

The regular meeting of the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, October 23, 2018, in Rooms 226-228 of the Greenfield Education and Training Center in Daleville, Virginia, beginning at 12:30 P. M.

PRESENT: Members: Mr. L. W. Leffel, Jr., Chairman
Dr. Donald M. Scothorn, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Steve Clinton
Mr. I. Ray Sloan
Mr. Billy W. Martin, Sr.

ABSENT: Members: None

Others present at the meeting:

Mr. Michael W. S. Lockaby, County Attorney
Mr. David V. Moorman, Deputy County Administrator
Mr. Gary Larrowe, County Administrator

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 12:30 P. M.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board went into Closed Session to discuss personnel issues; consideration of the acquisition of property for public purposes or the disposition of publicly held real estate in the Amsterdam and Valley Districts where discussion in open session would adversely affect negotiations; discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry in the Amsterdam, Buchanan, Valley and Blue Ridge Districts where no previous announcement has been made of the business or industry's interest in locating or expanding its facilities in the County; and consultation with legal counsel and briefings by staff members or consultants on a proposed rezoning in the Amsterdam District and pertaining to contract negotiations regarding an agreement with Virginia Western Community College where such consultations or briefings in an open meeting would adversely affect the negotiating or litigating posture of the County pursuant to Section 2.2-3711(A) (1), (3), (5), (7), and (8) of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended. (Resolution Number 18-10-01)

AYES: Mr. Leffel, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Mr. Sloan

ABSTAINING: None

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 2:04 P. M.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board returned to regular session from Closed Session and adopted the following resolution by roll-call vote. (Resolution Number 18-10-02)

AYES: Mr. Leffel, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Martin

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

BE IT RESOLVED, that to the best of the Board members' knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempt from open meeting requirements and only such matters as were identified in the motion to go into Closed Session were heard, discussed or considered during the Closed Session.

Mr. Leffel welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked for a moment of silence.

Mr. Sloan then led the group in reciting the pledge of allegiance.

Mr. Leffel then asked Mr. John Griffin to come forward. He noted that Mr. Griffin recently resigned as the Fincastle District representative on the Planning Commission and a proclamation has been drafted and framed expressing the County's appreciation for his 14 years of service on that Commission. Mr. Leffel then read the proclamation as follows:

WHEREAS, Mr. John Griffin served as the Fincastle District representative on the Botetourt County Planning Commission from January 2004 through September 2018, which included several terms as Chairman and Vice-Chairman; and,

WHEREAS, during his tenure Mr. Griffin participated in dozens of rezoning, special exception, and text amendment public hearing requests, and contributed to significant revisions of the County Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances, along with updates to the County's Comprehensive Plan; and,

WHEREAS, Mr. Griffin has been a diligent and steadfast representative for Botetourt County by listening to the concerns of all citizens while the County experienced tremendous growth and economic development opportunities during his tenure; and,

WHEREAS, Mr. Griffin is held in high regard by the citizens, staff, and his peers on the Botetourt County Planning Commission for his genuine concern and patience, and his knowledge and background in development and construction will be greatly missed;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors, on its own behalf and on behalf of the citizens of Botetourt County, expresses their appreciation, gratitude and respect and recognizes Mr. John Griffin for the sincere dedication and commitment given to the Planning Commission and the County of Botetourt in helping the County grow and progress during his fourteen years of service.

Mr. Griffin stated that he has appreciated the Board's support over the years and wishes the Board the best at tonight's rezoning public hearing.

Mr. Leffel stated that he has learned a lot from Mr. Griffin. He noted that the Planning Commission does the "dirty work" in regard to land use-related requests and leaves the final decision of these requests to the Board. Mr. Leffel stated that he appreciates the relationship between himself and Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Griffin stated that he has enjoyed serving on the Planning Commission and wishes the Board good luck in the future.

Mr. Martin noted that he serves as the Board's ex-official member on the Planning Commission and has learned that Mr. Griffin is not afraid to make a decision/motion on complicated land use requests. Mr. Martin stated that he appreciates Mr. Griffin's knowledge of the building and development process and not being afraid to make a decision on rezoning/SEP applications. Mr. Martin wished Mr. Griffin all the best.

Mr. Leffel stated that two big events occurred in the County over the past month. He noted that on October 4 the grand opening of Eldor's new facility in Greenfield was held. He further noted that this facility is amazing and is "beyond state-of-the-art." Mr. Leffel stated that this is Eldor's only North American facility.

Mr. Leffel stated that the second event was the Broadband Summit held in late September. He noted that this event had very good attendance and the County is well on its way to getting a lot of things accomplished to provide broadband service to its citizens and businesses.

Mr. Leffel thanked Dr. Scothorn for spearheading this event.

Ms. Lee Minnix then spoke during the public comment period. Ms. Minnix stated she is present along with Troutville Mayor David Horton, Ms. Shirley Mullins, Ms. Sharon Smith, and

Mrs. Paige Ware to invite the Board to the dedication service for the new Blue Star Memorial on November 11 at 2PM at the Troutville Town Park. She noted that this memorial will be placed in the Town’s new memorial garden area.

Ms. Minnix stated that the Blue Star Memorial program, which honors the armed forces, has been around for over 65 years and currently has memorial sites on I-64, I-81, I-77, and I-95. She noted that an application was submitted and approved to have a byway marker placed on Route 11 in Troutville.

The Board thanked Ms. Minnix for this invitation.

Mr. Leffel stated that the Blue Star memorial on Route 43 in Eagle Rock looks great.

Mr. Jason Ferguson, Battalion Chief in the Department of Fire and EMS, then recognized Mr. Daniel Murray for obtaining certification through the National Emergency Management Institute’s Advanced Academy. He noted that this certification reinforces the qualities needed to lead emergency management programs, provides relevant management theories and concepts, and utilizes appropriate case studies within a collaborative environment with a network of peers.

The Board congratulated Mr. Murray on obtaining this certification.

Mr. Murray thanked the Board for their support and noted that he learned a lot while attending this academy. He noted that emergency management personnel from all over the country participated in this training session.

Consideration was then held on approval of transfers and additional appropriations. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that there was one transfer, 6 pass-through appropriations, and 2 regular appropriations for the Board’s consideration this month. He noted that the transfer was for repairs for various County departments at the County garage, the pass-through appropriations were for receipt of grant funds, donations, and cost reimbursements, and the regular appropriations were for a public safety project in the dispatch center and payment of a consultant’s invoice which was prepaid by a third party in FY 18.

There being no discussion, on motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following transfers and additional appropriations: (Resolution Number 18-10-03)

AYES: Mr. Leffel, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Martin

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Transfer \$1,160.74 to Sheriff’s Department - Vehicle & Power Equipment Supplies, 100-4031200-31200-6009, from the various departments as follows for vehicle repairs at the County Garage:

- \$ 16.30 Dep. Co. Admin.-Rep. & Maint.–Veh., 100-4012120-12120-3312
- \$ 92.39 Comm. Dev. - Rep. & Maint.–Veh., 100-4081200-81200-3312
- \$106.08 Animal Cont. – Veh. & Power Suppl., 100-4035100-35100-6009
- \$565.08 Co. Admin.–Other Oper. Suppl., 100-4012110-12110-6014
- \$ 20.70 Maintenance – Rep. & Maint.–Veh., 100-4043000-43000-3312
- \$ 93.82 Fire & EMS – Rep. & Maint.–Veh., 100-4035500-35500-3312
- \$ 13.89 General Svce.-Rep. & Maint.–Veh., 100-4040000-40400-3312
- \$ 71.83 Parks & Rec. – Veh. & Power Suppl., 100-4071100-71100-6009
- \$180.65 Van Program – Rep. & Maint – Veh., 100-4071500-71500-3312

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$7,500.00 to Fire & EMS – Capital Outlay - Other Capital, 100-4035500-35500-8012. These are State Local Emergency Management Preparedness (LEMP) grant funds received.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$100.00 to Library – Books & Subscriptions, 100-4073100-73100-6012. These are donated funds received from Bonsack / Blue Ridge Ruritan Club.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$1,211.60 to the following Correction & Detention accounts: \$1,059.66 to Medical & Lab Supplies, 100-4033100-33100-6004; and \$151.94 to Uniforms, 100-4033100-33100-6011. The former is for reimbursement of Craig County inmate medical expenses, and the latter is for contract payments.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$955.08 to the following Sheriff's Department accounts: \$720.00 to Forest Patrol Salaries, 100-4031200-31200-1900; \$55.08 to FICA, 100-4031200-31200-2100; and \$180.00 to Vehicle Supplies, 100-4031200-31200-6009. These are reimbursed expenses for National Forest patrols.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$1,125.26 to the following Sheriff's Department accounts: \$698.02 to Firing Range Expenses, 100-4031200-31200-6015; and \$427.24 to Subsistence & Lodging, 100-4031200-31200-5530. The former represents State reimbursements for meeting lodging and meals and the latter is for sales of brass casings from firing range activity.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$156.75 to the following Sheriff's Department accounts: \$140.97 to Uniforms, 100-4031200-31200-6011, and \$15.78 to Emergency Response, 100-4031200-31200-5870. The former is for contract payments and the latter is for the return of equipment.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$35,000.00 to Dispatch – Capital Outlay – Machinery & Equipment, 100-4031400-31400-8001. These funds are for a 911 Radio Console upgrade and the installation of a ductless air conditioner for the Dispatch server room.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$6,500.00 to Community Development, 100-4081200-81200-3100. This appropriation covers a consulting bill received and being paid this month that was prepaid by a third party in FY18.

A public hearing was then held to amend the FY 18-19 County budget to reappropriate funds from the FY 17-18 budget. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that, when a budget amendment exceeds 1% of the original, approved budget, the County is required by the State Code to hold a public hearing.

He noted that a staff committee reviewed the departmental reappropriation requests from the FY 18 budget and submitted a list of requests to the General Fund Budget Subcommittee for review. He noted that the Subcommittee's recommendations for reappropriations from the FY 18 budget into the FY 19 budget for projects that were not completed in FY 18 were included in the Board's information packets.

He noted that these requests total \$3,650,096; \$2.6 million from General Fund Operations and \$1.02 million in Capital Improvements Projects and includes \$1.2 million for two fire trucks for the Eagle Rock Volunteer Fire Department; \$158,545 for employee compensation adjustments, and \$930,000 to be transferred to the Economic Development Authority for local incentive payments and economic development projects.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that the total CIP request represents 28% of the \$3.6 million total and will fund continued projects including new tax software, public safety projects, and the solid waste disposal plan.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, it was noted that there was no one present to speak regarding this matter. The public hearing was then closed.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following reappropriation of funds from the FY 18 budget to the FY 19 budget: (Resolution Number 18-10-04)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Destination Acct. #	Account Description	Amount	Explanation/Reason For Request
General Fund Operations:			
100-4012510-12510-3320	Techn. Services - Maint. Service Contr.	18,000	Annual maint. subscription services
100-4012510-12510-8008	Techn. Services - Cap. Out. - App. Softw.	9,500	Desktop imaging package project
100-4012510-12510-8009	Techn. Services - Cap. Out. - App. Softw.	5,500	Active directory password mgr. proj,
100-4031200-31200-3311	Sheriff - Repairs & Maintenance – Equip.	4,052	Repair/replace existing radios
100-4031200-31200-5830	Sheriff - RAID Patrol	31,182	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4031200-31200-5860	Sheriff - Anti-Drug Education	200	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4031200-31200-6015	Sheriff - Firing Range Expenses	4,761	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4031200-31200-8005	Sheriff - Cap. Out. - Motor Vehicle/ Veh. Equip.	4,825	Additional costs - late arriving vehicles
100-4033100-33100-5820	Correction & Det. - Inmate Phone Comm.	33,597	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4033100-33100-6010	Correction & Det. - Police Supplies	12,893	Vests & radios not purchased in FY18
100-4035500-35500-6011	Fire & EMS – Unif. & Wearing Apparel	23,521	Ongoing PPE replac.
100-4035500-35500-5641	Fire & EMS - Cap. Out. - Vol. Fire Depts.	17,120	Remaining Fire Program Funds
100-4035500-35500-5651	Fire & EMS - Cap. Out. - Vol. Rescue Depts.	21,985	Remaining 4 for Life Program Funds
100-4035500-35500-8001	Fire & EMS - Cap. Out. - Machinery & Equip.	7,380	Continuation of SCBA project
100-4035500-35500-8005	Fire & EMS - Cap. Out. - Motor Veh./Veh. Equip.	1,208,685	Two firetrucks & outfit two SUV's
100-4035500-35500-8012	Fire & EMS - Cap. Out. - Other Capital	55,000	Troutville ladder truck project
100-4043000-43000-6003	Maintenance – Agric. Supplies	1,215	Maint. scheduling & work order system
100-4081200-81200-3100	Comm. Devel. – Prof. Services	63,535	Remaining balance - Housing Study
100-4081200-81200-5840	Economic Devel. - Marketing	15,000	Mktg. - Events & Grfld. Master Plan
100-4091000-91000-1100	Salary Adjustments	158,545	Multi-year market adjustments
100-4091800-91800-3800	Transfer to Econ. Dev. Authority	<u>930,000</u>	Local incentive payments & projects
Total	General Fund Operations	<u>\$2,626,496</u>	
CIP			
100-4094000-12510-8008-112	County Website Redesign	9,800	To continue project
100-4094000-12510-8009-101	Enterprise-Wide Software	24,229	To continue project
100-4094000-12510-8009-102	Tax Software	279,602	To continue project
100-4094000-21600-8012-416	Circuit Courthouse Complex	30,376	To continue project
100-4094000-31200-8005-205	Sheriff Mobile Data Safety Plan	45,649	To continue project
100-4094000-35500-8001-313	Cardiac Monitor Repl. Plan	8,500	To continue project
100-4094000-35500-8001-314	Radio System Repl. Plan	55,000	To continue project
100-4094000-35600-8001-312	Portable Radio Upgrades	75,000	To continue project
100-4094000-35600-8012-309	Mobile Radio Repl. Program	80,000	To continue project
100-4094000-42400-8012-406	Solid Waste Disposal Plan	150,000	To continue project
100-4094000-42400-8012-407	Leachate Tank Maintenance	41,890	To continue project
100-4094000-43000-8012-602	Greenfield ETC Utilization Study	50,000	To continue project
100-4094000-71000-8012-720	Greenway Project	30,375	To continue project

100-4094000-71000-8012-723	Community Rec. Incentive Prog. Greenfield Historic Preservation	5,000	To continue project
100-4094000-72243-8012-733	Matching Funds	40,000	To continue project
100-4094000-73100-3100-702	Library System/Program Study	20,000	To continue project
100-4094000-81510-9402-405	Infrastructure Improvements	<u>78,179</u>	To continue projects
Total	Capital Improvement Projects (CIP)	<u>\$1,023,600</u>	
Total	General Operations and CIP	<u><u>\$3,650,096</u></u>	

On motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Clinton, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following consent agenda item: (Resolution Number 18-10-05)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Approval of minutes of the regular meeting held on September 25, 2018.

Consideration was then held on approval of the accounts payable and ratification of the Short Accounts Payable List. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that this month's accounts payable totaled \$1,486,600.67. He noted that this month's large expenditures included \$475,000 from the Fire and EMS Department for the purchase of two ambulances; \$82,313 for the quarterly payment to the Health Department; and \$37,549 for the quarterly payment to Visit Virginia's Blue Ridge.

There being no discussion, on motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Clinton, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the accounts payable and ratified the Short Accounts Payable List as submitted. (Resolution Number 18-10-06)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mrs. Mary Blackburn, Human Resources Director, then recognized two employees who had recently completed the certification process on the fundamentals of payroll through the American Payroll Association. She then introduced Mrs. Roni Ramsey and Mr. Eddie McDaniel to the Board.

The Board congratulated Mrs. Ramsey and Mr. McDaniel for obtaining these certifications.

Consideration was then held on proposed amendments to the Purchasing Manual. Mr. Lockaby, County Attorney, stated that the County's Purchasing Manual has not been updated since 2013. He noted that there have been very substantial amendments to the State Code's purchasing regulations since that time. He stated that these amendments include provisions regarding architectural and engineering job order contracts where these services are incidental and directly related to the job, do not exceed \$25,000 per job order, and do not exceed \$75,000 per contract term; changes to the purchasing limits to increase the small purchase ceiling from \$50,000 to \$100,000; revisions on how the County handles the administration/oversight of internal purchases, and the requirement that all purchases over \$100,000 be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Lockaby stated that the County's previous purchasing practices were very decentralized; however, this process has been made more centralized over the past few years through new Purchase Order software. He noted that this manual's provisions ensure that all contracts are lawfully entered into.

He noted that the new regulations also allowed some purchasing decisions that were previously made by the Board of Supervisors to be authorized by the County Administrator. He stated that sole source procurement contracts not subject to the small purchase policy may be negotiated and awarded without competitive sealed bidding or competitive negotiation; however, such contract in excess of \$100,000 must be approved by the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Lockaby further stated that the County Administrator or Deputy County Administrator is required to document the basis for the sole source contract award for file retention purposes.

Mr. Lockaby stated that large contract awards (\$60,000 for Professional Services/ \$100,000 for other Goods and Services, and higher) will still be brought before the Board of Supervisors for approval.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Lockaby stated that specific sections of the Purchasing Manual can apply to the Economic Development Authority (EDA), subject to their adoption by the EDA. He stated that the EDA has a partial exemption to the State's purchasing provisions.

Mr. Lockaby further stated that the School Board has also previously used the County's Purchasing Manual in their purchasing process.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Larrowe stated that the Purchasing Manual's provisions that apply to the EDA can be brought before the EDA for review and consideration of adoption. After further questioning, Mr. Larrowe noted that the EDA has worked to follow the County's purchasing procedures in the past even though they are not subject to the State Procurement Act's provisions.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Lockaby stated that the EDA is considered a separate, independent entity similar to the constitutional offices' in regards to purchasing provisions.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton regarding architectural/engineering contracts, Mr. Lockaby stated that the \$500,000 limit is referring to the total payments to the contractor, not the value of the project worked on.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Larrowe stated that the County does use a construction contract's retainage and will continue to do so.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the revised Purchasing Policy and Procedures Manual dated November 1, 2018. (Resolution 18-10-07)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Ray Varney, Resident Engineer with the Virginia Department of Transportation, was then present to speak to the Board.

Mr. Varney then reviewed VDoT's monthly report. He noted that VDoT has now obtained approval for all of the environmental permits needed for the Route 220 safety improvement project. He noted that traffic flagging operations continue from 7AM to 6PM on

this project. Mr. Varney noted that the Route 11 bridge improvement projects over Tinker Creek are continuing and the estimated construction start date on the Ball Park Road bridge renovation project is April 2019.

Mr. Varney then stated that most of the paving work on International Parkway is completed except for line striping; paving of I-81 from mile marker 161.6 to 163.4 is completed; and two land development projects have been reviewed over the past month: Colonial Elementary School grading which has been discussed with the County and the entrance permit for the LARE property on Route 11 is being reviewed. He also noted that 10 private entrance, special event, and utility permits have been approved in the past month.

Regarding traffic engineering studies, Mr. Varney stated that VDoT's Traffic Engineering Department reviewed a citizen's request for placement of deer crossing signs on Etzler Road. He noted that they reviewed the roadway's 3 year crash history which showed that only 2 vehicle/deer crashes were reported during that time; therefore, the request does not meet their sign installation requirements.

Mr. Varney stated that they have also completed their evaluation of the request to allow right turns on red at the Route 11/220 intersection in Daleville. He noted that vehicles on Route 220 southbound wishing to make right hand turns onto Route 11 south will be allowed to do so. Mr. Varney noted that some traffic signal modifications will be made to accommodate this turning movement.

Mr. Varney stated that VDoT staff met to discuss the Route 220 corridor study last week and a recommendation and public meeting on this study will be scheduled for later this year.

Regarding the Azalea Road traffic study, Mr. Varney stated that this study was requested by the area's residents to determine the percentage of cut-through traffic to and from Catawba Road and Route 220. He noted that four different traffic travel directions were studied from 6:45 AM to 9:30 AM and from 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM.

Mr. Varney stated that VDoT's guidelines require that 40% of a through road's traffic (150 vehicles per hour) be cut-through before safety measures are taken. He noted that their study indicated that only 17% of the traffic between Route 779 and U. S. Route 220 is considered cut-through. He noted that their traffic counts showed that there were only 72 cut-through vehicles measured on Azalea Road during the study hours so this roadway does not meet VDoT's warrant limits for improvements.

Mr. Varney noted that VDoT would only be able to fund 50% of any approved traffic calming measures on Azalea Road, with the County being billed for the remaining cost.

Mr. Varney then stated that there is no set deadline for the contractor to complete installation of guardrail on Mountain Pass Road. He noted that this project is considered non-emergency work.

Regarding Ridgewood Drive, Mr. Varney noted that he discussed this roadway, which has two grass islands in the middle of the street, with the Board last month. He noted that the grass island in the middle of the roadway which previously contained a utility pole will be removed by VDoT staff and the grass island located in the cul-de-sac will remain.

Regarding various in-house projects, Mr. Varney stated that their personnel have been cleaning up from damages caused by Hurricane Michael and beginning prep work on various roadways that are scheduled for paving next summer.

Mr. Varney stated that improvements at the Route 11/Simmons Road intersection was also discussed last month. He noted that VDoT's survey division is working to stake the existing

right-of-way but additional property will need to be purchased from the adjacent property owner to make the anticipated right turn lane improvements. He noted that the existing turning lane is too short to accommodate turns by tractor trailers without the vehicles crossing Simmons Road's center line or their rear wheels going off the pavement. Mr. Varney stated that the paved area in this turning lane will need to be widened and he anticipates difficulties in obtaining the needed right-of-way from the impacted landowner.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Varney stated that 38' in additional easement width is needed. After further questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Varney stated that VDoT has not yet contacted the affected property owner.

Mr. Varney then discussed the Route 43/Shiloh Drive intersection. He noted that last month's Board meeting minutes stated that VDoT is in the process of purchasing the needed right-of-way from Mr. VanNess to improve the sight distance along Route 43 at this intersection. Mr. Varney stated that he may have misspoke as VDoT is not purchasing any land from Mr. VanNess for this project.

Mr. Varney stated that VDoT has provided the property owner with another alternative that would not impact the cultivated farm field adjacent to this intersection but which provides 400' of sight distance; however, Mr. VanNess has not yet agreed to this proposal. He noted that VDoT continues to work on this project.

After questioning by Mr. Sloan, Mr. Varney stated that there are individuals, other than VDoT/County officials who have contacted Mr. VanNess about these sight distance improvements. He noted that these particular discussions are not helping to resolve this situation.

Regarding previous discussion on improvements to the Route 460/Laymantown Road intersection including a new right turn lane and bridge improvements, Mr. Varney stated that VDoT staff reviewed this situation. He noted that currently there is no dedicated right turn lane from 460 westbound onto Laymantown Road; however, there is a wide shoulder area. Mr. Varney stated that the addition of a right turn lane would necessitate improvements to the bridge which currently has a low traffic safety rating.

Mr. Varney stated that, if improvements could be funded, VDoT would replace the bridge with a box culvert. He noted that the Laymantown Road traffic flow across the structure would need to be maintained during construction as there are no suitable detour routes in this area. He estimated that it would cost \$3 million to make the necessary intersection/bridge improvements which would include "armoring" the creek and increasing the slope at the top by approximately 6' to give adequate space for the new right turn lane, shoulder, and guardrail areas.

Mr. Varney stated that he does not know how this project would be funded as VDoT currently has no plans to improve this intersection.

Mr. Martin stated that it appears to him that these improvements would need to be completed before the new Colonial Elementary School is finished and we are going to "have to find the money."

Mr. Varney questioned if it is unacceptable for vehicles to continue to make right hand turns onto Laymantown Road out of the existing Route 460 westbound through lane.

Mr. Martin stated that the Blue Ridge Fire and Rescue units have concerns about this intersection and noted that "this is one project that we need to do."

Mr. Varney stated that the right-of-way is wide enough to accommodate this project; however, the creek is the problem. He noted that the bridge's most recent safety inspection rated this structure as a 5, which is low. Mr. Varney stated that VDoT can further review this

intersection if buses continue to make right hand turns out of the through lane once the new elementary school is operational.

Mr. Martin noted that it is vital that we do something as there is a real potential danger for accidents at this intersection.

Mr. Varney further stated that Murray Drive will also need to be improved to accommodate traffic to the new elementary school. He noted that no cost estimates for these improvements are yet available.

Mr. Martin then thanked Mr. Varney and Mr. Kevin Hamm for their quick and effective response to a drainage issue on Welches Run Road. Mr. Martin stated that he has also received a call from a resident of Zimmerman Road regarding grading, ditch, and erosion issues and asked that VDoT consider possibly paving the gravel road portion from the current paved section up to Pebble Drive.

Mr. Varney stated that VDoT is already reviewing this situation. He noted that it does not make sense for VDoT to continue to spend funds to grade this gravel road and they continue to lose road width from erosion.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Varney stated that installing culverts along this roadway is not recommended as they are more difficult to maintain. He noted that there is a new, flexible, pre-cast paver product available that could be a possible option for these ditches. After further questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Varney stated that this section of roadway could be considered for paving through the Rural Rustic Road (RRR) program.

After questioning by Mr. Sloan, Mr. Varney stated that Loope Lane does qualify for paving as the most recent traffic count was over 50 vehicles per day. He noted that this request would need to come before the Board for consideration; however, there are other gravel roads in the County with higher traffic counts that also need to be paved.

Dr. Scothorn stated that he is working with the Deputy County Administrator to schedule a meeting to discuss the drainage issue on Sanderson Drive. Dr. Scothorn also requested that the speed limit on Route 11 from Lawrence Transportation to McDonald's be reduced from 45 to 35 mph.

Mr. Varney stated that he would forward this request to the appropriate department for review.

Mr. Clinton then questioned what is the next step on the Azalea Road cut-through traffic study issue.

Mr. Varney stated that he will write a formal letter to the County explaining the study's results but suggested that the Sheriff's Department try to improve their traffic control measures in this area.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton regarding funding, Mr. Varney stated that VDoT could contribute a maximum of 50% of the project's cost. He noted that the County could submit proposed solutions to VDoT for review.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Varney stated that their traffic study showed that most of the traffic on Azalea Road is obeying the 25 mph speed limit.

The Board thanked Mr. Varney for his report.

Consideration was then held on an I-81 corridor improvement funding resolution. Mr. Cody Sexton, Assistant to the County Administrator, stated that the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) recently adopted a resolution requesting that the General

Assembly consider solutions to support improvements to I-81 through designated funding to specifically benefit the I-81 corridor region. He noted that this study is still ongoing and there is a VDoT meeting scheduled for October 25 to obtain public input on possible funding options.

Mr. Sexton noted that the total estimated cost of I-81 improvements from Winchester to Abingdon is \$3 billion.

He noted that Mr. Martin has requested that the Board consider adoption of a resolution similar to the TPO resolution. He noted that this resolution asks the State, Commonwealth Transportation Board, and General Assembly to look at all funding alternatives to improve I-81.

Mr. Martin noted that the TPO has requested that each member government adopt a similar resolution of support to fund these improvements.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the following resolution requesting that the Virginia General Assembly consider solutions to support improvements to Interstate 81 through designated funding to specifically benefit the I-81 corridor region and directed staff to forward the resolution to the County's General Assembly representatives, VDoT, and the Chairs of the House of Representatives and Senate finance and transportation committees.

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Resolution Number 18-10-08

WHEREAS, the 2018 Virginia General Assembly directed the Commonwealth Transportation Board to develop and adopt an Interstate 81 Corridor Improvement Plan and evaluate financing options for Interstate 81 corridor improvements; and

WHEREAS, during the June 6 – August 6, 2018, public comment period, the Virginia Department of Transportation received 161 congestion comments, 138 safety comments, and 104 policy comments; and,

WHEREAS, data from the Virginia Department of Transportation shows that Interstate 81 has the highest proportion of incident delay compared to all other Virginia interstates, and the loss of one lane leads to a 65 percent reduction in highway capacity; and,

WHEREAS, Interstate 81 is critical to the economic vitality of western Virginia and Botetourt County, carrying \$312 billion in goods each year; and,

WHEREAS, the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (RVTPO) recently approved a "*Regional Study on Transportation Project Prioritization for Economic Development and Growth*" which stated that widening and improving I-81 between the Roanoke and New River Valleys (Exit 150 to Exit 118) was a priority for the local governments in the RVTPO service area; and,

WHEREAS, potential capital improvements identified by the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment are estimated to cost \$3 billion corridor-wide, with \$1.6 - \$2.1 billion in VDoT's Salem transportation district; and,

WHEREAS, the Virginia Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment will assess a variety of funding mechanisms and will report on the economic impact of truck-only tolling on Virginia manufacturing, agriculture, and logistics sector companies; and,

WHEREAS, existing revenues are not sufficient to fund the identified improvements to Interstate 81 and the highest investment on other Virginia interstates is sourced from regionally dedicated funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that, following the completion of the I-81 Corridor Improvement Plan and its approval by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors urges the General Assembly to

consider solutions to support improvements to Interstate 81 through designated funding, which would specifically benefit the I-81 Corridor region.

Consideration was then held on a request for placement of Lewis and Clark Trail signage on County property. Mr. Cody Sexton, Assistant to the County Administrator, stated that in September the County Administrator's Office was contacted by the local Lewis and Clark Committee regarding a grant process through the Great Valley Lewis and Clark Eastern Legacy Trail for placement of signs on several Lewis and Clark sites on County-owned property.

He noted that these markers have been placed on several sites related to Lewis and Clark across the country and are proposed to be located at Botetourt Center at Greenfield, the Circuit Courthouse, and the County Historical Society Museum. Mr. Sexton noted that the exact locations of these markers at these locations has not been determined.

Mr. Sexton stated that the grant application was due on October 1 and the County Administrator signed the necessary paperwork pending approval by the Board of Supervisors. He noted that the Board is not being asked to pay for these signs.

Mr. Weldon Martin, Executive Director of the Botetourt County Historical Society, stated that this project is sponsored by the local Lewis and Clark Committee which was formed approximately 7 years ago.

He noted that Ms. Peggy Crosson, Chairman of the Virginia Lewis and Clark Committee, Mrs. Ann Layman, President of the Botetourt Historical Society, and Mr. Danny Kyle, President of the Friends of Greenfield Preston Plantation were also present at this meeting.

Mr. Martin stated that placement of these signs will call attention to the County's significant connection to Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. He noted that the Lewis and Clark Eastern Legacy Trail extends to 10 counties in Virginia.

He noted that a Lewis and Clark disc was installed in November 2012 in front of the Circuit Courthouse. He noted that in 2016, Virginia was included in the Legacy Trail and in 2017 a trail implementation committee was established.

After discussion, Mr. Martin stated that four County applications were submitted for placement of these markers—three on County-owned property and one at Santillane where Mr. Lewis's wife was born. He noted that of the 10 total applications submitted to the State, 6 were approved and three of those were located in Botetourt County. He noted that the Greenfield location was not approved during the first round of applications due to the requirement that a Department of Historic Resources historical marker be installed.

Mr. Martin stated that there are no costs by the County for the installation, maintenance, or replacement of these 12" X 12" round markers; these expenses will be the responsibility of the Historical Society. He noted that the County can request that the signs be removed at any time. He noted that approval of the grant applications is expected in November.

After discussion, Mr. Martin stated that he appreciated the cooperation of County staff in the submittal of this grant application.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, Mr. Larowe stated that, if the Board thinks that the County should move forward with this project, then a motion to approve the placement of these signs on County property is appropriate. He further noted that the Board could also decide to delay consideration of this request until next month when the grant applications are to be approved.

Mr. Clinton stated that there are several good aspects to this request. He noted that the marker would be an historic resource that would benefit the County's tourism efforts. Mr. Clinton stated that this grant application process is a great example of volunteer effort.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Clinton, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the request for placement of Lewis and Clark Site signage at the Botetourt County Circuit Courthouse and the Botetourt County Historical Society Museum. (Resolution Number 18-10-09)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Martin noted that these sites will be included in the national Lewis and Clark Trail database for access by visitors to these locations.

Mr. Sexton noted that, at some point in the future, the Board will need to consider approval of the Greenfield location for this sign, if its grant application is approved.

Mrs. Ann Layman then presented the Board members with a lapel pin.

An update was then given by Appalachian Power Company on the Botetourt and Cloverdale substation projects. Mr. Tom Bailey, project manager for the new Botetourt substation to be located in Greenfield, stated that a 138 kV substation will be constructed on the northern side of the Greenfield property.

He noted that APCo has been working with County staff to close on the property's purchase by the end of 2018. Mr. Bailey noted that they have also been working with adjacent landowners on this project. He stated that construction will start in June 2019 and the facility should be operational by June 2020.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Bailey stated that APCo has reviewed their capacity in the Greenfield area and the existing infrastructure can handle the proposed addition of 170 new homes adjacent to Ashley Plantation Subdivision. Mr. Bailey stated that they have made some modifications to their distribution system and expect no service delivery problems at this time.

Mr. Tom Linkous, project manager for the Cloverdale substation, stated that they anticipate 2 – 3 more years of work on the Cloverdale substation. He noted that they are still upgrading their 765kV transformer and are doing work at the Mount Union (Roanoke Cement Plant) substation to retire and replace old equipment.

There being no further discussion, the Board thanked Mr. Bailey and Mr. Linkous for their reports.

The Chairman then called for a 5 minute break.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 3:45 P. M.

Mr. Michael Lockaby, County Attorney, then requested that consideration of Amendment Number 2 to the County Waste franchise agreements be tabled until the November regular meeting. Mr. Lockaby stated that County Waste's attorney submitted some revisions to the agreements yesterday and, as he was out of town, he was unable to review them prior to today's Board meeting.

The Board concurred with Mr. Lockaby's request to table consideration of Amendment Number 2 to the County Waste franchise agreements until the November regular meeting.

Consideration was then held on advertisement of a public hearing on amendments to Chapter 20. Solid Waste of the Botetourt County Code. Mr. Michael Lockaby, County Attorney, stated that these amendments are needed to bring the County's Solid Waste Ordinance and trash disposal fee schedule into compliance with the provisions of the County Waste agreements regarding operation of the County's landfill.

He noted that these proposed amendments would provide clarification that there are certain circumstances when out-of-County waste can be brought into and disposed in the landfill. He further noted that there are also minor changes being proposed to the rate structure for solid waste disposal in the landfill.

Mr. Lockaby stated that these changes include a small increase in the charge for disposal of vehicle tires larger than 20" in diameter from \$6.00 to \$10.00 and a decrease in the trash disposal rate from \$53.00 per ton to \$49.50 per ton. He noted that the monthly residential hauler rates will not change under this proposal.

He then requested that the Board direct staff to advertise these amendments for public hearing at the November regular meeting.

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board directed County staff to advertise for a public hearing at the November regular meeting on proposed amendments to Chapter 20. Solid Waste of the Botetourt County Code and to the Landfill's Rate, Fees, and Charges listing. (Resolution Number 18-10-10)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on approval of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with Virginia Western Community College regarding the Greenfield Education and Training Center. Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the Economic Development Authority owns the ETC property and leases the building to the Virginia Community College System (VCCS) which is managed by Virginia Western Community College (VWCC). He noted that the VCCS opened their shared services center in Daleville last year and relocated the data center equipment from the ETC to the new shared services center.

He noted that VWCC contacted the County to see if the County would like to use the space and equipment vacated by the data center and discussions were held on the larger use of space at the ETC by the County. Mr. Moorman stated that these discussions have resulted in the MoU included in the Board's information packets. He noted that it is proposed that the upper level of the ETC would be made available to the County as well as some downstairs classroom space. He further noted that VWCC would retain the downstairs heavy manufacturing lab space for workforce development classes.

Mr. Moorman stated that there are also third-party rental agreements currently in effect for certain spaces at the ETC. He noted that these particular agreements would remain in effect until July 2019.

He further noted that the MoU includes provisions that the County will pay to repair the building's generator (\$25,000) which will be transferred to the County's ownership and pay the

College \$30,000 for proportional base-line utility bill expenses through the end of the original lease agreement (May 30, 2020). Mr. Moorman stated that space will be made available in the ETC to the County through the life of the existing lease. He noted that both the County and VWCC also agree that, in any lease agreement for the ETC after 2020, space would be made available to VWCC for workforce development classes.

Mr. Moorman noted that the County Attorney has reviewed this agreement.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Moorman stated that VWCC will pay part of the building's operational expenses through May 2020 and the County's share of that cost is estimated to be \$30,000.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Moorman stated that \$30,000 is an approximate figure. After further questioning, Mr. Moorman stated that the County previously paid \$25,000 to repair the building's generator and took over maintenance of the generator earlier this year.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Moorman stated that the term of the proposed MoU would go through the term of the current lease (May 30, 2020), and the County would negotiate a new lease agreement with VWCC to be effective after that time.

After discussion, Mr. Moorman stated that VWCC wishes to continue to use the heavy manufacturing lab, as well as some office and classroom space after May 2020.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Moorman stated that VWCC would continue to handle reservation requests for the ETC through June 2019 and then the County would take over this responsibility.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Lockaby stated that he would amend the MoU to indicate that the appropriate cost figures included on page 4 under "Utilities and Insurance" are reflected as already having been completed.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved a Memorandum of Understanding with Virginia Western Community College for the use of space in the Greenfield Education and Training Center through the term of the current lease (May 30, 2020) with revisions to the "Utilities and Insurance" section. (Resolution Number 18-10-11)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Discussion was then held on various committee reports.

Dr. Scothorn stated that the Broadband Summit held last month was very successful and brought out ideas, thoughts, and discussions on many issues regarding provision of broadband services in the County. He noted that there was an overwhelming response to this Summit.

Dr. Scothorn then stated that he would like the Board members to consider scheduling a strategic planning session over a 1 – 2 day period sometime during the next few months. He requested that the Board members provide staff with potential dates for this session.

Mr. Leffel stated that it is important that the Board try to schedule a strategic planning session in the next few months.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn on whether a facilitator was needed for this meeting, Mr. Leffel stated that the facilitator used during the 2014 strategic planning sessions was very good in working with the Board in developing their ideas for the County's future.

Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that staff can check with Ms. Tyler St. Clair to ascertain her availability and inform the Board of possible dates for these meetings.

Mr. Clinton stated that the Broadband Summit was an exceptional program and brought new insights to all of the Board members about funding options, mobile sites, etc., to bring broadband service to the County. He noted that the event including a fascinating set of seminars and “puts us on the map.”

Consideration was then held on various appointments.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board reappointed Mrs. Amy Baker as the Fincastle District representative on the Library Board of Trustees for a four year term to expire on December 31, 2022. (Resolution Number 18-10-12)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board reappointed Mrs. Barbara Hawkins as the Valley District representative on the Library Board of Trustees for a four year term to expire on December 31, 2022. (Resolution Number 18-10-13)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board reappointed Mr. Sam Foster as the Blue Ridge District representative on the Planning Commission for a four year term to expire on January 1, 2023. (Resolution Number 18-10-14)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Regarding appointments to the Greenfield Historic Preservation Advisory Council, Mr. Clinton stated that he contacted various historic organizations and requested that they recommend an individual to represent their organization on this Advisory Council. He noted that the list in the Board’s information packet includes a diverse, motivated, and qualified group that includes eight Botetourt County citizens, himself as an ex-officio member, and 6 non-County individuals.

Mr. Clinton stated that all of these proposed appointees have a background or interest in historic preservation and/or the Greenfield property. He then read the proposed list of names.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board appointed the following individuals to the Greenfield Historic Preservation Advisory Council. (Resolution number 18-10-15)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

<u>Representative Organization</u>	<u>Name</u>
Botetourt County Public Schools	Lynne Bolton
Friends of Greenfield Preston Plantation	Judy Morris
Col. William Preston Chap., Daughters of the Am. Rev.	Wendy Warren
Botetourt County Chap. Daughters of the Am. Rev.	Roblyn Brand
Botetourt Historical Society	John Rader
Historic Fincastle, Inc.	Edward Preston
The Countywide League	Curtis Brown
Fincastle Resol. Chapter, Sons of the Am. Rev.	John Bradshaw
Mountain Valley Preservation Alliance	Jim Johnston
Board of Supervisors member, Amsterdam Dist.	Eugene Journiette
Board of Supervisors member, Fincastle Dist.	Danny Kyle
Board of Supervisors member, Blue Ridge Dist.	David Marcum
Board of Supervisors member, Valley District	Rupert Cutler
Board of Supervisors member, Buchanan District	Warner Barnett
Ex-Officio	Steve Clinton

After discussion, on motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board appointed the following individuals to the Botetourt County Sestercentennial Committee: Mrs. Donna Vaughn, Mrs. Lois Switzer, Mrs. Angela Coon, and Mrs. Wendy Wingo. (Resolution Number 18-10-16)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board appointed Mr. Ray Sloan as the County's voting delegate for the Virginia Association of Counties annual meeting to be held in November at the Omni Homestead in Bath County. (Resolution Number 18-10-17)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

There being no further discussion, the meeting was then adjourned at 4:15 P. M. until 6:00 P. M.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 6:04 P. M.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Amsterdam Magisterial District from VJL, LLC, (Cortland Meadow, LLC, contractual purchaser) for a Commission permit in accord with §15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia for the construction of public roads, in addition to a request for rezoning from the Agricultural (A-1) Use District to the Residential (R-3) Use District, with possible proffered conditions, on a 78.95-acre parcel, for single family detached dwellings with a maximum of 170 lots, located on Greenfield Street (Route 673), Troutville. The development is proposed to be accessed via Greenfield Street at the O'Hara Drive (Route 1155) intersection, approximately 0.5 miles northeast of the Roanoke Road (U. S. Route 220)/Greenfield Street intersection, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 88, Parcel 94.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval of the Commission Permit and made no recommendation on the rezoning request at their July meeting and the Board had tabled this request at their July meeting until October at the request of the applicant.

Dr. Scothorn then recused himself from this discussion item due to a potential conflict of interest.

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Director of Community Development, stated that the Board was being requested to act on two proposals: a rezoning request with potential proffered conditions, and a Commission Permit. She noted that the rezoning application being considered by the Board has been revised from the proposal reviewed by the Planning Commission in July. Mrs. Pendleton stated that the new proposal decreases the total number of proposed R-3 lots from 170 to 140.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the applicants are proposing three different sizes/types of lots: Estate Lots (26) which will be at least 100' in width at the building setback, Luxury Lots (95) which will be at least 70' in width at the building setback, and Premier Lots (19) which will be 60' – 70' in width at the setback line. She noted that the number of Premier Lots, shown in pink on the revised concept plan, have been reduced from 64 to 19.

After discussion, Mrs. Pendleton stated that a paved walkway is proposed to loop between two sections of Greenfield Street through the Luxury Lot portion of the development. She noted that other nature trails are also proposed in the concept plan but will not be paved.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the applicants have submitted a proffered condition that the property will be developed in substantial conformance to the development pattern shown on the concept plan. She further stated that the remaining proffered conditions include provisions that all homes will be single family detached dwellings, the development will have a maximum of 140 lots, and the development's covenants and restrictions will include minimum architectural requirements (finished square footage, exterior finishes, garages, fencing, no above-ground pools, etc.) for each of the three proposed lot types.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that, prior to the approval of the final subdivision plat, the applicant is required to submit information to the Planning/Zoning Office that the covenants and restrictions have been recorded in the Circuit Court Clerk's Office. She further noted that the County cannot withhold approval/issuance of a building permit if the proposed residence does not comply with the development's covenants and restrictions. Mrs. Pendleton stated that the County has no regulatory power regarding the covenants and restrictions for any development; it is the homeowners association's responsibility to enforce these restrictions.

She stated that 29 citizen comments were submitted to the Planning Commission regarding this proposed development with concerns regarding water supply, density, school attendance issues, burdens on Fire/EMS and Sheriff's Department, stormwater management, etc. She further stated that the Board members have also received at least 11 citizen comments/letters over the past few weeks—9 in opposition and 2 in support of this request.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the Comprehensive Plan does identify this area as medium density residential. She then noted that Mr. Robert Fralin of R. Fralin Companies and Mr. Bobby Wampler with Engineering Concepts, Inc., were present to speak regarding this request.

Mr. Wampler stated ECI was hired to assist the applicant with the development of this project after the July Planning Commission meeting. He noted that the citizens' feedback and concerns were used to adjust the original concept plan including reducing the number of lots

from 170 to 140. Mr. Wampler stated that the revised concept plan is less dense than a Residential R-1 zoning would allow.

He noted that a nature trail is proposed throughout the 79 acre tract and the developer has now included options to minimize the development's "footprint" including increasing the size of the lots along Greenfield Street and placement of the Premier Lots at the rear of the development in a location that will be screened with evergreen trees. Mr. Wampler stated that these revisions will result in a reduction in the amount of traffic and stormwater impacts from this development.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Wampler pointed out the proposed nature trail locations in the open space areas of this development and stated that the trail will be similar in construction to the low-impact trails on the Botetourt Center at Greenfield property. Mr. Wampler stated that the nature trails are not intended to be paved; however, the walking path from Greenfield Street through the Luxury Lot area, shown in blue on the concept plan, will be paved.

Mr. Fralin then stated that he began his company in 1999/2000 and they currently have 40 employees, 4 of which were present at this hearing. Mr. Fralin stated that his company constructs 100 homes per year in the Roanoke Valley at estimated values from \$140,000 to \$650,000.

Mr. Fralin stated that this site has available public water and sewer service which is not common in Botetourt County. He noted that the Comp Plan designates this area as medium density residential and the property is in a desirable area of the County.

Mr. Fralin then gave a PowerPoint presentation which showed the progress of this development's design from its originally proposed 213 lots to 190 lots then 170 lots and now 140 lots are being proposed after consideration of community input after the Planning Commission meeting. He noted that they contacted the Ashley Plantation Homeowners Association and held a meeting at Ballast Point to which all Ashley residents were invited to offer their input on the proposed design.

Mr. Fralin stated that the Estate Lots, shown in yellow on the concept plan and which will border Ashley Plantation, will be the same size as those in Ashley. He noted that the Premier Lots will be smaller (15,000 sf), will be buffered by Leyland cypress trees from the rest of the development, and have architectural restrictions on their design and exterior materials.

After discussion, Mr. Fralin stated that they do not want to violate the proffered conditions submitted with this request and noted that the Estate Lots will have the same lot/construction requirements as on the adjacent Ashley Plantation lots. Mr. Fralin stated that "no one can say that they did not listen" to the citizens' concerns in redesigning this project; however, they did not incorporate all suggestions that were submitted. He noted that they also sent a survey to all of the Ashley Homeowners Association members and received 24 responses. Mr. Fralin stated that he feels good about this proposal's conformance with the County's Comprehensive Plan.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Fralin stated that the Estate Lots along Greenfield Street will be constructed with the same architectural requirements as those in Ashley Plantation and the homes on these lots are estimated to cost between \$375,000 and \$800,000. He noted that these homes will be required to have more brick on their exterior than required in Ashley.

After further questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Fralin stated that prices in the home sales market frequently change. After further questioning, Mr. Fralin stated that the number of Estate

Lots along Greenfield Street has been reduced to 15 with a few similar sized lots on the eastern and western property lines.

After discussion regarding the prices of houses on these lots, Mr. Martin stated that previously Mr. Fralin stated that the houses would be valued between \$375,000 and \$800,000 and he is now saying that they would be as low as \$345,000.

Mr. Fralin stated that the prices of these houses will be high and there will be some expensive houses on these lots due to the construction restrictions placed on these parcels.

Mrs. Pendleton then stated that all lots less than 15,000 square feet would be considered “zero” lot line single-family dwellings.

Mr. Wampler stated that they worked with the Zoning Ordinance’s provisions in designing these lot sizes and noted that “zero” lot line does not equate to the structure itself. He stated that these lots would have a minimum of 20’ between the structures but there is no difference in the spacing of houses from the Residential R-1 minimums in the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff noted that this was incorrect as R-1 lots have a 15’ setback on each side of a single-family dwelling, requiring a minimum of at least 30’ between structures.

After questioning by Mr. Martin as to how the proposed Premier Lots would compare to the Altamira “zero” lot line, patio home development in Cloverdale, Mr. Wampler noted that the minimum separation is 20’ for both the R-1 and “zero” lot line properties.

Mr. Fralin stated that his company is not proposing to build an Altamira-type development on the Premier Lot parcels.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant has submitted proffered conditions for this request and he understands that conditions 1 through 3 are considered proffers and condition 4 and its subsections pertain to the declaration of covenants and restrictions.

Mr. Lockaby stated that “a proffer is just like a part of the Zoning Ordinance” and is enforceable by the County as a part of that ordinance. He noted that the County “does not play” in the world of covenants and restrictions. He noted that proffer #4 says that the covenants and restrictions will exist and that they will include the items listed—minimum finished square footage, exterior finishes, garage size limits, landscaping, mailbox size/design, fencing, etc. Mr. Lockaby stated that the County does not enforce covenants and restrictions—the homeowners association/other landowners in the development would enforce compliance with these provisions.

After discussion, Mr. Lockaby stated that usually the specifics of the covenants/restrictions are not included in the proffered conditions, as is currently proposed by the applicant. He noted that when the County receives off-site proffers, which pertain to the aesthetics of the proposed development/lots, they need to be considered very carefully. Mr. Lockaby further noted that he would have concerns about proffers 4.a., 4.b., and 4.c. as they have the potential to be considered off-site proffers.

Mr. Fralin stated that the covenants/restrictions proffers were included to relay to the Ashley community that they meant what they proposed in the community meetings regarding the design of this development and were willing to include them in the proffer statement to show their intentions.

Mr. Michael Dixon of Alabama Court then spoke on behalf of Amy Wilson, Vice-President of the Ashley Homeowners Association. Mr. Dixon stated that Ms. Wilson had to leave the meeting and asked that he read her personal statement regarding this request.

Mr. Dixon stated that Ms. Wilson feels that this property should be zoned R-1. He stated that Route 220 is already operating at a "B" level according to VDoT's grading scale and Ms. Wilson has concerns about the 220/Greenfield Street intersection as well as speeding on Greenfield Street. Mr. Dixon noted that Ms. Wilson states that the traffic on Greenfield Street will increase from 900 to 2,400 trips per day if this development is approved.

He noted that the developer has stated that this 79 acre parcel is one of the only properties in the area with public sewer and water. Mr. Dixon stated that the County's UDA (Urban Development Area) study does not include this area of the County and those ideas do not apply to this development. He noted that over 600 residential living units have been approved by the County in the Daleville area in the past few months.

Mr. Dixon stated that there are also stormwater problems in the Ashley Plantation area and heavy rains caused flooding to block U. S. Route 220 at the International Parkway intersection earlier this year. Mr. Dixon stated that Ms. Wilson also noted that she had met with the developers and others regarding this proposal and believes that the development should include larger lots.

Mr. Ali Khan of Tara Court then stated that he agrees with most of Ms. Wilson's comments regarding this proposed development. He noted that Greenfield Street is an access road for four of the County's premier developments and all of these developments' homes were built to the Ashley Plantation standards.

Mr. Khan stated that he has concerns about the size of the proposed homes and the amount of exterior brick that would be allowed. Mr. Khan stated that personally he is not against growth; however, the County should consider compatibility of the homes in this proposed development with those in the adjacent subdivisions.

Mr. Khan noted that the Estate Lots are now proposed to be more similar in size to those in Ashley; however, he would like to see the lot sizes of the Luxury Lots increased as well. He noted that the Luxury Lots are proposed to have homes with a minimum of 1,600 square feet and questioned how this house size can be considered comparable to the homes in Ashley. Mr. Khan suggested that these lots should have homes that are a minimum of 2,000 - 2,200 square feet.

Mr. Khan further noted that the patio homes proposed on the Premier Lots are proposed to be a minimum of 1,000 sf and both the Premier and Luxury Lots are only proposing to have a minimum of 1 car garages. Mr. Khan stated that he opposes both of these aspects. Mr. Khan stated that he is proud of what Botetourt County has done to maintain the standard of development in the County.

Mr. Jim Dutton of Ashby Drive in the Summit of Ashley stated that he still has concerns about what is proposed for this site. Mr. Dutton thanked the developer for meeting with the Ashley homeowners but "they (the developer) are still not where they need to be." He noted that the Ashley residents prefer only 118 lots on this property "to get the lot size and density where they need to be." Mr. Dutton stated that he has not seen any house design plans for this development and the residents have heard that several different house sizes are being proposed.

Mr. Dutton stated that he moved to the County 11 years ago from southwest Roanoke County. He stated that Botetourt is beautiful and they like the amenities but he does not want to see his neighborhood become overcrowded. Mr. Dutton noted that he also has concerns about the Route 220/Greenfield Street intersection.

He noted that they want to see something built on this property that is compatible with the neighborhood and suggested that the developer “go back one more time” and come up with a more sound plan that is compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Jay Engstrom of Island Green stated that much of what he had proposed to say at this hearing has been said by previous speakers. Mr. Engstrom stated that he moved to the County in 2015 and loved the Ashley neighborhood on his first drive through the area.

He noted that the Ashley homeowners are “looking at pretty, little drawings” that were created to appease the residents. He further noted that this proposed development is a “subdivision within a subdivision,” will ruin the aesthetics of this area, and to him it “almost looks like a spot zoning” situation. Mr. Engstrom asked that the Board think about this proposal as he does not think that this is the way to go and the property should remain zoned R-1.

Mrs. Michelle Adkins of Tara Court stated that she has been actively involved in corresponding with Mr. Fralin about this development over the past few months. Ms. Adkins stated that she has watched Mr. Fralin’s attitude change and would like to thank him for his efforts.

Mrs. Adkins stated that she is concerned about congestion, noise, and traffic safety at the proposed Greenfield Street entrance into this new subdivision, the development’s density, potential overcrowding at the local schools, and impact on the Ashley Plantation water system’s pressure.

She noted that there is big sky, open land, and large lot sizes in Botetourt County and, with this proposal, it appears that Botetourt County wants to “mimic” Roanoke County. She noted that high-density developments have recently been approved on the Baileywick Farms property, Daleville Town Center, 288 apartments behind Kroger, and patio homes in Santillane and questioned, “isn’t this enough homes for the businesses” that are locating/expanding here. Mrs. Adkins stated that we do not need to oversaturate Botetourt County.

After discussion, she noted that home values have increased since 2005 and asked the Board to consider all of these issues before making a decision on this development. Mrs. Adkins stated that the residents would like to see all of the proposed lots be Estate-sized lots which are similar in size to those in Ashley.

She stated that Mr. Fralin should be held to compliance with the proffered conditions.

Mr. Brad Gilbert of Greenfield Street stated that he had interactions with Mr. Fralin at the community meetings on this proposed development. Mr. Gilbert stated that as far as he is aware there have been 5 meetings held between Mr. Fralin and the area homeowners and “they have not figured anything out.” He noted that the interactions have been one sided and the information provided to the homeowners consisted of “smoke and mirrors.” Mr. Gilbert stated that “no one knows what is actually going” to be built in this development.

Mr. Gilbert stated that Runk and Pratt, which owns and operates several senior living communities in the State, currently owns the undeveloped lots in Ashley Plantation. Mr. Gilbert stated that he has heard that the company may develop an assisted living facility in Ashley in the future and questioned how this “would come into play” with the water pressure issues that have occurred.

Mr. Gilbert further stated that “hiding homes behind Leyland Cypress trees” is no way to help these smaller lots blend into Ashley. He noted that the citizens are being pushed to like something comparable to a pig and Mr. Fralin is putting lipstick on this pig.

Mr. Alan Long of Greenfield Street stated that he opposes this rezoning request and agrees with a majority of the comments made at this hearing. He noted that this development

as proposed will impact property values, increase traffic on Greenfield Street, and impact the water system's pressure and capacity.

Mr. Long stated that additional restrictions are needed on this development. He noted that the Estate Lots are acceptable but the other lot sizes and proposed minimum home sizes need to be larger. He noted that the smaller homes could be townhomes, duplexes, etc., and they do not fit in with those in Ashley Plantation.

Mr. Long stated that in Ashley they do not like to see cars parked in driveways and lots that are not maintained. He noted that these new lots will be visible from Greenfield Street. Mr. Long further stated that he is concerned about the drainage from this development as the development's current stormwater detention pond backs up during heavy rains.

Mr. Long stated that he was not notified about any of the meetings held by Mr. Fralin on this proposal and believes that a better plan can be designed if the developer goes back to the drawing board. He noted that larger lots will allow bigger homes, nicer landscaping, and suggested that there be more brick and stone on the proposed homes' exterior instead of vinyl siding.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel, it was noted that there was no one else present to speak regarding this request. The public hearing was then closed.

Mr. Leffel thanked those who spoke for their comments and for the gracious crowd's civility during this hearing.

Mr. Clinton stated that the civility during this hearing was appreciated. He noted that the Board has been involved in countless rezoning requests over the years and this issue did have the potential for controversy. He noted that "passions were high" regarding this proposal and Mr. Fralin has been exceedingly professional during this application and public hearing process.

Mr. Clinton stated that this proposal is a "big deal" for this area and he has tried to consider this concept plan dispassionately but it has not been easy. Mr. Clinton noted that he was involved in some of the community meetings and has met with the developer to discuss this request. Mr. Clinton stated that he is inclined to look at this proposal a little bit differently due to his engineering background. He noted that we tend to look at the details of this proposal, e.g., size of garages, fencing, etc., but that is not the Board's ultimate responsibility. Mr. Clinton further noted that, in this fast-growing community, we need to step back and, not look at each little pixel, but look at the big picture.

Mr. Clinton stated that this proposal "is a little bit more than what we need to be considering at this time in this district." Mr. Clinton noted that, in the last 18 months, the Board has approved the construction of 571 apartments in the Amsterdam District as well as 180 single family dwellings and questioned, "how much can we absorb." He noted that the governing body can say that development is happening too fast for the infrastructure and he believes that this is a real concern at this time on this project. Mr. Clinton stated that "you cannot please everyone" and questioned "what is the governing body here for in terms of zoning issues."

After discussion, Mr. Clinton stated that the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance is to give reasonable consideration to various aspects of a request including reducing or preventing congestion on streets, creation of an attractive and harmonious community, protection against overcrowding, and these issues relate directly to this request.

Regarding infrastructure capabilities, Mr. Clinton stated that we can say that Route 220 is substandard but it is pretty good except for several chokepoints and VDOT's SmartScale fund-

ing, if approved, will help improve these areas. He noted that “we need to be cautious about this particular proposal.”

Mr. Martin stated that he spent more time reviewing and researching this project than any prior rezoning/development request he has heard as a Board member. Mr. Martin noted that he made notes of the citizens’ comments at the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors’ public hearings and their concerns included the additional traffic impact on Greenfield Street, the existing speed limit on this road, safety issues from residents walking along Greenfield Street, etc.

Mr. Martin noted that he met with VDoT’s District Engineer, Mr. Ken King, and asked about a traffic study being conducted on Greenfield Street but was told that the street did not warrant a study at this time. He noted that VDoT uses an average figure of 10 vehicle trips per day per residence in its traffic count calculations. Mr. Martin stated that he tried to picture how these new homes would impact the traffic on Greenfield Street and believes it would increase significantly if this project were approved.

He also noted that there is no on-street parking allowed. Mr. Martin stated that he parked along Greenfield Street one morning to assess the traffic flow and counted 140 vehicles in 70 minutes. He noted that he did not see any vehicles exceeding the posted speed limit as had been previously mentioned by some residents.

After discussion, Mr. Martin stated that he has a problem with “zero” lot line developments but he understands from comments made today that there are not any “zero” lot line residences proposed in this project.

Regarding citizen concerns about electrical supply issues, Mr. Martin stated that he talked to American Electric Power (AEP) and was told that there would be no problem with providing electrical service to these 140 new homes through the current transmission system. He noted that AEP has been diligently working on the electrical service infrastructure in the Greenfield area and the new substation on the Botetourt Center at Greenfield property will improve the reliability of electricity in this area.

Mr. Martin stated that he also met with the Superintendent of Schools regarding concerns about the additional children from this development causing school overcrowding. He noted that the School system uses a figure of 0.66 children per home to calculate student population which results in a possible 92 new students from these 140 lots. Mr. Martin stated that Mr. Busher anticipated no negative impact from these additional students on the School system.

Regarding concerns about reduced water pressure caused by these new homes, Mr. Martin stated that he met with Mr. Steve Rossi, owner of Central Water Company which serves Ashley Plantation, for 4 – 5 hours. He noted that they discussed the water system and water tanks, etc., and was informed that the Health Department conducts monthly checks of all private water systems.

Mr. Martin noted that Mr. Rossi had reviewed all of the previous comments made by Ashley residents regarding their low water pressure issues. He noted that Mr. Rossi stated that the average water pressure provided in the Ashley system is 30 – 50 pounds per square inch and by law the pressure has to be at least 20 pounds per square inch. Mr. Martin stated that Mr. Rossi also noted that Central Water System has enough water supply to serve 800 homes in its service area. He further noted that Mr. Rossi encouraged any Ashley resident with water pressure problems to contact him (Mr. Rossi) directly.

Mr. Martin then stated that some citizens had concerns about the density of the proposed development. He noted that the original concept plan for this project was not in compliance with Ashley's density; however, the plan has been revised and Mr. Fralin has said that the homes to be constructed along Greenfield Street will be built on lots that are compatible in size to those in Ashley Plantation.

After discussion, Mr. Martin stated that overall he has found that the residents of Ashley Plantation are not spoiled and rich but have a lot of community pride and take care of their properties. He noted that the Ashley homes are their owners' "dream homes" and he does not think it would be fair to have homes that are lower in price or are not built as well as those in Ashley Plantation located adjacent to that development. He further noted that Mr. Fralin has informed him that several changes have been made to the proposed concept plan and has submitted several proffered conditions regarding the structures' size/materials. Mr. Martin stated that the County cannot hold builders to construction standards that are not proffered but are only included in the covenants and restrictions.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Lockaby confirmed that the County cannot enforce covenants and restrictions placed on developments.

Mr. Sloan stated that he received a copy of the County's Comprehensive Plan earlier today which was last approved in 2011. Mr. Sloan noted that in his district he does not have to worry about too many neighbors.

He noted that page 10 of the Comp Plan states that regional growth pressures will result in the conversion of farmland into residential uses. Mr. Sloan noted that the most recent citizen survey asked which three issues have changed for the worse in the County and the responses included population growth, traffic/roads, and high taxes.

Mr. Sloan further noted that, under "Land Use Policies" on page 43 of the Comp Plan, it states that large developments should only locate in similar areas and under "Design and Development Patterns" on page 47, it says that transportation districts should be coordinated with land use.

Mr. Sloan stated that he is concerned about where the County is going on Routes 220 and 11, and Interstate 81. He noted that "we keep on bringing" new businesses into the County but we do not have the road system to handle the traffic that these new businesses generate. Mr. Sloan noted that he is also concerned about traffic safety at the Greenfield Street/Route 220 intersection if this development is approved.

Mr. Leffel stated that he appreciates the comments made by the Board members and the homework that they have done regarding this request. He noted that the Board has not taken this request lightly and he is not the only member who has lost sleep over this proposal. Mr. Leffel stated that he "understands where everyone is coming from" in their concerns and acknowledged that the County's needed infrastructure improvements cannot keep up with the increased development.

Mr. Leffel stated, however, that there has been no mention of the fact that someone owns this 79 acres and they should have a right to determine what they do with the property. Mr. Leffel noted that he does not like the new State laws regarding what the Board cannot request in proffered conditions on such requests.

He stated that several years ago the Board conducted a strategic planning session and developed a 40 year plan for the County. He noted that when this was done there was no idea

that Eldor and Ballast Point would locate in the County or that a major expansion of Altec Industries was being considered.

Mr. Leffel further stated that the County is losing its student population to the point of being a detriment to education. He noted that we want to keep our brilliant, brightest children in the County and to do that places for them to come back to work are needed along with providing affordable places for them to live. Mr. Leffel stated that the Board began work several years ago to improve the County's housing options and have made a tremendous impact on increasing the number of new jobs in the County over the past few years. He stated that we are always going to have a problem with infrastructure.

After discussion, Mr. Leffel stated that he applauded the people who were present at this hearing but noted that the Ashley Plantation development was also opposed originally. Mr. Leffel stated that he believes in the County's strategic plan but acknowledged that the citizens have legitimate concerns about this proposal.

Mr. Clinton stated that he has total respect for the other Board members' comments on this proposal. Mr. Clinton noted that he felt the same as the Chairman about the County's inadequate infrastructure for a long time; however, if you continue to do that, you are saying that the County does not want growth. He noted that infrastructure concerns, including the Route 220 corridor, are an issue on this particular project. Mr. Clinton noted that this brings the County's transportation shortcomings into focus and he does not feel that it is in the best interests of the County or the citizens to support this proposal. He noted that it exacerbates a problem that the Board does not know when will be addressed.

Mr. Clinton stated that the school population impact also has to be taken into consideration.

Mr. Martin stated that he does not have a problem with voting against the opposition if it is warranted in these situations. Mr. Martin noted that he appreciated what Mr. Fralin tried to do to develop this property and thanked everyone for their patience and consideration throughout this process.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Mr. Sloan, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board overturned the Planning Commission's approval of the request in the Amsterdam Magisterial District from VJL, LLC, (Cortland Meadow, LLC, contractual purchaser) for a Commission Permit in accord with §15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia for the construction of public roads on a 78.95-acre parcel located on Greenfield Street (Route 673), Troutville, which is proposed to be accessed via Greenfield Street at the O'Hara Drive (Route 1155) intersection, and located approximately 0.5 miles northeast of the Roanoke Road (U. S. Route 220)/Greenfield Street intersection, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 88, Parcel 94. (Resolution Number 18-10-18)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin

NAYS: Mr. Leffel

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: Dr. Scothorn

On motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board denied the request in the Amsterdam Magisterial District from VJL, LLC, (Cortland Meadow, LLC, contractual purchaser) for a rezoning from the Agricultural (A-1) Use District to the Residential (R-3) Use District, with possible proffered conditions, on a 78.95-acre parcel for single family detached dwellings with a maximum of 170 lots, located on Greenfield

Street (Route 673), Troutville, which is proposed to be accessed via Greenfield Street at the O'Hara Drive (Route 1155) intersection, and located approximately 0.5 miles northeast of the Roanoke Road (U. S. Route 220)/Greenfield Street intersection, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 88, Parcel 94. (Resolution Number 18-10-19)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin

NAYS: Mr. Leffel

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: Dr. Scothorn

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the meeting was adjourned at 7:50 P. M. (Resolution Number 18-10-20)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None