Chairman Townsend called the May 17, 2016 meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. stating its purpose was for a work session to look at a particular issue.

Mr. Fowler stated an inquiry was presented from citizens who purchased approximately 27 acres with the intention of putting in a mobile home park. Guidelines were presented to the citizens; mobile home parks have considerable development standards, including required open space, minimum lot sizes and setbacks, and required paved access roads inside. It allows for a small convenience store and laundromat, built and dedicated to and in a manner that would only attract the park residents. It also requires a 300’ road frontage; the road frontage n the property in question is 245’. An option would be to seek a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals to reduce the road frontage. The citizens researched and found the mobile home subdivision ordinance.

Mr. Fowler said he and Mr. Bartlett, County Administrator, reviewed the mobile home subdivision contained in the Ordinance; while there is a definition for a manufactured home subdivision, it requires ten acres and it is listed as a permitted use in the A1 and A2 districts. There are no development standards tied to it. Mr. Fowler presented an example for discussion.

Mr. Fowler added it is recognized in the Comprehensive Plan and the manufactured home park comment that this is a desirable type of housing as it meets affordable housing options, but asked what type of development standards should be included in the ordinance and what process should be followed. Discussion followed.

Chairman Townsend asked if the 10-acre definition should also be examined. Mr. Fowler stated the minimum lot size for a stick-built is an acre and a half; he said the A1 and A2 ordinance would limit the number of parcels permitted.

Commissioner Mason questioned the acre and a half lot size in a regular subdivision requirement would factor in the lot density; Mr. Fowler said it would and there is a maximum density in A1 of 0.25 dwelling units per acre.

Commissioner Mason asked why the subdivision standards do not apply to this situation since this is a subdivision. Mr. Fowler stated they do; he said under the Residential Use Types it clearly states the allowance of a manufactured home subdivision. Mr. Fowler questioned the identification of the park but use a different definition for it in the ordinance. He said there should be development standards with specific criteria attached; discussion followed.
Mr. Fowler stated that the current ordinance will regulate any such subdivisions; it still must meet the specified criteria. He asked if the mobile home subdivision ordinance and definition should be kept, and if so, should it require a special use permit, and should there be specific criteria to develop one. Mr. Fowler said the development standards for a mobile home park which require a dedicated amount of open space which would not be preferable in a subdivision. Discussion followed.

Mr. Fowler asked if the language should be removed from the ordinance; he stated the type of housing intended to be built is not questioned as it cannot be restricted. He asked if other localities should be examined to see how they handle this issue.

The Commissioners discussed the specifics presented by the potential developer, and the differences between the requirements of a manufactured home park and a subdivision. Mr. Fowler asked if they should be treated differently, if so, how; or should the A1 and A2 be amended and the requirements as a residential use type removed. Discussion followed.

Mr. Fowler stated the interested party could get a variance for reduced road frontage; they would still need to meet all development standards. Another option would be to request an amendment to the development standard to remove the road requirement for the “mobile home park.” Commissioner Jones asked how many mobile homes they could place on that lot. Mr. Fowler said that it would be dependent on the perk test; wells and septic can be shared.

Mr. Fowler stated he will see how other localities handle this issue for discussion during the next meeting; an amendment to the Ordinance can be requested, or it and the definition can be removed completely. An amendment to the development standards could also be requested.

**Old Business**

Mr. Fowler reported the Subdivision Ordinance amendments were approved at the Board of Supervisors meeting; there were two people that spoke at the public hearing.

**New Business**

(Non)

Chairman Townsend made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Prengaman, and adopted by the following vote:

**Aye:** Donald Gilliam
Preston C. Hunt
Mark Jenkins
Robert M. Jones
Chris Mason
John “Jack” W. Peery, Jr.
John Prengaman
John Townsend, III
Cannon Watson

**Nay:** (None)

Absent: Clifford Jack Leatherwood

The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** June 21, 2016