

## Tartan Investment Group, LLC

633 St. Andrews Lane Weems, VA 22576 MEMORANDUM

**TO: Investors** 

**DATE:** March 2, 2007

RE.: Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan Revision

As you probably know, the Lancaster County Planning Commission is in the process of completing a review and revision of the Comprehensive Plan as required by the Commonwealth. The Officers and others associated with The Tartan Investment Group have been involved in this process, to protect and support the interests of the owners, residents and investors in the @ 165 acre area that includes The Tartan golf course and other property owned by The Tartan Investment Group.

A letter from Herb Aman, President of Tartan Investment Group is attached. This letter has been sent to the Planning Commission and Board of supervisors and addresses issues that are critical to all of us and the neighbors of our property. Our development plans are designed along Conservation Development lines. We do not foresee having more than @ 80 parcels on property that could, by right, be subdivided into approximately 150 individual parcels while meeting all current zoning requirements and overlays. We want our development to complement the property's natural features and the building that exists in the area, and preserve the value in our properties that would not be retained if our effort to preserve The Tartan Golf Course is not successful. Our plan will present our Community with over 100 acres of golf course that is intended to be forever preserved as open property. The surrounding residential development will be designed to be a gracious and attractive addition.

As we have monitored the work of the Planning Commission and reviewed the comments of individuals addressing that forum, we have felt that there is an element in our community that is not concentrating sufficiently upon future aspects of their current sentiments. Decisions made now will affect us forever, as the population of our County will continue to expand. Our approach to solving the problems of this day must be made considering a view to the future rather than rehashing the problems we have today with a look to the past.

Herb, in his letter, has identified what we feel to be the three most significant issues that need to be addressed in this revision of the Comprehensive Plan. Please read that letter, then answer the questionnaire attached to this memo,

and return your answers to Susan Price at The Tartan. She can be reached by email as **Error! Hyperlink reference not valid.**. We will tabulate the responses, which will allow Herb to speak for over one hundred investors and property owners that are part of our organization.

This is a Time for Action. This memo is a Call to Action for each of us. There are those who will speak in opposition to the positions Herb has put forward, and as usual those voices will be heard. Do not let our precious opportunity to substantially improve this significant portion and amenity of our community become lost due to our silence.

Thank you so much for your assistance. Robert F. Denny, Treasurer, TIG



To: Lancaster County Board of Supervisors

Lancaster County Planning Commission

Last week (2/15/07) at the Planning Commission meeting, there was a compelling slide show with overlays illustrating the actual progress of development in Lancaster County. It surely reinforced the notion that growth is already in the PGA (primary growth area), and if you followed the Chairman's thought, that's where it will stay. It was also noted the waterfront is practically all developed. Major development in that area is not any longer a threat. There were several people who came before the Commission to protest growth, and those in the audience who were stage whispering the same. Once again, the Chairman took it upon himself to note that growth was not the issue; it was already a fact in that the zoning exists for most of the development which is now underway and will come in the future, and is by right.

The real issue for all is controlling the growth. That is done with ordinances which will permit development to be organized in a way which leaves more open space, satisfying the call for maintaining the rural character of our County. I have not heard anyone, citizen or developer, call for more growth in this County than is currently allowed. The purpose of the exercise presently underway is to establish a plan for properly organizing what is to come. Most all of the ground in the county has a by right residential component. On the whole, that means there is no zoning necessary for much if not all of the development taking place. The better place to focus our attention is on the concepts and then ordinances which will establish the means for orderly development as time passes. It is our obligation to those who come after us to see to it that the ground which is

obviously going to be used anyway, is used in a manner which leaves the County we all hold dear in the most pleasant and attractive state possible. This has been my playground since 1958, and my home since 1986. I am devoted to this place. The subdivisions which are presently being laid out and recorded are ill conceived as a result of the present ordinances. They are really throwbacks to the 1950's designs. We should have progressed beyond that thinking. I have listened to people who are against everything, and after a while they cancel themselves out as they make their pleas before the governing bodies. They speak at every opportunity, generally offering no constructive solution to anything, as their comments are assembled to override and oppose, not to be creative and positive. They declare they want to preserve the rural character of the County. That is an admirable goal, and, I believe, one which is the goal of all parties, including those developing the various parcels as the market calls for it. Assuming we are all of the same mind, that is to control the development and future growth of the community, why don't we act like it? There are three major issues before us. They are Sewer, Conservation Planning (cluster), and the 800 overlay restriction.

There exists an underutilized sewer facility which is an economic drain to Kilmarnock and offers a real solution to most of the primary growth area for providing sewer to the properties to be built. RWC and New Tides LLC are about to construct additions to existing, or new sewer plants. This has created a storm of controversy. Those boutique plants should not be built when there is a more practical solution at hand. The already existing plant is there and has capacity. The capital investment has been made, and all the DEQ issues are resolved. The best planning for sewer is behind us, or should be. Let's quit the turf war. The extension of lines is modest in cost compared to the redundant costs to be incurred in adding more plants around the community. Proper maintenance can and will be addressed, and that is a manageable, but much more difficult issue with the boutique operations.

Other communities around the commonwealth can site horror stories about the boutique plants they now operate out of necessity. For some that seems to be the solution for local sewer here at the moment. Let's do something about this before we repeat the same mistakes. In extending the reach of the Kilmarnock system, the community would have control of the sewer, rather than the myriad entities created to build them, and over which there is not public control for consistent operating efficiency. We would also not have an Authority over which there is no control either.

Conservation Planning should be employed to retain as much rural character in the County as possible. This requires thoughtful ordinances laying out the parameters for the lot development and open space requirements. Let our consultants bring these concepts to the table. Randall Arendt has written much and performed his role well all around the Commonwealth and throughout the United States. Call upon him, or someone with his credentials if necessary to help bring it all together.

The 800 foot overlay is not well conceived and has wrought all sorts of inequities throughout the county. It is a symbol of no growth, not a real tool to make things more attractive. In fact, the rule has made development planning a nightmare and brings about problems with all sorts of development issues. A partial solution to this issue is to permit cluster development in the overlay district within the PGA (primary growth area) only. As a trade off, limit the density to some percentage of that presently permitted by right on the specific site. Allow it to be clustered to give the same benefit of open space, but taking away many of the problems found in lot line issues, etc., which disappear. The subdivision layouts would be much more reasonable and attractive. The lots would be consistent in design and size, and open space would be assured into the infinite future. If you want to focus the growth where it is designated, do so permitting some reasonable planning. The ripple effect of the layout of subdivided lots is to create lots with huge variance in lot sizes, which is both inefficient and

reasonable planning. The ripple effect of the layout of subdivided lots is to create lots with huge variance in lot sizes, which is both inefficient and unattractive. If you intend no new growth outside the PGA, leave the overlay in place until time and circumstances dictate a further review of the situation, but follow through with the stated goals.

We have the unusual opportunity to do something we will all be pleased with and benefit from over time, and it is a shame not to take advantage of it. It is unusual for all these forces to come together at once, and while presenting a challenge, it is possible to make a real model for the rest of the commonwealth with our efforts here in Lancaster County.

Herbert L. Aman III, President Tartan Investment Group LLC 2/22/2007

		======	======
<b>.</b>			

Response to Tartan Investment Group on the Issues of:

- 1. Sewer Plant Alternatives
- 2. Conservation Planning
- 3. 800 Foot Overlay

Please indicate below your position concerning Herb's stated position on these topics. We would also appreciate more extensive comments if you wish to make them.

<u>Item We Agree We Disagree</u>	
Sewer Plant	
Conservation Planning	
800' Overlay	

Sign if you wish, then return by e-mail (<u>tartansusan@kaballero.com</u>), or by