

Mr. Kidd called the June 28, 2022 joint work session of the Botetourt County Planning Commission with the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors to order at 7:47 PM after the Board of Supervisors meeting concluded, in the Botetourt County Administration Center Conference Room 229 in Daleville, Virginia.

PRESENT: Mr. Steven L. Kidd, Chairman, Planning Commission
Dr. Richard Bailey, Chairman, Board of Supervisors
Dr. Mac Scothorn, Vice-Chairman, Board of Supervisors
Mr. Brandon Nicely, Member, Planning Commission
Mrs. Amy White, Member, Board of Supervisors
Mr. Hiawatha Nicely, Jr., Planning Commission
Mr. Stephen Clinton, Member, Board of Supervisors
Mr. Billy Martin, Ex-Officio Member
Mr. Mark Popovich, County Attorney
Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Director of Community Development
Mr. Drew Pearson, Sr. Zoning Administrator
Mr. Jon McCoy, Long-Range Planner
Mr. Nick Baker, Code Enforcement
Mrs. Laura Goad, Administrative Assistant
Mr. Dalton Kaiser, Intern

ABSENT: Mr. Tim Lucas, Vice-Chairman, Planning Commission
Mr. Sam Foster, Member, Planning Commission

Mr. Kidd opened the meeting and called the Planning Commission to order.

Mrs. Pendleton turned meeting over to Mr. Larrowe.

Mr. Larrowe noted his appreciation for everyone's participation, and participants in attendance. Mr. Larrowe noted amount of work that has gone into this, and said this should maximize investments in place and the possibility for some restrictions being lifted.

Mrs. Pendleton thanked Mr. McCoy, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Kaiser, Mrs. Goad, and Mrs. Bradbury for their contributions, as well as the Planning Commission for providing constructive feedback and insight, as she said she looked forward to dialogue. Mrs. Pendleton stated that this meeting was not a public hearing, and Staff would be happy to engage one on one or in a group setting later because tonight's dialogue was for discussion between the Board and Planning Commission. She further stated materials would be available for folks later, as she provided a refresher on the Gateway Crossing status. Mrs. Pendleton stated that zoning is about striking a balance of private property rights and public interests; and that by having adopted codes and plans in place, they are presumed to be reasonable today.; The state enables local government to have plans and codes to reduce congestion on streets, protect historic areas, encourage economic development, and provide appropriate pathways to develop properties. Mrs. Pendleton further noted the ordinance was meant to evaluate when changes were appropriate for development and to talk specifically about Gateway Crossing with the constantly changing environment.

Mr. Pearson welcomed all, explaining that the ordinance was applied when projects come in, as he pointed out interest from developers. Mr. Pearson displayed a proposed apartment complex site at current Howard Johnson site, as he explained that in some cases the overlay could be used to make

requirements less restrictive. Today without the overlay, Mr. Pearson said developers would have to rezone from B-2 to R-4, with a SEP for increased density. He explained that the overlay looks at the kind of uses to combine a mix of uses, and in this case, the developer would meet the R-4 standards without rezoning, and they would only have to request a SEP for increased density, making it a simpler process for the developer. In this case, the developer plans to raze existing buildings and provide some commercial on the adjacent lot. He further explained the county hoped to encourage new growth to fill vacant properties and redevelop other properties. Regarding the same piece of property, Mr. Pearson said another developer contacted us about creating multiple apartments by keeping the buildings intact.

Mrs. Pendleton mentioned the first developer had other site plans in the office and had an interest in the county. She said that Staff asked them for their feedback on the proposed Overlay District, and it was 99% positive, that they were here because of the Board's vision, and it was important to recognize the good work done since 2015, some of which were grant funded processes. Mrs. Pendleton explained that the Board of Supervisors authorized the text to go to public hearing as soon as 2018, but with staff turnover and then the pandemic, the county was not able to move as quickly. She further explained that Mr. Jon McCoy, has been able to put a new set of eyes on the code and provide some feedback utilizing his past experience as a consultant across the state. in She then read the Board of Supervisors' vision slide, that was reaffirmed in 2022 at the Board's retreat:

The Exit 150 area is a gateway not only to Botetourt County, but to the entire Roanoke Valley, the Shenandoah Valley, Central Virginia and the Virginia Highlands. It is the starting point for visitors in search of scenic beauty, history, culture, and outdoor adventures. A nucleus of restaurants, lodging, entertainment, trails, and residential options, the Gateway Center lures travelers off the highway, hosts visitors, and provides convenient housing in the midst of varied amenities. Through design and dedicated effort, it serves as the major connection that economically and physically unites all areas of our county.

Mr. McCoy displayed the overlay slide as he described the overlay as layers over Lego blocks, pointing out how the overlay existed on top of zoning, and supplements it. He explained the current zoning would remain in place, that the overlay is a standard that provided flexibility in design, set of standards for one area of Botetourt, based on years of planning and visioning, permitted by state code, a tool to guide development to an appropriate location, a tool to foster an attractive entrance into Botetourt. Mr. McCoy further explained it was not restrictions preventing development. He noted that design standards could be part of a SEP, with restrictions against existing uses. Mr. McCoy stated it was not a means to take agricultural land, or a tool to guarantee development would occur, rather it is a method to encourage development in an appropriate location.

He displayed a slide depicting Rt. 11 near Country Cookin', with the next slide showing how it could look with development closer to the road. The next slide showed Hardees, and how development could be redesigned with mix of uses and increased parking. Mr. McCoy discussed the overlay's purpose to encourage efficient use of land with increased density, create walkable, pedestrian-oriented development with mix of land uses, with tools provided to implement these plans, as he highlighted the Board's vision for the Exit 150 area. As he displayed the next slide regarding the adopted Urban Development Area as part of the Comprehensive Plan, Mr. McCoy stated that Zoning is a tool meant to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. McCoy brought up the establishment of subdistricts, with an overlap in lot and building.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. McCoy pointed out US Rt. 220, Rt. 11, noting that the yellow was

the R-1 Use District zoning, then dark green for Forest Conservation, light green for Agricultural A-1 and various other use districts, the heavy lines show the various subdistricts. He further noted the heavy lines indicated the three subdistricts.

Mr. McCoy said the residential subdistrict, highlighted red lines, was intended to provide residential and small-scale commercial uses. The community business subdistrict highlighted in blue was intended to balance residential with commercial. The interstate subdistrict, highlighted in pink, focused more on business, with an intent to focus on existing businesses.

Mrs. Pendleton stated the key point was that these three districts were intended to provide a different focus on use types, with the Residential subdistrict focused on residential uses, the Community Business subdistrict focused on a mix of residential and local commercial, and the Interstate Business subdistrict focused primarily on interstate commercial uses.

Mr. McCoy commented that after hearing questions and concerns, the interstate subdistrict had been reduced in total size. He presented a map identifying the parcels located in the Interstate Business Subdistrict. He pointed out a single-family dwelling, a VDOT parcel, Hardees, Motel 6 and Cash Building Supply. He further commented that to give an understanding of interstate businesses, there were 55 total parcels, in this subdistrict, with 22 vacant and shown in green. Mr. McCoy mentioned that the yellow parcels would have no change in use impact as the parcels already permit B-2 uses. Mr. McCoy stated the only change would be with development standards, there were no changes in use and they could have more density. He further stated the uses in red on the Interstate Business-Parcel Analysis were currently conforming, and would become nonconforming if passed, including the two single-family dwellings, which would not be a by-right use.

Mrs. Pendleton explained that conforming meant the use could be continued or expanded.

Mr. McCoy explained that nonconforming meant the use could continue, but it could not expand, as he noted that B-2 was the most business friendly, and would have a few more uses in the overlay. He then explained that roughly 10% would become nonconforming.

Mr. McCoy displayed the Permitted Uses slide. This slide included the purpose, example of by-right uses, and example of SEP for each subdistrict. He explained the lot and building requirements, taking existing R-3, R-4 building requirements and applying to the overlay, with bringing the building closer to the street and building facades intended to provide people with more interest, height requirements, a business owner could have 45 feet in height by right for residential and community subdistricts, and up to 60 feet in the interstate business subdistrict.

Mr. Pearson stated the Gateway Crossing Area Plan already had a vision for what street crossings would look like, with the number of travel lanes set out, and on street parking, and the standards in the overlay district would bring forth these requirements with the new subdivision of land and those regulations would apply. He noted the block lengths of lots would have relaxed regulations of 750 feet between public intersections. Recognizing that restaurant trends have changed, Mr. Pearson stated staff's recommendation that the parking requirements be reduced. He went on to discuss sidewalk requirements, that could be waived by the zoning administrator, otherwise, sidewalks would be required for new and existing properties with certain renovations. Mr. Pearson explained parking standards would be relaxed in some parts of the overlay area, the county would reduce restaurant required parking, this would reduce minimum parking to 90% of the underlying district, on street parking immediately adjacent

to the parcel could count toward the parking requirements, a maximum of two rows of off-street parking would be allowed in front yards, and that drive through facilities between building and right-of-way would be prohibited. He noted the overlay was intended to relax some standards, and would not prevent a developer from developing Hardees as currently built. He also touched on requiring designated bicycle racks for uses requiring ten or more parking spaces.

Mrs. Pendleton commented that bicycle racks would not be required tomorrow, instead, what triggers this would be a change of land use, when there's a significant investment there's opportunity for change.

Mr. Pearson brought up drive-thru windows, noting the potential for conflict points between pedestrian and vehicles, as he displayed a Starbucks in Roanoke that allowed a drive-thru on the side with pedestrian entrance/access, and parking to side and rear of building. All the components of that site would conform to the proposed text.

Mr. Pearson discussed landscaping, buffering, screening and signs. He stated there was no reduction or changes to existing landscaping, buffering or screening. The sign ordinance remained unchanged, except through removal of square footage maximums. He explained the overlay relaxed this standard of maximum aggregate, so you don't have to pick and choose, although businesses would still be subject to maximum for each type of sign.

Mr. McCoy mentioned voluntary design guidelines. He said they were intended to show desired development and building features, such as windows, breaking up of landscaping, roof line variations, and the like. He wrapped up the presentation by providing implementation recommendations, and provided a link to the story map tool. Mr. McCoy also said Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors public hearings would be held in August and Staff wanted to continue to hear from the community.

Mrs. Pendleton concluded that everyone did a great job of explaining. Welcome comments and questions and gave planning email, website, and phone number.

Dr. Bailey thanked everyone, as he said it would be all right for people to ask questions and to hear their concerns.

Mr. Robert Young asked what would happen if the County was wrong, and this didn't work by disallowing certain things, as he referred to Roanoke City's plan and Orange Avenue. He then questioned who else owned property at Exit 150 and what would happen if the economy tanked.

When Mrs. Pendleton asked Mr. Young a question, Mr. Young responded that the County was getting rid of B-3. She then explained that the was not changing B-3.

After Mr. Robert Young, Jr. gave his opinion regarding the overlay district and the area regarding the former Cash Building Supply property, Mr. Pearson stated that property was zoned B-3 for lumber and building supply sales. He further stated they were still a conforming use to sell granite at that location. Mr. Pearson said if they needed to make any changes, such as a hotel site in the past, as people had previously thought, they would currently have to have public hearings. After the overlay district, towing might become nonconforming, they could continue, and you've had interest for a new convenience store which would not take a rezoning as it currently would. Mr. Pearson explained the overlay district would allow those properties to develop without the rezoning and would only need a SEP. He further explained the use was already recognized, would only have to go through the SEP process, now development

opportunities with B-2 uses that could occur without rezoning, and developers would only have to go through the site plan process. Mr. Pearson stated that the less developers had to go through public hearings, the better.

After further discussion, Mr. Young brought up the possibility of text amendments and said this was the first time he was seeing this.

Mrs. Pendleton explained this process began in 2015 and reiterated that a community meeting was held in 2017.

Mr. Bobby Young, Jr. stated the County was getting rid of 10% of all B-3 and you're pushing away B-3.

Mr. Goad said that lighting around Exit 150 was industrial, and questioned what would be permitted in terms of light generation. He noted if you wanted to attract people from 81, light tends to attract, as he asked if this was designed specifically for this area and mentioned 220 ALT, log trucks, if would it be feasible to have a building back up to the highway. He mentioned bicycles, noting that several people had been killed on Lee Highway. Mr. Goad commented the whole bicycle thing seemed like something needed in Northern Virginia, not Botetourt County. He then asked if studies had been done regarding runoff and improvements in place to allow the different types of zoning allowed.

In response to Mr. Goad, Mrs. Pendleton responded there was no proposed relaxation of lighting standards, with a total change for new uses, buildings close to the street effectively slowed down traffic, bicycles, with the overarching and bigger picture for long term, not only connected long-term uses but also encouraged multi-modal transportation, there were components about reducing curb cuts, making the environmental safer for all modes of travel. She further responded that with apartments, people want a different way to get around, and this provided an opportunity. Mrs. Pendleton stated that development would be held to the new higher stormwater standards imposed by the state but that there would be no additional county regulations that would be different in the overlay than elsewhere in the county.

Mr. Pearson stated the Gateway Overlay would not require someone to build at the road, rather it was allowing another opportunity. Referring back to the example of Hardees, he said it could still build just as it was today or the new way.

Mr. Pearson stated that developers would have to meet today's requirements, where we have parking standards of 1 space for GFA, the overlay would allow fewer parking spaces, which was more in line with today's trends, and not require more impervious surfaces, which would reduce runoff.

Someone asked the reason of stopping the overlay district near the Comfort Inn.

Mr. Pearson replied that the district went a little further down and took in some of the industrial property and with recent discussions, the County was not trying to put industrial properties in the overlay, so it was removed recently.

Mrs. Pendleton also mentioned transmission lines.

Mr. Young asked when changes were made to the overlay.

Mr. Pearson noted this was a living ordinance and map, with constant changes and public comments.

After further discussion, Mr. Martin thanked Mr. Young for his comments, as he suggested meeting with Mrs. Pendleton. Mr. Martin agreed with the need to make it easy for businesses to locate in Botetourt.

Mr. Moorman stated that where we are tonight is to share with the Board of Supervisors, and if Board saw fit to move forward, then ultimately the next move would be to public hearings, that would be a matter of public record. He further stated that much information had happened, it continued to be available, and the County would be happy to provide it.

At 9:26 PM, Mr. B. Nicely motioned to adjourn for the Planning Commission, Mr. Kidd seconded, which was approved 3:0:0:2, and the Planning Commission adjourned with the following recorded vote:

YES:	Mr. B. Nicely, Mr. H. Nicely, Mr. Kidd
NO:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Mr. Foster, Mr. Lucas

At 9:27 PM, Mr. Martin motioned to adjourn for the Board of Supervisors, Dr. Scothorn seconded, which was approved 5:0:0:0, and the Board of Supervisors adjourned with the following recorded vote:

YES:	Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Martin, Mrs. White, Mr. Clinton
NO:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	None