

Fluvanna County A-1 Zoning District Review Public Input Form Responses

March 2010

Should preserving and enhancing Fluvanna's unique identity and rural character be a major goal of the County as stated in the Comprehensive Plan? Why or why not?

- Yes. Important in 2001 and is more important now in 2010.
- Yes. Fluvanna has been rural and part of the county should remain rural.
- The Comp Plan goal to sustain Fluvanna's rural character is important. A sense of place, derived from the particular characteristics of local land and custom, deepens understanding, loyalty, and a feeling of belonging among the people who live there. A sense of place encourages responsible citizenship. Eventually new influences and aspirations may evolve into an authentic new ethos in Fluvanna. For the present it is valid to claim and cherish a rural, Fluvanna-flavored, Virginia Piedmont tradition as our core identity.
- Yes. Discouraging large developments will keep our taxes stationary. Fluvanna has little rural character left.
- Absolutely. I don't believe anyone would disagree with this concept.
- Rural character of Fluvanna County needs to be preserved.
- Absolutely. The rural character of Fluvanna County is its main draw. The beauty of a landscape contributes to the quality of life of its people.
- The Comp Plan is correct in asserting that a major goal should be to preserve and protect Fluvanna's rural character. Without its rural character, this county will become a collection of little boxes in subdivisions housing people who live, work, learn and play elsewhere.
- Yes, Fluvanna's rural character absolutely should be preserved. It is the single best distinguishing feature the county possesses. A majority of residents in the county's 2006 Planning Issues survey strongly supported rural preservation, to the extent that nearly half (49%) were willing to give up potential property value, if need be, to retain rural preservation.

Rural preservation is important for other reasons:

- It helps keep taxes down.
- True rural preservation helps the county achieve the goals in the "Financial Sustainability" chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.
- One acre of forest absorbs six tons of carbon dioxide and releases four tons of oxygen, enough to meet the needs of 18 people, according to the U.S.D.A.
- Yes. Open space, agricultural and forestal lands are being developed at alarming rates. Protection of these resources benefits the public in general and has many environmental benefits as well.
- No, the area needs jobs. Plenty of agricultural land exists, most of which is open space that is not even used for agriculture. County has one of the lowest population densities in the state; population could double and plenty of rural character would still exist.
- Yes. We all need trees and fields.

- We are not as unique, as much as we would like to think we are.
- We are not rural. Very few citizens make their living from agriculture; we are rapidly becoming a suburban, bedroom community.
- Yes, as long as you have a clear understanding of what rural actually means.
- No. Any property owner has many ways to limit development on private property. Any forced down zoning or division reduction must be paid for in full for lost property value.
- The major goal should be attracting clean industry and businesses with good paying jobs and lowering the tax burden on its citizens.
- Yes.
- Yes – it is why many people moved to this area. It also promotes clean air, allows for water absorption and reduces flood hazards. Promotes quality of life.
- Yes. It is why many people moved here and it is not available many places anymore. Will be lost forever if not protected.
- Should be within reason – a balance between the needs of the landowners and those who want areas to remain as rural as possible. The charm and attraction of Fluvanna is in its rural-ness.
- If you do not abide by keeping the rural character in the county you will eventually end up with row on row of big houses on little yards, and huge townhouses. This county is known for being dotted with charming farms. We should be helping out the farmers to improve their farming practices, not trying to destroy it.

What does rural preservation mean to you?

- Is well defined and written in the 2009 Comp Plan.
- Reduced density.
- No more than 64 homes per square mile (equates to a density of 1 unit per 10 acres).
- Rural preservation means retaining a physical and practical connection to agricultural cycles. It means that entrepreneurial newcomers who want to live as effective stewards on the land will find knowledgeable mentors prepared to help them. Rural preservation means respecting interdependencies between wildlife and habitats, between indigenous plants and traditional crops. It means safeguarding water quality in rivers, streams, and underground aquifers. It means retaining landmark trees, groves, and woods.
- Effective rural preservation means you retain and use old buildings. When planning new buildings, you work with a sensitive concern as to the site and scale of the new construction in relation to the old. Living in a rural place makes it natural to raise your own food. In addition, local plants, fruits, vegetables, dairy products, and meat can be bought near home. A rural way of life conserves resources; rural preservation makes good sense both in financial and ecological terms.
- A rural person knows his neighbors. A habit of reciprocity is ingrained. People who co-own private roadways share up-keep and make peace with each other's aesthetic preferences. The County, which signs off on public utility permits, makes sure (or should make sure) that utility easements are non-invasive, both in areas designated for rural preservation and in densely populated areas. Cyclists and pedestrians are safe along rural roadways. Hikers have ample opportunities to trek cross-country, hunters to hunt, and fishermen to fish. Rural preservation ensures that diverse, established, wildlife habitats remain healthy. Damaged habitats are restored, animal corridors are safeguarded.

- Rural preservation means you can predict tomorrow's weather by looking at a sky untainted by man-made smog. On clear nights, it means bright stars. A country person can sleep in perfect darkness. On moonlit nights, no suburban glow competes.
- Rural preservation means amateur theatre, community singing, dancing horses, bateaux. If nurtured carefully, the pleasures of life in Fluvanna will offset the fact that Fluvanna people must travel far to hear first class symphony orchestra, or see an all-star game, live. Rural preservationists, like their urban counterparts, accept the fact that if everything is everywhere, sense of place is non-existent.
- Keeping the rural areas as they are now; too much development has already occurred.
- Reminding future generations of the wonder of the past.
- Protecting a way of life before it becomes a picture on a postcard.
- Rural preservation means valuing the beauty of the natural landscape, wildlife habitat, and history over housing development for profit, uncontrolled business development and population growth.
- Rural preservation entails preservation of rural qualities such as the prevalence of forests, farms and fields in the landscape. They also include the absence of large numbers of houses packed close together. The U.S. Census Bureau defines rural as having population density no greater than 500 persons per square mile. That works out to a maximum density of one home for every four acres.
- Lots of trees, forests, woods, farms, agricultural enterprise and activities – not suburbia, not subdivisions, not curbs and sidewalks, not Fairfax. Rural clusters are not rural!
- Low population density (>1 dwelling per 15 acres) and primary land use being open space, agricultural and forestal.
- A lot of wasted space and lost county revenue from sales taxes and property taxes.
- No development; agricultural; trees. Lots of buildings does not equal rural.
- Wishing the world could be the way they always imagined it should be.
- "Rural preservation" is a buzz word for "no growth now that I am here".
- Preserving true rural uses like farming and forestry by prohibiting large-scale development in rural areas. New lots need to be large enough to not adversely impact adjacent rural areas. Rural means noisy, dusty, and smelly. Otherwise would be a park.
- Open space valuable to the conservation of game and non-game wildlife. Bulk of land is used for forest and farm production, hopefully managed so as to protect water quality and biodiversity values. Land provides rural residents and surrounding developed areas with food (including wild meat), fiber, oxygen, recreational opportunities, etc.
- Buying large tracts and preserving them by choice.
- Directing commercial and industrial growth away from rural areas.
- Not the massive developments with high densities that are currently permitted in the rural preservation and agricultural areas of the county. These developments destroy the character and privacy of property.
- Undisturbed views. Open space – fields, farmland, forests. Very limited buildings and growth. Policies to discourage growth and discourage people from moving here should be adopted.
- Preserving rural land for rural uses – farming, vineyard, timber, small businesses for agricultural products.
- Maintaining the status quo.

- It means a balance between the county remaining rural but also having designated growth areas to help build and sustain a solid economic base.
- Keeping the area marked for preservation. Keeping it farmland and being sure that developers do not infringe on this area with huge developments (than can do nothing but make life worse for us) is a must. Virginia is known for its rural character, and we do not want to see this changed. Though some changes are needed in this county, destroying the quiet countryside is not one of them. Developments in the middle of farms are not compatible to one another.

Division Rights – What is appropriate?

- Would like to see a lower density in the Rural Preservation Planning Area. Could be scaled based on the size of the parent parcel.
- Rural Preservation area: 5 division rights for parcels less than 20 acres; for parcels larger than 20 acres: 5 division rights plus one right for each additional 20 acres.
- One division right per 20 acres or 4 division rights per parcel.
- Within the boundaries of the Towns of Columbia and Scottsville, stick to existing plats. Encourage development on unbuilt or uninhabited town lots by having the Community Planning Area (or any high density zone) adhere to town boundaries. Then, outside the township, graduate immediately to a rural preservation zone, where parcels should be twenty five (25) acres minimum from now on. In effect, this would leave post 2010-Columbia and Scottsville surrounded by residential neighborhoods already extant, to be grandfathered, or re-thought. **(Staff note: The County does not control zoning within either town.)**
- For the sake of clarity in discussion, boundaries of un-chartered villages should be defined, if only unofficially. Then division rights should be worked out with respect the village character, the existing range of property sizes, and the wishes of the inhabitants.
- Should depend on the size of the property. A huge piece of property should be required to have larger minimum lots; clustering leads to more units and hence more services to be provided by the county.
- Better left in the hands of the planning department, but not the mess currently in effect.
- Need to take into consideration the choice of the individual landowner and also the choice of the other landowners around, as well as valuing the beauty of the landscape, wildlife habitat and areas of historical significance. Ideally = no division rights.
- Forget the idea of division as a right and permit division only to the extent that it furthers and does not hinder the larger goals of the community.
- The idea that somehow large landowners should have their real estate investment guaranteed seems ... out of sync with the rest of the world. Carried to its logical conclusion, claiming that government can't tinker with "division rights" resulting from some 1970s ordinance effectively would mean that no local law or ordinance could ever change once put into place because somebody somewhere made an investment based on those rules and could stand to lose money.
- Five divisions with a minimum lot size of two acres with a 25 acre lot minimum after the first 5 divisions would be appropriate.

- Families should be able to sell or bequeath lots to generational relatives without restrictions. Rural landowners should be able to sell their property to developers, but only after approval and it must be consistent with a comprehensive plan. Comp plan is pretty useless if the county does not have the power to enforce it.
- Any number, depending on minimum lot size. As many 10 acre lots as you can.
- Depends on the lay of the land.
- Do not use division rights based on a certain number of rights established on a given date – it does not work and is very difficult to keep track of. Let access and road standards prevent fly-by night developers from creating substandard lots without proper access.
- Something along the lines of 4-5 lots per parcel plus 1 per 21 acres.
- 2 acres on state road, 10 acres off, that is what landowners bought, minor subdivision should = 10 lots or less.
- Once a property is divided to its maximum under an existing ordinance, that ordinance should grandfather the tract.
- 1 lot per 10 acres.
- No division rights for parcels less than 5 acres; 5-10 acres: 1 division.
- Land in rural preservation area should have very limited division rights. Land was bought in rural preservation area assuming that it would be preserved, not developed.
- Hanover County – 1 lot per 10 acres. Also, landowners might consider dividing land into mini farms of 25 or 50 acres. Also, consideration should be made to agricultural and green related businesses. Orange County is a good model.
- Division of the property should be kept to a minimum; no developments. Allowing someone to build 15 or 20 houses on their land in a rural preservation area is not preserving anything. Also infringes on the rights of their neighbors to live peacefully in a rural preservation area.

Minimum Lot Size – How small should lots be?

- One acre.
- More interested in houses per square mile. More than 100 homes per square mile in the rural preservation area is not rural.
- ¼ acre to 25 acres, depending on location.
- 5 acre minimum.
- 25 acres. No more pipe-stem driveways off secondary roads, no more subdivisions in rural areas.
- No smaller than 10 acres.
- If we forget the concept of division rights, this question becomes moot. Lots should be exactly the size of existing parcels as they are right now unless rezoned. If a number is needed then one house for every four acres without any exceptions for clustering.
- No more than one unit for every five acres in the Rural Preservation areas.
- Two acres with well, septic, and 100% reserve on each lot. Ideally, the minimum lot size with existing state road frontage would be 10 acres, with subdivisions being more than two lots and required to locate off an internal road (2 acre min. lot size per above).
- Larger minimum lot size is needed.

- At least one acre, preferably two. Less than this presents the feeling of living in a “regular subdivision”, meaning people that move from a town to a rural cluster subdivision expect the same level of service that they had in their “regular subdivision” in town.
- Minimum required if septic tanks needed: one acre. If water is provided lots can be as small as one-third acre which is the norm at Lake Monticello. Smaller lots keep housing costs down and encourage a greater sense of community.
- 10 acres by right. Smaller lots would require rezoning.
- 10 acres.
- 2 acres is fine – greater than that is not necessary in your general agricultural district. If you want larger create a large lot zoning district (i.e. Cumberland County in 2009 – A-20 district).
- 2 acres, perhaps smaller if applicant can demonstrate that the property can support viable well and has adequate areas with soils that will support an adequate septic and reserve drainfield as per Health Dept. specs.
- 2 acres
- Minimum lot size in A-1 should be 2 acres.
- 10 acres.
- 3-5 acres; 10 acres if no frontage on public road.
- Average of 10 acres; 2 acres would be allowed but then the other lot should be 18 acres.
- 1 lot per 2 acres.
- 15 acres.

Setbacks (front, rear, sides) – How far from roads and lot lines should a house (or other structure) be?

- Satisfied with current setback requirements.
- No preference.
- 300’ from the front, sides, and back lines of the property.
- Do not feel qualified to answer this question. With that being said, 200 feet would seem appropriate.
- Setback requirements are fine.
- In the Rural Preservation areas, homes should be separated from each other and set back from the road as far as possible in order to preserve rural character. The setbacks on my 4-acre lot, which I consider pretty ideal, are about 330’ front, 125’ rear, 125’ sides. Those setbacks enable the lot to maintain a rural presence. Therefore, I believe setbacks should be at least as generous as those currently stipulated by the county. In addition, the county should do more to require buffers, such as large stands of trees, between residences and the road to preserve the rural viewshed.
- Rural clusters, because of their mass, should have bigger road setbacks – at least 350’. Such developments also should have, as a minimum, 75 feet of vegetative buffer between the primary road and structures to enhance the rural environment and screen the development.
- Front = 100 ft; side = 50 ft; rear = 40 ft (develop subdivisions off of internal roads).
- Front setbacks should be uniform.

- Current setback requirements are too stringent.
- Whatever is safe and protects utilities. 50 feet would seem appropriate.
- 100 feet on all roads; 50 feet from side/rear lines.
- 100 feet.
- They should not be changed – what do greater setbacks actually accomplish? If there is not a true need to change them then don't or you'll just have more variance requests.
- Ok with current regulations; should be smaller for cluster lots.
- As is.
- Setbacks are too restrictive, especially on major roads. Across the board setbacks in A-1 should be 100 feet, 30 feet sides, and 50 feet rear.
- Depends on area – subdivision vs. rural area – and road. Need buffers between subdivisions and adjacent properties.
- Front: 250'; Sides: 100'; Rear: 250'.
- Far back; should not be able to see developments, houses, businesses from road. Need tree or green shield.
- Houses should be closer to the road (less front setback) and have large rear and side setbacks so open land is of same use. It's one thing to have the "appearance of rural" and another to have "useful rural".
- Fluvanna regulations seem reasonable; Orange County, too.
- Not really sure. Shape of the property can affect this. Everything should be pleasing to the eye and as many trees as possible should be kept.

Road Frontage / Lot Width – How wide should a lot be at a minimum? How much road frontage should be required?

- Satisfied with current road frontage requirements; however, acknowledges that they are more extreme than other jurisdictions; could be changed.
- No preference.
- 300' each.
- Do not feel qualified to answer this question. 200 feet would seem appropriate.
- Existing requirements are fine.
- Lot width – 275 feet at a minimum. Current county road frontage standards seem fine.
- One of the things that makes our subdivision work so well is that a few properties don't have much road frontage at all. These properties have just a little road frontage, enough for a driveway and the requisite footage alongside it. They have long driveways and lots that flair out at the end of the driveways and sit far back off the road. The effect is that these lots alternate with lots that are a little closer to the road so that houses aren't all in a row, creating more privacy and leaving big stands of trees. Instead of rectangle after rectangle of lots following the same line, you have more of a scattered effect. I think this creative use of road frontage to design lots should also be allowed in A-1.
- 150 ft.
- Road frontage requirements are too strict.
- 100 feet.
- Minimum lot width: 300 feet at building location. No minimum road frontage with minimum 10 acre lot size.

- Depends on the way the roads lay. Driveway entrances should be shared between lots.
- Lot width and road frontage should be equal – keep it simple. 300 ft. on non-primary public roads is more than adequate; 500 ft. on primary roads is needed. Less than 300 ft. on private roads probably would be a problem.
- Same as existing; perhaps reduced for clusters. Adopt standard limiting “pencil” lots (i.e., Louisa’s). Width must be at least 20% of depth.
- Less than current. Allow 2 acre lots, reduce frontage and setbacks.
- Road frontage should be the same on all roads in A-1, 200 to 250 feet is more than adequate.
- Frontage: 400’; Lot width: 600’.
- 500’ road frontage on all roads.
- Existing Fluvanna regulations seem to be working, but no less than 150-200 feet.
- Depends on the way the property is laid out.

Rural Cluster Regulations (*See Rural Cluster Issues display*)

Density:

- 1 house per 17 acres.
- No objection to some clustering in the rural preservation area, but there should not be more than 64 homes per square mile.
- Opposed to clustering because it greatly increases the number of people living in the rural areas and thus increases the need for services.
- Should leave it up to planning department to determine what is suitable for cluster regulations.
- Rural cluster subdivisions larger than 5 dwellings should not be allowed in A1. Minor subdivisions should be permitted with density no greater than five units per 80 acres.
- In the county’s community planning survey, nearly 57 percent of respondents felt the county should mandate lower density in the rural areas. The density should be no more than 1 unit per 5 acres. Large-lot subdivisions should be allowed.
- One dwelling unit per 20 acres would go a long way to protect the rural preservation areas, including ag/forestal uses.
- No rural cluster in A-1. 10 acre minimum lots size. Any smaller lots or greater density would require rezoning.
- None in A-1.
- No more than what is permitted in the zoning district the cluster provisions are in.
- 1 per 10 acres.
- 1 lot per 2 acres.
- Rural cluster was a huge mistake in the A-1 zone. No sane person wants to move to the rural countryside and live on a city lot, then have to drive 30 miles to the city to work.
- 1 house per 10 acres.
- 1 per 2 acres.
- Should be more like Orange County regulations.
- 1 acre lots similar to the Acres at Lake Monticello. Otherwise, models like Fox Hollow and Merry Oaks (1 lot per 10 acres) are ideal.
- Condos and townhouses need to be considered.

Open Space Ownership:

- Already clarified in our ordinance so ownership issues are minimized.
- Open space could be owned by a homeowner's association, farmer, park, etc.
- Who takes care of the open space?
- Ideally, the open space should belong to one of the five units that may be constructed in a minor subdivision or owned by those who own residences are within the cluster. No third party ownership should be permitted under any circumstances.
- Open space should be owned by the homeowners, not by a third party except in the case of the farmer who wants to remain on his or her land (but the terms of that need to be more carefully constrained).
- Open space systems work well within planned developments. They should be owned by thoughtfully established homeowner's associations with sufficient funding to achieve intended uses.
- The original landowner, or the HOA
- Depends on what is in open space (i.e. mass drainfields). Homeowners association is best bet – if I was VOF or the County why would I want to own a conservation easement in the middle of a subdivision?
- Appropriate for it to be either an individual private lot and residence or an open space lot held by the subdivision homeowner's association or similar body.
- Common or private.
- Open space should be dedicated to the county to maintain.
- Community ownership.
- Common ownership.
- Commonly owned.

Open Space Location (arrangement):

- Better preliminary and final plans for clusters are needed.
- Open space should be so placed as to make clustered houses as invisible from adjacent roadways as physically possible. Beyond that, open space should be used to create the most pleasant environment and satisfying appreciation of natural features as possible.
- Loopholes in the use of open space have allowed developers to circumvent the county's intent. Houses should not be close to the road with the open space in the back. The open space should, as much as possible, buffer the houses from the road.
- Location should be based on intended use (e.g., stream corridor protection, recreational use, etc.)
- Not fragmented; need corridors. If any rural uses are to continue on open space, it has to be large without potentially conflicting with lot owners.
- Should be contiguous and valuable for farming or conservation use. Avoid multiple, poorly connected, scattered bits and pieces.
- Owner choice.
- Only on unusable land.
- Depends on topography.

- Scattered within subdivision with tree preservation unless designated as playground, etc. Important to preserve privacy in the sense that tree areas look as little disturbed as possible.
- Should be located with consideration to adjoining farms, ag/for districts, and conservation areas so that neighboring agricultural businesses are not impacted by noise, smell, and practice complaints.
- Depends on the subdivision.

Open Space Uses (utilities, community, etc.):

- No utilities in open space.
- Uses should be limited to those agricultural or similar purposes already in place when the property is subdivided for no more than five dwellings. If larger clusters are to be permitted, open space should be for recreational use and enjoyment of cluster residents with the provision that the space must be maintained in a condition as close to its natural state as possible.
- A farmer who subdivides should be able to remain the owner and sole user of most open space as long as new residents of the subdivision understand that the open space that is a required part of the subdivision is not theirs to use. Ownership of the open space should not be transferable from the farm to any other kind of use or operation except to the subdivision residents themselves.
- If a homeowners association owns the open space, use of the space ought to be determined by the will of the residents themselves. If they want a community garden, fine. If they want a pond, fine. If they want a riding stable, fine. As long as the use is consistent with rural character.
- Since centralized utilities should not be permitted in rural clusters, there is no need to place utilities in the open space. The utilities for each lot should be placed on that lot.
- Open space should be for the benefit of the owners of the subdivision. Open space systems should be protected by deed restrictions or in permanent conservation easements to entities such as the Virginia Outdoors Foundation.
- It should be left alone as open space.
- Utilities should be bucked out of the open space equation because they are truly part of subdivision development and not really “rural”. Would be hard to allow public to use cluster open space.
- No use for septic fields other than that required by the one residence if the lot is occupied.
- Utilities.
- Recreation if it can be agreed upon by the owners.
- Septic and reserve drainfields should not be allowed on open space. Setbacks of septic systems from adjoining properties should be regulated.
- Just community; allowing for utilities defeats the purpose of open space.
- No sewer treatment, septic systems, wells, etc. in the open space, as this land cannot be used or sold for agriculture.
- Recreational use or parks. Utility easements need to be considered for infrastructure purposes.

Major Subdivisions must Cluster:

- Fine but only with adequate public utilities; public utilities should limit growth.
- Good idea.
- Major subdivisions should not be permitted in A1.
- Major subdivisions should not be permitted in the Rural Preservation areas, only in designated growth or residential transition areas.
- Major subdivisions should only be allowed in Rural Residential areas. Appropriate densities should be established (1du/5 acres) and clustering should be required.
- There should not be any major subdivisions in A-1. Also, six lots on a family farm should not be considered a major subdivision.
- Need to prevent major subdivisions in rural preservation areas – doesn't matter where they are, there are still too many lots in a rural area that likely can't support them. Only residential major subdivisions should cluster, not industrial or business.
- Yes.
- No.
- This should be changed back to a conventional 2 acre or larger lot division of a tract.
- Major subdivisions should cluster but the arrangement of cluster should be environmentally friendly.
- Not necessarily if there are large lots.
- Yes.
- 1 acre lots similar to the Acres at Lake Monticello. Otherwise, models like Fox Hollow and Merry Oaks (1 lot per 10 acres) are ideal.

Number of Dwellings allowed on one parcel:

- Two.
- Five (no more than one every four acres).
- Depends on the size of the parcel. I think the most important stipulation is density of no more than 1 unit per 5 acres.
- One dwelling unit per parcel.
- One.
- 1-20 acres: 1 dwelling; 21-60 acres: 2 dwellings; 61-100+: 3 dwellings. Up to two additional dwellings allowed; total must remain under one ownership.
- One, not including clear dependencies, guest houses, etc.
- 1 per 2 acres.
- Depends on the size of the parcel, (tenant houses on a farm) (guest cottage on a 10 to 20 acre parcel) (1 dwelling on a two acre parcel)
- 1 house per 10 acres.
- One.
- One per parcel unless otherwise provided for.
- No less than one per $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ an acre.

General Comments

Please share any other thoughts you might have regarding the A-1 zoning district, this process, other land use tools the County should focus on such as TDRs (Transfer of Development Rights program), cash proffers (minimum cash amount paid to offset impacts from development), the provision of central water and sewer systems to areas of the county, and so on.

- Too much density allowed by right, which does not allow for proffers. Development rights need to be limited so we can get proffers if larger developments are allowed.
- Need to ensure vision of Comp Plan becomes a reality.
- Fluvanna citizens value open space and rural areas and are committed to their preservation; reflected in the 1999 and 2001 Heritage Forums and the 2006 Planning Commission citizen survey.
- Rural Preservation area should be afforded a high level of protection as stated in the Comp Plan.
- Designation of Zion Crossroads UDA and adoption of PUD ordinance are positive steps but meaningless without appropriate infrastructure.
- Dense cluster developments that have been approved violate the overall vision, spirit, and goals of the Comp Plan.
- New zoning ordinance should limit development rights within the rural areas of the county. Over-development such as cluster subdivisions will impact the agricultural usage, diminish water resources and unalterably change the character of the county.
- Current A-1 zoning district is outdated. Other zoning areas approved in past 30 years, and not correlated with the Comp Plan, are illegal “spot zones”.
- A-2 and/or Rural Preservation (RP) zones should be created.
- A-2 zoning district should be portions of the present A-1 which would be subject to rezonings into R-1, B-1, or I-1.
- RP zoning district should be those areas which would be protected from any more intensive development, such as parcels under conservation or historic easements and the parcels adjacent to these easements, and other areas deemed unsuited for more intensive development (wetlands, flood plains, etc.)
- A-2/RP rezoning should be initiated by the Planning Commission with approval by the Board of Supervisors (with proper notices to all landowners)
- County and citizens need to have a commitment to the preservation of open space.
- A public task force should be formed for A-1 review process.
- Developments should be for the good of the county taxpayers; tax impacts of potential developments should be taken into consideration. More rooftops = higher taxes, especially large developments such as Central Meadows.
- Private property rights and the public good should coincide with each other.
- Rural Preservation areas currently have no “teeth” (current zoning regulations do not allow for vision of Comp Plan to be achieved).
- With current zoning regulations and development activity, rural areas of Fluvanna are being transformed from farming areas to suburbs.
- Development leads to loss of land use taxation; increase in taxes.
- Need to consider what tax impacts development has on large landowners.

- County is losing farmable land.
- Need to achieve a balance of private property rights and public good.
- Citizens need to act as responsible landowners.
- Issue is not only private property rights but also taxpayer rights.
- Citizens have a need for choice.
- How have other localities used public utilities as a land use tool?
- County needs to have foresight in order to achieve it's vision.
- County needs to look at how other localities implement conservation easement programs (i.e., Albemarle, Goochland).
- Issue is not just about division rights but also about community rights as a whole.
- Property in Fluvanna is taxed as raw land, not on the "highest and best use"; taxes are not paid based on the development right potential of the land (\$5,000 per acre, no matter how many division rights may be associated with it).
- Need to address potential impact of developments on taxpayers.
- Zoning changes that reduce development are just about the only mechanism left to taxpayers to try to protect their rights to their own money.
- Need to address the cost or potential loss to the taxpayer from zoning.
- Need to add another issue to the Rural Cluster Regulation Issues board: "New subdivisions generally make taxes go up for existing county residents."
- The A-1 zone should be replaced by several zones implementing the following concepts:
 - Varied land use and population densities in appropriately designated areas of Fluvanna. No more one-rule-fits-all!
 - Yes to dense, mixed-use development at Zion Crossroads and to an inter-jurisdictional water system there. Zoning at Zion Crossroads in particular should invite new dwellings near jobs.
 - No to further subdivision, cluster or not, in rural preservation areas.
 - Fill in Columbia, Palmyra, and Scottsville while preventing strip development along roads leading in and out of these towns.
- Fluvanna County should require that utility companies to whom they grant rights-of-way: 1) Leave wide filtration buffers along streams crossing their easements; 2) Refrain from mowing easements in times of drought; 3) Refrain from using equipment too big for the job at hand; 4) Vary the mowing calendar from year to year, so as not to wipe out any one species of seasonal plant.
- Consider requiring that utility easements be positioned along the edges of properties claimed by eminent domain, so that owners of adjacent lands would divide the monetary and esthetic injuries to their holdings, rather than having the whole burden fall on one.
- Parents of children from the same neighborhood should arrange for them to meet the school bus in a group, rather than one by one. New residential and road designs should facilitate this, and schools should foster such arrangements.
- Fluvanna needs a full-time game warden.
- County regulations on sediment and erosion control should be more rigorously enforced.
- Require cash proffers from developers.

- Not much will change for the better, i.e. preserving what rural areas remain, until the Board of Supervisors tackles the zoning issue. I've lived in the county for 16 years and have come to realize statements in the Comp Plan are practically worthless for slowing development in the rural areas unless we have strict zoning laws. As the situation now stands, developers have their way in this county. We allow spot zoning throughout the county.
- Asking for proffers from the developers might reduce the number of new developments and would defray some of the expenses of the added services needed.
- A new home costs Fluvanna County \$2.56 in services for every dollar it returns in taxes over its projected 50-year useful life.
- For tax purposes, a new home must be appraised at a minimum of about \$520,000 to achieve a cost/benefit ratio of 1:1 (analysis done before the cost of the new high school was final; final high school costs may affect ratios).
- Developers need to share the costs of their development, whether through cash proffers or other means.
- Push for landowners to put their property under easements.
- Keep subdivision development out of the Rural Preservation area, period!
- Implement a zoning classification for the Rural Preservation area that keeps development out.
- Use any means available to protect the Rural Preservation area.
- Need strategies that can be employed to keep subdivision developments down to a minimum (ideally, zero).
- Cash proffers are a joke. Essentially "prostituting" the land to any one willing to pay for it. If cash proffers are allowed, should be paid to the citizen who would be negatively impacted and be forced to live within the "development" decisions of others.
- Better incentives for conservation easement and providing incentives for farming, raising livestock, or other agri-business is a better strategy. Attract businesses and individuals who want to "work" the land, not raze it and build on it.
- Remove major subdivisions from the list of uses permitted in A1.
- A zoning category that permits clusters, by-right, must be available to 40% of unimproved land, not that it must be on the ground. This means that the county must permit development within zones that could be on the ground if someone applies for the appropriate rezoning to allow for a by-right cluster. The cluster development is by-right., but the rezoning is not.
- No centralized water or sewer systems, whether public or private, should be permitted in A1. No alternative or experimental water or sewage treatment systems should be permitted in A1. State law says the county cannot prohibit these systems, but the law does not require that they be permitted in every zoning category. "Centralized" should be defined to mean any system serving more than two connections.
- Transfer of development rights is an excellent idea. Purchase of development rights is a poor idea insofar as it involves a government or any agency supported with tax money. Fluvanna Country should seek from the state a special code section permitting purchase of development rights by private entities.

- The county should consider creating a class of division rights that can be sold but cannot be exercised on the originating property. This would allow a land owner to capture value through the sale of rights, but would not allow that owner to divide his own property.
- **Central water and sewer systems:** Such systems should not be permitted in the Rural Preservation areas because they are designed to enable the very kind of large developments that the county does not want in the rural areas.
- **Cash proffers:** Cash proffers, impact fees and level-of-services standards should protect taxpayers, promote financial sustainability and assure that new developments are revenue-neutral in their impact on the county.
- **TDRs:** There should be more flexibility allowed so that a broker can buy up or bank development rights just as you now can buy up mineral rights, drilling rights or domain rights and resell them. One solution to the issue of “loss of division rights”: make it attractive for landowners to sell the division rights that can no longer be exercised on their particular piece of property. This would be particularly appealing if desired growth-area densities could only be achieved by purchasing division rights from landowners in rurally rezoned areas.
- Lots fronting on state primary or secondary roads should be discouraged. These roads are not intended to be utilized as subdivision streets. Lots fronting on a primary or secondary road should be at least 10 acres with a minimum frontage of 600-700 ft.
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs) would be great if it could be administered properly and have a viable market in the target area. The economics are problematic given the high cost of development.
- Central water and sewer, including privately owned systems, should only be allowed in the community planning areas. No central systems in the Rural Preservation areas.
- The creation of a subdivision (greater than 2 lots) should require a new internal street, either public or private, but if private to be constructed to VDOT standards.
- A \$450,000 home is required for the county to “break even” in taxes (as stated by a resident).
- A former Commissioner of Revenue study documented that the average priced household (\$250,000) generated approximately \$1.70 in costs for every \$1 of revenue.
- According to a previous Finance Dept. study, an \$11,521 proffer is required for each residential unit in rezonings with a residential component in order for taxes to be balanced.
- How many lots have been approved that have not been built on?
- Good planning can offset some of the costs of development (i.e., residential developments closer to schools cuts down on cost of transporting students to school via buses).
- Do rooftops in higher density developments cost less than others?
- Need to carefully look at the impact and effectiveness of non-cash proffers; proffers should be rational and useful to (and used by) the community.
- Alternative sewer systems must be allowed for by law which means the feasibility of development is less dependent on the quality of the soils in the area.
- People don’t move to rural areas to live on small lots (i.e., 1/3 acre, etc.).
- What are some of the current problems with the A-1 zoning district?

- The Future Land Use map and the zoning map do not coincide with one another as they should.
- The county needs a balance between division rights and property rights.
- Need to allow for large lot major subdivisions.
- Issues with “exempt lots” in the county (non-conforming lots and/or lots with little or no road frontage).
- By-right zoning uses to encourage/enable agriculturally oriented economic development.
- Major subdivisions should not be permitted by-right.
- What should constitute a major subdivision?
- Sliding scale density appears to be difficult to administer.
- Need to look at the uses currently permitted in A-1 and be sure to allow for uses that would maintain rural character.
- Need to limit driveways along public roads.
- People do not “move to the country” to live on small lot sizes. Current cluster subdivision ordinance doesn’t appear to lend itself to folks having larger lots.
- Like the sliding scale density concept for determining the number of lots permitted. The “lay of the land” needs to be taken into consideration when determining the number of lots that would be permitted.
- County needs more tax revenue. The lack of economic development places more burden on homeowners.
- Comp Plan should encourage sensible economic development. Don’t want the county to look like Route 29 in Greene County.
- County should have an architectural review board like Albemarle to encourage the construction of attractive business establishments that blend with the aesthetics of the area.
- Too much land is zoned agricultural. Small-scale agriculture is a dying business.
- The county needs to look to the future and attract environmentally friendly businesses and impose more rigorous standards on architecture and land maintenance.
- Concerns about subdividing in the rural areas, and agriculture goes away, and farming diminishes.
- Opposed to more restrictions with regard to land regulations.
- What effects does removing trees do to the environment and weather patterns, do we look at environmental impacts during the subdivision review process?
- Should be able to develop your own property, but the environment should be considered when doing so.
- How does 2007 state law about cluster development fit into Fluvanna County’s cluster ordinance?
- Cluster subdivision off of Antioch Road, 8 lots approx. 1 acre of open land with no vegetative cover, needs grass or landscaping. Only 3 houses in subdivision so far.
- Above ground power lines brought up as a concern. Is it a subdivision requirement to require underground utilities? **Yes, per section 19-8-7.**
- Why does the county even need to have major subdivisions? What is wrong with large lot subdivisions like we used to have?

- Is a 15 foot right-of-way (ROW) sufficient for family divisions? Width requirements for easements. **State code permits a 10-20' ROW for family subdivisions. Fluvanna requires a minimum of 20'.**
- We need to cluster large subdivisions to discourage sprawl.
- Concern about driveways off of state roads. Driveways are too frequent.
- Concern about backyards in subdivisions (Antioch Glen) facing the state road. The orientation of lots in subdivisions.
- Buffer and screening between subdivisions and roads.
- People shouldn't live in subdivisions if they are pro-property rights.
- Not sure PUDs will work as intended.
- Two acre lots may conflict with adjoining lot's well and septic systems.
- As this process moves forward, issues will center around division rights, and associated with that, issues around taking away potential development rights as landowners worry about not being able to divide their property if they need to for financial reasons.
- How to reconcile preserving open space without diminishing property rights?
- Favor stricter zoning regulations that prevent large residential developments in land zoned for agriculture or preservation.
- Transfer of Development Rights won't work – State enabling legislation remains flawed.
- County needs a cash proffer program. Cumberland has one at \$5,400 per residential unit.
- Add a large lot zoning district that won't permit the lots ever to be further subdivided.
- No more major subdivisions in rural preservation areas.
- What about a Purchase of Development Rights program? Why couldn't a line be included in the CIP program so that developers can proffer towards it? Then that could be used towards funding the PDR without using county money.
- County should consider lot width to setback ratio requirements.
- Additional rural zoning districts (such as an A-2) are needed.
- Cumberland County – parcel cannot be divided into three or more lots if it was created after 1991.
- Does the County have to allow for major subdivisions in the rural preservation areas?
- The issue in rural areas is density, not division rights.
- Is property rezoned based on the future land use map?
- How is Fluvanna implementing the vision of the Comp Plan?
- A cash proffer policy is needed to pay for the infrastructure required to support large developments.
- Residential rooftops are needed to bring in commercial/industrial businesses.
- Have studies been performed on the available ground water supply for Fluvanna?
- Issue with rural clusters – open space is being used for septic systems.
- County should do a build-out analysis under the current zoning ordinance regulations.
- The county needs more compact/dense development.
- Are Ag/Forestral districts only permitted in the A-1 zoning district?
- Restore original 2 on 10 off road 10 + lots. Please leave our property rights alone.
- If division rights are taken away or down-zoning occurs, then owners should be compensated for it.
- Any property owner can place a deed on their property to limit development.

- Grandfather clause for development rights.
- We don't need an A-2 district, leave A-1 as it is.
- Can't take away property rights because County cannot afford to compensate property owners.
- Rooftops with children (school-aged students) in the schools cost County money, (control school costs)
- Proffers need to be high enough to compensate for the cost of education.
- Property owners should have reasonable rights to develop their property.
- Don't want to move to rural areas and then have to look at other houses at the back door.
- It's easier to sell large lots, because there are no roads to build, thus cost to subdivide is lower.
- Law of unintended consequences triggers undesirable issues (e.g. mass platting of paper subdivisions).
- Incentive to sell large lots with low infrastructure
- General public not interested in A-1 district meetings, only a handful of people know.
- More variety of subdivisions is needed.
- Implementing cluster subdivisions was a big mistake because it creates large common areas that people cannot use.
- Do away with cluster development and you'll end up with sprawl.
- Large lot divisions (5-10 acre lots) is rural in character.
- Cluster development uses a lot of groundwater and natural resources.
- Have a mixture of lot sizes, must have a number of different lot sizes in order to pay for roads, otherwise developing is too expensive.
- Might be able to decrease development rights if private roads are allowed.
- Our County's Road Maintenance Agreement language is strict.
- If land regulations are too strict, then landowners will not want to stay in Fluvanna.
- Road Maintenance Agreements should be structured to the mortgage.
- How to bridge gap between price of lots vs. total number of lots.
- Need to explore new ways to allow land to produce revenue.
- Farming in Fluvanna County is not income producing enough.
- Zoning solution needs to be the least injurious to taxpayers for financial sustainability.
- If farmers stay on farm, then they have no incentive to subdivide.
- Large landowners need to be able to break off small parcels if need be - less restrictions and extracting value.
- 60 acre and 1,500 feet of road frontage exemption is ridiculous (should be less).
- How can uses in A-1 be augmented in order to create more revenue?
- Address lack of cemeteries in Fluvanna County.
- Allow A-1 by-right use of barns as warehouses.
- Adverse impacts in A-1 such as noise.
- Concern over private central sewer systems.
- The 200 foot setback requirement off of roads (which are generally on ridges) is an issue.
- Fluvanna needs to be more consistent in designating rural preservation areas that cannot be developed for housing or business uses.

- No more housing tracts because we do not have water and sewage infrastructure to make these kinds of things viable here. New housing may create more tax base, but it also costs more in taxes for infrastructure than it brings in.
- Need specific zoning for specific areas – rural/farm preservation areas, some zoning for growth for retail in specific areas and some housing areas with specific rules regarding good sized lots so that we don't have the character of "ticky-tacky" housing tracts which in the end just raise our taxes.
- Cash proffers should be collected.
- No by-right major subdivisions; all major subdivisions, especially cluster, should require permits. These subdivisions have a significant impact on rural areas from increases in population, traffic, and services. Increase minimum acreage for cluster subdivisions.
- An expansion of by right uses for agricultural uses should be considered.
- Do not force central water and sewer on residents who do not need them in order to make the projects financially viable. Sewers and public water lead to higher density development.
- Stop decreasing frontage for commercial developments.
- Use natural barriers (vegetation, landscaped swales, etc.) to protect sight views.
- Any higher density development should provide proffers to offset school costs, increased police, traffic, etc.
- Need buffers between new developments and existing properties.
- Need TDR and wetland banking programs. TDR's are especially important to help farmers hold onto their land.
- A-1 should be for agriculture only.
- Rural preservation is important.
- Zoning is a valid/important tool.
- Property rights need to be balanced with how land uses impact your neighbors.
- Growth impacts taxes (need for more services).
- Balance between provided services and keeping rural (services attract growth).
- Keep it rural, safe, and preserved.
- Too many subdivisions have been built in Fluvanna. New subdivisions have led to too much congestion on roads, particularly Route 53. Additional subdivision will require road improvements to maintain safety and increased traffic. County should slow the growth of subdivisions once the economy improves.
- Fluvanna County is missing the boat on business development at Zion Crossroads. More businesses are needed on the Fluvanna side of Zion Crossroads – that area can accommodate increased traffic.
- Residents of the county need more services; businesses bring jobs and tax revenue to the county. A business development plan is needed for the Zion Crossroads area.