



County of Surry Virginia Planning Commission Meeting Minutes January 23, 2023

MEETING CONVENED: The meeting of the Surry County Planning Commission was called to order at 7 PM on Monday, January 23, 2023, in the Surry County General District Court, 45 School Street, Surry, VA by Mr. Eddie Brock, Chair.

ATTENDANCE: The following members respond to Roll Call Present:

Mr. Eddie Brock, Chairperson
Mr. Giron Wooden, Jr.
Mr. Theodore Lunsford
Mr. Earl Newby, Sr.
Mr. Stephen Berryman
Mr. David Coggin
Mr. William Seward, IV
Ms. Dianne cheek
Ms. Carmen D. Judkins

Absent:

Ms. Judy S. Lyttle
Mr. Thomas Hardy

Also present were Mr. Horace Wade, Director of Planning and Community Development; Ms. Regina Hilton, Administrative Assistant; Lola Perkins, County Attorney

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: All

The Planning Commission meeting was then turned over to Mr. Wade. Mr. Wade stated that this meeting is being recorded and asked for nomination for Chair. Mr. Wooden nominated Mr. Eddie Brock as Chair and it was seconded by Mr. Newby. Mr. Wade asked if there were any other nominations, heard none, and asked for roll call.

In favor: (9) Brock, Newby, Berryman, Lunsford, Cheek, Judkins, Coggin, Seward, Wooden
Opposed: 0
Abstain: 0

Mr. Wade then turned the meeting over to Mr. Brock.

Mr. Brock asked to entertain a motion for Vice-Chair. Mr. Newby nominated Mr. Wooden and it was seconded by Mr. Lunsford. Mr. Brock asked for any other nominees, heard none, and asked for roll call.

In favor: (9) Brock, Newby, Berryman, Lunsford, Cheek, Judkins, Coggin, Seward, Wooden
Opposed: 0
Abstain: 0

ADOPTING OF AGENDA: Chair Brock entertained a motion to adopt the meeting’s agenda. It was moved by Mr. Wooden and seconded by Mr. Newby.

In favor: (9) Brock, Newby, Berryman, Lunsford, Cheek, Judkins, Coggin, Seward, Wooden
Opposed: 0
Abstain: 0

APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS: Chair Brock asked the Commissioners for the disposition of the minutes for the December 19, 2022, meeting. A motion to approve was made by Mr. Newby and seconded by Mr. Lunsford with the noted correction on pages four and eight to correct engine projects to energy projects. Ms. Cheek asked to correct her last name again found on page one.

In favor: (10) Brock, Lyttle, Newby, Hardy, Berryman, Lunsford, Cheek, Judkins, Coggin, Seward
Opposed: 0
Abstain: 0

Mr. Brock entertained a motion to approve the list of meeting dates for 2023 found within the agenda. Mr. Wooden moved to approve the meeting dates for 2023 as presented and seconded by Mr. Newby.

In favor: (9) Brock, Newby, Berryman, Lunsford, Cheek, Judkins, Coggin, Seward, Wooden
Opposed: 0
Abstain: 0

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Surry County Comprehensive Plan Update

The Surry County Comprehensive Plan Amendment, if recommended by the Planning Commission, will amend the existing Comprehensive Plan (adopted in 2020). The Surry County 2040 Comprehensive Plan (“Plan”) is used by County citizens, staff, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors as a guide for future decisions affecting the County including, but not limited to, decisions related to future land use, road networks, and zoning case actions. The Plan encompasses all of Surry County. The Plan does not rezone land, but it suggests ordinance amendments and other actions that will facilitate the implementation of the Plan after adoption by the Board of Supervisors.

Plan recommendations are to update the Future Land Use text to include data, information, mapping, policy analysis, and implementation measures concerning the future location of energy projects within the county.

Mr. Wade presented to the Commission new information.

- There was research on stormwater that was completed by the consultants. One item researched was presented by Mr. Coggin. The consultant was asked to research if we could receive more information from the developers considering DEQ's new ruling to move forward for any inner connection happening after 2024 and to require going by the panel sizes versus the post size.
- Regarding the research that was received, the locality can request that the developers would go by the panel size, versus the post size for stormwater as a part of the application. The consultants have drafted language in the packet tonight. It states under "potential amendment language, the County will enforce the Virginia Storm Water Management Program regulation for each utility-scale and community-scale solar photovoltaic energy project's solar panels will be considered unconnected impervious surfaces in a water quantity and water quality calculations that will employ."
- Mr. Wade stated that DEQ reviews the projects, but we would have our engineers, whom the applicant pays to review the stormwater plans to ensure it is met because it is in addition to what the DEQ requires.
- The other language discussed was strategy six. The County will adopt an approval process for utility-scale energy facilities in any zoning district that consist of negotiation of a siting agreement, which includes a determination that the project is in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan. This will simplify and streamline the process to the benefit of the applicant, the Board of Commissioners, the Planning Commission, and the public.

Mr. Wade stated to the Commission, by adding the new amendment concerning stormwater and the current language in the plan, that staff recommends the Comprehensive Plan Amendment be approved by the Board.

Ms. Cheek asked Mr. Wade if the proposed amendment language for strategy four is new because the subsequent strategies were numbered. "Are you now saying that it would be number four?" Are the two bulleted items coming straight from the DEQ requirements that were done in the memo dated April? Mr. Wade stated that the memo came from DEQ.

Ms. Cheek asked if the two bullets reflect the memo and if the wording matches what DEQ is putting in place and if it captures the intent. Ms. Cheek would like to hear it's not what Mr. Wade thought, but that it truly was developed based on that. Mr. Wade answered and said that it was developed based on DEQ.

Ms. Cheek asked if it was correct to say that it captures the intent of what DEQ has put out which they are going to act upon in 2024. Mr. Wade stated for clarification, the interconnection requests are for those projects happening in 2024, and there are interconnection requests happening now. Your project could not come before a Planning Commission Board until 2028 if your interconnection request came in 2023. So, this language helps with what we have. The language is written to let developers understand that 2024 is not when their application is reviewed, but when it's received for interconnection. The

current request that is up for 2024 is held to lower standards. The condition will be put in place in future Conditional Use Permits and will be in our Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Berryman asked if their interconnection request is done basically before coming before the County. If an applicant comes in next month and they have their request done, can we add it to the CUP. Mr. Wade answered from the discussion with DEQ with our CUP, we would have to enforce it then. DEQ would only enforce the stormwater plans per what's in place. We would have it reviewed by our stormwater person. There are third-party engineers that are already in place that the applicants are required to make payments to for the review of their regular set of controls. Per this section, it would be a requirement to review it for stormwater. The third-party engineer would basically verify that they are following that section or condition.

Ms. Cheek asked on the second item, are we talking about strategy six. She understood the matter of streamlining, but felt that in the previous agenda with Cavalier, there were four items. The Comprehensive Plan Map Update, Rezoning Application, Conditional Use Permit, and the Substantially in Accord Determination. Her understanding of strategy six is that only the substantially in accord determination will be done.

Mr. Wade stated that we will do a substantial accord determination. "The recommendation would be to work in concert to amend the whole ordinance so that it would be only a CUP process." It would be a substantial accord. I spoke with Ms. Perkins about having us under the agreement and working it out with the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to the Board. Previously, you would not have looked at the siting agreement, it would have gone straight to the Board. But, to have you all make a recommendation. It is not a requirement or a state code. We do feel as though for everyone to be on the same page maybe the Planning Commission needs to make the recommendation to the Board. Some of the items are coming out of the CIP (. We are looking at the CIP to make a recommendation to the Board. Look at the siting agreement and see if you can make any recommendations, maybe for improvement with the siting agreement as well. So, substantial accord siting agreement and CUP."

Ms. Cheek asked will we no longer rezone the land to be M1 and Mr. Wade answered "correct". Ms. Cheek stated her concerns for the Commissioners, that the approach we have in place is important for public comments and that the commissioners would be remiss in their duties. To streamline the process so that there is no rezoning and not look at the four things that already exist. Ms. Cheek asked to hear thoughts from the other commissioners on the way we should go forward.

Mr. Brock asked would the value of the land be the same. Mr. Wade stated that for solar projects, the land is valued with the panels. There are several projects in Surry that are alike. Some projects are zoned as M1, and other projects are done off of CUPs. The rezoning doesn't have a financial impact because rezoning has been conditional rezone which eliminates every use except for CUP.

Mr. Wade stated that he did speak with the Commissioner of Revenue to update the ordinance which shows that there is not a difference in value for a realtor for project that changes from M1 to AR property proposing the same type of project.

Mr. Wooden asked Mr. Wade, with streamlining the process, was he correct by saying, "There would be one other hearing that basically would account for what Ms. Cheek was talking about as far as getting rid of the four individual aspects, which streamline it, and have a public hearing where the public actually has an opportunity to speak to those different lists."

Mr. Wade stated that the public can speak. "You would not be required to have a rezoning case or be required to have a map amendment for each of the projects because we have a Comprehensive Plan and at this time, you must find out if it's in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan. Also, you must find, if it's in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan, you would not have to rezone because essentially, the part of the map change would be for the rezoning case. With those two, one to one, you lose that, and it's gone. So, what you end up with is Substantial Accord and a CUP and will probably gain the siting agreement, which is what I think you all should look at anyway. I think it is staff opinion that you all should see the siting agreement that goes before the Board of Supervisors. It's not a requirement. It requires just to be heard at a public hearing by the Board of Supervisors."

Ms. Cheek asked if everything stayed the same, "If we kept it the way we have it, you could still add our review of the siting agreement," she felt that there is bargaining. You could have the siting agreement added to the review and not change the current procedure and not get rid of the previous process. Would that be true or would we have to eliminate the procedure to see the siting agreement?

Mr. Wade stated that it would add something things and have an unnecessary step. Ms. Cheek asked, "By looking at the siting agreement?" Mr. Wade said no but by having a rezoning requirement and a map amendment that's associated. If you rezone property, you will go through a map amendment. "What you're working on right now is a comprehensive plan amendment that would address your primary issues. I think because you were adding some steps here and needing the comprehensive plan here, you don't necessarily need to do a map amendment. If the project meets the requirements of the comprehensive plan, you will not need to do a map amendment. You need to do a rezoning request because the project will be allowed to be in any zoned district."

Mr. Wooden asked "what we have now, does each piece requires a public hearing?" Mr. Wade stated that what was chosen is only one. Mr. Berryman asked is there a need for rezoning and would we need to revisit the solar energy ordinance to remove rezoning? Mr. Wade answered yes and will start working on that once all the recommendations are received.

Ms. Cheek asked is the process changing just energy projects. Mr. Wade answered yes, and solar energy projects require rezoning of the property to M1 or M2.

Mr. Berryman stated that we went from not having to be zoned to having to be zoned industrial and why was that done. Ms. Cheek asked if research could be done to see why.

Ms. Cheek stated that the statement of SMR's was removed and would state new technology that comes out. Ms. Perkins recalled that there was a discussion about that paragraph. "But ultimately, it was left in because that specific type of technology is one of the Governor's initiatives, and there was specific discussion on how that is coming soon. So, it was the consultant's recommendation that we specifically call out that technology with an understanding that in the future, there may be other technologies."

Ms. Cheek expressed that "things are so tied to this one thing, where it feels as if we need to say something about the Governor's initiatives as they go forward. I don't think anything in this plan

prohibits this new initiative from coming to our County.” She doesn’t understand why we need to call this one out, other than there's a recommendation from the consultant.

Mr. Coggin asked if potential SMR’s in Surry County would not be addressed in the amendment and will be addressed in a separate public process. Mr. Wade stated that it spells out “these projects are now” and the Governor released a statement in October. Ms. Cheek asked are SMRs energy projects and Mr. Wade said yes.

Mr. Wooden stated “If I remember the discussion correctly, this particular one was just called out because it was known to the Commission. “So, to Ms. Cheek, we ended up saying that because of the processes that we either have in place now or that we may amend the plan going forward, any future projects not only to the Planning Commission, but the Board of Supervisors that meets certain criteria.”

Ms. Cheek stated that her recommendation would be to generalize the amendment and not have it so specific as SMRs. She would say new technologies that come out would be addressed. Ms. Cheek asked if she should motion that.

Mr. Wade stated for a more general statement, he would work with the consultants on drafting the recommendation from staff and keeping the information about Governor Youngkin with SMRs. “If having a statement about other future energy projects or something along those lines, that may be more appropriate, but it is the pleasure of the Commissioner’s recommendation that goes before the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Wade stated that he will send the Commissioners articles which spell out SMRs basically in Louisa and Surry County.

Mr. Brock asked should the amendment be deferred to allow answers to the questions asked. Mr. Wade asked if the Commission is looking for a deferment or the Chair and Vice Chair work with the consultants to draft the language for the Board. Mr. Brock stated his recommendation would be for the subcommittee to meet with Mr. Wade and the consultants.

Ms. Perkins stated from a procedural standpoint that “the Planning Commission must make a recommendation for the Comprehensive Plan to the Board about the Comprehensive Plan. Providing the subcommittee, the ability to make that call one way or another would muddy the waters, in terms of having clear approval from the Planning Commission. She could suggest scheduling a special meeting to discuss the two items and at that special meeting, if the Planning Commission is satisfied, they could vote on a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. That would expedite the process instead of having to wait until the February Planning Commission meeting. Even if the Planning Commission recommended approval to the Board of Supervisors tonight, there would be insufficient time to get it on the Board's agenda for their February meeting, which is next Thursday. So, the earliest the Comprehensive plan could go to the Board of Supervisors would be the March meeting.”

Mr. Coggin stated that it seems to be a lot of work for one sentence and is in favor of Mr. Wade’s recommendation that the Commission should vote on the two separate items and that the paragraph doesn’t hurt the document.

Mr. Brock asked for a motion to accept the document as written or a motion to have a special meeting to bring the recommendation back to the Planning Commission by February 6th. Ms. Cheek asked before the motion is made, that there could be public comments tonight on the topics which have been discussed. Mr. Brock stated that there isn't a public hearing for tonight's discussion. Ms. Perkins stated that it is not legally required because a public hearing had already occurred on the items and the legal requirement has already been fulfilled.

Mr. Wooden agreed with Mr. Coggin, but with the questions on the table tonight and knowing that we are making a decision in the best interest of the public, it should be deferred until February 6th. Then at that time all the information needed not only relates to SMRs, but also the data that Mr. Wade would provide from the Commission of Revenue to make an informed decision.

Mr. Wooden moved to defer the Comprehensive Plan Amendment until Monday, February 6th for a special meeting. It was seconded by Ms. Cheek

In favor: (9) Brock, Newby, Berryman, Lunsford, Cheek, Judkins, Coggin, Seward, Wooden

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0

Mr. Wade asked for clarification that the meeting with the consultants would be to rework the first page with the paragraphs referring to SMRs as an example and separately. He will be working with the Commission of Revenue's Office to show that there is no cost differential between the rezoning of panels underneath the M1 zone property versus the AR zoned property. Mr. Brock answered, right.

Ms. Cheek asked Mr. Wade the history of why the Board of Supervisors changed rezoning. It was asked that they undo that decision. Mr. Wade stated they could look at previous minutes of when the solar ordinance was passed.

NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Ordinance Amendment 2023-01:** Ordinance to amend Article III, Section 3-302 Permitted Uses (C) by adding Business or Trade School as a Commercial Use Type that requires a conditional use permit. Business or Trade School Use is currently defined in the Zoning Ordinance as a use providing education or training in business, commerce, language or other similar activity or occupational pursuit, and not otherwise specifically defined as an educational facility.

Mr. Wade stated that this is a zoning ordinance amendment in the AR zoning district, Article III, Section 302, Permitted Uses (C) by adding a Business or a Trade School as a Commercial Use type and requires a conditional use permit. Business or trade school is defined in the ordinance as a use providing education or training in business, commerce, language, or other similar activity, or occupational pursuit, and not otherwise specifically defined as an educational facility.

- One of the projects that the County is working on, is being looked through the zoning ordinance to find categories to place them in and the ordinance for AR uses is not there. The definition that may be used is educational facility but not spelled out in the ordinance. It cannot be used as a commercial operation or as an educational facility. It would have to be zoned as a business or trade school and would have to be added in as another type through the ordinance.
- Tonight's request is to add the use to the AR district as a conditional use permit. It would be a requirement to go before the County Commission as well as the Board of Supervisors for approval. The project is currently working with several other federal or state agencies. They had their community meeting and at this time they would not be able to apply until that use is added to the AR zoning district.

Ms. Perkins stated when the project initially came in, she conducted a legal review because both the applicant and Planning felt that it would fall under the educational facility. "With further research into the definition of educational facility, as Mr. Wade shared, it has that restriction on commercial use. So, because of the project that is being contemplated, and other potential projects in the future that may want to locate in the AR district under an educational umbrella, if they have a commercial component, they would not be allowed in an AR district unless a change was made to add the business or trade school use to this particular district." If someone decided to run a college prep course, or an LSAT review course, and start that type of business, if Kaplan wanted to locate and open a facility, they would not be able to because of that commercial component. The educational facility is really meant for more of just a plain school setting, where there is not a commercial, or is not a payment component to it.

Ms. Cheek asked if when the Comprehensive Plan is done, if the Commission thinks the commercial uses are going to be more in our already-zoned commercial areas, not the AR areas. For this project, do we want to open it to AR area and could tell this company that? "Well, you could be in this other area of the county." Mr. Wade stated that there are various use groups for each zoning category. In those use groups they have residential components and civic components for each type of use group. The AR district is similar as well and it has commercial components and staff recommends adding an additional one.

Mr. Coggin asked if a conditional use is needed if a large farm wanted to teach blacksmithing or horse shoeing and Mr. Wade answered yes.

Mr. Berryman asked would this be allowed with the conditional use permit, whereas there is a list of commercial use types that require the special exception from the Board of Zoning Appeals. So, what is the difference on why some commercial-use types would require a special exception and some require conditional use? Mr. Wade answered for a project of this magnitude, it would not go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a special exception. This is a quasi-judicial board, and their vote is final. Whereas you go to a conditional-use permit process, it requires Planning Commission review, which requires a lot of thoughtfulness to go into the project to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to decide. That is the difference. Because of the magnitude of this project, it shouldn't just go before special exception by one review, it should go before a review by the Planning Commission as well as the Board for a final vote.

Mr. Brock asked Mr. Wade of business or trade school in the agricultural district, which type would fit in that characteristics. Would it be under a regular school or a type of educational facility. In the agriculture world, there would be schools teaching agricultural courses and will this be a trade school

teaching vegetable gardening be considered? Mr. Wade thought that there may be some allowances with the state code for Agritourism, that it may be exempt, and he would investigate.

Mr. Coggin asked if we didn't agree that the project did fit in that area and another project wanted to have a machine shop that will train guys and will make a lot of noise close to a group of houses. Then, when it come before the Commission for a conditional use permit, we would say, "No, you need to go to the industrial," Mr. Wade answered correct. Mr. Coggin stated that the Commission would still have guidance. Mr. Wade answer correct, and now the use is permitted as a CUP. It doesn't necessarily mean the project's going to be allowed at a specific location that's properly zoned, because you still are required to have it approved by the Board of Supervisors after review by the Planning Commission. So, it doesn't necessarily guarantee your project will be approved, it only allows a project to be heard.

Mr. Brock obtain a motion to approve or deny. Mr. Coggin made a motion to approve Ordinance Amendment 2023-01 and it was seconded by Mr. Wooden.

In favor: (9) Brock, Newby, Berryman, Lunsford, Cheek, Judkins, Coggin, Seward, Wooden

Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Mr. Mike Drewry, 541 Strawberry Lane, Wakefield Virginia. Mr. Drewry does local government law and has an interest in the solar comprehensive plan. After reading Surry comprehensive plan, Mr. Drewry had the following concerns.

- When serving on the Board of Supervisors, he was the one who inserted rezoning into the solar ordinance.
- Page three, strategy six, streamlining the process for CUP. Attorneys have different interpretations. Developers do not like rezoning but love CUPs. In other localities, when solar a ordinance is passed, if you put to rezone, developers and solar people, start calling. They call the Planning Department; they call the Board of Supervisors. "Don't do that." The reason why is that on rezoning, legally a developer doesn't have a right, there's no right to get your property rezoned. The Board can go "Yes, no." No question.
- When you have a conditional use permit, it goes further than that. What developers will say, "Hey this is my right. Not my right, but basically, it's allowable in this district. All I have to do is put in conditions to meet your concerns," and it puts the Board in your locality on a shakier existence to deny. Mr. Drewry has seen it here in Surry County and have seen this attack used by developers when he was on the Board.
- It was not about finance, because the Board asked the Treasurer at that time, was there any difference when it came to the Board? It came to the Board and the Board didn't want that. The Board wanted the ability to control it. "Yes, no," no questions. The Board wanted the rezoning. In fact, he was the one that made that motion. The board was not going to approve the ordinance that night and he made the motion to rezone, and it was approved.
- At that time, we asked staff to go back, and Mr. Wade wasn't here, to go back and revisit this ordinance because there were some issues in the solar ordinance. It is now being brought up

that it was not financial. It was the ease. In other words, it's easier for a solar developer to put in a project in Surry County by just the CUP. The Board didn't want that.

- As a citizen of Surry County, zoning ordinances, rely too heavily on CUPs. In other words, Developer come in here ... saying, "Hey, this use is in that zoning ordinance. Tell me what your issues are," and you've got to tell them.
- Your solar developers want only a CUP, and they lobby hard in other localities for it, so where you want to strengthen it, you do a rezoning. That's what it has been.
- The comp plan is on page one, it goes back to what was told about the SMRs. By reading it, he didn't quite understand. The Commission did mention the SMRs, which is a technology, but what about alternative methods of energy that we have now? He didn't understand whether this comp plan policy addressed that. Talking about wind, renewables, wood pellets, biomass, he did not understand this policy.
- Another specific that it might be in the future but wasn't mentioned was alternate methods. I urge you not to do it by CUP. I know what they call it, streamlining, but that's the reason the Board, was going to turn it down. I hope they would turn it down again if it is sent through with just a CUP. Mr. Drewry certainly will be advocating to hold the tone.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED:

COMMITTEE UPDATES:

Mr. Wade gave an update on Cavalier Solar.

- A meeting with Cavalier Solar in the Planning office is done weekly, typically on Tuesdays around three o'clock, with a few of the Cavalier Solar team and with staff from Isle of Wight to go over concerns.
- One of the major concerns was the recent truck traffic. They are not currently working using the current traffic mitigation plan that was approved. An approved traffic plan will be sent via email and in addition to the email address and phone number of Cavalier Solar's contact person. If there are complaints about Cavalier Solar, you can help them out and send them to the right location.
- Working with Cavalier to provide a website address to update citizens on their current progress of the project. The process will take approximately 18 months to complete if everything goes as scheduled. The public wants to know how much truck traffic is expected. What type of truck traffic are we expecting? Are we going to see panels delivered? When are we going to see panels delivered? How long are we going to be dealing with rock traffic?
- Mr. Wade thought at this time they will be sending information to the affected property owners and suggest putting up a website to alert everyone. It's not just the people living in those areas but there are those passing through these areas all the time. The public would like to know what's coming up and if we should avoid at a certain area at a certain time or if traffic is going to be heavily impacted a certain hour, choosing to leave their home earlier.
- Receiving lots of complaints and the heaviest part of construction hasn't begun. Mr. Wade needs assistance to enforce our site plan approval as well as our traffic plan and if there are citizens that feel like AES is not addressing the problem, there will be a phone number and an email address provided.

Mr. Brock asked what the truck route from the two laydown yards was. Mr. Wade said that is supposed to come down highway 10 and then to White Marsh Road. Mr. Newby asked if the information was included in the traffic plan. Mr. Wade said there is a map of the traffic management plan as well as where all signs would be located and that he would send the information to the commissioners.

Mr. Brock stated that things change once it leaves the department. The project was supposed to have the laydown yard on the facility and then put in a crossroad leading to Beechland and not use the highway to take the material to the facilities. The laydown yards are in Bacon Castle, and they were supposed to come from Wakefield and then down White Marsh Road. Mr. Wade said that he heard that they would come from Wakefield and not from Bacon Castle.

Mr. Brock stated that "the Commission listens and makes recommendations and thought that would be the way it was presented to the Board. But once it got there it seems to have changed. The whole idea was to keep them from destroying the crossroads at Beechland Road. You stage it on-site, go pick up what you need and take it to the area that is going to be built and work your way away from the staging site. That's not happening."

Mr. Newby said to his understanding that the CUP is the policer of the project. Mr. Wade stated that CUPs are the conditions that must be followed. The site plan is the plan that must be followed, that follows the ordinance, and the CUPs encompass everything. There's a separate traffic plan that is a construction management plan that you operate from to deliver all the different goods to the project that is reviewed by VDOT, Emergency Management, the Sheriff Department, and Planning Staff.

Mr. Berryman asked Mr. Wade if the Commissioners could get a copy of the CUP conditions. Mr. Wade said that he would send the approved conditions as well as the construction traffic management plan and the number for AES. AES also said that by February, there will a website for the Surry and Isle of Wight citizens.

Mr. Seward stated the largest concern was the roads. "When they came in front of the Commission, "Who's going to be responsible?" They said they would be wholeheartedly, and I said, "Okay, who's going to tell the subcontractors and all the other truck ... you can't just tell them. Somewhere along the line it's got to be passed on to ... It's 20 trucks a day at a minimum. Dispatch has got to be told somewhere, and all those guys are doing is following the GPS. That's why the solar projects have a horrible name in this area. It's just because of what the citizens see every day as soon as one starts." Mr. Wade extended an invite to the Commissioners to join the weekly virtual meeting with AES.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Brock entertained a motion to adjourn at 8:30 until the February 6th Special meeting. It was moved Mr. Berryman and second by Mr. Newby. Properly moved and second. All those in favor signify by saying Aye.

Commissioners: Aye