

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE TOWN OF VINTON PLANNING COMMISSION  
HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 2008, AT 7 P.M., IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AT THE  
VINTON MUNICIPAL BUILDING LOCATED AT 311 SOUTH POLLARD STREET.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Bruce Mayer, Chairman  
Joan Drewery, Vice Chairperson  
Dave Jones  
Dawn Michelsen  
Bob Patterson

**STAFF PRESENT:** Anita McMillan, Planning and Zoning Director  
Julie S. Tucei, Planning and Zoning Coordinator  
Karla Turman, Associate Planner/Code Enforcement Officer

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Richard Cranwell, Vinton (at 7:25 p.m.)

**PUBLIC HEARING AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of Minutes: Work Sessions, January 31, 2008 and March 19, 2008**
- III. Public Hearings:**
  - 1. Town Council proposed amendments to 4-23(b), Permitted uses and structures and 4-25(b), Lot area and lot width requirements, of Division 5, R-B Residential-Business District, of Article IV, District Regulations, of Appendix B, Zoning, of the Town Code, to provide for two-family dwellings that do not meet lot size requirements in the R-B Residential-Business District by special use permit.**
  - 2. Petition of C. Richard Cranwell, for a Special Use Permit (SUP) to convert a single-family dwelling, located at 115 West Virginia Avenue, Vinton, Virginia, tax map number 060.15-05-09.00, into a two-family dwelling.**
- IV. Other Business**
- V. Adjournment**

The meeting of the Vinton Planning Commission was called to order at 7 p.m. by Chairman Mayer. All members were present. Chairman Mayer declared a quorum to be present.

The first item on the agenda was the approval of minutes from January 13, 2008, and March 19, 2008. Mr. Jones requested that a sentence be reworded by Ms. Tucei in the March 19<sup>th</sup> minutes. He said it was the second sentence from the bottom of page two, which states, "He said it was in the CIP at one time and then was taken out." He requested that it be revised to state, "He said Council once considered reworking the downtown storm sewer system but, due to cost, it was removed when the actual work was done." There were no other corrections or additions for the minutes. Therefore, Mr. Patterson made a motion to approve both sets of minutes, with the correction noted to the March 19, 2008 minutes. Ms. Drewery seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and all members voted in favor of the motion.

The next item on the agenda was the first public hearing: Town Council proposed amendments to 4-23(b), Permitted uses and structures and 4-25(b), Lot area and lot width requirements, of Division 5, R-B

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
MAY 7, 2008  
PAGE 2**

Residential-Business District, of Article IV, District Regulations, of Appendix B, Zoning, of the Town Code, to provide for two-family dwellings that do not meet lot size requirements in the R-B Residential-Business District by special use permit. Chairman Mayer reminded them that they had Ms. McMillan's staff report. He asked if she had any additions or corrections for the report. Ms. McMillan mentioned that she had given them a copy of the resolution and also a copy of the draft ordinance, which was provided by the Town Attorney. She stated that it does not have any lot size or width requirements in it. Chairman Mayer mentioned that there were no members of the public present. Mr. Jones said that he had two things to add to the discussion. He said that one is that he still wants to use Jon Weersing, the zoning consultant, to look over the zoning ordinance, including the R-B District. He said that two is that it is obvious that Council wants this revision to the ordinance done; however, the Planning Commission should not blindly allow it if there are "holes" in it. He stated that there are no minimums in the suggested amendment and that there needed to be a minimum lot size and width. He felt that the minimum lot size should be at least 6,000 square feet. Chairman Mayer asked what width they wanted to consider, and mentioned that there are some lots in the Town that are 40 feet and many with 50 feet in width. Mr. Jones suggested 6,000 square feet and 50 feet in width for the minimums. Mr. Patterson agreed with Mr. Jones' suggestions. Ms. Drewery felt that it should be more than 6,000 square feet minimum. Chairman Mayer stated that in 1995, the requirement was changed from 8,000 square feet to 10,000 square feet. Ms. Drewery suggested that the minimums be 8,000 square feet and 50 feet in width. Ms. McMillan reminded them that the request is for a lot that is about 7,600 square feet total. Chairman Mayer asked about putting the parking requirements in the amendment, but Ms. McMillan stated that she would not recommend that. She said that should be included in the SUP request recommendations instead. Chairman Mayer asked about requiring a fenced yard for children who might live in the duplexes. Ms. McMillan said she did not think they could require a fenced yard, and reminded them that the parking areas would be on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Michelsen suggested that, because more than one family would live on a lot, the minimum be 7,500 square feet. Chairman Mayer reminded them of the suggestions for the minimum lot area that had been suggested—6,000; 7,500; and 8,000. Ms. Michelsen said they should consider that there will be multiple families on one lot. Ms. McMillan stated that having the larger lot size will allow more room for parking spaces. Ms. Michelsen asked if there were any other important factors they should consider. Chairman Mayer mentioned lot coverage is something they could look at. Ms. McMillan did some calculations and found that the average lot coverage was only ten percent, with the one in the request being only eleven percent. She also mentioned that a site plan may not be required for conversion of a house to a duplex, as normally only newly constructed duplexes require a site plan. She stated that the parking spaces do not have to be marked since there will be less than five spaces. Chairman Mayer said they would either need a motion to approve the passage of the amendment or not approve it, and also if there were any suggested lot area and/or width minimums. He also reminded them that they had voted once before to recommend denial of the amendment. Mr. Jones made a motion to recommend that the ordinance be amended as proposed with a minimum lot area of 6,000 square feet required, and a preferred minimum lot area of 8,000 square feet and with a 50 feet lot width minimum. Ms. Michelsen seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the following members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Jones, Ms. Michelsen, and Chairman Mayer. The following members voted against the motion: Mr. Patterson and Ms. Drewery. With three votes in favor of the motion, the amendment as suggested in Mr. Jones' motion is recommended by the Planning Commission for approval by Council.

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
MAY 7, 2008  
PAGE 3**

The next public hearing on the agenda was the petition of C. Richard Cranwell, for a Special Use Permit (SUP) to convert a single-family dwelling, located at 115 West Virginia Avenue, Vinton, Virginia, tax map number 060.15-05-09.00, into a two-family dwelling. Chairman Mayer stated that they had a copy of the staff report, and asked if there were any additions to it. Ms. McMillan offered to summarize the staff report or answer any questions about it. She stated that they had not received any calls from citizens regarding the letters that had been sent out per State Code requirements. She said it had also been advertised in the Vinton Messenger per the requirements. Chairman Mayer reminded the Commission that they can impose conditions on the SUP. Mr. Jones said that one of the conditions should be no parking in the front yard. Another suggestion made for the conditions was to require a reasonably fenced recreational area which complies with the zoning ordinance. Ms. McMillan reminded them that some people feel that fencing is not friendly. Chairman Mayer stated that he would rather require it than not. Mr. Cranwell arrived at 7:25 p.m., and Ms. McMillan gave him a copy of the staff report. Chairman Mayer stated that the ordinance requires four parking spaces. Chairman Mayer said they could require that the front yard be fenced. Ms. McMillan mentioned she would not recommend that they require the front yard to be fenced since the property is on a major corridor through Town. Chairman Mayer said they could just say a fenced area should be provided somewhere on the lot. Mr. Cranwell stated that he felt that they were treating him differently than the apartment building next door. Chairman Mayer said that the apartment building had been built long ago when the regulations were different. It was mentioned that the aerial map shows plenty of space in the rear yard for the parking area and fenced area. Chairman Mayer said the existing carport could be relocated if necessary. Ms. Drewery asked if there was room for parking on the side of the house. Ms. McMillan said there was not enough room there for parking. She also mentioned that the use of the driveway for parking could limit access. However, she said that the ordinance doesn't regulate the width of the access aisle/driveway for a single family house or a duplex. Also, she said that if the parking spaces aren't paved, there is no size requirement and they don't have to be marked. Chairman Mayer asked if Mr. Cranwell had anything to add. Mr. Cranwell did not have any further comments. Chairman Mayer asked Ms. Tucei to read the proposed conditions again. Ms. Tucei said the proposed conditions were: (1) no parking of vehicles in the front yard; and (2) provide a reasonably fenced recreational area which complies with the zoning ordinance. Mr. Jones made a motion to approve the request with the two added conditions. Chairman Mayer asked for a second of Mr. Jones' motion. The motion was not seconded. Afterwards, Ms. Michelsen stated that she thinks that the requirement of no parking in the front yard is reasonable, but she did not think Mr. Cranwell should be required to put up a fence. Mr. Patterson agreed with Ms. Michelsen. Chairman Mayer said that his thoughts were that it was a smaller lot size, so the fence requirement should be considered. Ms. Drewery agreed and said it was a safety issue. Chairman Mayer asked if there was another motion. Ms. Michelsen made a motion that the request be accepted with the requirement that the off-street parking not be located in the front yard. Mr. Patterson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the following members voted in favor of the motion: Mr. Patterson and Ms. Michelsen. The following members voted against the motion: Mr. Jones, Ms. Drewery, and Chairman Mayer. With three votes against the motion, Mr. Cranwell's request is recommended by the Planning Commission for denial by Council. Ms. McMillan told Mr. Cranwell that Town Council will hear his request on May 20, 2008 at 7 p.m.

In other business, Chairman Mayer said he is looking forward to working on the R-B District regulations. They discussed the different facets of the district. Mr. Jones came up with a suggestion of splitting the R-B

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
MAY 7, 2008  
PAGE 4**

District into two, one for the portions that are mostly businesses and the other for the portions that are mostly residential.

With there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on a motion by Chairman Mayer and a second by Ms. Drewery at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anita McMillan  
Planning Commission Secretary