

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE TOWN OF VINTON PLANNING COMMISSION
HELD ON THURSDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2009, AT 6:45 P.M., IN THE ADMINISTRATION
CONFERENCE ROOM AT THE VINTON MUNICIPAL BUILDING LOCATED AT
311 SOUTH POLLARD STREET.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dave Jones, Chairman
Dawn Michelsen, Vice Chairperson
C.W. Pace, Jr.
Bob Patterson

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Philip Thompson, Roanoke County Deputy Director of Planning
Lindsay Blankenship, Roanoke County Planner II
Tammi Wood, Roanoke County Planner I
Steve Azar, Vice Chairman, Roanoke County Planning Commission
David Radford, Roanoke County Planning Commissioner
Rodney McNeil, Roanoke County Planning Commissioner

WORK SESSION AGENDA

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Vinton Area Corridors Plan Update**
- III. Family Day-care**
- IV. Fences on Corner Lots**
- V. Upcoming meetings:**
 - A Joint Public Hearing of the Roanoke County and Vinton Planning Commission on the Vinton Area Corridors Plan: Date(s) to be Determined**
 - Vinton Planning Commission Public Hearing for Family Day-care and Fences: Date to be Determined**
- VI. Other Business**
- VII. Adjournment**

The meeting of the Vinton Planning Commission was called to order at 6:40 p.m. by Chairman Jones. He asked that each person in the room state their name for the record. Ms. Michelsen, Mr. Pace, and Mr. Patterson were present. Vinton staff including Chris Lawrence, Anita McMillan, Karla Turman, and Julie Tucei were also present. Additionally, members of Roanoke County's Planning Commission were in attendance including: Steve Azar, David Radford, and Rodney McNeil. County staff including, Philip Thompson, Lindsay Blankenship, and Tammi Wood were also in attendance.

The next item of business was the Vinton Area Corridors Plan Update. Ms. McMillan recommended that they concentrate on scenario number 4 rather than scenarios 1 through 3, which they looked at during the

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
OCTOBER 8, 2009
PAGE 2**

previous work session. However, she did give Chairman Jones the option to discuss only scenario 4 or to go back and talk about the other 3 scenarios. Chairman Jones said he was comfortable with just discussing scenario 4. Ms. McMillan mentioned that, for scenario 4, the old William Byrd High property future land use was changed to parks/recreation and community facilities. She also pointed out that a portion of Tinker Avenue in the dark green was changed to conservation open space. She stated that some of those properties were purchased through hazard mitigation grant. She said some need to be changed to low density residential since they have existing houses on them and are out of the flood plain. Several of those property owners had obtained LOMAs from FEMA. Ms. McMillan mentioned that some properties along Virginia Avenue near Precision Fabrics Group should be changed to retail service from residential business. Mr. Jones elaborated on it by saying that the current zoning limits the uses that can go there. Ms. McMillan pointed out that the properties to the west of New York Pizza are currently medium density and should be changed to retail service. She explained that the owner of New York Pizza had submitted a master plan several years ago showing mixed uses, including some upper floor residential units. The Lake Drive Plaza block is currently retail-service and will be changed to general commercial. Next, she discussed the block that Valley Bank is in and stated that it needs to be retail service. The rest in that area is to remain residential business. The Wolf Creek pump station will go to community facilities, where it is currently residential business. Chairman Jones said he felt that scenario 4 had cleaned up some items they had missed. Mr. Lawrence said they are ramping some of the designations up, such as along Hardy Road across from CVS. Next, Ms. Blankenship explained scenario 4 in relation to East Roanoke County. She stated that they had also cleaned up some items that were off the corridors while they were doing the updates. Ms. Blankenship stated that she felt that their Commissioners were comfortable with the proposal. Chairman Jones asked Mr. Patterson if he was in agreement. Mr. Patterson said he was comfortable with it. He then asked Ms. Michelsen. She said it made sense to her. Mr. Pace also said he is in agreement with the proposal. Mr. Lawrence mentioned that he feels it encourages redevelopment of existing properties for commercial uses. This was in reference to the area from the Dillon Woods entrance to the Town line. He said that area would remain low-key office type uses in a residential setting. At the corner of Hardy Road across from CVS, it would encourage a more commercial or retail type of use to fit in better with that part of the corridor. Mr. Lawrence asked if Hardy Road in the County is on VDOT's six-year plan. Ms. Blankenship said it had been pushed back. She asked how the Walnut Avenue project was coming. Mr. Lawrence and Ms. McMillan both stated that some work on it should begin hopefully next year. Ms. Blankenship mentioned that signage is in the process of being planned for the Vinton Business center to give it more visibility. She also mentioned that the William Byrd traffic study had been done. Mr. Lawrence told them that public works has already taken down about 90 signs along Virginia Avenue and Washington Avenue to reduce the sign clutter as a result of this study. Ms. McMillan said they also are in the process of working on the downtown area plan and that a planning grant had been received for it. Ms. McMillan asked Mr. Thompson to address the next step for this process. He said originally they had discussed having two separate public hearings, but now they are trying schedule a joint public hearing with both commissions to hear citizen comments and then have a recommendation for Town Council and the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Jones asked if they had done a proper job of educating the Town citizens about this. Ms. McMillan stated that they have held public meetings and the County sent out letters to property owners about it. Ms. McMillan mentioned that they had a good response from the citizens on the survey. Ms. McMillan said they need more than two weeks to notify the public of the hearing. Mr. Thompson stated that he felt it would probably need to be held in December so that staff can

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
OCTOBER 8, 2009
PAGE 3**

have a draft document to review and for citizens to review. Ms. McMillan stated that they would try for 12/3 and would email the commissioners about the date. Mr. Jones said he would hate for citizens to show up and say that this was the first time they ever heard about the study. Ms. Blankenship asked if they wanted another work session for the document. Mr. Jones said he felt it needed to be moved on. Ms. McMillan stated that the next dinner/work session will be from 5:30 to 7 p.m., and the public hearing would begin at 7 p.m. She said it will be held at the Vinton War Memorial. Ms. Blankenship mentioned that the Director of Libraries had inquired as to what the citizen comments on the Vinton library had been during the corridor study process. Mr. Jones concluded the corridor discussion and invited the County members to stay for the rest of the meeting if they wished.

Mr. Jones stated that this issue on child daycare in homes had been continued from the previous meeting. He said there were new submittals in the packet for them to read this time. Ms. Turman explained the chart she had provided in their packets. She said that she recommends by use by right for one to five children, and by special use permit (SUP) for six to nine children. Care for ten or more children would not be allowed in residential districts. Ms. McMillan stated that the SUP would be similar to the ones that hair dressers have to get in residential areas. Ms. Turman said it would allow a review of each property during the SUP to make sure they are suitable for childcare. Mr. Jones asked if this were the same of use as the group home that used to be on Cedar Avenue. Ms. McMillan explained that it was not and also explained how it differed. Ms. Michelsen asked about the home occupation regulation where it limits staff people in the home. Ms. McMillan stated that up to five children will be a home occupation by right; and six to nine children will be by special use permit. Mr. Lawrence said the SUP will allow them to review the need for staff members and whether or not to allow employees in the home. Ms. Turman said they may also need to weigh the amount of children that live in the home in relation to how many from outside the home will be allowed to be kept as a home occupation. Mr. Lawrence said there could be issues with traffic and also with noise. Ms. McMillan said they may not be able to limit that due to the state code. She said will have to check with the Town Attorney to see what they can do as far as limits. Mr. Pace stated that in Bedford City one to three children are by right and more are by SUP. Mr. Lawrence said that low number would cause a lot more SUPs to come before them. Ms. Turman asked if they were ok with the recommendations they were given. Mr. Pace said he thought it was a good middle ground, and that it was good to be somewhat consistent with surrounding localities. Mr. Patterson said he was ok with it. Ms. McMillan recommended that they hold a public hearing for this issue sometime in November or January. It was discovered that Dec. 3rd is the Vinton Christmas parade. So December 2nd, 9th, or 10th may have to be the date. For November, perhaps the 10th may work.

Ms. Turman explained that there have been several issues with fences on corner lots in the last year and a half. She said she was asked to look at other localities regulations to see if our regulations could be relaxed or changed to allow owners of corner lots to have taller fences along the front yards. Mr. Lawrence said many people on corner lots want to build privacy fences that are 6 feet tall, but our regulations won't allow it. He said we have to protect the intersection and sight visibility for motorists. Ms. McMillan said it was originally done that way for aesthetics. She said having the tall fences right up to the property line can seem unfriendly. Mr. Lawrence said the Town is interested in protecting sight visibility and also aesthetics. Mr. Pace asked for an explanation of the sight visibility triangle. Mr. Lawrence explained how it works to him using a drawing he did on the chalkboard. Mr. Jones asked if it

**PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
OCTOBER 8, 2009
PAGE 4**

made any difference whether the fences are solid or open. Ms. Turman stated that it currently does not matter whether the fence is solid or open. Mr. Patterson asked if they put the fence next to the curb if the fence would be on the Town property. Mr. Lawrence said it varies with different properties. He mentioned one case where a property line is in the paved portion of the street. Mr. Lawrence stated that the sight visibility triangle must be preserved. He also said aesthetics should be preserved as well. He said there needs to be some green space between the road and fence. Mr. Jones asked what would happen if the regulation were for the fences to be three feet off the sidewalk. Ms. McMillan said there were a lot of properties with no sidewalks. Mr. Pace asked about having the regulation for the fence to setback from the curb. Ms. McMillan said not all areas have curbs either. Mr. Lawrence suggested using edge of pavement. Ms. McMillan said she felt that the property line would be better guideline for the regulation. Mr. Jones said someone could put fence outside the sidewalk. Mr. Lawrence said sidewalk is always in the right of way, and it can't be placed in the right of way. Mr. Jones asked about dropping the fence height to three feet. Mr. Lawrence said in regards to dogs, three feet is too short and that four feet is the standard for chain link fencing. Ms. McMillan said many citizens would like taller fences than four feet to be allowed on the corner lots. Ms. McMillan asked if they need more time to study the fences. Mr. Pace asked how pressing the fencing issue is at this time, and Ms. McMillan said it is not that pressing. The Commission felt that it might be good to have more examples of fences in town on corner lots. Mr. Lawrence mentioned a case of an existing six foot high fence on Clearview Drive which was taken down all at once and replaced with a new fence. This caused the grandfathering of the fence to be lost. Ms. Turman stated that she can give more information and picture examples for the next meeting. Mr. Lawrence said they can also provide some addresses of examples as well.

With there being no further business, Mr. Patterson made a motion to adjourn the work session, and Mr. Pace seconded it at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anita McMillan
Planning Commission Secretary