

The regular meeting of the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, October 24, 2017, in Rooms 226-228 of the Greenfield Education and Training Center in Daleville, Virginia, beginning at 12:45 P. M.

PRESENT: Members: Mr. L. W. Leffel, Jr., Chairman  
Mr. Todd L. Dodson, Vice-Chairman  
Dr. Donald M. Scothorn (left at 6:50 P. M.)  
Mr. John B. Williamson, III  
Mr. Billy W. Martin, Sr.

ABSENT: Members: None

Others present at the meeting:

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

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 12:45 P. M.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board went into Closed Session to discuss personnel matters regarding specific individuals; the acquisition of real property for public uses or the disposition of publicly held real property where discussion in open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body; discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry 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 regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice as per Section 2.2-3711 (A) (1), (3), (5), and (8) of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended. (Resolution Number 17-10-01)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Dodson, Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Martin

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 2:02 P. M.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Dodson, 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 17-10-02)

AYES: Mr. Leffel, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, 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. Dodson then led the group in reciting the pledge of allegiance.

Mr. Dodson then stated that the Governor of Virginia had announced earlier today that Altec Industries is expanding their Botetourt County facility. He noted that this expansion will create 180 new jobs and invest \$30 million in their Altec's building located in Botetourt Center at

Greenfield. Mr. Dodson stated that Altec is one of the County's leading employers and they have added numerous skilled workers to the area's labor market over the years.

Mr. Dodson stated that the Board appreciates everything that Altec does and all that they provide to Botetourt County and its citizens. He noted that this expansion will provide good-paying jobs with the salaries paid to these new employees above the current average salaries offered by businesses in the County.

Mr. Dodson stated that the Board is glad that Altec selected the County for this expansion as it is a great testament to the County's economic development recruitment work.

Mr. Leffel then welcomed Mr. Jim Barley to the meeting. He noted that Mr. Barley is present today to receive a long-deserved recognition—a lifetime achievement award for his service in the County's volunteer fire and EMS community.

Fire Chief Matt Britt stated that Mr. Barley has over 40 years of service to the County's fire and EMS community.

Mr. Ray Sloan, Fire/EMS Chaplain, stated that Mr. Barley has always been the "chief" in his opinion and it has been an honor to know him and be a part of today's award presentation. He noted that this recognition is richly deserved and long overdue.

Mr. Dean Paderick stated that Mr. Barley helped mentor him during his involvement with the Troutville Volunteer Fire Department. Mr. Paderick stated that he learned a lot from Mr. Barley and they had the opportunity to do many things together. Mr. Paderick stated that it was a great pleasure to serve with and for Mr. Barley; he was a great leader and mentor and deserves this award and thanked Mr. Barley for his service to the County.

Mr. Leffel then stated that he has known Mr. Barley for many years and each has had a lot of respect for the other. He then read the following proclamation which had been framed for presentation to Mr. Barley:

**WHEREAS**, James Taliferro Barley, Jr. served as a member of the Buchanan Volunteer Fire Department for over 40 years; and,

**WHEREAS**, James faithfully served as a member of the public safety community in the County of Botetourt, Virginia, with the utmost dedication and commitment; and,

**WHEREAS**, During his extensive tenure as a volunteer, James contributed countless hours to call response, training, fund raising and other community activities, including the Buchanan Fireman's Carnival that fostered the support and development of fire and emergency services in and around the Town of Buchanan; and,

**WHEREAS**, James served as a longstanding Chief of the Department providing vision, strategy and leadership to the volunteers faithfully serving their community; and,

**WHEREAS**, Botetourt County, and more specifically the Town of Buchanan, its citizens and visitors, are safer because of the dedication and sincere commitment of James's volunteerism; and,

**WHEREAS**, James not only committed the majority of his adult life to protecting his community as a faithful volunteer servant, exuding the qualities of an individual deserving of recognition for his lifetime commitment to serving his community;

**NOW, THEREFORE**, we, the Board of Supervisors of Botetourt County, Virginia, do hereby recognize James Taliferro Barley, Jr., and his family for all of the service, dedication, and commitment to the citizens and visitors of Botetourt County; and,

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT**, James is receiving the Lifetime Achievement award in recognition for his years of service in fire and emergency services.

Mr. Barley was then presented with a fire ax which had been mounted on a display board.

Mr. Barley thanked the Board for this award presentation.

Mr. John Shotwell then thanked the Board for their service to the County's citizens. Mr. Shotwell stated that he came to the County in September 1961 and lived across the street from Mr. Barley. He noted that they have been friends since that time.

Mr. Shotwell stated that Mr. Barley has done much for Buchanan over the years. Mr. Shotwell noted that in the 1960s/1970s, Mr. Barley drove James River High School athletes to games as school buses were not available and even purchased meals for those kids who did not have money. He stated that Mr. Barley has done a great job and thanked him for his service to the County and its citizens.

Mr. Leffel then stated that consent agenda item number 6 regarding a request for proposals for a Fire Station Feasibility and Facilities Study would be removed from consideration on this month's agenda.

After discussion, on motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the following consent items: (Resolution Number 17-10-03)

AYES: Mr. Leffel, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Martin

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Approval of minutes of the regular meeting held on September 26, 2017;

Approval of the following Transfers and Additional Appropriations:

Transfer \$698.35 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:

- \$ 17.16 Dep. Co. Admin.-Rep. & Maint.-Veh., 100-4012120-12120-3312
- \$ 78.77 Comm. Devel.-Rep. & Maint.-Vehicles, 100-4081200-81200-3312
- \$ 99.48 Animal Control – Veh. & Power Suppl., 100-4035100-35100-6009
- \$ 73.10 Techn. Svces.-Rep. & Maint.-Veh., 100-4012510-12510-3312
- \$ 73.99 Maintenance-Rep. & Maint.-Vehicles, 100-4043000-43000-3312
- \$124.52 Fire & EMS – Rep. & Maint.-Vehicles, 100-4035500-35500-3312
- \$ 62.30 General Svces.-Rep. & Maint.-Veh., 100-4040000-40000-3312
- \$ 28.22 Parks & Rec. – Veh. & Power Supp., 100-4071100-71100-6009
- \$ 61.07 Van Program – Rep. & Maint. – Veh., 100-4071500-71500-3312
- \$ 63.44 Library – Rep. & Maint – Vehicles, 100-4073100-73100-3312
- \$ 16.30 Econ. Devel. – Rep & Maint. Veh. - 100-4081500-81500-3312

Transfer budgeted funds of \$225,000 from CIP-Economic Development Program, 100-4094000-81500-8012-803, to EDA of Botetourt County, 100-4091800-91800-3800. This request provides budgeted funds and associated appropriation for the actual transfer of funds to the EDA for an Arkay Packaging economic incentive payment.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$375.00 to Fire & EMS – Other Operating Supplies, 100-4035500-35500-6014. These are contribution funds received in memory of Bethany Franklin & Phillip Gimlimead.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,400.00 to Fire & EMS – Professional Services, 100-4035500-35500-3100. These are funds received from an apparatus sale; this covers the sale commission.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$8,018.22 to Volunteer Fire & Rescue – Fire Insurance, 100-4032200-32200-5302. These are insurance recovery funds from claims for damaged vehicles.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,690.15 to Volunteer Fire & Rescue – Fire Insurance, 100-4032200-32200-5302. These are insurance adjustment checks received from VFIS.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$827.08 to the following Sheriff's Department accounts: \$110.00 to Uniforms, 100-4031200-31200-6011, \$50.96 to FICA, 100-4031200-31200-2100, and \$666.12 to Overtime, 100-4031200-31200-1200. The former is for a contract payment, and the latter two are for traffic control reimbursements.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$7,331.44 to the following Correction & Detention accounts: \$7,271.44 to Professional Services, 100-4033100-33100-3100, and \$60.00 to Uniforms, 100-4033100-33100-6011. The former is for medical cost reimbursements, and the latter is for a contract payment;

Approval of Accounts Payable and ratification of the Short Accounts Payable List;

Resolution declaring November 25, 2017, as "Small Business Saturday" as follows:

**WHEREAS**, Botetourt County believes that small businesses are the backbone of our economy and the glue that holds communities together; and

**WHEREAS**, small businesses employ 90 percent of the employees in the private sector in Botetourt County;

**WHEREAS**, Botetourt County supports our local businesses that create jobs, boost our local economy, and preserve our neighborhoods; and

**WHEREAS**, a majority of consumers agree it is important to support the small businesses they value in their communities; and

**WHEREAS**, the Botetourt County Chamber of Commerce, along with advocacy groups and public and private organizations across the country have endorsed the Saturday after Thanksgiving as Small Business Saturday; and

**WHEREAS**, residents of our community, and communities across the country, are being asked to support small businesses and merchants on Small Business Saturday and throughout the year;

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors do hereby proclaim November 25, 2017, as:

***"Small Business Saturday"***

And that Botetourt County:

- supports the designation of a "Small Business Saturday"; and
- supports efforts—
  - to encourage consumers to shop locally; and
  - to increase awareness of the value of locally owned small businesses and the impact of locally owned small businesses on the economy of Botetourt County.

and;

A letter of support for a Small Community Air Service Development Grant for the Roanoke-Blacksburg Regional Airport.

A public hearing was then held on the proposed reappropriation of \$1.12 million in funds from the FY 17 budget to the FY 18 budget. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance stated that this hearing is on the proposed reappropriation of funds from the FY 17 budget into the FY 18

budget for projects that were not completed prior to June 30, 2017. He noted that the Code of Virginia requires that a public hearing be conducted on any budget amendment which is larger than 1% of the approved budget allocation. Mr. Zerrilla stated that the County's FY 18 budget was \$95 million and the departmental reappropriation requests being considered today total \$1.12 million.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that these department, CIP, and debt service requests were reviewed by County staff and the General Fund Budget Subcommittee (Mr. Leffel and Mr. Williamson). He noted that these requests include \$474,170 (42%) from the operational budget with the largest requests from the Fire and EMS and the Volunteer Fire and Rescue Departments; \$631,322 (56%) from the Capital Improvements Program budget; and \$23,134 (2%) from the Debt Service budget.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Zerrilla confirmed that these allocations were approved in the FY 17 budget but were not completed within that fiscal year and are being requested for reappropriation into the FY 18 budget for project completion. He stated that these requests are not departmental refunds or for new projects.

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

On motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following budget reappropriation requests for FY 18 for projects that were not completed in FY 17: (Resolution Number 17-10-04)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

<u>Destination Account #</u>	<u>Account Description</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Explanation/Reason For Request</u>
<u>General Fund Operations:</u>			
100-4012120-12120-3100	Dep. Co. Admin. – Prof. Svces.	\$20,000	Greenfield presentation consulting
100-4012120-12120-3180	Dep. Co. Admin. – Instruct. & Training	5,000	Training, Professional Development
100-4012510-12510-5230	Techn. Services - Telecommunications	8,500	Read Mtn. 2nd internet connection
100-4012510-12510-3180	Techn. Services - Instruction & Training	4,000	Training module
100-4012510-12510-3320	Techn. Services - Maint. Svce. Contracts	10,600	Harris upgrade, S3 Integration contract
100-4012510-12510-8008	Techn. Serv.-Cap. Outlay-App. Software	6,800	Sophos system purchase
100-4031200-31200-5830	Sheriff - RAID Patrol	35,970	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4031200-31200-5860	Sheriff - Anti-Drug Education	100	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4031200-31200-6015	Sheriff - Firing Range Expenses	5,554	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4032200-32200-5641	Vol. F&R - County Vol. Fire Depts.	10,120	Fire Program Funds to be spent in FY18
100-4032200-32200-5651	Vol. F&R - County Vol. Rescue Squads	28,000	Generator, pad, vehicle retrofit
100-4032200-32200-8012	Vol. F&R - Cap. Outlay - Other Capital	40,000	Finc. Station construct., Arkay donation
100,4033100-33100-5820	Corr. & Det-Inmate Phone Commissions	33,597	Sheriff proprietary funds
100-4035500-35500-1100	Fire & EMS - Salaries Wages - Regular	4,750	Support for BLS staff member to ALS
100-4035500-35500-8005	Fire & EMS-Cap. Out.-Motor Veh./Veh. Equip.	54,617	Replacement of oldest staff vehicle
100-4035500-35500-8012	Fire & EMS - Cap. Outlay - Other Capital	15,000	Troutville station construction
100-4043000-43000-3320	Maintenance – Maint. Svce. Contracts	39,683	Maint. scheduling & work order system
100-4043000-43000-8012	Maintenance - Cap. Outlay - Other Cap.	17,647	Finish GETC exterior painting
100-4071100-71100-8012	Rec. & Facilities-Cap. Outlay-Other Cap.	4,232	Lagging invoice to repair ballfield lights
100-4081200-81200-3100	Comm. Devel. - Professional Services	70,000	Ord. updates, Comp. Plan amendm.
100-4081500-81500-3100	Economic Devel. - Professional Services	40,000	Broadband Authority project
100-4081500-81500-5810	Economic Devel. - Dues & Assoc. Memb.	20,000	Bot. Co. Chamber additional funding
Total	General Fund Operations	<u>\$474,170</u>	

CIP

100-4094000-12510-8008-112	County Website Redesign	\$10,000	To continue project
100-4094000-12510-8009-101	Enterprise-Wide Software	128,532	To continue project
100-4094000-12510-8009-102	Tax Software	425,000	To continue project
100-4094000-21600-8012-416	Circuit Courthouse Complex	6,584	To continue project
100-4094000-35600-8012-310	Emergency Operations Center	7,762	To continue project
100-4094000-43000-8012-601	Greenfield ETC Building Maintenance	11,325	To continue projects
100-4094000-71000-8012-723	Comm. Rec. Incentive Program	22,119	To continue projects
100-4094000-73100-3100-702	Library System/Program Study	<u>20,000</u>	To continue project
<b>Total</b>	<b>Capital Improvement Projects (CIP)</b>	<b><u>\$631,322</u></b>	

Debt Service:

100-4095000-6000-9500-696	School Energy Performance Lease	<u>\$23,134</u>	First debt service payment
<b>Total</b>	<b>General Operations, CIP, Debt Service</b>	<b><u>\$1,128,626</u></b>	

Mr. Leffel then presented Mr. Martin with a Board of Supervisors Service Award from the Virginia Association of Counties for ten years of dedicated service to Botetourt County.

Mr. Martin thanked Mr. Leffel for this presentation.

Consideration was then held on employee group health insurance renewals. Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the County's group health insurance benefits consist of dental insurance, prescription drug insurance, and medical insurance. He noted that the new insurance plan year begins on December 1.

Mr. Moorman noted that a staff team reviewed this year's claims data and renewal analysis for all three plans with the County's insurance consultant, OneDigital. He noted that Ms. Nancy Grasso from OneDigital is present at this meeting to update the Board on the current year's claim experience and recommendations for plan renewals.

Ms. Grasso stated that the County offers a self-funded employee benefit program with the three insurance coverages mentioned by Mr. Moorman. She noted that the health insurance plan (MedCost) is the largest expense in premium dollars for the County and this year's claims experience is better than in the past two years. Ms. Grasso stated that the 2018-2019 health insurance renewal increase will be 2.7%.

After discussion, Ms. Grasso noted that reinsurance (Optum), which covers the County in the event of unusually large claims over \$100,000, is anticipated to increase 16.6% in the new plan year. She noted that this increase is in-line with current health industry trends.

Ms. Grasso noted that the County's total health insurance claims in the current year were \$1.4 million which was 5.8% lower than in the 2015-2016 plan year. She noted that the average annual cost per person is \$11,200 compared to a national average of \$10,779.

Ms. Grasso stated that some management program changes were made to the new year's prescription drug program (Kroger) which will help to reduce some costs. She further stated that an Employee Assistance Program (EAP) was added in the new plan year which will be funded by the County's health insurance fund. Ms. Grasso stated that this program will cost \$1.18 per person for both full- and part-time employees.

Regarding dental insurance (Revolv), Ms. Grasso stated that the plan's benefits will remain the same in the new year with a 2.9% premium decrease. She further noted that all of the current Wellness Reimbursement Program benefits will remain in the new plan.

After discussion, Ms. Grasso stated that she is recommending that the County add a Medication Therapy Management Program as of December 1 at a cost of 15¢ per participating member per month. She noted that this "another level of coverage" to help employees be compliant with their prescription medications. Ms. Grasso also stated that the County should increase its efforts to encourage participation in the New World Travel benefit program. She noted that this program offers employees a discount to obtain treatment in out-of-state facilities with a 25% cost savings being offered in the new plan year—an increase over the 20% savings offered in the current year.

She noted that OneDigital and County staff are recommending that the Board authorize continuance of the current employee health insurance programs in the new plan year.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Moorman stated that the County had one employee participate in the New World Travel program in the current plan year. He noted that the employee had a good experience with the program and highly recommended it to other employees.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Ms. Grasso stated that there are no changes being proposed in the individual and aggregate stop loss insurance limits. She further noted that no changes are being recommended in any benefit levels for the new health plan year.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Moorman noted that the EAP provider is Anthem. After further questioning, Mr. Moorman noted that participation in this program is voluntary by County employees and he does not know if the County could require employees to participate the program.

Mr. Williamson noted that he has seen similar programs in the past and EAP referrals can be used by employers to deal with employee discipline problems.

After discussion by Mr. Martin, Mr. Moorman stated that, if the County has issues with an employee, the employee can be sent to an EAP for help as well as the employee requesting help personally.

Ms. Grasso noted that EAPs are confidential environments; however, the County/consultant does receive an aggregate report at the end of the year on the program's participation figures.

Mr. Dodson noted that he served on the employee health insurance committee last year and believes that the County has a good employee health plan.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Zerrilla stated that the County's health insurance reserve fund is stable and currently contains approximately \$1.4 million. He noted that the reinsurance coverage through Optum provides funding for large dollar claims.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized a one-year renewal of group health insurance plans with MedCost Benefit Plans, Kroger Prescription Plans, and Revolv effective December 1, 2017, with no increase in active employee premiums, incorporating the recommendations of OneDigital (continue with the current wellness programs; add a Medication Therapy Management Program to assist in assuring that members are compliant with medications at a nominal cost of \$0.15 per member per month for those using the management system only; encourage participation in the New World Travel benefit by increasing the

current incentive from 20% of the savings up to \$2,500 per year to 25% of the savings up to \$10,000.00; continue with current surcharges for spouses who have access to employer sponsored benefits and for insured members who attest to being tobacco users, the proposed rate sheet, and authorized staff to execute all necessary contract instruments upon the review and approval of the County Attorney. (Resolution Number 17-10-05)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Kevin Hamm, Maintenance Operations Manager, and Mr. Brian Blevins, Assistant Resident Engineer, with the Virginia Department of Transportation, were then present to speak to the Board.

Mr. Hamm then reviewed VDoT's monthly report. He noted that the Exit 150 project is on-schedule and the Lithia Road stream relocation project is proceeding and should be completed by the end of December. He stated that paving work is being wrapped up with night-time paving on Route 220 through Daleville still to be completed. Mr. Hamm stated that paving on Route 11 is complete for this year.

Mr. Williamson complemented VDoT personnel for the work on Route 11 that has been done to date.

Mr. Hamm stated that there were 3 land development and 11 land use permits issued in the past month. He further stated that various traffic study requests are still under view. Regarding area headquarters projects, Mr. Hamm stated that their staff have been busy for the last few weeks and are in the process of conducting snow removal equipment inspections for the upcoming winter weather season. He noted that they have also completed various drainage improvement projects on Route 220, Hunter's Green, and Thornblade Way.

After discussion, Mr. Hamm stated that VDoT personnel are placing the scratch coating on the British Woods Drive Rural Addition project and they hope to finish this project by the end of the week. He noted that work to put down the final pavement coat has begun at the far end of the roadway and there will still need to be work done at the end of the project to tie-in shoulder areas with the paved areas.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mr. Hamm stated that work will begin on the McFall's Road Rural Rustic Road project in the spring of 2018.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Hamm stated that VDoT representatives plan to meet with the property owner at the Springwood Road/Copps Hill Road intersection early next week to discuss this intersection improvement project. Mr. Hamm stated that VDoT plans to remove part of the rock wall and reduce the slope at this intersection to improve drivers' sight distance. Mr. Hamm noted that no additional right-of-way would be required for these improvements.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson regarding the Route 220 corridor study, Mr. Brian Blevins stated that VDoT recently held a pre-planning meeting in Lynchburg on this study. He noted that a public outreach meeting is planned for January 2018 and final recommendations will be drafted in March in time for consideration during the 2018-2019 SmartScale program funding application cycle.

Mr. Dodson stated that there continue to be traffic backups onto I-81 at Exits 150A and 150B in Daleville. He requested that VDoT install temporary signs at the Exit 150B off-ramp onto Route 220 northbound informing drivers that they can merge onto Route 220.

Mr. Blevins stated that VDoT has retimed the Route 11/220 stoplights to help with these traffic delay problems but they will review the options to see what else can be done to improve traffic flow.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel regarding the culvert on Route 43 in Eagle Rock near the Botetourt Funeral Home, Mr. Hamm stated that VDoT staff has met to discuss this issue and old records have been researched to ascertain if VDoT owns the culvert/easement. Mr. Hamm stated that their research has not found any deeds that indicate that there is a right-of-way associated with this culvert. He noted that the only option for VDoT is to open up the road and do away with the culvert box/pipe; however, this will not resolve the downstream drainage issue.

Mr. Leffel stated that he will have to inform the affected property owners that the drainage problem which was caused by VDoT cannot be resolved because VDoT has no legal remedy to resolve the matter. He noted that "it is just not right" that VDoT cannot resolve this drainage problem.

Mr. Hamm stated that he cannot make any improvements off of VDoT's rights-of-way. Mr. Hamm further stated that he is willing to meet with Mr. Leffel and the funeral home's owner on site about this matter.

Mr. Leffel stated that he appreciates what Mr. Hamm has done to research this issue but it is frustrating for the affected property owners that there is no solution to this problem.

After questioning by Mr. Leffel regarding an erosion issue at 4554 Breckinridge Mill Road, Mr. Hamm stated that their headquarters is waiting on an environmental permit before beginning work on these repairs. Mr. Hamm noted that he will follow up with their staff to check on this permit's status.

Mr. Leffel noted that the affected property owner was present at today's meeting to provide some details on this matter.

Mr. Loren Bruffey of 4554 Breckinridge Mill Road stated that this erosion issue developed 25 years ago when VDoT raised the level of the roadway on his property. He noted that there are erosion problems in the area where the culvert was buried and it has caused a large hole to be created on his property.

Mr. Bruffey stated that he asked VDoT approximately 4 years ago to make these repairs but nothing has been done. Mr. Bruffey noted that this hole is now approximately 6" from his paved driveway and he would like the problem repaired.

The Board thanked Mr. Bruffey for his comments.

After discussion, the Board thanked Mr. Hamm and Mr. Blevins for their report.

Consideration was then held on approval of the Voting Credentials Form for the VACo annual meeting in November. Mr. Larrowe stated that the Virginia Association of Counties annual meeting is scheduled for November 12 – 14 at the Omni Homestead Resort in Bath County.

He noted that three Supervisors members are attending this conference which includes a business meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Larrowe stated that the County is required to appoint a voting delegate and an alternate to cast votes on the County's behalf at this business meeting.

After discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board designated Mr. Todd Dodson as the County's voting delegate and Dr. Donald Scothorn as the alternate for the Virginia Association of Counties annual business meeting on November 14. (Resolution Number 17-10-06)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on a resolution accepting Brookfield Court in Brookfield Patio Homes, Phase 1, into the Secondary System of Highways. Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Planning Manager, stated that the County has received a request from the developer of Brookfield Patio Homes that Brookfield Court be accepted into VDoT's Secondary System. She noted that VDoT has reviewed and approved the street's construction and it is eligible for acceptance into the Secondary System.

On motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following resolution accepting Brookfield Court in Brookfield Patio Homes, Phase 1, into the Secondary System of Highways.

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Resolution Number 17-10-07

**WHEREAS**, the streets, Brookfield Court in Brookfield Patio Homes, Phase 1, described on the attached Additions Form AM-4.3, fully incorporated herein by reference, is shown on a plat recorded in the Clerk's Office of the Circuit Court of Botetourt County; and

**WHEREAS**, the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation has advised this Board that the street meets the requirements established by the Subdivision Street Requirements of the Virginia Department of Transportation; and

**WHEREAS**, the County and the Virginia Department of Transportation have entered into an agreement on January 11, 1994, for comprehensive stormwater detention which applies to this request for addition.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of Botetourt County** that this Board requests the Virginia Department of Transportation to add the street described on the attached Additions AM-4.3 to the secondary system of state highways, pursuant to Section 33.2-705, Code of Virginia, and the Department's Street Subdivision Requirements; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this Board guarantees a clear and unrestricted right-of-way, as described, and any necessary easements for cuts, fills and drainage; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Resident Engineer for the Virginia Department of Transportation.

The Chairman then called for a 5 minute break.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 3:05 P. M.

A public hearing was then held on proposed amendments to Chapter 6 Buildings and Building Regulations of the Botetourt County Code regarding unsafe structures. Mr. Jeff Scott, Building Official, stated that these proposed revisions were reviewed with the Board members twice over the past few months.

He noted that a couple of the Board members had expressed concerns regarding potential impacts from these proposed amendments on farm and historical structures. Mr. Scott stated that he believes that the incorporation by the County Attorney of definitions of these two types of structures from the Code of Virginia has clarified these issues. Mr. Scott further noted that these two types of structures are exempt from the ordinance's demolition provisions.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Scott stated that no comments have been received from any citizens regarding these proposed ordinance amendments.

After further questioning by Mr. Williamson regarding exemptions for farm and historical structures, Mr. Scott then read that proposed section ("Farm buildings or structures and certified historic structures are exempt from the demolition provisions of this Article, except that the Building Official may order an unsafe structure be made secure in the interest of the public safety, and if the owner fails to secure the property in a reasonable period, the Building Official may take such actions as may be necessary to secure the structure.")

Mr. Williamson then questioned what would happen if he has a dilapidated structure that may not be structurally safe but is used to store hay/equipment. Mr. Scott stated that this would be considered a farm building and exempt from demolition under the proposed amendments and the provisions of the Uniform Statewide Building Code. Mr. Scott stated that, if he received a complaint about the unsafe building and determined through a site inspection that it was unsafe and Mr. Williamson as owner did not respond to a request in writing to secure the building, then he (Mr. Scott) would have the building secured for safety purposes.

After discussion, Mr. Lockaby stated that these amendments are in part designed to allow a building which is historic or a farm structure that is creating an actual/imminent danger to the public to be secured. He noted that the buildings could not be razed under Mr. Williamson's scenario. He noted that securing the structure could include yellow tape around the site or boarding up the structure to keep out trespassers.

He noted that the proposed amendments include language to secure an unsafe structure in the event that there is a safety/hazardous situation that requires immediate action.

Mr. Martin then questioned if Mr. Scott would still secure a barn on a parcel which is posted for no trespassing. Mr. Scott stated that if the barn is on a parcel consisting of active farming operations he has no interest in securing it.

Mr. Dodson then asked that Mr. Scott provide the complaint procedure once a call is received regarding an unsafe structure and is there an appeal process to Mr. Scott's determination that the building is unsafe.

Mr. Scott stated that if a structure is an imminent danger there is language in the Building Code that requires the Building Official to take immediate action. He further stated that when a complaint is received, and after inspection of the site by his office to determine the complaint's validity, a certified letter is sent to the property owner of record giving them a certain amount of time to secure the structure. He noted that, if no response is received, a second certified letter is mailed and a notice to this effect is published in the local newspaper. Mr. Scott stated that he can only take action to secure the structure after 30 days of the second letter being mailed or publication of the notice in the newspaper.

After discussion, Mr. Scott stated that there is an appeals process that the landowner can implement to a Building Official's decision to the Building Code Board of Appeals (BCBoA).

Mr. Lockaby stated that the BCBoA hears appeals of the Building Official's decisions in the same manner as the Board of Zoning Appeals hears appeals of the Zoning Administrator's decisions.

Mr. Leffel stated that there is a barn in his district which is barely located off of a VDoT right-of-way. He noted that this barn is currently used to store hay.

Mr. Scott stated that this is considered a farm structure and exempt from the Building Code's provisions. Mr. Scott noted that his office took action on approximately 12 unsafe structure complaints in the past year. He noted that only one of these structures was demolished with the remainder being secured by the respective property owners.

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

On motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the attached amendments to Chapter 6. Buildings and Building Regulations of the Botetourt County Code regarding unsafe structures. (Resolution Number 17-10-08)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

A public hearing was then held on proposed amendments to Chapter 8 Demonstrations and Parades of the Botetourt County Code to bring the ordinance into compliance with the Code of Virginia. Mr. Michael Lockaby, County Attorney, stated that as time allows he reviews the County Code for ordinances that need to be updated. Mr. Lockaby stated that the Demonstrations and Parades Ordinance has not been updated since the 1960s and there have been numerous court decisions and State Code amendments enacted since that time which impact these provisions.

Mr. Lockaby stated that he reviewed the draft amendments with Sheriff Ronnie Sprinkle and Commonwealth's Attorney Joel Branscom and believes that the proposed amendments are "legally sound."

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.

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adopted the attached amendments to Chapter 8 Demonstrations and Parades of the Botetourt County Code to bring the ordinance into compliance with the Code of Virginia. (Resolution Number 17-10-09)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Consideration was then held on revised Protective Covenants and Restrictions for Botetourt Center at Greenfield. Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the purpose in requesting these proposed revisions is for simplification of existing language and to reflect changes in development and construction materials since these provisions were originally enacted in 1996 and amended in 2011. He noted that the proposals maintain the original

design vision for Botetourt Center at Greenfield but provide greater flexibility in specific materials utilized on buildings/structures.

Mr. Moorman noted that another proposed revision pertains to the approval process of future covenant amendments. He noted that currently unanimous consent is required of all park landowners of any proposed amendments. Mr. Moorman noted that the proposed language would require approval by 2/3 of the landowners and ratification by the Board of Supervisors to be obtained before the covenants are amended.

Mr. Moorman noted that the County Attorney, Planning Manager, and the County Administrator, assisted him in drafting these amendments.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Moorman stated that representatives from Eldor, Ballast Point, and Altec have indicated informal consent of these revisions and the Greenfield Development Foundation has approved the amendments and signed the document accordingly.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Moorman stated that he has discussed exempting the Greenfield historic preservation area from compliance with these covenants and restrictions with Mr. Lockaby, County Attorney, and Mrs. Pendleton, Planning Manager. Mr. Moorman noted that the preservation area will be platted separately from the remainder of the park and he does not expect any objection from the park's other property owners to exempting the preservation area from these provisions.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved amendments to the Declaration of Protective Covenants for Botetourt Center at Greenfield, including the exemption of the historic preservation area from these provisions, and authorized the County Administrator to execute this document in substantive conformance with the draft presented and upon final review and approval by the County Attorney. (Resolution Number 17-10-10)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Williamson then stated that the Solid Waste Committee, which includes himself and Mr. Leffel and various County staff, has met a couple of times over the past month. He noted that a report should be completed by the November Supervisors meeting on the potential for utilizing the remainder of the landfill's disposal area and plans for eventual capping of the landfill cell areas and future environmental monitoring needs.

After discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board appointed Ms. Melinda Otey as a private provider representative from Family Preservation Services—Roanoke on the Community Policy and Management Team for a term to expire on September 1, 2018. (Resolution Number 17-10-11)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mr. Dodson noted that there was a Captains and Chiefs meeting held last week. He also noted that the Fire/EMS Facilities Study RFP was pulled from today's agenda to allow additional review but it is expected to be finalized for consideration by the Board at the November meeting.

The Chairman then called for a break.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 4:00 P. M.

A presentation was then given on the Greenfield Historical Preservation Commission's final report. Mr. David Marcum, Chairman of the Commission, stated that it has been one year since the Commission's first meeting. Mr. Marcum stated that since his last report to the Board in May, the final master plan for the Greenfield preservation area has been developed. He noted that there was significant input from the Commission members and the community, including an electronic community survey which received almost 100 responses.

Mr. Marcum stated that from August to October the Commission worked with Hill Studio to finalize the report. He noted that Ms. Alison Blanton and Ms. Ashley Kritzberger from Hill Studio were present at today's meeting to provide an overview of the report.

Ms. Blanton stated that the master plan includes a conceptual plan, summary of the content, time period artifacts, structures for public display, evaluation of target visitors, a proposed plan for the park's design, timeline, and a summary of the public's involvement in the development of the plan. Ms. Blanton stated that they believe that this plan can be implemented successfully.

After discussion, Ms. Blanton stated that today's presentation will include an overview of the master plan and a methodology of how the Commission and Hill Studio got to this point. She noted that the Commission's members consisted of a good cross-section of the community.

Ms. Kritzberger stated that the historic preservation area on the Greenfield property was designated in 1996 when the land was purchased. She noted that the County originally estimated that this area would consist of 30 acres, but they are recommending that the site be increased to 38 acres to take into account the topography of the land.

She noted that Hill Studio's project approach was to pull together existing information on the site, including previous cultural reports, the County's Comprehensive Plan, the Greenfield Master Plan, etc., and they also worked with a tourism consultant to obtain statistics and comparable sites for potential visitor numbers to assist them in forming their recommendations to the Board.

Ms. Kritzberger stated that a design workshop was also held at the Education and Training Center to obtain input on how the park's design should be laid out. She noted that there was also public engagement through an on-line survey, and meetings with County staff and school representatives to "ensure that they were on the right track." She noted that there were approximately 70-75 people in attendance at the design workshop.

Regarding comparable tourism sites, Ms. Kritzberger stated that background and general data was obtained on six heritage tourism historical properties in Virginia, including Fort Christanna in Brunswick County and the Frontier Culture Museum in Staunton. She noted that this data indicated what was involved in operating these historical sites, tourism visitor numbers, budget/operational funding, etc.

Ms. Kritzberger stated that 5 components were identified to ensure a successful master plan for this site: historic resources, interpretative time-line trail, interpretative center, digital/virtual interpretation, and integration into Greenfield as a whole. She then reviewed the proposed site plan.

It was stated that Greenfield's historical resources is the reason the County designated preservation area. She noted that these resources are a tangible reminder of the area's past for future generations.

Ms. Blanton stated that the first step would be to stabilize and take care of the kitchen and slave cabin that were relocated to this site last year. She suggested that these structures not be opened for public tours but treat them as "3-D artifacts". She suggested that the site's interpretative trail be connected to the existing Cherry Blossom Trail. She noted that the trail could be a time-line trail with plaques/displays showing various events throughout the passage of history which will allow the site to tell a multi-level story. Ms. Kritzberger also stated that the report recommends that an interpretative center with toilet facilities be constructed on the site for display of the artifacts excavated from the property by the County and the Friends of the Greenfield Preston Plantation group.

She noted that all of their recommendations can be accomplished in steps.

After discussion, Ms. Kritzberger noted that the report recommends that digital/virtual interpretations of the site be included as they would be cost-effective, adaptable, and allow for unlimited content. She further noted that QR (Quick Response) codes could also be included in the displays to allow electronic access to other information.

Regarding phasing/funding strategy for the site, Ms. Blanton stated that cost estimates were broken down into various master plan components. She noted that the Commission tried to make the cost estimates flexible and included recommendations that the County provide matching funds for the projects. Ms. Blanton stated that funding for the buildings' stabilization and other site improvements need to be a partnership between the County and citizen/ historical groups. She also suggested that a tax-exempt, 501(c)(3) entity could be created to handle funding for the site's improvements.

She stated that public/private partnerships could be used to "get the public engaged and on-site" to appreciate the resources that are there. Ms. Kritzberger stated that they want this site to be something that grows with community support with the County working hand in hand with the community moving forward.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Ms. Blanton stated that it is estimated to cost \$28,500 to rebuild the porches on the two historic structures including restoration of the doors and windows. After further questioning, Ms. Blanton stated that Hill Studio frequently works with an architect and outside contractor who provided these cost estimates.

Mr. Marcum thanked Ms. Blanton, Ms. Kritzberger, and the Hill Studio staff for their work with the Commission in preparing this report. He noted that they recognized the potential for tying this project into other regional, historical projects. After discussion, Mr. Marcum encouraged the Board to authorize the creation of a 501(c)(3) entity to serve as a friend of the park and to work toward providing supplementary funds for the park's future improvements.

Mr. Marcum then recognized the Commission's members who were present at this meeting—Ann Layman, Angela Coon, Cheryl Sullivan Willis, Danny Kyle, Donna Henderson, and Rupert Cutler, Vice-Chairman. He noted that they have been relentless champions of this cause and brought invaluable experience and knowledge to this project. Mr. Marcum also

thanked Cody Sexton for his leadership, efforts, and patience as the County's representative to the Commission.

Mr. Marcum then asked that the Board receive the Commission's final report and recommendations.

The Board thanked Mr. Marcum and the Commission for their work with Hill Studio on this report.

Mr. Williamson stated that he appreciated the work done by the Commission members and commended their reporting on this project. He noted that the report seems to be very reasoned, reasonable, and thorough.

Mr. Leffel then gave his sincere thanks to the Commission members for the time and efforts that they provided in compiling this report. He noted that this report will be a help to the Board in going forward with plans for this site and the Commission's work is appreciated.

Mr. Dodson thanked Hill Studio for their work throughout this process and in developing this report and thanked the Commission members for their time, effort, and great ideas. He noted that this information will be used to bring together a celebration of Botetourt County's history and to build partnerships to make the site successful.

He stated that the Board and staff will delve into the report and come up with concrete recommendations to move forward and to begin to put together an execution plan for these improvements.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board accepted the report on the Greenfield Preservation Area Master Plan and directed staff to provide the Board with a report at the January 2018 meeting on the proposed next steps in developing the preservation area. (Resolution Number 17-10-12)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board went into Closed Session at 4:37 P. M. to discuss personnel matters regarding specific individuals; the acquisition of real property for public uses or the disposition of publicly held real property where discussion in open session would adversely affect the bargaining position or negotiating strategy of the public body; discussion concerning a prospective business or industry or the expansion of an existing business or industry 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 regarding specific legal matters requiring legal advice as per Section 2.2-3711 (A) (1), (3), (5), and (8) of the Code of Virginia of 1950, as amended. (Resolution Number 17-10-13)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Leffel, Mr. Dodson, Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Martin

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 6:00 P. M.

On motion by Mr. Leffel, seconded by Mr. Dodson, 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 17-10-14)

AYES: Mr. Leffel, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, 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.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Amsterdam District from Eric A. and Elaine M. Daniels for a Special Exception Permit, with possible conditions, to construct a second accessory building in the Residential R-1 Use District in accordance with Section 25-123. (17) Uses permissible by special exception of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance. The request will also require the administrative vacation of an interior lot line on a total of 1.2456 acres at 840 Catawba Road (State Route 779), Daleville, approximately 0.04 miles southeast from its intersection with Willis Way Road (State Route 1330), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87A(7), Parcels BK 6-2 and BK 6-3.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended conditional approval of this request.

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Planning Manager, stated that the provisions of the R-1 Use District require a landowner to obtain a SEP if they want to have more than one accessory building on their property. She noted that Mr. and Mrs. Daniels, applicants, were present at the meeting.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the Daniels own three lots along Catawba Road but only two are affected by this SEP request. She noted that the original residence was built in 1974 and a 240 square foot (sf) accessory building was on the property when the Daniels purchased it in 2012. She noted that residential zoning provisions limit the building surface area of a parcel to 10% of the lot's size. Mrs. Pendleton stated that, with the proposed 47' 4" X 15' 8" structure, the lot's coverage area would be approximately 8%.

She stated that surrounding properties are zoned Residential R-1 and then read the following proposed conditions: "The materials and color of the structure will be identical to that of the existing accessory building on the property; The proposed structure shall be limited to 750 square feet."

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that the total storage area of both accessory buildings would be approximately 1,000' sf.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that the Daniels own 3 lots—one a corner lot at the Catawba/Willis Way intersection and two adjacent lots which currently contain a house and one accessory building.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that the proposed second accessory building would be located away from the rear property line in accordance with R-1 setback requirements--no closer than 5' from the rear property line.

After further questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that, under current Zoning Ordinance provisions, this accessory building could not be placed on the property as the building is proposed to be located on an interior lot line. She noted that the Daniels are also requesting an administrative interior lot line vacation of the line between Parcels 2 and 3.

Mrs. Pendleton then displayed and Mr. Daniels described various photographs taken by Mr. Daniels of the rear yard and the proposed location of the accessory building in relation to his neighbor's property.

Mr. Daniels stated that he received the same e-mail as the County staff and Board members did from his rear neighbor with their concerns about the proposed location of the accessory building. Mr. Daniels stated that he has spoken to all of the neighbors about this proposed building over the past year. He noted that the building will be used as a workshop and to store his pop-up camper, trailer, lawn equipment, etc., out of sight.

Mr. Daniels stated that he is agreeable to installing a staggered privacy fence along the McCullochs property line if they have concerns about viewing this building from their property. Mr. Daniels stated that he is also willing to plant trees along this property line as he wants to work to resolve this situation.

He stated that the new structure will match the colors of the existing accessory building; however, the new building will be constructed of metal.

Mrs. Pam McCulloch of Wentworth Lane stated that she and her husband are not opposed to this building being constructed but they feel that it will be a large building—46' – 47' long—which is more in line with a commercial-sized structure.

Mrs. McCulloch stated that Mr. Daniels also owns a vacant lot at the Catawba Road/Willis Way intersection which is screened by trees on which the accessory building could be constructed. Mrs. McCulloch stated that Mr. Daniels' residence and vehicles are barely visible from her property now but this new building will be and it will block her views of the mountains. She further stated that they believe that the visibility of this structure will affect the resale value of their property.

After discussion, Mrs. McCulloch requested that Mr. Daniels be required to plant 4' – 5' trees along their shared property line or construct the building somewhere less visible by all of the neighbors.

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.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Daniels stated that the proposed building is slightly less than 48' long and slightly less than 16' wide. After further questioning, Mr. Daniels stated that his third lot is a spare, buildable lot.

Mr. Daniels noted that he currently has a 15' tall tree buffer along a portion of his property and he could plant some additional trees to help block the McCullochs view. He noted that these trees would eventually grow to 25' – 30' in height and would block the McCullochs view of the mountains. Mr. Daniels stated that he could also install a solid privacy fence in this area.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Daniels stated that he could plant approximately 10 – 12 trees every 5' – 7' along 60' of his rear property line to block the McCullochs view of the proposed building. After further questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Daniels stated that he has no objection to planting these trees.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Daniels stated that he works at a carpet restoration business. After further questioning, Mr. Daniels stated that he has no plans to use the accessory building for his business-related storage; only for personal items.

After questioning by Mr. Martin, Mrs. McCulloch stated that Mr. Daniels does park his commercial van at the rear of the property.

After further discussion with Mr. Martin, Mrs. McCulloch stated that the proposed staggered evergreen buffer could be placed in the 10' easement between their two properties; however, she is still opposed to having a building of this size in a residential district.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Daniels stated that he is not planning to include any electrical wiring in this building at this time but may have a light installed in the future.

After further questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Daniels stated that he is offering to plant trees along his property line with the McCullochs.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Lockaby, County Attorney, stated that this condition would be added to this request as a part of any approval motion considered by the Board.

After questioning, Mr. Daniels stated that the proposed building is 47½' long by 182" wide according to the paperwork received from the building's contractor.

After discussion regarding the total building coverage area on this property and the actual size of the proposed structure, Mr. Lockaby suggested that the Board revise the existing condition that the new accessory building be a maximum of 775 sf instead of 750 sf.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Dodson, seconded by Mr. Williamson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved a request in the Amsterdam District from Eric A. and Elaine M. Daniels for a Special Exception Permit to construct a second accessory building in the Residential R-1 Use District in accordance with Section 25-123. (17) Uses permissible by special exception of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance and approved the administrative vacation of an interior lot line on a total of 1.2456 acres at 840 Catawba Road (State Route 779), Daleville, approximately 0.04 miles southeast from its intersection with Willis Way Road (State Route 1330), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87A(7), Parcels BK 6-2 and BK 6-3, with the following revised conditions: (Resolution Number 17-10-15)

AYES: Mr. Leffel, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Martin

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

1. The materials and color of the structure will be identical to that of the existing accessory building on the property.
2. The proposed structure shall be limited to 775 square feet.
3. The applicant will install a 60' staggered evergreen buffer along the rear property line with the McCullochs.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Valley District from Our Savior Evangelical Lutheran Church of Roanoke for a Change of Proffers in the Business B-2 Use District to modify existing proffered conditions limiting uses to office, retail and family day care homes. The new proffered conditions propose to include church and day care center as permitted uses within the Business B-1 and B-2 Use Districts in accordance with Section 25-242 Permitted uses of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance on a site adjacent to northbound Cloverdale Road (Alternate U. S. Route 220), Troutville, at the Autumnwood Lane intersection (Route 1028), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 101, Parcel 281.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval of this request.

Mr. Jerod Myers, Long-Range Planner, stated that this is a change in proffers request. He noted that the applicants purchased the property in July 2017 and would like to construct a church facility and then a child care center in the future. He noted that in 1997 the property was rezoned from Agricultural A-1 to Business B-2 with proffered conditions which limited the use of the property to office, retail, and family day care homes.

Mr. Myers stated that the Comprehensive Plan's future land use map designates this area as commercial. He noted that there are currently no public utilities on this parcel and the applicants are proposing to install a private well and septic system to serve the church. He further noted that a commercial entrance permit from VDOT will be required to be obtained as approximately 19,000 vehicles per day travel this section of Alternate 220.

Mr. Myers stated that one individual spoke at the Planning Commission meeting with concerns about the construction entrance being located off of Autumnwood Lane as well as instances of visitors to the proposed church site parking on his property.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Myers concurred that the only proposed change with this request is to modify the previously approved proffered conditions to allow a church and day care center on this property. Mr. Myers stated that the applicant's original request was only to be allowed to construct a church on this parcel but, after discussions with Planning Department staff, the proffered condition request was amended to also allow a day care center in the future.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Myers stated that in the current Zoning Ordinance there is no definition for family day care homes. He noted that this request will eliminate confusion.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Lockaby, County Attorney, stated that proffered conditions must be submitted voluntarily by the applicant.

Mr. John Cooper, Secretary for the Church, stated that their pastor and several church members were present at this meeting. Mr. Cooper stated that they are a small church currently located on a landlocked parcel in Bonsack and the membership decided to purchase a lot to construct a new church. He noted that they hope to eventually increase their membership to 150.

Mr. Cooper stated that a day care center was added to this request after their discussions with County staff.

Dr. Scothorn stated that this section of Alternate 220 is very busy and would suggest that a deceleration lane be constructed into the church's property.

Mr. Cooper stated that the entrance to the property is proposed to be off of Autumnwood Lane, not Alternate 220. He noted that they will work with their neighbors during this construction process and they will comply with the County's regulations.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Myers stated that the property was rezoned to B-2 in 1997 but he does not know what the proposed use of the property would have been.

Dr. Scothorn stated that he would like to see renderings of the proposed church structure. Mr. Cooper provided him with pictures of a similar building to what is proposed on this property.

Mr. James Germann of Autumnwood Lane stated that he is not opposed to this development but he does have concerns. Mr. Germann stated that his property is located across the street from the church's parcel and he is concerned that heavy construction equipment and visitor traffic will park on his property during the building process.

Mr. Williamson stated that anyone parking on Mr. Germann's property without permission could be considered trespassers and could be reported to the Sheriff's Department.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Germann stated that there are currently instances of people parking on his property to visit the church site.

Mr. Dodson stated that Mr. Germann could also discuss these issues with the construction supervisor or the church's representatives if they continue to occur.

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.

Discussion was then held on the inclusion of "family day care homes" in the proposed list of allowable B-2 uses in the proffered conditions when no official definition of this use is in the current Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Lockaby suggested that the applicant's representative strike through this language in the list of proffered conditions, then sign and date this amended language

This was accomplished and presented to staff for file purposes.

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved a request in the Valley District from Our Savior Evangelical Lutheran Church of Roanoke for a Change of Proffers in the Business B-2 Use District to modify existing proffered conditions limiting uses to office, retail and family day care homes. The new proffered conditions propose to include church and day care center as permitted uses within the Business B-1 and B-2 Use Districts in accordance with Section 25-242 Permitted uses of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance on a site adjacent to northbound Cloverdale Road (Alternate U. S. Route 220), Troutville, at the Autumnwood Lane intersection (Route 1028), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 101, Parcel 281, as follows: (Resolution Number 17-10-16)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

- a. Professional offices
- b. Medical, dental offices and clinics.
- c. Financial offices, including banks, real estate, insurance and other general business offices.
- d. Wearing apparel shops, home appliance sales and service, retail shops, personal and professional offices.
- e. Administrative, executive and editorial offices.
- f. Churches
- g. Daycare centers.

A public hearing was then held on proposed amendments to Chapter 25. Zoning of the Botetourt County Code to create a higher-density Residential (R-4) Use District and associated text amendments.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval of these amendments.

Mr. Drew Pearson, County Planner, stated that these amendments were drafted in response to the upcoming Martlet rezoning request for a proposed apartment complex more-dense and with a proposed building height higher than currently allowed in the R-3 Use District. He noted that creating a new R-4 district also required that clarifications be made to other Zoning Ordinance provisions, including R-3. Mr. Pearson noted that the proposed amendments were shared with various developers and others in the building community for their input.

Mr. Pearson then reviewed the proposed amendments. He noted that these amendments also include language to allow more than one principal use on a lot unless otherwise specified in the ordinance.

Mr. Pearson stated that staff modified the residential district names as follows: Low Density Residential District R-1; Low-Medium Density Residential District R-2; Medium Density Residential District R-3; and High Density Residential District R-4. He noted that when the Zoning Ordinance was updated several years ago the Agricultural Rural Residential AR District was removed and a new Rural Residential RR District was created. Mr. Pearson further noted that there are still properties in the County zoned for this (AR) use and the District's name is included in the RR District's title as ("formerly AR") but the AR District is not recognized in the current Zoning Ordinance.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Pearson stated that AR is only mentioned in the RR District; there is no longer any specific AR-related language provisions in the Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Planning Manager, stated that there are two different sets of regulations in the ordinance but one of them (AR) is no longer an official zoning designation.

Mr. Pearson noted that this is a phase one approach to the AR zoning district as staff would like to eventually re-establish ordinance standards specific to the AR district.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that there are currently properties on the County's zoning maps that are still zoned for AR use. She noted that these properties were not rezoned to RR when that new district was created.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Myers stated that the AR zoning provisions were eliminated prior to the 2002 Zoning Ordinance updates.

Mr. Pearson then stated that staff recently discovered that the Code of Virginia classifies "Commercial Stable" as an agricultural land use and local governments are prohibited from requiring a SEP for this and other agricultural uses in a zoning district that otherwise allows agricultural uses by right, unless there is a substantial impact to public health and safety from the agricultural use. He noted, therefore, that the draft amendments add "commercial stable" as a permitted use in Section 25-72 and removes it from the listing of uses requiring a SEP under Section 25-73.

Mr. Williamson then questioned how a commercial stable has anything to do with agritourism.

Mr. Lockaby, County Attorney, stated that the Code of Virginia has a broad definition of what constitutes an agricultural use. He noted that the Board could adopt any regulation that is reasonable for these types of uses and the economic impact of the use can be taken into consideration during the approval process.

Mr. Pearson then noted that the proposed amendments also include: language requiring a SEP for structures in excess of 40' under the conventional A-1 development options and in the cluster A-1 development options sections; the minimum lot width in A-1 conventional developments be 150' at the minimum front yard setback line and have a front setback of 60'; and adjust wording for accessory building setbacks to make it more consistent throughout the ordinance.

Dr. Scothorn then left the meeting at this time (6:50 P. M.).

Mr. Williamson then expressed concern over the varying front setback distances in the various zoning districts and suggested that consistency of these setbacks be considered by staff. Mr. Dodson agreed with Mr. Williamson's comments.

Mr. Pearson noted that proposed amendments in the Forest Conservation FC Use District include moving commercial stable from a SEP to a permitted use. In the Rural Residen-

tial RR District, Mr. Pearson noted that it is being proposed that structures in excess of 40' tall be required to obtain a SEP unless exempt under Section 25-15(b); the minimum lot width is proposed to be 125' at the front yard's minimum setback line; and designate specific front, side and rear yard distances instead of various distances depending on whether the lot has a well or septic system or public water or sewer.

In the Residential R-1 Use District, Mr. Pearson stated that staff is again proposing that structures taller than 40' obtain a SEP unless exempt. He further stated that there are some non-residential uses allowed in the R-1 District (churches and schools) which have a maximum height of 60'. Mr. Pearson stated that the maximum height of any other buildings in R-1 Districts, except for single family dwellings, churches, and schools, will be set at 35'.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Pearson stated that the 35' building height was included as a "catch all." Mr. Williamson noted that consistency should be considered for building heights where possible and suggested a height of 40'.

Mr. Pearson further stated that the language in "Use Limitations" under the R-1 District was made consistent with other ordinance language.

Regarding proposed R-2 amendments, Mr. Pearson stated that "Uses Permissible by special exception" was amended to allow structures in excess of 40' unless exempt; in "Minimum lot area," "dwellings" was changed to "dwelling unit;" and a minimum lot area for "Other uses: 20,000 square feet" was added.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Pearson stated that, in a R-2 use, public well and septic systems would be necessary to create a new lot. After further questioning, Mrs. Pendleton stated that there is an exemption in the ordinance for public utility lot sizes.

Mr. Pearson further noted that it is recommended that the "Minimum gross density" section of the R-2 district be removed and the minimum lot width is proposed to be 80' at the front setback line. He noted that the minimum height of dwellings and "other" structures in the R-2 district would be amended to 40' instead of 35' for consistency as per Mr. Williamson's previous comments.

Mr. Pearson stated that with the creation of a new R-4 District, staff is proposing significant changes to the R-3 district regulations. He noted that these amendments include a requirement that all R-3 development be served by either public water and sewer facilities; removed the density language for dwellings under "Permitted uses;" removed "dwelling multi-family" from the "Permitted uses" and SEP permitted uses sections; and amended the "Minimum lot area" requirements.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson as to whether there are any R-3 districts of less than 1 acre, Mr. Pearson stated that most of the County's R-3 zoned parcels were approved with SEPs and would still be classified as conforming land uses. After further questioning, Mr. Pearson stated that he does not think that the County will be creating any non-conforming R-3 lots with these amendments.

Under "Section 25-166 Use limitations," Mr. Pearson noted that staff is proposing amendments to the open space requirements in the R-3 district similar to those in the proposed R-4 district.

Mr. Pearson then reviewed the provisions of the new R-4 zoning district. He noted that this district is not too different from the R-3 regulations except for the inclusion of land planned for high-density residential uses on the future land use map or located within a designated Urban Development Area (UDA).

Mr. Williamson noted that, unless located within an UDA, any R-4 zoning districts would be inconsistent with the current Comprehensive Plan.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Lockaby stated that the Comp Plan is in the process of being updated by staff but noted that the proposed Martlet R-4 zoning application is located in the Exit 150/Gateway Crossing UDA.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that, if a R-4 zoning request is submitted outside of a UDA, the applicant could file an application to amend the Comp Plan.

Mr. Pearson then reviewed the proposed R-4 permitted uses: church; single family attached dwelling with up to 6 units per net acre; multi-family dwelling with up to 8 units per acre; group home; home occupation; library; unlighted park, unlighted playground, public school, and telecommunications tower. He noted that the proposed R-4 SEP uses include community centers; day care centers; single family attached dwellings with up to 12 units per net acre; multi-family dwellings with up to 24 units per acre; fire/police/rescue stations; nursing homes; public utility plants, trunk lines, substations; private schools, senior assisting living facilities, etc.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that she believes that the proposed apartment complex on Alternate 220 has 15 units per acre and the existing Daleville Town Center apartments are higher than 24 units per acre as is the proposed new DTC four-story apartment complex. Mr. Pearson noted that the Martlet apartment request is proposing approximately 16 dwelling units per acre.

After questioning by Mr. Dodson regarding prevailing multi-family dwelling units allowed per acre in Virginia, Mr. Pearson stated that the proposed standards were in line with ordinances that he reviewed from Roanoke County, Bedford County, and nearby cities. Mrs. Pendleton stated that Renaissance Planning, the County's consultant, stated that 24 units per acre "was a good number" for the County to consider.

Mr. Pearson stated that the R-4 permitted use provisions are 6 units per acre for single family attached and 8 units per acre for multi-family dwellings.

Mr. Dodson questioned whether we are "limiting ourselves" with these figures and "how do we make ourselves attractive" to dense multi-family development projects "without giving away the farm."

Mr. Lockaby stated that these R-4 provisions are partly to do with the General Assembly revisions to the proffered conditions language in the State Code which limit what localities can require developers to do. He noted that the higher acreage density requests were included under the R-4 SEP provisions in order for the Commission/Board to have detailed discussions with the applicant on their proposed development.

Mr. Dodson stated that this will be a balancing act for the County.

Regarding R-4 lot requirement provisions, Mr. Pearson stated that single family attached dwelling developments require a minimum of 2 acres and must contain 2,000 sf per individual unit. He further noted that the R-3 language was used in the "Building requirements; minimum yards" section, and staff added language limiting "groups of dwelling units" to a minimum of 12 units separated by a minimum of 20' in any single family attached development. Mr. Pearson noted that the front setback for single-family attached dwellings is proposed to be 20' and 50' for multi-family structures and other types of uses; only 1 accessory building per lot will be permitted with the exception for multi-family dwelling units; and the maximum building heights were reduced to 35' for single family attached dwellings and 45' for multi-family dwellings.

Regarding "Use limitations" in the R-4 District, Mr. Pearson reviewed minimum common open space provisions that were included--pointing out substantive changes in requirements that stormwater management facilities would count as part of the open space calculations if they are designed to hold water throughout the year and are surrounded by a walking trail/sidewalk with benches for the residents/users. He further stated that greenway trails offered/accepted by the County in R-4 developments will require an easement/right-of-way to be granted. Mr. Pearson stated that this provision was included due to the proposed location of a greenway along Tinker Creek and the granting of possible future easements on the Martlet R-4 project.

After discussion, Mr. Dodson stated that such projects could receive credit for these types of easements and "double credit" if the developer actually constructed the greenway.

In the "Definitions" section, Mr. Pearson stated that clarifications are proposed for "green," "lot area, net," and "open space, common." He noted that net lot area is proposed to be defined as the "total lot area less land devoted to public or private street rights-of-way, but including areas designated as for common or natural open space." Regarding common open space, Mr. Pearson stated that the open space requirement of 50% green area was removed.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson regarding the mechanism for conveying the public right-of-way for a greenway to an entity such as the County, Mr. Lockaby stated that a separate deed or plat is required in this instance and he believes that greenways require an easement, not a fee simple strip.

Ms. Liz Belcher, Coordinator with the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission, stated that the Commission requires a recorded easement for rights-of-way proposed to be used as a greenway.

Mr. Pearson noted that Martlet is proposing a 30' easement along Tinker Creek for a future greenway. He further noted that a plat combining the two separate parcels will also be required if the R-4 rezoning request is approved by the Commission/Board later this year.

Mr. Robert Frydrych of Country Club Road then requested clarification on the determination that commercial stables are considered an agricultural use. Mr. Frydrych stated that he believes that this issue should be considered further. He also stated that dog kennels should not be allowed in the agricultural use district.

Mr. Lockaby stated that the "right to farm act" issue in discussions pertaining to commercial stables has been brought up many times. He noted that it has been found that the noises made by horses are not sufficient to create a substantial impact on the public's health and welfare compared to barking dogs. He stated that, as a result, most localities do require use permits for kennels on smaller parcels.

Mr. Williamson stated that an individual owning more than 4 dogs is required to obtain a SEP for a kennel from the County.

Mr. Frydrych stated that he does not have a problem with horses.

Ms. Belcher stated that zoning can be complicated but it can "do a lot for you" regarding greenways. Ms. Belcher thanked the Board for adding the minimum usable open space requirements and the provision for granting greenway easements in these proposed amendments. She noted that in another jurisdiction there was a proffer for a greenway included with a rezoning request. Ms. Belcher stated that language was included on the plat giving permission to have a greenway corridor through the property but the easement was not included on the recorded plat except to have it located in the public roadway. She noted that people using greenways do not like to walk along/in public roadways.

Ms. Belcher cautioned the Board to ensure that any proposed location for a greenway is a buildable location, have a 30% slope, not be located too close to a creek, or have some other access-related issue. She noted that it is a State standard that there be a 25' riparian buffer along any creek proposed to have a greenway easement.

Ms. Belcher also thanked the Board for including provisions for greenway easements in the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments. She noted that this language will help the Commission as they proceed to develop greenways in Botetourt County.

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

After questioning by Mr. Dodson, Mr. Pearson stated that the Planning Commission had a few questions about these proposed amendments but recommended approval as presented.

Mr. Pearson further stated that these amendments were shared with some representatives of the engineering and development community for their input. After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Pearson stated that Mr. Reid McMurry, Mr. Chris McMurry, Engineering Concepts, Balzer and Associates, Renaissance Planning, and the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission reviewed these proposed amendments.

Mrs. Pendleton noted that they also received some comments about the proposed amendments from Martlet representatives and another future multi-family developer that the County has dealt with in the past.

Mr. Leffel stated that the staff did a lot of work on these amendments but this is a lot of material to absorb at this meeting and then also have the Board members consider how to vote on the matter.

Mr. Dodson agreed with Mr. Williamson's suggestion that the building height revisions be consistent wherever possible in the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Dodson stated that he also does not understand the issue of commercial stables being considered an agricultural use and the County not be allowed under the Code of Virginia to require a SEP for these types of uses. He asked if these two issues could be brought back before the Board for consideration at a future meeting.

After discussion, Mr. Lockaby stated that, if the Board has any serious concerns about receiving numerous requests for commercial stables in the next 6 weeks and if they intend for delay consideration of these R-4 related amendments until the next regular meeting, staff could develop some suggested language on specific regulations for commercial stables.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Lockaby stated that, based on the Board's discussion, these additional amendments to the Zoning Ordinance above what was discussed at this meeting would be considered an appropriate change to the advertised amendments and no new public hearing would need to be advertised.

Mr. Dodson then questioned whether new densities for R-4 zoning requests should be considered

Mr. Williamson suggested that the density for multi-family uses in R-4 be amended to 8 per acre by right, and up to 24 units per acre with a SEP.

Mr. Dodson questioned whether the "by right" densities should be given "some leeway."

Mr. Pearson stated that "you have to be cautious" with "by right" requests.

Mr. Dodson stated that we do not want potential residential developers to look at the ordinance's provisions, think that they are too restrictive, and not want to build in Botetourt County.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the staff is recommending increasing the density in R-3 and R-4 districts by the revisions that are proposed in calculating density. She noted that the ordinance provisions are “going from net to gross” density which has “opened the door” to increased residential construction per acre.

Mr. Pearson stated that the current R-3 provisions would calculate Martlet’s proposal at a density of 22 units per acre and under the new language the density would be calculated to be 16 units per acre.

After questioning by Mr. Williamson, Mrs. Pendleton stated that the Martlet R-4 rezoning request is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors at their November meetings.

After discussion by Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mrs. Pendleton, and Mr. Lockaby on a recommendation by the Planning Commission in November on the Martlet request for a R-4 zoning for which corresponding ordinance amendments have not yet been approved by the Board of Supervisors, Mr. Lockaby stated that the Commission could recommend approval of the rezoning request contingent upon passage of the R-4 amendments by the Board of Supervisors at their November meeting.

Mr. Williamson stated that the Planning Department staff did a good job in drafting these amendments. Mr. Leffel agreed with Mr. Williamson’s comment.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Leffel, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board tabled consideration of proposed amendments to Chapter 25. Zoning to create a higher-density Residential (R-4) Use District and associated text amendments until the November regular meeting to allow staff to make further revisions based on the Board’s comments at this meeting. (Resolution Number 17-10-17)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

After discussion by Mr. Lockaby, on motion by Mr. Williamson, seconded by Mr. Dodson, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board tabled consideration of amendments to the Planning/Zoning fee schedule until the November regular meeting. (Resolution Number 17-10-18)

AYES: Mr. Williamson, Mr. Dodson, Mr. Martin, Mr. Leffel

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Dr. Scothorn

ABSTAINING: None

It was noted that the Planning Commission had accepted the applicant’s request for a deferral on a request in the Amsterdam Magisterial District from Martlet, LLC, to rezone a total of 17.862 acres from the Shopping Center (SC) Use District and the Agricultural (A-1) Use District to the Residential (R-4) Use District, with possible proffered conditions, in accordance with the proposed Section 25-168. Permitted Uses of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance; and a Special Exception Permit, with possible conditions, for up to eighteen (18) multi-family dwellings per acre in accordance with the proposed Section 25-167. Uses permitted by special exception of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance on a site located adjacent to and on 557 Roanoke Road, Daleville, approximately 0.41 miles southwest of the Commons Parkway intersection with Roanoke Road (U.S. Route 220), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt

County as Section 101, Parcels 44M and 50; therefore, this request would not be considered by the Board of Supervisors at this meeting.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 8:00 P. M.