

The Planning Commission of the City of Waynesboro, Virginia, held a regular meeting on the 18th day of January 2022, at 7:00 P.M., in Council Chambers, Charles T. Yancey Municipal Building, 503 West Main Street, Waynesboro, Virginia:

PRESENT: Commission Members: Shannon Boyle, Chair
 Stephen Arey, Vice-chair
 Bobby Henderson, Council Liaison
 Sarah Severs
 W. Lowrie Tucker

 City Planner &
 Clerk of the Commission: Luke Juday
 Associate Planner: Alisande Tombarge

ABSENT: Commission Members: Michael Gibson
 Noelle Owen

1. Call to order. Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. Boyle called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and asked Mr. Tucker to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Adoption of agenda

Mr. Arey made the motion to adopt the agenda; Mr. Tucker seconded. All voted in favor.

3. Review and approval of minutes of meeting held December 7, 2021.

Mr. Henderson made the motion to approve the minutes for the December 7, 2021, meeting; Ms. Severs seconded. All voted in favor.

4. Public comment period for items not on the agenda.

None.

5. Public hearing for a preliminary subdivision plat request by The Q, LLC, c/o Milestone Partners, agent for WMD Quesenbery Jr Estate (et al) c/o Whitney Quesenbery, owner, to amend a preliminary subdivision plat approved on May 7, 2020, for a 214-lot subdivision on 66.106 acres at 0 Ivy Street, Waynesboro, Virginia, Tax Map No. 14-6-25, including a waiver to allow street trees in the ROW.

Mr. Juday gave a presentation on The Q, LLC's preliminary plat amendment application. Staff recommended approval of the amended preliminary plat with the waiver to allow street trees in the ROW with the condition that the tree species be approved by City staff. For details, see the staff report in the agenda packet for the January 18, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Arey asked who would be held liable for any injuries or property damage related to the trees. Mr. Juday responded that the city would be liable, assuming a report was filed. However, the Parks & Recreation Department would be responsible for maintenance of the trees, and they do not expect much maintenance for at least 20-25 years. The first trimming would occur after five years.

Mr. Arey confirmed that the streets would be 25-26 feet wide, that parking would be limited to one side of the street, and that the buyers of the houses would be informed of the parking limitation prior to purchase. Mr. Juday confirmed that there are provisions in place to make the buyers aware of the parking limitations.

Ms. Boyle opened the public hearing.

Ms. Boyle invited the applicant to come forward and speak on behalf of the application. LJ Lopez of Milestone Partners, applicant, spoke in support of the waiver to allow the trees in the ROW, stating that the ROW is the best place for the trees, given the density of the development and the required setbacks.

No member of the public came forward to speak; staff confirmed no public comments were received via phone or email. Mr. Juday mentioned that the neighboring developer is in support of the application.

Ms. Boyle closed the public hearing.

Mr. Tucker made the motion to approve the preliminary plat amendment with the waiver to allow trees in the ROW with the condition that the City approve the tree species planted. Mr. Arey seconded. Vote was 5-0 in favor.

6. Public hearing for a zoning text amendment request by The Q, LLC, c/o Milestone Partners, applicant, to amend City Code Section 98.5.1.5.A.3.(g) to change the allowable maximum width of impervious vehicle travel ways and parking areas within the required front yard setback.

Mr. Juday gave the presentation on the proposed zoning text amendment to change the allowable maximum width of impervious vehicle travel ways and parking areas within the required front yard setback with staff not putting forth a recommendation. For details see the staff report in the agenda packet for the January 18, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Boyle opened the public hearing.

Ms. Boyle invited the applicant to come forward and speak on behalf of the application. LJ Lopez of Milestone Partners, applicant, gave a presentation in favor of the proposed text amendment. Mr. Lopez's primary concerns were providing adequate parking for the houses in the Ivy Commons subdivision and aesthetics. He stated that the houses would be built with two-car garages, and a 13-foot-wide driveway that flares out right at the garage would look strange. For aesthetic purposes, the driveway should align with the 16-foot garage door. Mr. Lopez showed examples of subdivisions with narrow lots and 16-foot driveways that were similar to the cluster development occurring at the Ivy Commons subdivision. The houses in the Ivy Commons development have compact front lawns with 15-foot setbacks. The houses are being built several feet back from the front yard setback to allow a vehicle to be parked in the driveway without sidewalk overhang. He concluded by observing that the small change in driveway width would have a big impact on the neighborhood and help curtail inappropriate changes buyers might later make to expand the driveways.

Ms. Severs asked if there would be any restriction on the buyers of the houses adding more driveway surface area. Mr. Juday said no, that there is no way to monitor the widening of driveways by homeowners because the required permit does not require a site plan review. There has been discussion

about trying to monitor and cite homeowners as needed for driveway expansions that exceed what is allowable under the zoning ordinance, but that it's been considered an overreach.

It was suggested that, in order to limit the ability of homeowners to expand the driveways wider than 16-feet, a restriction be included in the subdivision's covenants.

Mr. Arey suggested removing the "or 25% of lot width, whichever is greater" from the proposed language. Mr. Tucker agreed with Mr. Arey's suggestion.

Mr. Lopez, applicant, reiterated that widening the driveways to 16-feet is only in the area between the ROW and the front yard setback, and it would help decrease pressure on available parking and align the zoning ordinance with the application of cluster developments with two-car garages. The site plan takes into account the stormwater runoff associated with the increased impervious surfaces.

David Sheldon, president of the Claybrook Homeowners Association Phase 1, came forward to speak. He was not opposed to the expansion of the driveways, but did express concerns about the stormwater infrastructure being able to handle the additional runoff. The Homeowners Association owns and maintains a pond and has already had issues with runoff from the new development. The Association would like some assurances that the additional runoff from the increased driveway width would be adequately handled by the stormwater system.

Mr. Tucker asked the applicant about the status of the stormwater management plan. Mr. Lopez confirmed that the stormwater management plans were reviewed and approved as part of the public improvement plans. Mr. Tucker then asked for confirmation that the impervious calculations for the stormwater management plans included the expanded driveways. Mr. Lopez confirmed it. Mr. Juday commented that the plans submitted for the Ivy Commons subdivision included 16-foot-wide driveways.

Staff confirmed no public comments were received via phone or email.

Ms. Boyle closed the public hearing.

Mr. Henderson commented on the difficulty of plowing snow in the new portion of the Claybrook subdivision due to the narrower streets. Mr. Tucker said Mr. Arey's idea of removing "or 25% of the lot width, whichever is greater" was a good idea. Ms. Boyle agreed.

Mr. Arey made the motion to amended the City Code Section 98.5.1.5.A.3(g) to change the allowable maximum width of impervious vehicle travel ways and parking areas within the required front yard setback to 16 feet as proposed, eliminating the portion of the proposal containing "or 25% of the lot width, whichever is greater."

Ms. Severs seconded. Vote was 5-0 in favor.

7. Presentation of the 2021 Planning Commission Annual Report

Ms. Tombarge presented the annual report. For details, see the 2021 Planning Commission Annual Report in the agenda packet for the January 18, 2022, Planning Commission meeting.

Ms. Boyle asked for a motion to approve the 2021 Planning Commission Annual Report.

Mr. Tucker made the motion to approve. Mr. Henderson seconded. Vote was 5-0 in favor.

8. Other Business/Commissioners' Correspondence and Communications.

Mr. Juday said that if any of the Planning Commissioners had any ideas for SMARTScale projects, to let him know. Mr. Tucker asked if there was a possibility of a parking garage for downtown. Mr. Juday said no, not with SMARTScale; a parking garage would be a project the city would need to fund and build itself or by entering into a public/private partnership.

Ms. Severs inquired about the status of the Leggett building on West Main Street. Mr. Juday said that the owners have applied for a Certificate of Appropriateness to demolish that building and its annex and it would appear on the Planning Commission's February 2022 agenda.

Mr. Henderson inquired if anything was going on in the old Ruby Tuesday's building on Rosser Avenue. Mr. Juday said there was not; a car wash company was looking at the site, but the status of that is unknown.

Ms. Boyle commended the City's snow removal crews for an excellent job clearing the snow from the snowstorm that took place on January 16th. The Planning Commission members mutually agreed that the crews did an excellent job.

9. Adjournment.

Mr. Henderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Tucker seconded. Vote was 5-0 in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 P.M.