

AT A MEETING OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION ON JUNE 17, 2020 AT THE COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, CHRISTIANSBURG, VIRGINIA:

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Foster called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm in the Multipurpose Room on the first floor of the Government Center due to a power outage.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Mr. Workman called the roll to determine a quorum.

Present: Bill Foster, Chair
Trey Wolz, Vice-Chair
Adam Workman, Secretary
Coy Allen
Will Bulloss
Bryan Katz
Robert Miller
Bryan Rice
Sara Bohn, Board of Supervisors Liaison

Absent: Scott Kroll

Staff: Emily Gibson, Director of Planning & GIS Services
Brea Hopkins, Development Planner
Justin Sanders, Development Planner

PRESENTATION OF RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

Chair Foster asked Mr. Workman to share a resolution that had been prepared by the members of the Planning Commission. The resolution read as follows:

The Montgomery County, Virginia Planning Commission, in the execution of its planning, zoning and land-use responsibilities, relies upon a close professional working relationship with the County's Planning & GIS Department staff. It is appropriate at this moment to acknowledge the laudable efforts of the Planning & GIS Department employees.

Whereas, Executive Order #51, dated March 12, 2020, declared a State of Emergency in the Commonwealth of Virginia in response to the Covid-19 virus; and,

Whereas, response to Executive Order #51 necessitated the closure of County facilities to employees, thus requiring Planning & GIS Department employees, and indeed all County employees, to find alternative in-home work and communications capabilities; and,

Whereas, the ongoing volume of work has been handled primarily from employee residences for the last three months in order to comply with the limitations of inaccessible facilities and physical distancing; and,

Whereas, the employees of Montgomery County's Planning & GIS Department continued to surmount the challenges they encountered in order to capably accommodate the public need for said services; now therefore,

Be It Resolved, that the Montgomery County, Virginia Planning Commission does herewith offer its sincere appreciation for the commendable work ethic, resilience, and professionalism displayed by the employees of the Planning & GIS Department on behalf of the citizens of Montgomery County, Virginia.

On a motion by Mr. Workman, and seconded by Mr. Miller, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the resolution as presented.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion by Mr. Katz, and seconded by Mr. Workman, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the agenda as presented.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

February 12, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

On a motion by Mr. Miller, and seconded by Mr. Katz, the Planning Commission unanimously approved the consent agenda as presented.

Abstained: Will Bulloss

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. A request by **Oak Forest MHC, LLC.** (Agent: Gay and Neel, Inc.) to rezone a total of 8.013 acres from Agricultural (A1) to Planned Mobile Home Residential Park (PMR) to allow for the addition of twenty-three (23) mobile homes to the existing Oak Forest Mobile Home Park. The property is located **1070 Hightop Road, Blacksburg**; identified as Tax Map 066-A-99 (Parcel ID: 004860) in the Prices Fork Magisterial District. The property currently lies in an area designated as Urban Expansion in the Comprehensive Plan with no defined density; however, is stated to accommodate a full range of residential unit types and densities.

A request by **Oak Forest MHC, LLC.** (Agent: Gay and Neel, Inc.) for amendment of an existing Special Use Permit (SUP) approved in 2004 and last amended on June 14, 2010 to update the *Oak Forest Mobile Home Park Conceptual Plan* and allow for the addition of twenty-three (23) mobile homes to the existing Oak Forest Mobile Home Park. The property is located at 511 Payne Drive and 1070 Hightop Road and identified as Tax Parcels 066-A-98 and 066-A-99; (Parcel IDs: 016259 and 004860) in the Prices Fork Magisterial District. The property currently lies in an area designated as Urban Expansion in the Comprehensive Plan with no defined density; however, is stated to accommodate a full range of residential unit types and densities.

Ms. Hopkins presented the application and indicated that Mr. John Neel, agent, was present to answer any questions the Commission may have after staff's presentation.

Ms. Hopkins provided an overview of the application, which proposes rezoning of 6.79 acres to Planned Mobile Home Residential to allow for the addition of 20 additional manufactured homes to the Oak Forest Mobile Home Park. Ms. Hopkins also shared the request for a Special Use Permit, amending the existing Master Plan for the Oak Forest Mobile Home Park.

Ms. Hopkins provided the Commission with background information on the original 1984 rezoning, Special Use Permit, and master plan. The existing Special Use Permit has been amended five times, with the latest amendment in 2010. Ms. Hopkins noted that several amenities had been added to the

property since the 2010 SUP amendment and the park had been updated to current 911 addressing standards, including the naming of internal streets.

Ms. Hopkins provided an overview of the proposed lot configuration for the new 20 manufactured homes, noting proposed open space, installation of a new private street, and existing landscaping/tree cover that might be used to meet buffer requirements.

Ms. Hopkins reviewed VDOT comments which indicated that no entrance upgrades would be required and that no negative impacts were foreseen on existing traffic patterns and volume. Ms. Hopkins stated that the project may add approximately 12 students to the school system, and that no comments were received from Montgomery County Public Schools.

Ms. Hopkins noted that the property does not lie within a FEMA designated flood zone. A full review of erosion and sediment control measures and stormwater requirements would be provided at site plan submission. Ms. Hopkins also noted that a fire hydrant would be installed as part of the project.

The Comprehensive Plan designates the site as "Urban Expansion" with no defined density. The Comprehensive Plan designation does accommodate a variety of residential types and densities. Ms. Hopkins stated that the proposed rezoning appears consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and qualified for consideration for rezoning.

Ms. Hopkins then outlined the staff analysis of the existing Special Use Permit. She noted that staff suggests the removal of the following conditions:

3. Final development plans shall be approved by the zoning administrator prior to the issuance of building permits. Rationale: Site plans and zoning permits are required by Montgomery County Code.

4. & 5. Related to bus shelter construction. Rationale: Bus shelter is constructed

8. Related to drainage improvements and easements required. Rationale: This project has been completed.

9. Restoration of existing detention pond. Rationale: This project has been completed.

Ms. Hopkins noted that staff has suggested modifications to remaining conditions clarifying maintenance requirements and to updating the master plan references. In addition, she commented that staff recommends a condition to clarify the maintenance requirements of the private streets.

Ms. Hopkins stated that staff had received a letter from an adjacent property owner concerning the property which was distributed to the Commission for review.

Chair Foster then asked the Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Mr. Bulloss asked if any new trails or amenities were proposed as part of the application. Ms. Hopkins stated that no new amenities were to be added as part of the proposal the open space area would be passive recreation.

Mr. Katz asked Ms. Hopkins to indicate the location of the adjacent property referenced in the letter provided to the Commission.

Mr. John Neel, Applicant Representative and Project Engineer, referenced handouts provided to the Commission concerning the updates made to the park over the past few years. He highlighted the amenities added by the owners, the updates to the parks septic/sewer system, and the update of street names and 911 addresses. Mr. Neel also referenced information provided by the New River Valley Regional Commission regarding the need for increased affordable housing near Blacksburg and other commercial centers in Montgomery County. Mr. Neel expressed that he felt the proposed expansion would address the needs outlined in the NRVRC report.

Chair Foster then asked the Commission if there were any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Bulloss asked if any consideration had been given to connecting the expansion to existing roads within the park, noting that first responders often have difficulty navigating the private roads throughout the park because they often have to use reverse. Mr. Neel noted that these connections were not feasible due to the topographic conditions.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification on the proposed Type 3 buffer along the adjoining property line. Mr. Neel noted that the area near this property line was wooded, and that existing tree cover would be used along with new landscaping to meet the buffer requirements.

Seeing no additional questions for Mr. Neel, Chair Foster opened the public hearing at 7:32 pm.

Mr. Gary Walker, identified himself as the owner of 1074 High Top Road stated that "he had purchased the home due to the agricultural nature of the property. You currently see the open space and the trees, not the mobile homes. I am concerned about property values and traffic. High Top Road traffic is already dangerous. I am also concerned about water runoff. The previous owner had alpacas, this would change the whole nature of the property. With 20 units being placed on the property, I don't feel that this buffer would provide enough privacy."

Ms. Gibson noted that no other individuals had signed up to speak during the public hearing.

Seeing no additional speakers, Chair Foster closed the public hearing at 7:35 pm.

Mr. Katz expressed a reservation about the time needed for buffer plants to grow to provide the privacy and screening intended and asked if considerations could be made in plant selection to alleviate the amount of time needed for the plants to grow. Mr. Neel stated that evergreens could be considered.

Ms. Gibson noted that the Commission could consider adding a condition to the Special Use Permit for the planting of evergreens of a certain height and/or spacing as part of the buffer requirement.

Chair Foster asked about the specifics of a Type 3 Buffer and those of a Type 4 Buffer.

Mr. Wolze asked if a power line easement would preclude the planting of certain vegetation.

Ms. Hopkins outlined the requirements set forth in the ordinance regarding the Type 3 and Type 4 buffer yards.

Mr. Neel expressed a willingness to substitute evergreens in the Type 3 Buffer to address the concerns expressed.

Mr. Allen asked for clarification on whether the existing wooded area would be counted toward meeting the buffer requirements. Ms. Hopkins noted that the existing woods would be allowed as part of the buffer yard, but additional landscaping would be added.

Mr. Bulloss stated that while the addition of affordable housing meets the intent of the Comprehensive Plan, he questions the inclusion of Section HSG 1.2. Mr. Bulloss questioned whether the Planning Commission should be encouraging more mobile home parks in Montgomery County.

Mr. Rice commented that the need for more affordable housing exists in Montgomery County. He stated that the proposal meets the goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Rice also commented on Mr. Bulloss's statement saying that it would be difficult under current regulations to construct a new mobile home park and expressed that he felt that it was reasonable to expand an existing park under the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Wolz stated that he felt that the proposal does meet the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. He also noted that he felt the buffer could be changed to accommodate the concerns of the adjacent property owner.

Mr. Allen stated that he felt that the proposal meets the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that he felt that the buffer should be maximized as much as possible, making it wider and more dense to address the privacy and visual impacts noted by the adjacent property owner.

Mr. Katz expressed concern of the plantings selected for the buffer yard being placed too close together, stating that overcrowding could hamper the plant's growth and effectiveness as a screen.

Ms. Gibson stated that the Commission could recommend an evergreen screen in lieu of the standard buffer as a means to address the concerns raised from canopy trees shading out others.

Chair Foster asked if the developer could plant outside the property boundaries to provide additional screening for the adjacent property owner.

Ms. Gibson stated that the developer and the adjacent property owners could agree to plant additional plantings on the adjacent property. She noted that such an agreement would be conducted outside of the scope of the proposal, and not considered by Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors as part of the application process.

Mr. Bulloss asked about the network of trails on the site whether residents utilized them to access certain areas of the park. Mr. Neel stated that he did not have enough information to answer the question.

On a motion made by Mr. Katz, seconded by Mr. Wolz and carried by a 7-1 vote (Bulloss opposed), the Planning Commission recommended approval of the proposed rezoning request to rezone a total of 8.013 acres from Agricultural (A1) to Planned Mobile Home Residential Park (PMR) to allow for the addition of twenty (20) mobile homes to the existing Oak Forest Mobile Home Park.

In the same motion made by Mr. Katz, seconded by Mr. Wolz and carried by a 7-1 vote (Bulloss opposed), the Planning Commission further recommended approval of the Special Use Permit, with the following conditions recommended by staff:

1. The previous Special Use Permit (SUP) approved June 14, 2010 is hereby repealed and replaced with this SUP.
2. This SUP authorizes the build-out (expansion) of Oak Forest Mobile Home Park to a maximum of 234 units (an increase of up to 20 additional units above the previous SUP) and construction will be in general conformance with the Conceptual Plan Titled "Oak Forest Addition Overall Master Plan" prepared by Gay and Neel, Inc. dated 02-21-2020, last revised.

3. The amenities as shown on the plan shall be maintained by the developer. These amenities include recreation amenities, trails, bus shelter, cross-walks, and off-street parking as shown on the plan.
4. Private streets shall be maintained in good condition by the owner/developer and shall be easily accessible by emergency personnel.
5. Final development plans shall include specific fire hydrant locations installed throughout the park so that no mobile home is more than 500 feet by road from a hydrant, subject to engineering constraints. Fire protection shall be installed prior to the rental of any mobile homes over 186 units. All necessary fees for maintaining the hydrants shall be paid by property owner to Montgomery County PSA.

And the addition of the following condition:

6. Evergreen trees shall be installed as screening along any unwooded portion of the southern property line of Parcel ID 004860. Trees shall be a minimum of 6 feet in height at planting and placement of trees shall be designed to maximize screening from adjoining properties.

- B. An ordinance amending Chapter 10 entitled Zoning of the Code of the County of Montgomery, Virginia by adding **travel center** as a use permissible by special use permit in section 10-28(4), General Business, Section 10-30(4), M-1 Manufacturing and Section 10-31(4), M-L Manufacturing Light and by adding travel center as a defined use under section 10-61 definitions.

Ms. Hopkins came forward to present the proposed amendments to Chapter 10 of County Code concerning travel centers. Ms. Hopkins outlined the rationale behind the proposed amendments, stating that currently these types of facilities are not defined within the Zoning Ordinance and no comparable uses existed in the current Code. She noted that a potential applicant had come forward with a desire to locate a modern travel center within Montgomery County. Ms. Hopkins noted that for previous travel centers/truck stops, staff had worked to piece together various uses and regulations throughout the Zoning Ordinance to respond to applicants' projects. She stated that the new amendments would better allow for the development of a modern travel center that caters to trucks and the motoring public with a mix of needs.

Ms. Hopkins outlined the proposed definition for a travel center as *land area and buildings containing long-term parking (rest) area, motor-fuel sales, charging station, restaurant, convenience store, and other travel related services. A travel center shall be located within one-half (1/2) mile distance of interstate highway exit or major arterial routes. Also known as "Truck Stop"*. Ms. Hopkins then noted that the greater one-half (1/2) mile distance was advertised, so that the Commission could consider either the one-half (1/2) or shorter one-quarter (1/4) mile distance in their discussions.

Ms. Hopkins then provided graphics to the Commission showing the one-half (1/2) and one-quarter (1/4) mile distance radiuses superimposed on aerials from Exit 109 and Exit 128 on Interstate 81. Ms. Hopkins shared that Exit 105 would not support a proposed travel center because of the zoning district and Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Gibson noted that staff recommends the one-quarter (1/4) mile distance.

Ms. Hopkins then outlined the proposed additions of travel center as use permitted by Special Use Permit to the General Business (GB), Manufacturing (M1), and Manufacturing-Light (ML) zoning districts.

Chair Foster then asked the Commission if there were any questions for staff on the proposed amendments.

Mr. Miller asked which point was used as the center of the radius at Exit 109. Ms. Gibson responded that the center points were the locations where the exit ramps meet the local road.

Mr. Miller stated his concern that travel centers at Exit 109 could impact the small and large farms in that area. Ms. Gibson stated that the properties surrounding Exit 109 are contained within the designated Urban Development Area. She noted that the current Comprehensive Plan would support upzoning those parcels for future development even though they are currently fields.

Mr. Miller referenced Route 177 shared revenue agreement and asked if these changes would be supported by that agreement. Staff confirmed the agreement was related to water availability and development would need to be in compliance with that overlay district.

Mr. Bulloss asked why staff had recommended the one-quarter (1/4) mile distance. Ms. Gibson responded that staff felt the one-quarter (1/4) mile distance encompassed a large enough area to support the uses near the exit. She also noted the consistency with staff's recommendation for a one-quarter (1/4) mile distance for high rise signage from interstate exits.

Mr. Katz expressed concern over the inclusion of major arterial routes in the proposed definition. He stated that the inclusion of a major arterial route as a possible location for a travel center would provide a different set of circumstances than a center located off an interstate exit.

Mr. Bulloss asked if that "major arterial" meant a travel center could go on US 11 or US 460. Ms. Gibson stated that US 11 and US 460 were originally included.

Planning Commissioners discussed the distances and concluded the one-quarter (1/4) mile distance would be appropriate and could be revisited in the future if necessary.

Mr. Rice commented that his concern centered on the location of travel centers in curves or along smaller roads. Ms. Gibson noted that road geometry would be a major factor in the location of travel centers and that main roads would be necessary to accommodate the required access requirements for travel centers.

Seeing no further questions from the Commission for staff, Chair Foster opened the public hearing at 8:13 pm.

Mr. Steve Semones, of 1335 Cambria Street, Christiansburg, came forward to address the Commission stating that he "has a client who is interested in working with Balzer and Associates to bring a travel center to Montgomery County." Mr. Semones continued that he "has had conversations with the client concerning the distance from the interstate exit and we are supportive of staff's recommendation of one-quarter (1/4) mile."

Ms. Gibson noted that no other individuals had signed up to speak during the public hearing.

Chair Foster closed the public hearing at 8:14 pm.

On a motion made by Mr. Katz, seconded by Mr. Allen, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of an ordinance amending Chapter 10 entitled Zoning of the Code of the County of Montgomery, Virginia by adding travel center as a use permissible by special use permit in section 10-28(4), General Business, Section 10-30(4), M-1 Manufacturing and Section 10-31(4), M-L

Manufacturing Light and by adding travel center as a defined use, with the one-quarter (1/4) mile distance recommended by staff, under section 10-61 definitions.

- C. An ordinance amending Chapter 10 entitled Zoning of the Code of the County of Montgomery, Virginia by amending section 10-45 **sign regulations** by adding a definition for high rise sign to be a free standing sign up to forty feet (40') that may be located in Community Business (CB), General Business (GB), Planned Unit Development Commercial (PUD-COM), Manufacturing (M1), Manufacturing Light (ML) and Planned Industrial Districts under certain requirements on certain qualifying land in order to obtain sign visibility from an interstate highway and by allowing the high rise sign to exceed forty feet (40') under certain circumstances by grant of a special use permit.

Ms. Gibson came forward to present the proposed amendments to Chapter 10 of County Code concerning sign regulations. Ms. Gibson outlined the rationale for the proposed amendments to the sign regulations and noted that when the sign ordinance was updated, the decision was made to revisit specific issues brought up during the process at a later time. She noted that the amendments are proposed to address issues with limited signage for properties near the Interstate 81 interchanges which are zoned for development (or are designated for development on the future land use map) and properties seeking to increase visibility on the 460 Business Corridor.

Ms. Gibson provided the Commission with the proposed definition for a high rise sign as an *on premise freestanding sign up to forty (40) feet in height or greater with an approved special use permit, located in a non-residential zoning district and on a qualified parcel of land for the purpose of obtaining visibility from the interstate highway.* Ms. Gibson stated that the current sign ordinance limits free standing sign height to 12 feet.

Ms. Gibson noted that the Commission would need to select a distance from the Interstate exit or state or county road to define the area in which these high rise signage would be considered for a Special Use Permit. She then provided graphics to the Commission showing the one-half (1/2) and one-quarter (1/4) mile distance radiuses superimposed on aerials from Exit 109 and Exit 128 on Interstate 81. Ms. Gibson stated that staff recommends the one-quarter (1/4) mile distance.

Ms. Gibson then highlighted the changes to the sections of the ordinance concerning Special Use Permits for signage, noting changes to address both the 460 bypass and the Interstate 81 corridor.

Chair Foster then opened the floor for questions from the Commission for staff.

Mr. Miller expressed concern about the brightness of LED signs and the lumens emitted by signs along the Interstate corridors. He shared his observation that these signs are very bright and could often block vision of drivers. Mr. Miller asked if these considerations were taken into account in the proposed amendments and requested mapping to show the visual impact of forty (40) foot tall signs specifically at Exit 109.

Ms. Gibson stated that the existing sign ordinance does require that LED signs dim at night. She noted that more restrictions and considerations for Night Sky/Dark Sky compliant signage could be considered as part of a Special Use Permit. She also noted that light trespass considerations could be taken into account when approving a Special Use Permit for a high rise sign. Mapping could be provided but specific locations would be needed.

Mr. Bulloss asked if wireless communications facilities could be placed on high rise signs. Ms. Gibson noted that co-location of these facilities was supported by current State Code language adopted by the General Assembly and could not be prevented.

Mr. Bulloss then asked if it would be possible for an applicant to proffer not to put a wireless telecommunications facility on a sign. Ms. Gibson noted that she would discuss that issue with the County Attorney to make a determination. .

Seeing no further questions from the Commission for staff, Chair Foster opened the public hearing at 8:31 pm.

Ms. Gibson noted that no one had signed up to speak during the public hearing.

Chair Foster closed the public hearing.

Mr. Miller moved to table the proposed sign regulation amendments pending more information and modeling from staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Rice for discussion to proceed.

Mr. Katz stated that he did not believe all situations could be addressed through modeling and that standard language was needed to address signage regardless of location.

Ms. Gibson noted that it would be possible for staff to model a specific scenario, but it would be challenging to model multiple topographical areas. She also noted that the model would not account for tree cover and other factors.

Mr. Allen expressed that he did not feel that the additional visualizations would provide much more information and recommended voting on the proposal presented by staff.

Seeing no further discussion, Chair Foster called for a vote on the motion to table. The motion to table was defeated unanimously.

On a motion made by Mr. Allen, seconded by Mr. Bulloss and carried by a 7-1 vote (Miller opposed), the Planning Commission recommended approval of an ordinance amending Chapter 10 entitled Zoning of the Code of the County of Montgomery, Virginia by amending section 10-45 sign regulations by adding a definition for high rise sign to be a free standing sign up to forty feet (40') that may be located in Community Business (CB), General Business (GB), Planned Unit Development Commercial (PUD-COM), Manufacturing (M1), Manufacturing Light (ML) and Planned Industrial Districts under certain requirements on certain qualifying land in order to obtain sign visibility from an interstate highway and by allowing the high rise sign to exceed forty feet (40') under certain circumstances by grant of a special use permit.

PUBLIC ADDRESS

Chair Foster opened this portion of the meeting at 8:41 p.m. Having no speakers, the public address session was closed.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. WORKSESSION – Akers-Kidd Rezoning

A request by **Jerry L. and Vickie L. Akers** (Agent: Brushy Mountain Engineering) to rezone a total of 1.317 acres from Agricultural (A1) to Manufacturing Light (ML) to allow a Flex Industrial Use (Machine Shop) with proffered conditions. The property is located **10001 Roanoke Road**, Elliston; identified as Tax Map 060-A-9 (Parcel ID: 007525) in the Shawsville Magisterial District. The property currently lies in an area designated as Village Expansion in the 2025 Montgomery County Comprehensive Plan and further designated as Mixed Use in the Elliston-Lafayette Village Plan.

Ms. Hopkins came forward to provide an overview of the rezoning request. Ms. Hopkins shared that the current owners of the property were in negotiations to sell the property to Mr. Nathan Kidd, who seeks to open a machine shop on the site which is the former location of the Greenhill Meat Packing Plant in the Village of Elliston. Ms. Hopkins shared that the site was within an area designed as Village Expansion in the Comprehensive Plan and that it was designated as Mixed Use in the Elliston/Lafayette Village Plan. Ms. Hopkins stated that the request for rezoning would allow for a flex-industrial use, defined as *light industrial activities that occur in buildings of no more than two (2) stories in height, with one (1) or more loading docks, and not more than half of the gross floor area used for offices.*

Ms. Hopkins also presented the concept plan, highlighting the applicant's desire to utilize the existing building on site. The facility would utilize public sewer and an on-site well. She shared that VDOT has reviewed the existing entrance to Route 11/460 and determined that no updates are required at this time. Ms. Hopkins also noted the location of the property lines and their impact on landscaping and buffer yard requirements. She shared that the applicant does seek to remove some of the existing pavement to accommodate landscaping on the site.

Chair Foster asked members of the Commission if they had any questions for staff concerning the rezoning request.

Mr. Miller noted that there was no setback in the front based on the location of the existing building on the line.

Mr. Foster noted the turning radius for the loading dock may not be achievable as shown on the concept plan. Ms. Hopkins confirmed that the applicant had proffered for the development to be in "general conformance" with the concept plan so there may be adjustments once the site is fully engineered for site plan approval.

Seeing no further questions, the Planning Commission recommended that the application be forwarded on for public hearing at the July meeting.

B. WORKSESSION – McGrady-Lambert Rezoning

A request by **Jason and Indra McGrady** (Agent: Balzer and Associates, Inc) to rezone a 3.358 acre portion of a 5.295 acre parcel from Agricultural (A1) to Community Business (CB) to allow for the construction of a contractor service establishment. The property is located at **421 Jennelle Road, Blacksburg**; identified as Tax Map 067-10-2 (Parcel ID: 025143) in the Shawsville Magisterial District. The property currently lies in an area designated as Urban Expansion in the Montgomery County 2025 Comprehensive Plan.

AND

A request by **Jason and Indra McGrady** (Agent: Balzer and Associates, Inc) for a Special Use Permit to allow the construction of a contractor service establishment on the same parcel.

Mr. Sanders shared that staff had received a request to rezone a 3.358 acre portion of a 5.295 acre parcel from Agricultural (A-1) to Community Business (CB). If approved for rezoning, the applicant also

requests a Special Use Permit to construct a contractor service establishment on the rezoned parcel. Mr. Sanders shared that the parcel was located in an area designated as Urban Expansion in the Comprehensive Plan. Community Business (CB) zoning designations are a qualifying zoning designation in the Urban Expansion.

Mr. Sanders highlighted existing structures located on the property and the gravel driveway connection with Jennelle Road.

Mr. Sanders then shared the parcel layout proposed by the applicant. 3.358 acres of the parcel would be rezoned to Community Business, with the remaining acreage retaining the Agricultural zoning designation. The applicant seeks to construct a contractor service establishment on the rezoned parcel. A contractor service establishment is defined as *any establishment from which services are provided for building construction, building repair or building equipment installation or repair, such as, but not limited to flooring, heating and plumbing. The outdoor storage of equipment and/or materials shall be prohibited in a contractor's service establishment.* Mr. Sanders shared that the property owner is the owner of McGrady-Lambert Electric, and that the applicant seeks to move the company's main office from Salem to Montgomery County.

Mr. Sanders noted that the rezoned parcel would be serviced by private water and septic systems. He stated that VDOT had reviewed the entrance and determined that it met access requirements, however consideration should be given to paving the entrance due to the nature of trucks and other vehicles entering and exiting the site. Mr. Sanders shared that the property owner intended to use the existing metal building for equipment storage, and that no client meetings or work vehicle storage would occur on the site.

Mr. Sanders then shared a rendering of the proposed office building provided. The proposed structure would house 3-4 administrative staff.

Chair Foster then asked members of the Commission for any questions for staff regarding the application.

Mr. Katz asked if public water and sewer were required for the Community Business (CB) zoning designation. Ms. Hopkins shared that there was a provision in the zoning ordinance for properties who did not meet the public water and sewer criteria. She noted that the applicant must receive approval from the Virginia Department of Health that private water and sewer would be permitted on the site. Mr. Sanders noted that staff would work with the applicant ensure that that certification was received before the public hearing.

Mr. Sanders introduced Steve Semones, applicant representative and Project Manager for Balzer and Associates, who began with a kudos to the staff of Planning & GIS Services during the COVID-19 closure to the public. He then provided an overview of the proposed office design. Mr. Semones noted that the property owner had contracted with Balzer and Associates to perform the architectural services for the office design. Mr. Semones also noted that final design and landscaping would be designed in conjunction with staff during the site plan review process.

Seeing no further questions, the Planning Commission recommended that the application be forwarded on for public hearing at the July meeting.

Future Items Coming Before the Planning Commission

Ms. Gibson shared that staff had been working on four draft text amendments over the past few months and would be advancing those amendments forward for review by the Development Committee. These amendments concern a variety of issues including agricultural processing and telecommunications.

Ms. Gibson shared that there were three Agricultural and Forestral Districts are up for renewal this year. Letters will be sent to owners within the next week. Currently Mr. Rice is a liaison for this committee and asked the PC to determine if he will continue to serve in this role.

LIAISON REPORTS

Board of Supervisors – Supervisor Bohn began by expressing the Board of Supervisors gratitude to County staff for their efforts to continue to provide services during the pandemic and subsequent closure of the Government Center. She discussed the recent adjustments to Board of Supervisors meetings to accommodate social distancing, while still performing the work of the Board. Supervisor Bohn also shared that she was highly impressed by how the community has come together to provide extensive COVID-19 testing to the entire New River Valley. She also shared news regarding the collection of real estate taxes being on par with previous years. Finally, Supervisor Bohn shared her gratitude for the collaboration between Blacksburg, Christiansburg, and the County during the response to COVID-19. She noted that this collaboration would continue as the County allocates the \$8.3 million received from CARES Act funding.

Public Service Authority – The PSA had not met until the most previous month due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Supervisor Bohn shared that a public hearing had been scheduled to discuss a rate increase. She noted this would increase average bills by approximately \$5.00.

Blacksburg Planning Commission – Mr. Allen had no report to share

Christiansburg Planning Commission – Mr. Wolz had no report to share, but noted that the Planning Commission would meet on June 22. Mr. Rice may try to attend that meeting.

Radford Planning Commission – Mr. Miller reported that the Radford Planning Commission had met once over the past few months. The Commission will be considering Radford University's request to construct a new hotel and conference center on Tyler Avenue.

Tourism Council – Mr. Miller reported the Tourism Council has not met.

Parks and Recreation – Mr. Workman had no report to share.

Planning Director's Report – Ms. Gibson thanked members of the Commission for the thoughtful resolution recognizing staff. She noted that the past few months had been challenging, but she was proud of the efforts made by staff to continue to provide services to the County's citizens. Ms. Gibson shared that the new MyGIS OneView portal had launched and that staff was receiving positive feedback. She also shared that the GovSense permitting software would be going live in July. Finally, Ms. Gibson shared that the County was currently discussing ways in which to spend the CARES Act funding mentioned earlier by Supervisor Bohn.

ADJOURNMENT

With no additional business, Chair Foster adjourned the meeting at 9:25 p.m.