

At a regular meeting of the Southampton County Board of Supervisors held in the Board Room of the Southampton County Office Center at 26022 Administration Center Drive, Courtland, Virginia on May 23, 2005 at 8:30 AM.

SUPERVISORS PRESENT

Dallas O. Jones, Chairman (Drewryville)  
Walter L. Young, Jr., Vice-Chairman (Franklin)  
Walter D. "Walt" Brown, III (Newsoms)  
Carl J. Faison (Boykins-Branchville)  
Anita T. Felts (Jerusalem)  
Ronald M. West (Berlin-Ivor)  
Moses Wyche (Capron)

SUPERVISORS ABSENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

Michael W. Johnson, County Administrator (Clerk)  
Richard E. Railey, Jr., County Attorney  
Julia G. Williams, Finance Director  
Robert L. Barnett, Building Official/Zoning Administrator  
Cynthia L. Cave, Community/Economic Development Director  
Julien W. Johnson, Jr., Public Utilities Director  
Susan H. Wright, Administrative Secretary

Chairman Jones called the meeting to order, and after the *Pledge of Allegiance*, Supervisor Faison gave the invocation.

Chairman Jones sought approval of the minutes of the April 6, 2005 budget workshop, April 13, 2005 budget workshop, and April 25, 2005 regular meeting. They were approved as recorded, as there were no additions or corrections.

Regarding highway matters, Chairman Jones recognized Mr. Randolph Cook, Resident Engineer of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).

Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was a pair of quarterly reports – one was a statewide report from Commissioner Shucet and the other was a local residency report from Mr. Cook. On the statewide level, the numbers of projects completed on time and within budget continued to improve on Commissioner Shucet's watch. And with the General Assembly's passage of the new \$848 million transportation program, more than \$256 million in highway deficits would be fully paid this year, which would free up additional state and federal funding for new construction projects. He advised that on the local level, upcoming projects would include the widening and paving of White House Road, the widening of Route 671 between Delaware Road and Shady Brook Trail to 5 lanes, and the ongoing pavement repair and resurfacing of U.S. Route 58.

Mr. Cook advised that along with that, to his knowledge, Southampton County only had one deficit that would be paid out of that, with some monies left on the Monroe Bridge project.

He acknowledged that there was a lot of grass that needed mowing in the County and they were working on it every day. They had a lot of resurfacing going on around the County also, and they should be finishing up probably in the next 2-3 weeks, except for the primary routes.

Chairman Jones asked how far they were going with the resurfacing on Route 58? Mr. Cook replied that they were done for this fiscal year. They had another project that hopefully would finish it all the way to Capron. He hoped they could start back in July but he did not know how quickly the money would become available.

Vice-Chairman Young advised that he had received a couple of calls and concerns about the water in the road on Delaware Road. He had not checked it out, but thought he knew where it was and would check it out and give him a call. Mr. Cook stated that he thought he knew where it was as well.

Supervisor Felts informed that she received a letter and briefly shared it with Mr. Cook prior to the meeting regarding "Children At Play" signs being placed on Peachtree Avenue in Sedley in the vicinity of Grace Memorial Methodist Church, as there were a lot of children that lived on that street. The letter was signed by 3 residents. Mr. Cook advised that he thought that signatures from people of at least 5 residences were required. Mr. Johnson advised that they had an adopted policy on the placement of "Children At Play" signs and he would be glad to get her a copy. He was fairly certain that that area would qualify, as did Mr. Cook. They just needed to be sure to get all of the signatures.

Supervisor Wyche asked what was the progress of Whitehouse Road? Did they get any bids? Mr. Cook advised that Whitehouse Road went back for bids this month, so hopefully by sometime this summer they would have contractors out there taking care of that problem. Supervisor Wyche asked what was the status of Indiantown Road? Mr. Cook advised that he did not have the Six-Year Plan with him, but Indiantown Road was in the Six-Year Plan and was a priority. Old Place Road was next on the list but he thought that Indiantown Road was next after that.

Supervisor Brown stated that in reference to the cluster of houses and the Baptist Church on Riverdale Road located in a curve, they were hoping that between Route 258 and Riverdale Road to the intersection of Sandy Ridge Road, they could get a 45 mph sign. He noted that there was a tragedy out there a couple weeks ago. Mr. Cook advised that he had already requested a speed study for that area.

Regarding monthly reports, Mr. Johnson received various reports and provided them in the agenda. They were Financial, Sheriff's Office, Communication Center Activity Report, Traffic Tickets, Building Inspections, and New Housing Starts. Also, Delinquent Tax Collection, Daytime E.M.S. Contract, Reassessment, Public Safety Radio System, and Personnel.

In reference to the Reassessment Report, Supervisor Brown asked if in the future, could that report indicate the approximate number of parcels remaining? Mr. Johnson replied that he would ask them to provide that information. He noted that we were roughly 46% complete.

In reference to the personnel report, Mr. Johnson announced that a number of employees of the Sheriff's Office received annual salary increases effective 05/01/05. The salary of Douglas G. Bailey increased to \$33,889, the salary of J. Michael Blythe increased to \$31,047, and the salary of Suzette B. Carpenito increased to \$33,669. Michael L. Darden's salary increased to \$33,547, Phillip G. Darden's salary increased to \$28,905, and Ben G. Davis's salary increased to \$27,832. The salary of Marcia L. Garriss, John N. Magette, and Roberta L. Neave increased to \$31,047, \$31,047, and \$27,832 respectively. The salary of Jerry L. Smith increased to \$22,510, the salary of Mark B. Turner increased to \$27,832, and the salary of Josh A. Wyche increased to \$38,658. He advised that J. Waverly Coggsdale, III of County Administration resigned effective 04/01/05. Valerie B. Taylor of the Sheriff's Office resigned effective 04/16/05. Vicki L. Xinos of the Sheriff's Office resigned effective 05/20/05. He stated that Raymond E. Merkh and Derek W. Ayers of the Sheriff's Office remained on active military leave. He asked that everyone keep them in their thoughts and prayers.

Moving forward to financial matters, Mr. Johnson announced that bills in the amount of \$970,583.99 were received. **Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, that the bills in the amount of \$970,583.99 be paid with check numbers 69248 through 69770. All were in favor.**

Moving to appointments, Mr. Johnson announced that he had served on the executive committee of the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC) for roughly 10 years and his term would expire June 30, 2005. He was eligible for reappointment. He noted that this appointment had historically been included in the County Administrator's job description and required 1 monthly meeting.

**Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to reappoint Mr. Johnson to the executive committee of the HRPDC. All were in favor.**

Mr. Johnson advised that as they may recall from their June 2004 session, Supervisor Faison was appointed to fill Mrs. Sykes' unexpired term, through December 31, 2005, on the Board of Directors for the Senior Services of Southeastern Virginia (SSSEVA). Supervisor Faison had indicated to him that he simply had too many work conflicts to continue to serve in this capacity

and had asked that they consider appointing another Board member to serve. He informed that the SSSEVA met on the third Thursday of March, May, July, September, and November at 1:30 PM in Chesapeake. An annual meeting was also held in January, but not necessarily on the third Thursday. He noted that Southampton County was also represented by Myrtle Claud and Arthur Harris, Jr., both of Branchville.

Supervisor Faison stated that he enjoyed serving on the SSSEVA Board, but Thursdays was probably the busiest day for court, and he had had to miss meetings because of that. He informed that Mrs. Myrtle Claud had resigned from the Board. The President of SSSEVA advised that he and Mr. Arthur Harris, Jr. could appoint someone to replace her. They had appointed David Price and he had been serving for about a month.

Supervisor West nominated Supervisor Brown to replace Supervisor Faison and he gladly accepted.

**Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisor Felts, to appoint Supervisor Walter D. "Walt" Brown, III to the SSSEVA Board of Directors to replace Supervisor Carl Faison. All were in favor.**

Supervisor Faison asked Mr. Johnson if they needed to do anything regarding the appointment of Mr. David Price or if that was satisfactory? Mr. Johnson advised that it may be appropriate to have this Board ratify that appointment for the record.

**Supervisor Faison moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to appoint Mr. David Price to the SSSEVA Board of Directors to replace Mrs. Myrtle Claude. All were in favor.**

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was correspondence from Ms. Pat Ward, Executive Director of the Blackwater Regional Library, regarding the expiration of Mr. Edward Gardner's term on that Board of Directors effective June 30 of this year. Mr. Gardner had indicated that he was unable to serve another term. He stated that there were ten (10) monthly meetings of the Board on the third Wednesday at 2:00 PM. Meetings were rotated among the various branch libraries in Franklin, Isle of Wight, Southampton, Surry, and Sussex. There were also approximately eight (8) additional committee meetings throughout the year, typically scheduled at the convenience of the members. He noted that in addition to Mr. Gardner, other current members of the Board from Southampton County were Alice Joyner (Berlin-Ivor), Dorothy Harris (Jerusalem), Joy Collier (Franklin), and Paige Sturdifen (Capron). Accordingly, they may wish for Mr. Gardner's successor to come from either the Boykins, Drewryville, or Newsoms District(s). He advised that the action he was seeking tonight was simply for Supervisors Faison, Jones, and Brown to reach consensus on who would be responsible for seeking a successor for Mr. Gardner.

Chairman Jones and Supervisor Faison both agreed to seek a successor. Supervisor West asked, couldn't that present a little bit of a problem if they had 2 viable candidates? Chairman Jones and Supervisor Faison assured Supervisor West that they would closely communicate with each other on this matter.

Continuing with appointments, Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was correspondence from Dr. Val Livingston regarding the expiration of Mr. James Ricks' term on the Genieve Shelter Board of Directors in August 2005. Mr. Ricks had indicated that he was unable to serve another term. He noted that the Genieve Shelter Board met six times annually on the third Monday of every other month at 5:30 PM in Suffolk. The action he was seeking this evening was simply to reach consensus on who would search for a successor for Mr. Ricks.

Supervisor West advised that he would like the opportunity to seek a successor, as he had someone in mind.

Mr. Johnson advised that as discussed last month, the new economic development marketing organization would be directed by a 5-member Board of Directors, with appointees nominated by the City of Franklin, Southampton County, participating foundations, Chamber of Commerce, and the Franklin-Southampton Alliance. Each of these 5 groups or organizations had been asked to nominate 3 candidates for submission to the recently expanded 15-member F-S Alliance Executive Committee (Warren Beale, Teresa Beale, Felicia Blow, Doug Boyce, Ernest Claud, Carolyn Crowder, Harriet Duck, Damian Dwyer, Carl Faison, Brian Hedgepeth, Mike Johnson, Donna

McCullough, Kent Pope, Sol Rawls, Rowland Taylor). The Executive Committee would exercise its discretion in the actual appointment of the 5 nominees, trying to insure geographic, racial, gender, and professional diversity. Only 1 of the 3 nominees from each group would be selected to serve. He advised that as shared last month, their 3 nominees needed to be among the best and brightest business and professional leaders in Southampton County. It had been suggested that each group at least begin by looking at business leaders that had participated in the work of the Alliance over the course of the past 18 months. Included in the agenda for their reference was a list of Alliance members, with each Southampton County member highlighted along with their current profession. He pointed out that if the work was to remain on schedule, it was very important that these nominations be made this month.

Supervisor West advised that he had made contact with Mr. Bob Felts in Ivor. Supervisor Faison advised that he would like to nominate Mr. Larry Blunt, but he had not yet contacted him.

Supervisor Brown stated that it appeared that they were not ready to make nominations at this time. He asked, what was window on this? Mr. Johnson advised that the timeline was an artificially imposed deadline, but they were really trying to have all the nominations in by May 31, as they had asked that of all the organizations.

Supervisor Felts advised that she had spoken to Mr. Jim Bradshaw today. He actually contacted her.

Mr. Johnson stated that he had heard the names Bob Felts, Jim Bradshaw, and Larry Blunt. Supervisor Faison stated that he would also like to contact Mr. Harrell Turner. Mr. Johnson advised that he needed consensus on 3 nominees. He clarified that only 1 of the 3 nominees would be appointed, but they had asked for 3 because, again, they were trying to balance the geographic, racial, gender, and professional diversity among the group.

Supervisor Brown stated that we were throwing names out, but this was a very important issue to this County. We needed to make sure that these people really wanted to be involved in this. Mr. Johnson advised that that was one of the reasons why it was suggested to look first at the membership of the Alliance. Those people had invested the last 18-20 months working on this project, so the assumption was that they would be willing to continue to serve.

Supervisor Faison advised that he would like to contact both Larry Blunt and Harrell Turner and then call Mr. Johnson with his nomination. Supervisor West advised that he would like to contact Massey Joyner as well, as they really needed representation from that end of the County, and then call Mr. Johnson with his nomination of either Massey Joyner or Bob Felts.

Mr. Johnson advised that he would await calls from Supervisors Faison and West by the end of the week.

Proceeding to citizen requests to address the Board, Chairman Jones recognized Mr. Larry Rose and Mr. Charlie Williams.

Mr. Larry Rose advised that he wanted to address the Board on an issue he felt very strongly about. He had been in Southampton County for 29 years and he was really proud of Southampton County and the job the Board was doing. He stated that his wife had open-heart surgery a couple years ago and she now needed a lot of exercise – a lot of walking. Unfortunately, he did not know of a paved track in Southampton County, and he was ashamed to say that. When it rained, the track at the high school became a mud field. There were a lot of people that used that track in the morning, afternoon, and night. One of the most persistent individuals (who used the track) was a past Board of Supervisors Chairman. Taxpayers believed that it was time to pave the track. They needed the hard surface. He was asking that the Board of Supervisors consider paving the track at Southampton High School.

Mr. Charlie Williams addressed the Board. He stated that he and Mr. Rose were 2 of the citizens in the County who spent a lot of time on projects to raise money for the school system, so they were not here asking them to do something that they had not personally contributed to themselves. He went to all the football games at all the other schools in the district, and all those other schools had a paved track. In asking for a track, they were not just talking about track meets. That was just for a short time during the spring. He pointed out that their team had to have track meets at other schools because we did not have a paved track. There were 739 students at the middle

school that used that field and unpaved track during Physical Education. Little League Football, High School Band, and cheerleaders for all sports used the track and field, and when it rained, they had to stand and walk around in water. This was affecting quite a number of kids in the County – not just a small few. He stated that he did not think that the money had been appropriated to the School Board to spend for a track. They wanted to bring this to the Board's attention because they were sure that some of them were not familiar with the conditions of the track. He asked that they kindly consider this. He thanked them for their time.

Supervisor Faison asked Mr. Johnson if he had any idea what the cost of a project like that would be? Mr. Johnson replied no. Supervisor Faison stated that he thought they should certainly look into it and put a dollar figure on it and see if it were something that the County could address. He had seen a lot of adults using the track also, so he thought it was a worthwhile project to look into.

Supervisor Wyche agreed that it was something the Board should look at, but commented that it would be nice if they had some figures as to what it would cost. Mr. Rose advised that he would be glad to get those figures. Supervisor Wyche pointed out that they appropriated a certain amount of money to the schools but they could not tell them how to spend that money. Mr. Rose stated that he knew the schools could use a lot more than what was appropriated to them, as he was there everyday, so he was pretty sure they needed some help with the track.

Supervisor Brown stated that he supported this but it would have to come out of some other fund, because they could not "line-item" or mandate how money allocated to the schools was spent.

Mr. Johnson advised that there were a number of avenues in which they could address those concerns. One was that they could fund that project outside of their appropriation to the schools with the school board's blessings, since it was their property. Or, they could simply enter into some kind of agreement with the school board where they would voluntarily agree to appropriate whatever funds the Board of Supervisors would provide to that project. So those issues could be addressed.

Chairman Jones stated that they would take this under advisement and see what they could do.

Continuing with citizen requests to address the Board, Chairman Jones recognized Mr. Todd Cales, Local Director of Western Tidewater AAU Basketball.

Mr. Todd Cales addressed the Board. He thanked them for allowing him to speak. He advised that he had been director of this program for the last several years, and for the fifth time, they were fortunate enough to have a team qualify for the national championship. That team was the boys team, ages 10 and under. They were hoping to travel to Fort Wayne, Indiana the week of July 24<sup>th</sup> to play for a national title. However, as in the past, it would not happen without their help. This group of young men had been together for 3 years. The first year they got beat bad and often. But every kid came back the second year and the results were a little better, but they still got beat up pretty bad. So he was not expecting a lot of them to come back this year, but he was wrong. Every one of them came back with the attitude that they were going to get better. They showed up for every practice and 31 games. They were the state runner-up, thereby qualifying for the national title. This was the fourth team he had coached and he could say that they were without a doubt the toughest and hardest working bunch of kids he had ever been around. They had earned their place in this tournament and deserved to go. As most of them knew, they hosted a big tournament every year in this area. They did it for two reasons. One was to raise money for the program, and the other was to give other teams and their parents a chance to spend a weekend in our area. They had gotten a lot of feedback every year from our hotels and restaurants that it was one of their busiest weekends of the year. As they knew, that equated to a lot of revenue for this area. So in a big way, they were giving back to the community.

He informed that the cost was \$8,000 just for travel, lodging, and the tournament entry fee. They had fundraisers in the works including car washes, discount nights at Dairy Queen and Applebees, and For Pete's Sake Restaurant was working with them on a barbecue dinner on June 25. They always carried their share of the load. But even as hard as these kids and their parents worked, it would not be enough. They were asking the Board for anything they could give them. If they could not find the funds this year, at least they could recognize these young men because they deserved it and had made this County proud. He, his assistant coach, Keith Doyle, and team coordinator, Cheryl Doyle, and the parents were very proud of them. He then introduced the players to the Board. There were 8 players, 5 of which were from Southampton County.

Supervisor Brown asked Mr. Cales what amount had they raised from fundraisers in the past? Mr. Cales advised that they had several fundraisers in the works and some of them were new, so he did not know how much they would generate. But they would need the support of the Board of Supervisors and Franklin City Council. Supervisor Brown advised that he was asking because he was wondering if they actually needed more than the \$8,000 to make the trip. Mr. Cales replied that \$8,000 was not going to do it. That figure did not include meals and there would be some expense to the parents. Mr. Cales excused himself from the meeting, as he had to attend the Franklin City Council meeting.

Chairman Jones stated that the Board had appropriated \$3,000 in the past.

Supervisor Faison advised that his sons had gone through this program. It was a great program and they represented Southampton County very well.

**Supervisor Faison moved, seconded by Supervisor Brown, to specially appropriate \$3,000 to the Western Tidewater AAU Basketball Association. All were in favor.**

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was copied correspondence from Mr. Justin Brooks of the City of Suffolk's staff, relative to redesignation of the Western Tidewater HOME Consortium. HUD guidelines required that we renew our 1995 Cooperative Agreement and pass a new resolution of support prior to May 31, 2005 in order to participate in the FY 2006-2009 program cycle. He advised that notwithstanding some widely-reported administrative issues last year associated with the Consortium's inability to expend the funds in a timely fashion, Southampton County had accessed more than \$913,000 in HOME funds over the past decade. The STOP Organization served as our direct subrecipient of these funds and provided housing rehabilitation services for qualified county residents, among other programs. He informed that it was necessary for the Board to adopt the resolution, included in the agenda, which would authorize our continued participation in the Consortium and further authorize him to sign the Cooperative Agreement, also included in the agenda, on behalf of Southampton County.

Mr. Johnson read aloud the following resolution:

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION IN THE  
WESTERN TIDEWATER HOME CONSORTIUM FOR THE  
PURPOSE OF OBTAINING FEDERAL FUNDING UNDER THE HUD HOME  
INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Western Tidewater HOME Consortium was established on June 7, 1995; and

WHEREAS, the Western Tidewater HOME Consortium must be recertified for participation beginning in 2006; and

WHEREAS, the County of Southampton has receive \$913,534 in HOME Investment Partnership Funds over the course of the past decade; and

WHEREAS, many low and moderate income families have received a benefit from the HOME Investment Partnership funds; and

WHEREAS, HOME Investment Partnership funds provide additional financial resources to the County of Southampton and the Western Tidewater region to alleviate certain housing conditions through activities including but not limited to new housing construction, home ownership assistance, and home rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, every citizen should have a decent, safe, and sanitary living environment in which to live and the County of Southampton supports efforts to affirmatively further fair housing; and

WHEREAS, the continuation of the Western Tidewater HOME Consortium is necessary in order to receive further HOME Investment Partnership funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOVED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton, Virginia that the County formally supports its continuing participation in the Western Tidewater

HOME Consortium and designates its County Administrator to do all things necessary to submit a proposal for funding and to implement the program.

Adopted this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of May, 2005.

TESTE:

---

Michael W. Johnson, Clerk  
Board of Supervisors

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to adopt the resolution and authorize the County Administrator to sign the Cooperative Agreement. All were in favor.**

Chairman Jones advised that he had been informed of a lady in the County in her late 80's who was almost homeless because her house was falling down. Mr. Johnson asked Chairman Jones to get him her name and address and he would have Mr. Sessoms of STOP contact her directly to see if she qualified for the program.

Supervisor Faison asked, regarding the Consortium's inability to expend the funds in a timely fashion, did that impact Southampton County? Mr. Johnson advised that it impacted the entire Western Tidewater Region. HUD withheld the funding for one fiscal year pending the Consortium getting some issues resolved. They were just not spending the money fast enough.

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was an application for a fireworks permit from Charles B. Darden, Jr., pursuant to **Sec. 10-73** of the *Southampton County Code*. The display was scheduled for July 2, 2005 at approximately 9:15 PM, with a rain date of July 3. The application was in order and a draft permit was included in the agenda for their consideration.

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to approve issuance of the fireworks permit. All were in favor.**

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was notification that Southampton County's share of the 2005 State Homeland Security Program grant was \$35,227. In order to access the funding, it was necessary that the Board adopt a resolution designating the County Administrator as its agent and authorizing him to execute all the required forms on their behalf. He noted that a copy of the proposed resolution was included in the agenda for their consideration. He advised that unless otherwise instructed, it was his intention to apply the funding towards equipment associated with the new public safety communications system, a qualifying expenditure under the terms of the grant.

The resolution is as follows:

**DESIGNATION OF APPLICANTS AGENT**

**RESOLUTION**

BE IT RESOLVED BY OF Board of Supervisors OF Southampton County

THAT Michael W. Johnson , County Administrator

Is hereby authorized to execute for and in behalf of

Southampton County , a public entity established under the laws of the State of Virginia, this application and to file it in the appropriate State Office for the purpose of obtaining certain Federal financial assistance under the OJP, National Domestic Preparedness Office Grant Program(s), administered by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

That, Southampton County , a public entity established under the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia, hereby authorizes its agent to provide to the Commonwealth and to the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) for all matters pertaining to such Federal financial assistance any and all information pertaining to these Grants as may be requested.

Passed and approved this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of May , 20 05

- Dallas O. Jones
- Walter L. Young, Jr.
- Walter D. Brown, III
- Carl J. Faison
- Anita T. Felts
- Ronald M. West
- Moses Wyche

**CERTIFICATION**

I, Michael W. Johnson , duly appointed and Clerk for the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County , do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a

Resolution passed and approved by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County

On the 23<sup>rd</sup> Day of May , 20 05

Date: May 23, 2005 Clerk to the Board

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to adopt the resolution. All were in favor.**

Proceeding to consideration of the FY 2006 annual budget and associated tax levies, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was a copy of the budget synopsis as advertised for public comment. (A public hearing was held on May 16, 2005.)

The budget synopsis is as follows:

**FY 2006 REVENUE ESTIMATES**

<b>REVENUE FROM COUNTY SOURCES:</b>		<b>BUILDING FUND REVENUE:</b>	
GENERAL PROPERTY TAXES	12,851,079	UTILITY TAX - ELECTRICITY	464,000
OTHER LOCAL TAXES	825,562	UTILITY TAX - TELEPHONE	343,507
PERMITS, PRIVILEGE FEES & REGULATORY LICENSES	95,250	TRANSFER - UTILITY RESERVE	549,412
FINES & FORFEITURES	498,021	RENTAL OF PROPERTY	60,556
REVENUE FROM THE USE OF MONEY & PROPERTY	35,000		
CHARGES FOR SERVICE	368,825	<b>TOTAL REVENUE/BUILDING FUND</b>	<b>1,417,475</b>
MISCELLANEOUS REVENUE	685,949		
<b>TOTAL REVENUE/COUNTY SOURCES</b>	<b>15,359,686</b>	<b>REVENUE FROM THE COMMONWEALTH:</b>	
<b>OTHER COUNTY SOURCES:</b>		NON-CATEGORICAL AID	172,034
TRANSFER IN/GEN FUND RESERVE	768,217	CATEGORICAL AID	3,056,715
TRANSFER IN/BLDG FUND	0	OTHER CATEGORICAL AID	491,127
SCHOOL FUNDS/SCHOOL FOOD	563,870	SCHOOL AID/SCH OPERATING	12,754,059
SCHOOL FUNDS/SCHOOL OPER	2,000	SCHOOL AID/SCHOOL FOOD	13,755
		SCHOOL AID/SALES TAX	2,991,010
<b>TOTAL REVENUE/OTHER COUNTY SOURCES</b>	<b>1,334,087</b>	PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	1,732,949
<b>E-911 REVENUE:</b>		<b>TOTAL REVENUE/STATE</b>	<b>21,211,649</b>
TRANSFER FROM E-911 RESERVE	34,713		
E-911 REVENUE	144,000	<b>REVENUE FROM FEDERAL SOURCES:</b>	
PSAP FUNDS	37,809	SCHOOL AID/SCHOOL OPER	11,500
		SCHOOL AID/FEDERAL PROGRAMS	1,477,706
<b>TOTAL REVENUE/E-911</b>	<b>216,522</b>	SCHOOL AID/SCHOOL FOOD	480,000
<b>ENTERPRISE REVENUE:</b>		<b>TOTAL REVENUE/FEDERAL</b>	<b>1,969,206</b>
WATER SERVICE FEES	270,705		
SEWER SERVICE FEES	703,153	<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>42,542,125</b>
OTHER FEES/CONNECTIONS	59,642		<b>=====</b>
<b>TOTAL REVENUE/ENTERPRISE FUND</b>	<b>1,033,500</b>		

**FY 2006 EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES**

<b>GENERAL FUND:</b>		<b>E-911 FUND:</b>	<b>216,522</b>
<b>GENERAL GOV'T ADMINISTRATION:</b>			
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	103,875	<b>ENTERPRISE FUND:</b>	
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION	276,139	UTILITY EXTENSION	225,049
COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE	213,452	ENTERPRISE/SEWER	850,175
BOARD OF ASSESSORS	63,184	ENTERPRISE/WATER	508,380
TREASURER	202,144		
DELINQUENT TAX COLLECTIONS	56,700	<b>TOTAL ENTERPRISE</b>	<b>1,583,604</b>
ACCOUNTING	157,077		
DATA PROCESSING	198,367	<b>BUILDING FUND:</b>	
INSURANCE/COUNTY CODE	103,246	BUILDING FUND	1,417,475
REGISTRAR	123,018	TRANSFER TO SCHOOL FUND	(262,566)
		TRANSFER TO ENTERPRISE	(128,000)
<b>JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION:</b>		<b>TOTAL BUILDING FUND</b>	<b>1,026,909</b>
CIRCUIT COURT	61,008		
COMBINED DISTRICT COURT	20,926	<b>SCHOOL FUND:</b>	
SPECIAL MAGISTRATES	1,438	INSTRUCTION	15,868,061
CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT	112,636	ADMIN., ATTENDANCE & HEALTH	1,172,185
SHERIFF-BAILIFF	347,002	OTHER DIRECTION & MANAGEMENT	2,202,843
COURTHOUSE SECURITY	51,483	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE SER	2,598,411
COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY	352,862	SCHOOL FOOD SER & NON OPER	82,170
		FACILITIES	204,026
<b>PUBLIC SAFETY:</b>		DEBT SERVICE	1,991,001
SHERIFF	1,367,475	RENTAL TEXTBOOK	126,260
SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICER PROG	34,405	TECHNOLOGY	206,000
VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS	249,688	AT RISK 4 YRS OLD	62,191
VOLUNTEER RESCUE SQUADS	867,203	EARLY READING INTERVENTION	28,044
STATE FORESTRY SERVICES	13,257		
DETENTION	2,278,104	<b>FEDERAL SCHOOL FUNDS:</b>	
PROBATION	52,696	TITLE I	601,500
INSPECTIONS	52,779	TITLE VIB SP ED-FLOW THROUGH	515,192
ANIMAL CONTROL	77,701	TITLE VI INNOVATIVE EDUC PROGRAM	22,195
MEDICAL EXAMINER	1,500	SUBSTANCE & DRUG PREVENTION	20,470
EMERGENCY SER & CIVIL DEF	27,032	VOCATION SPECIAL EDUCATION	60,336
		PRE-SCHOOL INCENTIVE	15,442
<b>PUBLIC WORKS:</b>		SLIVER GRANT	18,617
STREET LIGHTS	39,000	TITLE IIA TRAINING & RECRUIT	157,897
REFUSE COLLECTION	362,121	COMMUNITY SERVICE GRANT	50,000
REFUSE DISPOSAL	1,090,234	TITLE IID ED TECH	16,057
BUILDINGS & GROUNDS	396,282	<b>TOTAL SCHOOL FUNDS</b>	<b>26,018,898</b>
<b>HEALTH &amp; WELFARE:</b>		<b>SCHOOL FOOD:</b>	<b>1,057,625</b>
LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT	281,540		
MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES	71,706	<b>VIRGINIA PUBLIC ASSISTANCE FUND:</b>	
STATE & LOCAL HOSPITALIZATION	5,982	ELIGIBILITY ADMINISTRATION	625,707
TRANSPORTATION PROG-ELDERLY	5,265	SERVICE ADMINISTRATION	472,828
COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES ACT	57,991	JOINT ADMINISTRATION	347,867
TRANSFER TO SOCIAL SERVICES	(10,500)	BENEFIT PROGRAMS	554,520
COMMUNITY SERVICE	1,706	ENERGY ADMINISTRATION	19,660
		VIEW ADMINISTRATION	68,263
<b>PARKS, RECREATION &amp; CULTURAL:</b>		<b>TOTAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE</b>	<b>2,088,845</b>
CULTURAL	4,000		
RAWLS MUSEUM ARTS	10,000	<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>42,542,125</b>
CULTURAL ENRICHMENT	3,500	=====	
WALTER C RAWLS LIBRARY	183,877		
		GENERAL FUND CAPITAL PROJECTS	1,962,319
<b>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT:</b>			
PLANNING/ZONING	197,212		
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	150,000		
SOIL & WATER CONS DISTRICT	10,000		
COOP EXTENSION SERVICE	54,789		
<b>NON-DEPARTMENTAL</b>			
NON-DEPARTMENTAL OPERATING	168,620		
<b>TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES</b>	<b>10,549,722</b>		

Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to adopt the FY 2006 annual budget as advertised. All were in favor.

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was an ordinance establishing the 2005 (FY 2006) tax levy.

The ordinance is as follows:

TAX ORDINANCE

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia, that for the year 2005 there is hereby levied:

1. A tax of \$0.74 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all real estate in Southampton County, including manufactured homes.
2. A tax of \$4.00 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all taxable, tangible, personal property located in Southampton County, except household goods and personal effects.
3. A tax of \$1.95 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all farm machinery and farm implements, save and except machinery described in paragraph 4 herein below, located in Southampton County.
4. A tax of \$1.25 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all farm machinery designed solely for the planting, production or harvesting of a single product or commodity, located in Southampton County.
5. A tax of \$0.74 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all real estate and \$4.00 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all taxable, tangible personal property of public service corporations based on the assessment fixed by the State Corporation Commission of Virginia.
6. A tax of \$2.40 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all machinery and tools.
7. A tax of \$0.50 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on merchant's capital.
8. A tax of \$2.40 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all heavy construction machinery, including but not limited to land movers, bulldozers, front-end loaders, graders, packers, power shovels, cranes, pile drivers, forest harvesting equipment and ditch and other types of diggers.
9. A tax of \$2.40 per \$100.00 assessed valuation on all motor vehicles, trailers, and semitrailers with a gross vehicle weight of 10,000 pounds or more used to transport property for hire by a motor carrier engaged in interstate commerce.

All levies shall be due on or before December 5, 2005.

**Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to adopt the ordinance establishing the 2005 (FY 2006) tax levies. Chairman Jones and Supervisors Brown, Faison, Felts, West, and Wyche voted in favor of the motion. Vice-Chairman Young voted in opposition to the motion. The vote was 6-1 in favor of the motion, thus the motion passed.**

Moving forward to public hearings, Mr. Johnson announced that the first public hearing was being held for the following purpose:

To receive public comment on an offer by Southampton County to convey to Sanzio Properties, LLC approximately 1.756 acres of real property in the Franklin Magisterial District on Southampton Parkway, in front of the Southampton Business Park for \$70,000.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing. No members of the public desired to speak. Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to authorize conveyance of the property described above to Sanzio Properties, LLC for \$70,000. All were in favor.**

Mr. Johnson advised that the second public hearing was being held for the following purpose:

To receive public comment on a proposed ordinance to amend and reordain Article V, Chapter 16, Section 16-204, et seq., of the *Southampton County Code* for the purpose of increasing water and sewer connection fees and imposing facility fees for new water and sewer connections.

The ordinance is as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 16 OF THE SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY CODE, 1991, SO AS TO REVISE WATER AND SEWER CONNECTION CHARGES AND IMPOSE WATER AND SEWER FACILITY FEES

-----

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that the Southampton County Code be, and hereby is amended and reordained so as to amend Article V, Chapter 16, Section 16-204, et seq. and reading as follows:

CHAPTER 16  
ARTICLE V  
Fees; Service Charges

**Sec. 16-204. *Water charges generally.***

(a) There shall be a water connection fee, payable to the county at the time application is made for connection to the water distribution system, as follows:

USE	TYPE OF CONNECTION	CONNECTION FEE
Single-family dwelling	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$1,000.00
Single-family dwelling	1" water tap	\$1,500.00
Mobile homes	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$1,000.00
Duplex (Two-family dwelling)	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$1,800.00
Duplex (Two-family dwelling)	1" water tap	\$2,675.00
Townhouse or apartment (for the first 6 units)	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$600.00 per unit
Townhouse or apartment (for the first 6 units)	1" water tap	\$1,000.00 per unit
Townhouse or apartment (for each additional unit above 6)	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$425.00 per unit
Townhouse or apartment (for each additional unit above 6)	1" water tap	\$700.00 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$900.00 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	1" water tap	\$1,500.00 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	1 1/2" water tap	\$1,875.00 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	2" water tap	\$2,500.00 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	> 2" water tap	Cost of meter + 25%
Fire service line	2"	\$2,600.00
Fire service line	3"	\$3,800.00
Fire service line	4"	\$4,500.00
Fire service line	6"	\$7,600.00
Fire service line	8"	\$10,500.00
Fire service line	> 8"	\$12,500.00

(b) Where the above schedule of connection fees is not applicable to an application for water service, the proposed service shall be investigated by the administrator. The administrator, upon completion of his investigation, shall recommend to the board a fair and equitable connection charge to be assessed to the applicant.

(c) For residential subdivisions where water distribution mains and meters have been installed at the expense of the developer in accordance with county standards, and such water mains and meters have been dedicated to and accepted by the county, the water connection fee shall be one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per meter.

**Deleted:** Water connection fees.

**Deleted:** (1) For a building under one (1) roof, owned or leased by one (1) party, and occupied as one (1) business or residence, the connection fee will be four hundred fifty (\$450.00) or the cost to the county should the cost of connection exceed four hundred fifty (\$450.00). ¶

**Deleted:** (2) Reserved. ¶

(3) For a duplex house (defined as having two (2) dwelling units under one (1) roof), the connection fee will be eight hundred (\$800.00) or the cost to the county should the cost of connection exceed eight hundred (\$800.00). ¶

(4) For multifamily dwellings (defined as dwellings containing three (3) or more living units), the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (a) of this section for the first dwelling and three hundred dollars (\$300.00) for each dwelling unit in addition to the first unit. ¶

(5) For motels, tourist cabins and tourist courts, where multiple units or cabins use a single water source connection, there shall be an availability charge as stated in subsection (1) of this section for the first dwelling unit, and for each dwelling unit in addition to the first unit the charge shall be: ¶

**Deleted:** a. For a 0--50 unit installation \$200.00 ¶

**Deleted:** b. For a 51--100 unit installation 175.00 ¶

**Deleted:** c. For an over 100 unit installation 150.00 ¶

(6) For trailer parks and mobile home parks, the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (1) of this section for the first unit or lot, plus a charge of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each trailer or mobile home space or lot. ¶

(7) For shopping centers and commercial groups (where two (2) or more stores or commercial establishments are grouped together to form a complex having one (1) water connection and meter for the entire group), the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (1) of this section for the first unit, plus three hundred fifty dollars (\$350.00) for each additional store. ¶

(8) For subdivision developments (where water distribution mains have been installed at the expense of the developer in accord with standards of the county and such mains dedicated to and accepted by the county), the connection fee shall be three hundred dollars (\$300.00) each. ¶

(9) For restaurants, the connection fee shall be four ... [1]

**Deleted:** (10) For filling stations, the connection fee shall be four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00), plus one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per delivery hose. ¶

**Deleted:** (11) Schools, the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (1) above, plus (Reserved) per pupil. ¶

**Deleted:** (12) Hospitals and institutions, the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (1) above, plus (Reserved) per bed. ¶

**Deleted:** (13) Subsequent to the approval of the initial application for such water service connections outlined above, no service shall be provided for any additional single or multiple units or spaces before the connection fee or fees are paid therefor. ¶ ... [2]

**Deleted:** (14) Where the above schedule of connection fees is not applicable to an application for water service, the proposed service shall be investigated by the administrator. The administrator, upon completion of his investigation, shall recommend to the board a fair and equitable availability charge to be assessed to the applicant. ¶ ... [3]

**Deleted:** (15) The board may waive connection fees where these fees are paid on behalf of individuals by third parties, or by contract with grantor agencies. ¶

**Deleted:** (16) Reserved.

(d) In addition to the connection fee set forth in subsection (a), (b) or (c) of this section, at the time a building permit is obtained from the county, each applicant shall pay a facility fee to reimburse the county for system capacity that is made available for the intended use, in accordance with the following schedule:

USE	TYPE OF CONNECTION	FACILITY FEE
Single family dwelling	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$1,500.00
Single family dwelling	1" water tap	\$2,500.00
Mobile homes	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$1,500.00
Duplex, townhouse or apartment	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$1,500.00 per unit
Duplex, townhouse or apartment	1" water tap	\$2,500.00 per unit
Motels and hotels	varies	\$500 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$1,500.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional	1" water tap	\$2,500.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional	1 1/2" water tap	\$5,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	2" water tap	\$8,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	3" water tap	\$15,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	4" water tap	\$25,000.00

**Sec. 16-214.** *Sewer charges generally.*

There shall be a sewer connection fee, payable to the county at the time application is made for connection to the county sewage system as follows:

USE	CONNECTION FEE
Single-family dwelling	\$1,800.00
Mobile homes	\$1,800.00
Duplex (Two-family dwelling)	\$2,700.00
Townhouse or apartment	\$1,350.00 per unit
Motels and hotels	\$400.00 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	\$1,800.00 per unit

(b) Where the above schedule of connection fees is not applicable to an application for water service, the proposed service shall be investigated by the administrator. The administrator, upon completion of his investigation, shall recommend to the board a fair and equitable connection charge to be assessed to the applicant.

(c) For residential subdivisions where sewerage collection lines have been installed at the expense of the developer in accordance with county standards, and such collection lines have been dedicated to and accepted by the county, the sewerage connection fee shall be one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per building lot.

(d) Whenever extenuating circumstances shall cause the actual cost, including material, equipment, and labor of installing a sewerage connection to exceed the connection fee set forth in subsection (a), the connection fee shall be equal to the actual cost. Connection fees exceeding

**Deleted:** Sewerage connection fee-- Required.

**Deleted:** (1) Single-family dwelling, building under one (1) roof, owned or leased by one (1) party and occupied as one (1) residence, nine hundred dollars (\$900.00). ¶

¶ (2) Duplex dwelling, two (2) living units under one (1) roof, five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per unit. ¶

¶ (3) Multifamily dwelling, a dwelling containing three (3) or more living units under one (1) roof, four hundred dollars (\$400.00) per unit. ¶

¶ (4) Motels, hotels, tourist cabins and tourist courts where multiple units or cabins use a single sewerage service connection, three hundred dollars (\$300.00) per unit or cabin. ¶

¶ (5) Trailer parks and mobile home parks, one hundred fifty dollars (\$150.00) per trailer or mobile home space. ¶

¶ (6) Subdivision developments where sewerage mains and service laterals have been installed at the expense of the developer in accordance with standards of the county and such mains and service laterals dedicated to and accepted by the county, five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per private residence. ¶

¶ (7) Commercial businesses, such as individual offices, shops, stores and the like, cost plus twenty (20) percent overhead plus one thousand, two hundred dollars (\$1,200.00). ¶

¶ (8) Shopping centers and other multi-unit commercial/office buildings, cost plus twenty (20) percent over ... [4]

**Deleted:** (10) Filling stations, for an installation with three (3) or less delivery hoses, one thousand, two hundred dollars (\$1,200.00); per additional hose in excess of three (3), two hundred dollars (\$200.00). ¶

**Deleted:** (11) Hospitals and institutions, where the county installs or has installed by contract sewer lines to provide services to the property, the fee shall be the cost plus twenty (20) percent overhead plus one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per residential unit (a unit to be defined as one (1) room with one (1) or two (2) beds). Where lines exist or the developer installs the lines in accordance with county requirements the fee shall be ... [5]

**Deleted:** (12) Hospitals and institutions, the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (1) above, plus (Reserved) per bed. ¶

**Deleted:** (13) Subsequent to the approval of the initial application for such water service connections outlined above, no service shall be provided for any additional single or multiple units or spaces before the connection fee or fees are paid therefor. ¶

**Deleted:** (14) Where the above schedule of connection fees is not applicable to an application for water service, the proposed service shall be investigated by the administrator. The administrator, upon completion of his investigation, shall recommend to the board a fair and equitable availability charge to be assessed to the applicant. ¶

**Deleted:** (15) The board may waive connection fees where these fees are paid on behalf of individuals by third parties, or by contract with grantor agencies. ¶

those set forth in subsection (a) by more than fifty percent (50%) may be financed over a period of three (3) years, due and payable monthly, at an interest rate equal to prime rate.

(e) In addition to the connection fee set forth in subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of this section, at the time a building permit is obtained from the county, each applicant shall pay a facility fee to reimburse the county for sewer system capacity that is made available for the intended use, in accordance with the following schedule:

USE	TYPE OF CONNECTION	FACILITY FEE
Single family dwelling	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$2,000.00
Single family dwelling	1" water tap	\$3,000.00
Mobile homes	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$2,000.00
Duplex, townhouse or apartment	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$2,000.00 per unit
Duplex, townhouse or apartment	1" water tap	\$3,000.00 per unit
Motels and hotels	varies	\$500 per unit
Commercial, industrial or institutional	5/8" or 3/4" water tap	\$2,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional	1" water tap	\$3,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional	1 1/2" water tap	\$5,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	2" water tap	\$8,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	3" water tap	\$15,000.00
Commercial, industrial or institutional uses	4" water tap	\$25,000.00

This ordinance shall become effective at 12:01 a.m., May 24, 2005.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing. No members of the public desired to speak. Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to adopt the ordinance. All were in favor.**

Mr. Johnson advised that the third public hearing was being held for the following purpose:

To receive public comment on a proposed ordinance to amend and reordain Chapter 18 of the *Southampton County Code* by defining the term, "canine training facility, commercial", and providing that land in the Agricultural A-1 zoning district may be utilized for such facilities, provided that a conditional use permit is issued, in advance, by the Board of Supervisors pursuant to Article XVII, Chapter 18 of the *Southampton County Code*.

The ordinance is as follows:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 18 OF THE SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY CODE TO ADD A PERMITTED USE IN THE AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT (A-1)

----

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that the Southampton County Code be, and hereby is amended and reordained and reading as follows:

ADD the following definition to Section 18-1 Definitions.

*Canine Training Facility, Commercial:* A contained or fenced area of land consisting of a minimum of one hundred (100) acres used for the sole purpose of training dogs to chase, run

or tree non-domestic animals as a public or private commercial endeavor in which a fee may be charged and is normally used by participants other than the landowner.

ADD the following permitted use to Section 18-37 Permitted Uses.

- (9) Canine training facility, commercial, with a conditional use permit

This ordinance shall be effective immediately upon adoption.

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing. No members of the public desired to speak. Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

**Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to adopt the ordinance. All were in favor.**

Mr. Johnson announced that the fourth and final public hearing was being held for the following purpose:

To received public comment on a proposed ordinance establishing the salaries of members of the Board of Supervisors for fiscal year 2006 at \$5,500 annually and providing an additional annual sum of \$1,800 for the board chairman and an additional sum of \$1,200 for the board vice chairman.

The ordinance is as follows:

AN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING THE SALARIES  
FOR MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
IN FISCAL YEAR 2006 AND THEREAFTER, UNTIL FURTHER AMENDED

-----

WHEREAS, Section 15.2-1414.3 of the 1950 Code of Virginia, as amended, provides an alternative procedure for establishing salaries of boards of supervisors; and

WHEREAS, this Board has published notice of its intention to consider this ordinance in accordance with the provisions of Section 15.2-1427, Code of Virginia.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that beginning on July 1, 2005, the annual salary of each member of the Board of Supervisors is hereby established at \$5,500; and,

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an additional annual sum of \$1,800 shall be provided to the chairman of the board; and

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an additional annual sum of \$1,200 shall be provided to the vice chairman of the board.

Adopted: May 23, 2005

Chairman Jones opened the public hearing. No members of the public desired to speak. Chairman Jones closed the public hearing.

Supervisor West stated that it was poor practice to raise taxes and salaries for county representatives in the same year. He could not, in good faith, be in favor of it.

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to adopt the ordinance. Chairman Jones, Vice-Chairman Young, and Supervisors Brown, Faison, Felts, and Wyche voted in favor of the motion. Supervisor West voted in opposition to the motion. The voted was 6-1 in favor of the motion, thus the motion passed.**

Regarding miscellaneous issues, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda was a copy of the recently-published Request for Proposals (RFP) for Pay and Classification/Organizational Staffing Study Services. Proposals were due Friday, May 27. He advised that the project would include:

- 1) a classification and compensation study of roughly 40 different positions in Southampton County's organizational structure including a comparison of our current salary structure to that of comparable local governments and private sector organizations. The study will develop comparisons for not only the County Administrator's staff, but also the respective staffs of all 5 constitutional officers and the Department of Social Services;
- 2) development of updated job descriptions for each position;
- 3) development of a classification system that keeps salaries throughout the organization in proper relation to one another;
- 4) identification of positions in our organization which are "exempt" and "non-exempt" under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA);
- 5) quantification of the cost of implementing any recommended changes; and
- 6) an organizational and staffing utilization study to identify the ideal number of employees in each department over the next 10 years.

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Brown, to authorize the County Administrator to proceed in contracting the services referenced above in accordance with the provisions of the RFP included in the agenda, the cost of which was not to exceed the amount budgeted for this purpose in the FY 2005 annual budget. All were in favor.**

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda for their consideration was a proclamation recognizing the weekend of May 27-29, 2005 as "Southampton County Training School Weekend." Alumni of the school had scheduled a grand reunion that weekend.

The proclamation is as follows:

### Proclamation

*Whereas*, Southampton County Training School was opened in the Fall of 1939 for the purpose of providing a centrally located high school to serve the secondary educational needs of the African American population in Southampton County; and

*Whereas*, Southampton County Training School provided quality educational opportunities for its many students from the time its doors opened in 1939 through its final year in 1963; and

*Whereas*, over its twenty-five years, Southampton County Training School served to effectively prepare its students for meaningful employment and active community involvement; and

*Whereas*, the graduates of Southampton County Training School have contributed immeasurably to the quality of life in Southampton County in addition to the many other counties, cities, and towns in which they may now reside; and

*Whereas*, the graduates of Southampton County Training School have scheduled a grand reunion to renew acquaintances and celebrate their many accomplishments during the weekend of May 27-29, 2005.

**Now, therefore**, in honor and recognition of the many graduates, teachers, and administrative and support staff of Southampton County Training School, the Southampton County Board of Supervisors does hereby proclaim and recognize the weekend of May 27-29, 2005 as "Southampton County Training School Weekend."

**And, further**, the Board of Supervisors encourages all its citizens to pause and reflect upon the exceptional educational opportunities imparted to its students by Southampton County Training School.

---

Dallas O. Jones, Chairman  
Board of Supervisors

**Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisors Felts and Wyche, to adopt the proclamation. All were in favor.**

Continuing with miscellaneous issues, Mr. Johnson informed that included in the agenda was correspondence from the County of Isle of Wight regarding our interest in participating with them in a regular regional forum along with the City of Franklin. The idea was to have a small committee (two elected officials and CAO's from each locality) that would meet regularly to discuss matters of mutual interest. In the late 1990's, a similar group existed, and was very helpful in facilitating communication and encouraging good will.

**Supervisor Wyche moved, seconded by Supervisor Faison, to appoint Chairman Jones and Vice-Chairman Young to serve on this committee. All were in favor.**

Mr. Johnson advised that included in the agenda was email correspondence from Dr. Patsy Joyner of Paul D. Camp Community College (PDCCC) seeking their interest in making an additional donation to the college in the form of a gold sponsorship of their upcoming annual golf tournament. She had indicated that the cities of Franklin and Suffolk and the County of Isle of Wight had already agreed. The tournament would be held on Monday, August 22 at the Cypress Cove Country Club. Gold sponsorship included 18 holes of golf for a team of 4, and a sign denoting the County's sponsorship on one of the eighteen holes.

**Supervisor West moved, seconded by Supervisor Brown, to specially appropriate \$500 to PDCCC and register for a gold sponsorship of their annual golf tournament. All were in favor.**

He advised that the following environmental notices were received:

- 1) From the Virginia Department of Health, a notice of violation to Southampton County for exceedence of the total coliform standard at the Southampton Business Park during the month of April;
- 2) From the Virginia Department of Health, a copied notice of violation to the 460 Café for failure to collect the required bacteriological samples during the first quarter of 2005;
- 3) From the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, a copy of the public notice regarding reissuance of a wastewater discharge permit to the Southampton Power Station.

He advised that copies of the following incoming correspondence were received:

- 1) From the Courtland Volunteer Rescue Squad regarding wear and tear on their zone car, associated with the recently-expanded EM services;
- 2) From James Chisolm, attorney for Dave Copeland, advising that he's been retained by Mr. Copeland to review the lease authorized by the County earlier this year;
- 3) From Robert Barnett, a copy of correspondence to Mr. Paul Tolson regarding the status of his rezoning application which was referred back to the Planning Commission last month;
- 4) From the South Centre Corridors RC&D Council, a copy of correspondence to Walt Young regarding his recent appointment to their group;
- 5) From the City of Franklin, notice that they have deferred consideration of extension of utilities to Forest Lakes and Riverwood Estates pending completion of a planned water and sewer study;
- 6) From the Town of Courtland, notice that they have approved the agreement for meter reading and utility billing services;
- 7) From the Town of Courtland, notice that a representative of the Commission on Local Government will attend their June 14 meeting to discuss annexation, generally;
- 8) From the South Centre Corridors RC&D Council, a copy of correspondence to M.L. Everett, Jr. regarding his recent appointment to their group;
- 9) From SPSA, an impact statement evaluating the costs and sacrifices associated with adoption of a \$46/ton tipping fee in FY 2006.

Mr. Johnson advised that outgoing correspondence and articles of interest were also in the agenda.

Moving forward, Mr. Johnson announced that included in the agenda for their consideration was a proposed ordinance regarding land use value taxation, which if adopted, would give citizens who owned qualifying agricultural, horticultural, forest, or open space real estate the opportunity to pay lower taxes based on the land use rather than fair market value. The ordinance was endorsed by the Land Development Task Force at its May 12 meeting. As they may recall, the 25-member Task Force included representatives of the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, respective Town Councils, and county staff, as well as citizens who had publicly expressed interest in the future growth and development of Southampton County. He advised that of the 25 members, 19 were present at the May 12 meeting and voted 17-2 to endorse the ordinance. He noted that a membership roster was included in the agenda for their reference.

Mr. Johnson then shared a brief PowerPoint presentation that provided a general overview of what land use taxation was, how it worked, and what the expected fiscal impact may be.

He advised that use value taxation had been authorized in Virginia since 1972 and was currently adopted by 70 of 95 Virginia counties. Its intent was “to foster the preservation of real estate for agricultural, horticultural, forest and open space use”. He stated that fair market value was the value of a particular parcel in its “highest and best” use. Use value was the amount that one would expect to sell the land for if it were restricted to one particular use (i.e. agriculture, forestry, etc.) He informed that the Virginia Farm Bureau Federation Study on use value taxation that was done in October 2004 assumed the following: 1) average cropland - \$400/acre, 2) average timber - \$540/acre, and 3) 60% participation rate among eligible properties. Their conclusion was that the real estate tax rate would need to be raised by six or seven cents per hundred based on the assumptions of the study.

He shared the following impact of use value taxation on a hypothetical farm:

Hypothetical Farm – 249 acres cropland

<u>FAIR MARKET VALUE</u>	<u>USE VALUE</u>
249 ac. X \$1,500 = \$373,500	249 ac. X \$400 = \$99,600
\$373,500/100 x \$0.67 = \$2,502	\$99,600/100 x \$0.67 = \$667

Mr. Johnson advised that the program would be voluntary and that applications to participate in the use value taxation program would be due to the Commissioner of the Revenue by November 1. The Commissioner would determine the eligibility of the parcel(s) and consult SLEAC (State Land Evaluation Advisory Council) and establish the “use value”. The Commissioner would then place use value and fair market value on the land book with the tax based on the use value. He stated that there were provisions in the ordinance to address delinquent taxes, use changes, rezoning changes, misstatements of facts, etc. He shared the following timeline:

- June 27, 2005 – Ordinance Adopted
- November 1, 2005 – Applications due
- June 1, 2006 – Land book complete
- October 1, 2006 – Tax bills mailed
- December 5, 2006 – Taxes due

He pointed out that perhaps the most significant matter associated with this issue was the fact that the ordinance must be adopted no later than June 30 of this year in order for the program to be made available in fiscal year 2007. Any delays would defer implementation by at least 12 months.

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor West, to advertise the ordinance for public comment at their June 27, 2005 regular session. All were in favor.**

Accordingly, a First Reading was held on the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REORDAIN CHAPTER 15 OF THE SOUTHAMPTON  
COUNTY CODE, 1991, SO AS TO PROVIDE A NEW DIVISION 3  
UNDER ARTICLE IV, SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FOR AGRICULTURAL, HORTICULTURAL,  
FOREST, OR OPEN SPACE REAL ESTATE

-----

BE IT ORDAINED by the Board of Supervisors of Southampton County, Virginia that the Southampton County Code be, and hereby is amended and reordained so as to provide a new division 3, article IV, Chapter 15, Section 15-96, et seq. and reading as follows:

CHAPTER 15  
ARTICLE IV  
DIVISION 3  
SPECIAL ASSESSMENT FOR AGRICULTURAL  
HORTICULTURAL, FOREST, OR OPEN SPACE REAL ESTATE

**Sec. 15-96. Findings.**

The County of Southampton finds that the preservation of real estate devoted to agricultural, horticultural, forest and open space uses within its boundaries is in the public interest and, having heretofore adopted a land use plan, hereby ordains that such real estate shall be taxed in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 of Chapter 32 of Title 58.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, the standards prescribed by the Director of the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, the Virginia Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services, the State Forester and this ordinance.

**Sec. 15.97. Application for special assessment; fees.**

(a) Applications for taxation of real estate on the basis of the use assessment shall be submitted to the commissioner of the revenue on forms provided by the Virginia Department of Taxation and supplied by the commissioner of the revenue. The application shall include such additional schedules, photographs, and drawings as may be required by the commissioner of the revenue.

(b) Applications shall be submitted:

(1) At least sixty days preceding the tax year for which such taxation is sought; or

(2) In any year in which a general reassessment is being made, until thirty days have elapsed after the notice of increase in assessment has been mailed to the property owner in accordance with § 58.1-3330 of the *Code of Virginia*, or sixty days preceding the tax year, whichever is later.

(c) The application shall be signed by all owners of the subject property. An owner of an undivided interest in the property may apply on behalf of owners that are minors or that cannot be located, upon submitting an affidavit attesting to such facts.

(d) A separate application shall be filed for each parcel or tract shown on the land book.

(e) An application fee of \$20.00 shall accompany each application.

(f) An application shall be submitted whenever the use or acreage of such land previously approved changes; provided, however, that no application shall be required when a change in acreage occurs solely as a result of a conveyance necessitated by government action or condemnation of a portion of any land previously approved.

(g) If any tax on the land affected by an application is delinquent when the application is filed, then the application shall not be accepted. Upon payment of all delinquent taxes, interest and penalties relating to such land, the application shall then be treated with the provisions of this section.

(h) Such property owner must revalidate annually with the commissioner of the revenue any application previously approved.

**Sec. 15-98. Determination of use value and assessment.**

(a) Promptly upon receipt of any application, the commissioner of the revenue shall determine whether the subject property meets the criteria for taxation under this ordinance, the provisions of

Article 4 of Chapter 32 of Title 58.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, and the applicable standards prescribed by the Director of the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, the Virginia Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services, and the State Forester.

(b) *Minimum acreage requirements.*

(1) Real estate devoted to:

- a. agriculture or horticultural use shall consist of a minimum of five acres; and
- b. forest uses shall consist of a minimum of twenty acres.
- c. open-space shall consist of a minimum of five acres, except that real estate adjacent to a scenic river, a scenic highway, Virginia Byway or public property shall consist of a minimum of two acres. A scenic river, scenic highway, Virginia Byway or public property under this paragraph means those which are listed in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreational Plan, also known as the Virginia Outdoors Plan.

(2) The foregoing requirements for minimum acreage shall be determined by adding together the total area of contiguous real estate excluding recorded subdivision lots in the same ownership. For purposes of this section, properties separated by only a public right of way are considered contiguous.

(c) In addition to meeting the foregoing requirements for minimum acreage, real estate devoted to open-space use shall be:

- (1) within an agricultural, a forestal, or an agricultural and forestal district entered into pursuant to Chapter 43 of Title 15.2 of the *Code of Virginia*, or
- (2) subject to a recorded perpetual easement that is held by a public body, and that promotes the open-space use classification as defined in § 58.1-3230 of the *Code of Virginia*, or
- (3) subject to a recorded commitment meeting the standards prescribed by the Director of the Department of Conservation and Recreation entered into by the landowner and the County of Southampton.

(d) If the commissioner of the revenue determines that the property does meet such criteria, he shall determine the value of such property for its qualifying use, as well as its fair market value.

(e) In determining whether the subject property meets the criteria for “agricultural use” or “horticultural use” the commissioner of the revenue may request an opinion from the Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services; in determining whether the subject property meets the criteria for “forest use” he may request an opinion from the State Forester; and in determining whether the subject property meets the criteria for “open space use” he may request an opinion from the Director of Conservation and Recreation. Upon the refusal of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services, State Forester, or the Director of the Department of Conservation and Recreation to issue an opinion, or in the event of an unfavorable opinion which does not comport with standards set forth by the respective director, the party aggrieved may seek relief from any court of record wherein the real estate in question is located. If the court finds in his favor it may issue an order which shall serve in lieu of an opinion for the purposes of this ordinance.

**Sec. 15-99. Taxation based on qualifying use.**

The use value and fair market value of any qualifying property shall be placed on the land book before delivery to the treasurer, and the tax shall be extended from the use value. Continuation of valuation, assessment and taxation based upon land use shall depend on continuance of the real estate in a qualifying use, continued payment of taxes as required in § 58.1-3235 and compliance with the other requirements of Article 4 of Chapter 32 of Title 58.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, the applicable standards prescribed by the Director of the Department of Conservation and Recreation, the Commissioner of Agriculture and Consumer Services, the State Forester, and this ordinance and not upon continuance in the same owner of title to the land.

**Sec. 15-100. Delinquent taxes.**

If on April 1 of any year the taxes for any prior year on any parcel of real property which has a special assessment as provided for in this ordinance are delinquent, the county treasurer shall send notice of that fact and the general provisions of § 58.1-3235 of the *Code of Virginia* to the property owner by first-class mail. If after sending such notice, such delinquent taxes remain unpaid on June 1,

the treasurer shall notify the commissioner of the revenue who shall remove such parcel from the land use program. Such removal shall become effective for the current year.

**Sec. 15-101. Change in use, zoning or area; roll-back taxes.**

There is hereby imposed a roll-back tax, and interest thereon, in such amounts as may be determined under Virginia Code § 58.1-3232, on real estate which has qualified for assessment and taxation on the basis of use under this ordinance, upon one or more of the following occurrences:

- (a) when the use by which it qualified changes to a more intensive use;
- (b) when it is rezoned to a more intensive use, as described in § 58.1-3237 of the *Code of Virginia*; or
- (c) when one or more parcels, lots or pieces of land are separated or split off from the real estate, as described in § 58.1-3241 of the *Code of Virginia*.

**Sec. 15-102. Failure to report changes; misstatements in application.**

(a) The owner of any real estate liable for roll-back taxes shall, within sixty days following a change in use, report such change to the commissioner of the revenue on such forms as may be prescribed. The commissioner of the revenue shall forthwith determine and assess the roll-back tax, which shall be paid to the treasurer within 30 days of assessment. On failure to report within 60 days following such change in use and/or failure to pay within 30 days of assessment, such owner shall be liable for any additional penalty equal to ten per centum of the amount of the roll-back tax and interest, which penalty shall be collected as part of the tax. In addition to such penalty for failure to make the required report, there is hereby imposed interest of one-half per centum of the amount of the roll-back tax, interest and penalty, for each month or fraction thereof during which the failure continues.

(b) Any person making material misstatement of fact other than a clerical error in any application filed pursuant hereto shall be liable for all taxes, in such amounts and at such times as if such property had been assessed on the basis of fair market value as applied to other real estate in the taxing jurisdiction, together with interest and penalties thereon, and he shall be further assessed with an additional penalty of one hundred per centum of such unpaid taxes. The term "material misstatement of fact" shall have the same meaning as it has under § 58.1-3238 of the *Code of Virginia*.

**Sec. 15-103. Applicability of state provisions.**

The provisions of Title 58.1 of the *Code of Virginia* applicable to local levies and real estate assessment and taxation shall be applicable to assessments and taxation hereunder mutatis mutandis including without limitation, provisions relating to tax liens and the correction of erroneous assessments, and for such purposes the roll-back taxes shall be considered to be deferred real estate taxes.

**Sec. 15-104. Effective date.**

This ordinance shall be effective for all tax years beginning on and after January 1, 2006.

A copy teste: \_\_\_\_\_, Clerk  
Southampton County Board of Supervisors  
Adopted: \_\_\_\_\_, 2005

**Chairman Jones announced that it was necessary for the Board to conduct a closed meeting in accordance with the provisions set out in the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, for the following purposes:**

**Section 2.2-3711 (A) (3) Discussion of the disposition of publicly held property where discussion in an open meeting would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body;**

**Section 2.2-3711 (A) (5) Discussion concerning prospective industries where no previous announcement has been made of the business' or industry's interest in locating its facilities in the community; and**

**Section 2.2-3711 (A) (7) Consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by counsel.**

**Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to conduct a closed meeting for the purposes previously read.**

Mr. Richard Railey, County Attorney, Mrs. Julia Williams, Finance Director, Ms. Cindy Cave, Community/Economic Development Director, and Mr. Julien Johnson, Public Utilities Director, were also present in the closed meeting.

Upon returning to open session, **Vice-Chairman Young moved, seconded by Supervisor Wyche, to adopt the following resolution:**

**RESOLUTION OF CLOSED MEETING**

**WHEREAS, the Southampton County Board of Supervisors had convened a closed meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and**

**WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3712 (D) of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Board that such closed meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.**

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Southampton County Board of Supervisors hereby certifies that, to the best of each member's knowledge, (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public matters as were identified in the motion convening the closed meeting were heard, discussed and considered by the Southampton County Board of Supervisors.**

**Supervisors Voting Aye: Dallas O. Jones  
Walter L. Young, Jr.  
Walter D. "Walt" Brown, III  
Carl J. Faison  
Anita T. Felts  
Ronald M. West  
Moses Wyche**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

---

Dallas O. Jones, Chairman

---

Michael W. Johnson, Clerk

c. For an over 100 unit installation 150.00

(6) For trailer parks and mobile home parks, the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (1) of this section for the first unit or lot, plus a charge of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for each trailer or mobile home space or lot.

(7) For shopping centers and commercial groups (where two (2) or more stores or commercial establishments are grouped together to form a complex having one (1) water connection and meter for the entire group), the connection fee shall be as stated in subsection (1) of this section for the first unit, plus three hundred fifty dollars (\$350.00) for each additional store.

(8) For subdivision developments (where water distribution mains have been installed at the expense of the developer in accord with standards of the county and such mains dedicated to and accepted by the county), the connection fee shall be three hundred dollars (\$300.00) each.

(9) For restaurants, the connection fee shall be four hundred fifty dollars (\$450.00) base charge, plus twenty-five dollars (\$25.00) per seat for zero to one hundred (100) seats and fifteen dollars (\$15.00) per seat for one hundred one (101) seats or more.

~~(13)~~ Subsequent to the approval of the initial application for such water service connections outlined above, no service shall be provided for any additional single or multiple units or spaces before the connection fee or fees are paid therefor.

(14) Where the above schedule of connection fees is not applicable to an application for water service, the proposed service shall be investigated by the administrator. The administrator, upon completion of his investigation, shall recommend to the board a fair and equitable availability charge to be assessed to the applicant.

(1) Single-family dwelling, building under one (1) roof, owned or leased by one (1) party and occupied as one (1) residence, nine hundred dollars (\$900.00).

(2) Duplex dwelling, two (2) living units under one (1) roof, five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per unit.

- (3) Multifamily dwelling, a dwelling containing three (3) or more living units under one (1) roof, four hundred dollars (\$400.00) per unit.
- (4) Motels, hotels, tourist cabins and tourist courts where multiple units or cabins use a single sewerage service connection, three hundred dollars (\$300.00) per unit or cabin.
- (5) Trailer parks and mobile home parks, one hundred fifty dollars (\$150.00) per trailer or mobile home space.
- (6) Subdivision developments where sewerage mains and service laterals have been installed at the expense of the developer in accordance with standards of the county and such mains and service laterals dedicated to and accepted by the county, five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per private residence.
- (7) Commercial businesses, such as individual offices, shops, stores and the like, cost plus twenty (20) percent overhead plus one thousand, two hundred dollars (\$1,200.00).
- (8) Shopping centers and other multi-unit commercial/office buildings, cost plus twenty (20) percent overhead plus one thousand, two hundred dollars (\$1,200.00) for the first rental space plus nine hundred dollars (\$900.00) per each additional rental space.
- (9) Restaurants, zero to fifty (50) seats, cost plus twenty (20) percent overhead plus one thousand, two hundred dollars (\$1,200.00); per additional seat in excess of fifty (50), twenty dollars (\$20.00) each.

- (11) Hospitals and institutions, where the county installs or has installed by contract sewer lines to provide services to the property, the fee shall be the cost plus twenty (20) percent overhead plus one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per residential unit (a unit to be defined as one (1) room with one (1) or two (2) beds). Where lines exist or the developer installs the lines in accordance with county requirements the fee shall be one hundred dollars (\$100.00) per residential unit as defined herein.