4. Zoning Compatibility

In which zoning districts or land use categories might CLTs be most appropriate to promote neighborhood integration and affordability?

END OF DOCUMENT