December 4th, 2018

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: WILLIAM G. SAUNDERS, IV, AICP, CZA
DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, ENGINEERING & PUBLIC WORKS

RE: PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

The Planning Commission will hold its regular meeting Tuesday, December 11th, 2018 at 6:30 PM in Conference Rooms A & B in the Smithfield Center.

Please call 1-(757)-365-4266 or email wsaunders@smithfieldva.gov with any questions.

Enclosures

cc: Town Council
    William H. Riddick, III, Town Attorney
    The Smithfield Times
    The Daily Press
    File
1) **Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works Activity Report**
   - Clontz Park Boat Ramp
   - Joseph W. Luter, Jr. Sports Complex
   - Cypress Creek Phase 7 B&C

2) **Upcoming Meetings and Activities**
   - Tuesday, December 11th – 6:30 PM – Planning Commission Meeting
   - Monday, December 17th – 3:00 PM – Town Council Committee Meetings
   - Tuesday, December 18th – 3:00 PM – Town Council Committee Meetings
   - Tuesday, December 18th – 6:30 PM – Board of Historic & Architectural Review Meeting
   - Tuesday, December 18th – 7:30 PM – Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) Meeting (Cancelled)
   - Tuesday, January 8th – 6:30 PM – Planning Commission Meeting

3) **Public Comments**
   The public is invited to speak to the Planning Commission on any matters, except scheduled public hearing(s). Please use the sign-up sheet. Comments are limited to five (5) minutes per person. Any required response(s) from the Town will be provided in writing following the meeting.

4) **Planning Commission Comments**

5) **Public Hearing** Special Use Permit (SUP) Application – Carver Ave – Moody Properties Inc, applicant (Staff report, application, narrative of operations, site plan, and draft lot consolidation plat enclosed.)

   a) Staff Report
   b) Applicant Presentation
   c) Public Hearing Opened
   d) Public Hearing Closed
   e) Consideration

6) **Public Hearing** Special Sign Exception (SSE) Application – 841 & 845 W Main St – Jiyan 2 LLC & Interstate Sign Co Inc, applicants (Staff report, application, sign elevations, and site photographs enclosed.)

   a) Staff Report
   b) Applicant Presentation
   c) Public Hearing Opened
   d) Public Hearing Closed
   e) Consideration

7) **Public Hearing** – Amendments to Article 3.R of the Zoning Ordinance – Entrance Corridor Overlay (ECO) District – Town of Smithfield, applicant (Staff report and draft amended ordinance enclosed).

   a) Staff Report/Presentation
   b) Public Hearing Opened
   c) Public Hearing Closed
   d) Consideration

8) **Approval of the Tuesday, November 13th, 2018 meeting minutes** (Enclosed)

9) **Adjournment**

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO COMPLY WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA)**
Reasonable efforts will be made to provide assistance or special arrangements to qualified individuals with disabilities in order to participate in or attend Planning Commission meetings. ADA compliant hearing devices are available for use upon request. Please call 1-(757)-365-4200 at least twenty-four (24) hours prior to the meeting date so that proper arrangements may be made.
PLANNING COMMISSION (PC) STAFF REPORT: SPECIAL SIGN EXCEPTION (SSE)

PUBLIC HEARING: TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11TH, 2018, 6:30 PM

Applicant
Investstate Sign Co Inc
ATTN Tammy Brindle
1990 Rockford St
Mount Airy, NC 27030

Owner
Jiyan 2 LLC
ATTN Jignesh Nisar
2025 Indian Point Rd
Suffolk, VA 23434

Property
841 & 845 W Main St
TPIN 21-01-070F
.72 ac SE side W Main St;
W Main St & Hearn Dr

Zoning
Highway Retail Commercial (HRC) &
Entrance Corridor (EC) overlay

Adjacent Zoning
Community Conservation (CC),
Heavy Industrial (I2),
Mobile Home Park (MHP),
HRC & EC overlay

Project Description
The applicants have applied for a SSE for the replacement
of an internally-illuminated sign utilizing white light with a
new, internally-illuminated sign utilizing a red light within
the EC overlay (see attached illustrations).

Staff Comments
A strength of this application is the fact that the proposed
signage complies with the Entrance Corridor Design
Guidelines (ECDG).

A weakness of this application is the fact that, because the
replacement sign utilizes a red light, the proposed signage
does not comply with Smithfield Zoning Ordinance (SZO)
Section 3.R.L.5.b:

*Internal illumination shall be limited to an internal white
light contained within translucent letters and internal
illuminated sign boxes, provided the background or field on
which the copy and/or logos are placed, is opaque. The
area illuminated is restricted to the sign face only.*

Please direct inquiries to William Saunders at 1-(757)-365-4266 or wsaunders@smithfieldva.gov.
TOWN OF SMITHFIELD
310 Institute Street, P. O. Box 246 Smithfield, VA 23431
(757) 365-4200 Fax (757)357-9933

APPLICATION FOR:
☐ Special Use Permit ☐ Variance ☐ Special Yard Exception
☐ Special Sign Exception ☐ Other

Applicant(s) Name: Interstate Sign Co., Inc. / Tammy Brindle
Address: 1990 Rockford Street
City, State, Zip: Mount Airy, NC 27030
Phone Number(s): 336-789-3069

Property Owner(s) Name: Jiyan 2 LLC
Address: 2025 Indian Point Rd.
City, State, Zip: Suffolk, VA 23434
Phone Number(s): 804

Property Address: 841 West Main St., Smithfield, VA 23430
Tax Map Number(s): 21-01-070F
Property Description: Convenience Market w/ Fuel Sales

Zoning: HRC, MH-P Acreage: .72 Application Fee: $150.00
Legal Reference: Deed Book#: Page#: 

Proposed Use/Exception: Existing use will remain. Fuel Price on existing free-standing sign to be converted from static foam pricing to LED pricing. LED pricing is more convenient for changing prices and more visible to motorists.

Tammy Brindle 11/5/2013
Applicant(s) Signature Date

Applicant(s) Signature Date
Maaninisheel, Hears General Store, 841 W Main St, Smithfield, VA

CUSTOMER APPROVAL: SALES APPROVAL:

DESIGNER: DUSTIN BLEDSOE
DATE: 00/00/2018

LED SET CONFIGURATION

ITEM CONSISTS OF
(2) RED 12" LED PRICE LINE
ONE MASTER CONTROLLER
ONE REMOTE CONTROL

SPECIFIED LED MANUFACTURE
DAKTRONIC

PARTS COMPONENT LIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>PART NUMBER</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1CGOLED0188</td>
<td>PRICER FACE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1DKP12L1IP</td>
<td>1 PRODUCT 12&quot; LED PRICE LINE</td>
<td>1-SET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1DK05ALTR</td>
<td>5&quot; LED ALTERNATOR (DAKTRONIC)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVISION HISTORY:

1. INITIAL DRAFT
2. INITIAL DRAWING
3. INITIAL DRAFT
4. FINAL DRAFT
5. FINAL DRAWING
6. FINAL DRAFT
7. FINAL DRAWING

NOTE: Weights and Measures requirements vary by State, County and Municipality. It is the responsibility of the customer to confirm that these graphics are compliant with all local Regulations, Statutes and Ordinances. Compliance must be confirmed by the party obtaining the permit. SignResource is not liable for misinterpretation of local Weights and Measures requirements or any A&E Changes that may occur after the order has been placed.

If permitting and installation is provided by SignResource, we will make every effort to confirm the signage provided is compliant at the time of installation.

INFORMATION BAR

THIS IS A KIT PART ORDER
CGOLED0188-KIT
PAGE NUMBER
1 OF 3
QUOTE
11014004

CUSTOMER APPROVAL:
SALES APPROVAL:

COPYRIGHT © INTERSTATE SIGN CO., INC.
DUPICATION OR USE OF THIS DESIGN WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN AUTHORIZATION OF INTERSTATE SIGN CO., INC. IS PROHIBITED BY LAW

ALL INTERIOR COMPONENTS, I.E. BALLASTS, LAMPS, ETC. WILL BE U.L. APPROVED, ANCO IS A U.L. APPROVED COMPANY AND ALL OF OUR PRODUCTS BEAR THEIR SEAL.

DESIGNER: DUSTIN BLEDSOE
DATE: 00/00/2018
Please Note: Weights and Measures requirements vary by State, County and Municipality. It is the responsibility of the customer to confirm that these graphics are compliant with all local Regulations, Statutes and Ordinances. Compliance must be confirmed by the party obtaining the permit. SignGroup is not liable for misinterpretation of local Weights and Measures requirements or any rule changes that may occur after the order has been placed. If permitting and installation is provided by SignGroup, we will make every effort to confirm the signage provided is compliant at the time of installation.

TO BE MANUFACTURED WITH

DAKTRONICLEDs - (2) 1DK1211P

PRODUCT COPY:
PART NUMBER: CGOLED0188-KIT
WHITE COPY ON TRANSLUCENT BLUE BACKGROUND

LED DEBOSSMENT AND WINDOW DETAIL

8" OVERALL ALTERNATOR
CHARACTER HEIGHT: 5"
DROP-IN CABINET DIMENSIONS: 8" x 13"
CUT-OUT DIMENSIONS: 7" x 10"

12" RED DAKTRONIC 7-SEGMENT LED
LED UNIT SIZE: 15 1/4" x 34 1/2"
FIRST SURFACE MOUNTED FORNING DIMENSIONS:
FLANGE RECESS: 16 1/4" x 35 1/4" W x 1/4" D
FORNING WINDOW CUT OUT: 13 1/4" X 22 1/4" WINDOW SIZE

DEBIT

REGULAR UNLEADED

1" RADIUS FORNING
47 5/8" TRIM SIZE
45 3/4" W.O.
44" FORNING AREA
44" FORNING AREA
44" FORNING AREA
45 3/4" W.O.
47 5/8" TRIM SIZE
2 1/4"
Face Replacement
LED Pricer
ONLY
(To be opaque)
Applicant: Moody Properties Inc  
PO Box 10  
Smithfield, VA 23431

Owner: Ibid

Property: Carver Ave  
TPINs 21A-02-064, 21A-02-065, 21A-02-066 & 21A-02-067  
.551 ac S side of Carver Ave;  
475’ W of Carver Ave & Pinewood Dr

Zoning: Commercial/Industrial (CI)

Adjacent Zoning: Heavy Industrial (I2)

Project Description: The applicant is seeking to operate a “business services and supply establishment” on the premises, with an outdoor storage accessory use in the form of a laydown yard. “Any use requiring outdoor storage, loading, or display” within the CI zoning district requires an SU, as per Smithfield Zoning Ordinance (SZO) Section 3.K.2.C.10. Specifically, the applicant intends to store trailers, CONEX boxes, dumpsters, excavators, trucks, recreational vehicles, and boats onsite.

Comprehensive Plan: The future land use map indicates that this property is to be zoned for heavy industrial uses in the future, which would encompass the specific use of a laydown yard.

Staff Comments: Town staff would recommend the following conditions of approval for the applicant’s SU:

1. The applicant must furnish a landscaping bond in an amount estimated by a licensed professional landscape architect. The amount of such landscaping bond shall not exceed 120% of the total of the estimated cost of the landscaping based on unit prices for new public or private sector landscaping in the Town of Smithfield. Such landscaping bond shall be payable to and held by the Town Council, and the form of such shall be approved by the Town Attorney.

2. The applicant must consolidate all four (4) lots, collectively comprising approximately .551 acres, located on the south side of Carver Ave, approximately 475’ west of its intersection with Pinewood Dr, and known to the Town as TPINs 21A-02-064, 21A-02-065, 21A-02-066, and 21A-02-067, as this would result in the creation of a legal, conforming, CI-zoned lot of record.

Staff have deemed the application to be complete and the proposal seems to be within the parameters of SZO Articles 3.K and 6. As this is an SU application, reasonable conditions may be recommended by the Planning Commission as deemed necessary to protect the public interest and welfare.

Please direct inquires to William Saunders at 1-(757)-365-4266 or wsaunders@smithfieldva.gov.
APPLICATION FOR:

☒ Special Use Permit ☐ Variance ☐ Special Yard Exception
☐ Special Sign Exception ☐ Other

Applicant(s) Name: MOODY PROPERTIES, INC. (DAWSON & NEAL)
Address: P.O. BOX 10
City, State, Zip: SMITHFIELD, VA 23430
Phone Number(s): (757) 641-9361

Property Owner(s) Name: SAME AS ABOVE
Address: 
City, State, Zip: 
Phone Number(s): 

Property Address: CHEROKEE AVENUE
Tax Map Number(s): 20A-02-064, 20A-02-065, 20A-02-066, 20A-02-067
Property Description: SOUTH SIDE OF CHEROKEE AVENUE, 475' WEST OF CHEROKEE AVENUE'S INTERSECTION WITH PINWIND DRIVE
Zoning: C-T
Acreage: 0.51
Application Fee: $400.00

Legal Reference: PINWIND HEIGHTS Deed Book: INST # B5068089 Page: 

Proposed Use/Exception: ARTICLE 3. K:2 - SECTION C: ANY USE REQUIRING OUTDOOR STORAGE, LOADING OR DISPLAY

Applicant(s) Signature: P. J. [Signature]
Date: 10/12/18

Applicant(s) Signature: 
Date: 
To: Town of Smithfield
From: Moody Properties Inc.
P.O. Box 10
Smithfield, Virginia 23430

Subject: Apply for Special Use Permit for Outdoor Storage Yard

a. Store equipment
b. Operate a storage yard for a business, Moody Sanitation LLC (Roll-off container business).

Address: Lots #64, #65, #66, #67
Carver Ave., Smithfield, Virginia 23430

Reference to:
Smithfield Zoning Ordinance
Article 3, K: 2
C - I
(Commercial/Industrial District)

B. Permitted Uses:
11. Business Services and Supply Establishment
C. Uses Permitted by Special Use Permit
10. Any use requiring outdoor storage, loading, or display.

J. Additional Regulations
11. There shall be a minimum landscaped buffer strip of 10 feet in depth along all C - I District property frontage.

Etc...
Type of equipment to be stored on property:

1. Enclosed Trailers  
   up to 53' length
2. Flat Bed Trailers  
   up to 53' length
3. Conex Boxes  
   up to 40' length
4. Roll off Dumpster Containers  
   12' to 20' length
5. Backhoe and similar equipment
6. Work Trucks
7. Boat Trailers
8. RV's
9. Boats
10. Utility Trailers: enclosed and open
MOODY PROPERTIES, INC. HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY SHOWN ON THIS PLAT AND THAT THIS CONSOLIDATION IS WITH MY FREE CONSENT AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH MY DESIRES.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL THIS _____ DAY OF ____________

for MOODY PROPERTIES, INC.

STATE OF VIRGINIA
CITY/COUNTY OF ______________________, TO WIT:

A NOTARY PUBLIC FOR THE AFORESAID JURISDICTION,
THIS _____ DAY OF ____________

NOTARY PUBLIC
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES ____________

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAT AND CONSOLIDATION WAS MADE BY ME AT THE DIRECTION OF THE OWNER AND IS ENTIRELY WITHIN THE BOUNDARIES OF LAND OWNED BY MOODY PROPERTIES, INC.

THE LAST INSTRUMENT OF TITLE BEING IN
LOTS 64 AND 65 I.N. 0700007299
LOT 66 I.N. 0700007139
LOT 67 I.N. 0600008099

I CERTIFY THAT TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF
ALL THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND ORDINANCES OF TOWN OF SMITHFIELD, ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA, REGARDING THE PLANNING OF SUBDIVISIONS WITHIN THE TOWN HAVE BEEN COMPLIED WITH.

OCTOBER 24, 2018

CHARLES REID SHECKLER, CLS 1925

APPROVAL
THIS PLAT IS IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE TOWN OF SMITHFIELD, ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY, VIRGINIA AND MAY BE ADMITTED TO RECORD.

NOTE
LINES A TO B, C TO D AND E TO F
HEREBY EXTINGUISHED

PLAT APPROVING AGENT
TOWN OF SMITHFIELD, VIRGINIA

CHAS. R. SHECKLER, SURVEYOR, P. O. BOX 27, SURRY, VIRGINIA 23883

PLAT OF CONSOLIDATION
MOODY PROPERTIES, INC.
FOUR LOTS IN PINEWOOD
HEIGHTS
TOWN OF SMITHFIELD, VIRGINIA

SCALE 1" = 50'
REFERENCE NOTED
DATE OCTOBER 24, 2018
JO 0230.2018
Zoning Ordinance Article 3.R: Entrance Corridor Overlay District

For approximately ten (10) years, Town staff have been approving applications for certain types of new signage within the Entrance Corridor Overlay (ECO) district. These signs have typically been smaller signs affiliated with small-scale applications intending to permit the transition of a new business into an existing commercial space. However, in recent weeks, Town staff have reexamined the ECO district ordinance and now interpret that no language exists in the ordinance allowing for this administrative permitting avenue for new signage within the ECO district.

This misinterpretation of language does not waive the fact that Town staff have established an administrative precedent in the handling of applications for new signage within the ECO district. With this in mind, it may be perilous for Town staff to abruptly alter their handling of these applications, which would entail their review and approval by the Planning Commission, pursuant to Smithfield Zoning Ordinance (SZO) Section 3.R.C.1:

. . . All proposed development activities located within the Entrance Corridor Zoning District shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission . . .

Consequently, Town staff have proposed several slight alterations to the ECO district ordinance (see the attached pages), which, in our opinion, will:

(1) Assure consistency between the language of the ordinance and staff’s precedent of reviewing and approving certain sign applications.
(2) Avoid the possibility of overwhelming the Planning Commission with an influx of applications which would have otherwise been reviewed and approved by Town staff.
(3) Maintain an administrative permitting avenue that has been both cherished and praised by many applicants over the course of the last decade.

Lastly, the proposed amendment appearing in SZO Section 3.R.L.5.a is intended to remedy what has often been thought to be an error in language.

Staff Comments

Strengths:
(1) Assure consistency between the language of the ordinance and staff’s precedent of reviewing and approving certain sign applications.
(2) Avoid the possibility of overwhelming the Planning Commission with an influx of applications which would have otherwise been reviewed and approved by Town staff.
(3) Maintain an administrative permitting avenue that has been both cherished and praised by many applicants over the course of the last decade.

Weaknesses:

(1) None identified at this time.

Staff recommends approval of the amendments to the zoning ordinance.

Contact William Saunders at 1-(757)-365-4266 or wsaunders@smithfieldva.gov with any questions.
Article 3.R:
Entrance Corridor Overlay District (ECO)

A. Purpose

The purpose for establishing these provisions is to protect the aesthetic and visual character of land in the Town of Smithfield adjacent to major existing and proposed highway corridors, as defined herein, and to provide for and promote their orderly development. The overlay district regulations are intended to supplement the regulations of the underlying zoning districts and to provide for compatibility of development along the identified corridors. All development proposed within this District shall be subject to the procedures, standards, and guidelines specified in the following Sections, in addition to those standards pertaining to the particular base zoning district in which the development occurs. In particular, the purpose of the Entrance Corridor District is to:

1. Encourage and better articulate positive visual experiences along the town’s major existing and proposed highway corridors.
2. Provide for the continued safe and efficient use of these highway corridors.
3. Maintain natural beauty and scenic, cultural, and historical character of these corridors, particularly distinctive views, vistas, and visual continuity.
4. Protect existing natural vegetation and wildlife habitats along these corridors.
5. Discourage indiscriminate clearing, excessive grading, and clear cutting along these corridors.
6. Minimize cut and fill operations by placing emphasis on the retention of natural topography of these corridors.
7. Minimize intersections and individual site access points along these corridors.

The Planning Commission shall evaluate all proposed development activities within the Entrance Corridor Overlay District, with the exception of signage pursuant to Section L.2.a of this Article, which will include a review of the location, character and appearance of new development in the District. It is the purpose of such review to determine, in a cooperative fashion with the applicant, whether a proposed development plan meets the guidelines and other standards of this District.

B. Intent

The Entrance Corridor District shall include all lands within five-hundred (500) feet of each side of the following arterial rights-of-ways:
1. North Church Street/Business Route 10, extending from the town limits to the Pagan River Bridge.

2. West Main Street/United States Route 258, extending from the town limits to the intersection of United States Route 258 and United States Highway Route 10 Bypass.

3. South Church Street from Battery Park Road to the Cypress Creek Bridge.

4. South Church Street from the Bypass to Battery Park Road.

5. Benne Church Boulevard/United States Highway Route 10 Bypass, extending the entire distance between the town corporate boundaries.

6. Battery Park Road from South Church Street to the Corporate Town Limits.

The boundary of the Entrance Corridor District may either follow a fixed distance as set forth in Section B of this Article or the defined boundaries of a natural or man-made feature as determined by the Planning Commission.

The boundary of the Entrance Corridor District shall be shown on the official Town of Smithfield Zoning Maps and shall be delineated as a surveyed line on any property proposed for development.

C. Affected Development

1. Review Required. All proposed development activities located within the Entrance Corridor Zoning District, with the exception of signage pursuant to Section L.2.a of this Article, shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Any changes shall also receive such approval before proceeding. If a portion of the District will not be visible from the arterial highway once the project is completed, the Planning Commission may waive the special requirements of this Section for that portion. The Planning Commission may also review preliminary development plans or design development drawings at the request of the applicant.

2. Development activity permitted within the District. There shall be no alteration of the existing condition of the lands, uses or structures within the Entrance Corridor Overlay District from the date of enactment of this Article henceforth, except as provided for by this Section or by other sections of this Article.
(8) to twelve (12) feet. The minimum height of new shrubs used to create the minimum visual buffer shall be three (3) feet.

L. Signs

1. Purpose and intent. The purpose and intent of this Section is to regulate the use of publicly visible displays or graphics within the Entrance Corridor District; to protect and enhance the character of these arterial highways and surrounding areas; to prevent diminishing property values within these areas; to safeguard the public use and nature of these arterial highways; and, to minimize visual distractions to motorists along these arterial highways.

2. General regulations. The following shall apply to all signs within the District:

   a. Applicants for new or replacement signs in the District shall apply to the Zoning Administrator for review at the time of development plan review or as a separate submittal. The Planning and Zoning Administrator may approve any sign permitted in a residential district and/or any permitted sign not exceeding 150 square feet in area in a business or industrial district, if, in the opinion of the Planning and Zoning Administrator, such sign will not impair the character of the district.

   b. Signs shall meet all applicable requirements contained in Article 10 of the Town of Smithfield Zoning Ordinance.

   c. All signs shall meet the requirements of applicable State and Federal laws and/or regulations.

   d. The amount of information on signs shall be no more than is necessary to provide reasonable identification of the name and nature of the business to the passerby.

   e. Signs and advertising structures shall not obstruct any window, door, fire escape, stairway, ladder or opening intended to provide light, air or ingress and egress for any building or structure.

   f. No sign shall be used or permitted to portray information of an unlawful nature.

   g. Individual rate signs or price signs shall be prohibited. Motor vehicle fuel and service stations shall be allowed to integrate fuel and price information into a freestanding, detached business identification sign.
a. Landscaping shall be integrated with each individual freestanding, detached sign. Clustering of plant species shall be required to provide a pleasing composition mix of natural vegetation.

b. All such landscaping shall be depicted on the landscaping plan as required in Section K of this Article.

5. **Sign illumination standards.** The following sign illumination standards shall apply to all signs within the District:

   a. External lighting shall be limited to light fixtures utilizing white, not colored, lighting and shall not be blinking, fluctuating, or moving. Concealed and/or screened spotlight(s) or floodlight(s) shall provide external lighting. Spotlighting of signs shall be restricted to not more than one (1) 150-watt light per sign faces over up to forty (40) square feet and no more than two (2) 150-watt lights per sign faces over forty (40) square feet. The sign base and/or proposed landscaping shall be designed to shield the light from on-coming motorists and to conceal the light fixture.

   b. Internal illumination shall be limited to an internal white light contained within translucent letters and internal illuminated sign boxes, provided the background or field on which the copy and/or logos are placed, is opaque. The area illuminated is restricted to the sign face only.

6. **Sign maintenance and abandonment.**

   a. Following project completion, all appearance features of signage required by the Planning Commission, the Planning and Zoning Administrator, or shown on an approved development plan shall be maintained in good condition by the owner and all subsequent owners of the property.

   b. Any sign located on property that becomes vacant and is unoccupied for a period of sixty (60) days or more shall be deemed abandoned. The sign face or faces of an abandoned sign shall be removed by the owner of the sign or the owner or lessee of the property.

   c. If the owner or lessee fails to remove the sign, the Zoning Administrator shall give the owner thirty (30) days written notice to remove the abandoned sign face or faces. Upon failure to comply with this notice, the Zoning Administrator may initiate such action as may be necessary to gain compliance with this Subsection.
7. **Comprehensive sign plan.**

   a. Prior to erection of any sign, with the exception of temporary construction signs, noted herein, a comprehensive sign plan shall be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for review. **and approval if the proposed signage is in accordance with Section L.2.a of this Article.**

   b. The Plan shall provide the location and size of all proposed sign or signs within the development as well as proposed colors, sizes, lighting, location, etc.

M. **Exemptions to the Requirements of the Highway Corridor District**

1. **Single-family dwellings.** The construction of detached single-family dwellings on individual lots or parcels within the Entrance Corridor District which are not located within a residential subdivision are exempt from this Article. Also construction of detached single-family dwellings on lots or parcels within a residential subdivision are exempt if the subdivision plat was legally recorded prior to adoption of this Article.

2. **Agricultural structures.** The construction of bona-fide agricultural structures required for on-premise farming operations involving the cultivation of crops or the raising and keeping of livestock and the preparation of land for cultivation of crops are exempt.

N. **Development Plan Review**

1. **Applicability.** All development proposed in the Entrance Corridor District and other applicable projects, **with the exception of signage pursuant to Section L.2.a of this Article,** shall submit a development plan to the Zoning Administrator for review by the Planning Commission.

2. **Minimum requirements for development plan review.** All development plans submitted for review shall be complete according to the requirements of this Article before being reviewed by the Planning Commission for conformance with all standards and guidelines of this Article. No development plan submitted for review shall be considered until the minimum items of submission required by this Article have been submitted in a format acceptable to the Zoning Administrator and the review fee as established by this Ordinance has been paid.

3. **Content of development plan.** A development plan submitted for review by the Planning Commission shall include clearly labeled plans, drawings, photographs and/or narratives
depicting or presenting the following, unless deemed unnecessary by the Zoning Administrator due to the scope and nature of the proposed development:

a. Surveyed property lines.

b. Survey of existing topography and the location of trees and other vegetation meeting the preservation and/or protection provisions of this Article.

c. A site development plan or plans depicting the dimensions and location of all structures (including rooflines), all site improvements with distances and dimensions, and the bufferyard requirements of Section E of this Article.

d. Photographs or drawings of neighboring uses and architectural styles.

e. Location of bordering public or private streets or roads and existing, proposed, and/or approved access points.

f. Comprehensive sign plan prepared pursuant to Section L of this Article.

g. Location, dimensions, and layout of all areas to be used for pedestrian movement areas and vehicular and parking areas.

h. Architect's or artist's rendering of all proposed structures depicting the front, side and rear elevations including architectural treatment of all structural exteriors, including building materials and colors to be utilized.

i. A landscaping plan prepared pursuant to Section K of this Article.

j. Location and design of all proposed exterior site lighting within the proposed development.

k. Location, size, and dimension of all yards and setbacks.

l. A time-line or schedule as to the project start date, completion date, and occupancy date.

O. Development Plan Review Procedures

1. All development plans, with the exception of signage pursuant to Section L.2.a of this Article, shall be submitted and reviewed according to the following procedures:
The Smithfield Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Tuesday, November 13th, 2018. The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. Members present were Mr. Randy Pack, Chairman; Mr. Charles Bryan, Vice Chairman; Mr. Bill Davidson, Dr. Thomas Pope, Ms. Julia Hillegass, and Mr. Michael Torrey. Mr. Mike Swecker was absent. The staff members present were Mr. William G. Saunders IV, Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works; Mr. William H. Riddick, III, Town Attorney; and Mr. John Settle, Planning and Zoning Administrator. There were four (4) citizens present. The media was not represented.

Chairman Pack – Good evening ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the Smithfield Planning Commission meeting of November 13th, 2018. We will start our meeting with the Pledge. Please stand.

Everyone present stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chairman Pack – The first item on the agenda is the Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works Activity Report with Mr. William Saunders.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. The contractor for the Joseph W. Luter, Jr. Sports Complex is going to begin replacement of some of the faulty elements in the sewer system the week after Thanksgiving. Hopefully, it will wrap that project up for the most part. The turn lane right-of-way acquisition has been cleared with VDOT. We advertised the Invitation for Bids. We will have a bid opening on November 29th. The Clontz Park Boat Ramp contractor has cleared all of his permitting hurdles and hopes to start breaking ground over there as soon as the weather clears. He has already mobilized some equipment. Lastly, I would like to introduce our new Planning and Zoning Administrator, Mr. John Settle. He has been with us for about a month. He grew up in Virginia Beach. He is a Hampton Roads fellow; but his last station was the Town of Strasburg. We are certainly glad to have him onboard.

Chairman Pack – Welcome John. We are glad to have you. We will now move to Upcoming Meetings and Activities. Please review the list. We will move to Public Comments. The public is invited to speak to the Planning Commission on any matters except for scheduled public hearings. We do not have any of those tonight. Comments are limited to five minutes per person and any required response from the town will be
provided in writing following the meeting. There are no signups this evening. Is there anyone who would like to speak that did not sign up? Hearing none, we will now move to Planning Commission Comments. Are there any comments from the Planning Commission members? Hearing none, we move to the Entrance Corridor Overlay District Design Review – 1604 S. Church St. – Ray Barlow, applicant. Could we have a staff report please?

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – Mr. Barlow came in month before last for an application for 1604 S. Church Street to do some interior and exterior renovations. It is the old Boulevard Cleaners building. He proposed, at that time, to do a speculative unit with multiple office spaces inside. I believe now he has a buyer for that. It may have spurred some changes but I will let him discuss those details further with you all. Previously approved by the Planning Commission at the August 14th meeting was an application to replace the existing siding with gray vinyl siding. He planned to replace two existing front windows with picture windows, remove the chimney, install wheelchair ramps on either end of the front porch, and remove a large pine tree in the front of the building. There were a couple of conditions on those approvals. The first was that there would be a landscaping plan compliant with the ECO District Ordinance and standards be submitted to the town. The other was that the wording for the picture windows provided some flexibility as to the size. The applicant has now amended this application to include the following proposed improvements: installation of a seven foot wide and four foot deep gable porch roof on the southern doorway of the primary façade, the rake end of the gable will be sided in vinyl to match the remainder of the building that was approved in August, install one pair of raised panel shutters on either side of the picture windows, install a wheelchair ramp on the southern end, install front porch steps in front of the southern doorway, and install front porch steps on the northern end of the front porch. The design and materials proposed are in keeping with the ECO requirements. A strength noted on this application is that the proposed changes will improve the façade of an existing building that pre-dated the ECO requirements. This will bring it more into conformity with the district. A weakness of the application is that the applicant has still not submitted a landscaping plan compliant with the ECO District Ordinance standards. Thank you.
Chairman Pack – Would the applicant like to speak? Please come to the podium and state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Barlow – I live at 17541 Scotts Factory Road in Smithfield. As you heard from Mr. Saunders, I am proposing a simple front porch façade on the building. We have sold the building and are doing some changes to the exterior to fit the buyer’s needs and also the needs of the Town. Obviously, a handicap ramp is required. By doing this, we are giving a balanced look on the front of the building so it looks more appealing instead of a random ramp on the side of the building which took away from the front façade. By adding the gable to the front porch, it provides a place for anyone to come up and be out of the weather to get in the door. Another reason we could not have the ramp on the side of the building is because the back door entrance now goes straight into the kitchen of the bakery. By code, we cannot have a random person walking straight into that area because it is a health violation. This will allow every customer to come in through either front door. Everything else is pretty basic with shutters on the side of the windows for curb appeal. We left the chimney intact. We were going to take it out. The reason we left it is because the whole chimney is the flue vent for the furnace that is inside. We would have had to have another roof collar and roof vents in place of the chimney so we left it as it was. Nothing has changed really to affect anything else on the interior that you all would be concerned with anyway. There were only some minor changes. We did stick with the size windows that you saw last time and had agreed upon. The only other thing I can think of is that you had mentioned the landscaping. The business owner is actually going to come up with her landscaping scheme and submit that to the town. I will bring it for her. She is working with a landscape architect now to work something up. When it is done, we will have all of it presented at another meeting.

Does anyone have any questions?

Dr. Pope – Is the handicap ramp going to be long enough to be able to accommodate whatever the rise and run is for that section of the building?

Mr. Barlow – It is sixteen inches high from the ground level to the bottom of the door stoop. The run of the ramp is exactly sixteen inches to the edge of that building. It is a one by one fall. It worked out perfectly.
Chairman Pack – Thank you, Mr. Barlow. I have a question for Mr. Saunders. One of the things we discussed was the landscaping plan. If we were to provide approval tonight, what do we need to bring the landscaping into compliance? What tools do we have at our disposal if they fail to do something?

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – There may be a Certificate of Occupancy required because of a change of use; sometimes there is and sometimes there is not. If they needed a new Certificate of Occupancy, we could certainly make sure that the landscaping was either done or bonded before we would issue the Certificate of Occupancy. If you all vote with a condition on it, regardless, it is a regulation applied to their property. When there is a Certificate of Occupancy in play that makes it a lot cleaner because you can do a partial approval with the landscaping outstanding if need be. They can then bond the landscaping. Sometimes we like to do that so they can plant at the right time of year. We want their landscaping to succeed as much as they do. It is not abnormal to do that.

Chairman Pack – Has the pine tree been removed at this point?

Mr. Barlow – Yes.

Mr. Davidson – Isn’t that pretty much what we did last month? We approved it with the exception of the landscaping.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – Yes. You had a condition that a landscaping plan compliant with the ordinance and standards be submitted to the town.

Mr. Davidson – We can do that again.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – We can administratively review it and approve that.

Chairman Pack – Are there any other comments or concerns? Hearing none, do I have a motion?

Mr. Davidson – I would like to make a motion that we approve it as presented with the exception of having a landscaping plan compliant with the ECO District Ordinance be submitted to the town.

Vice Chairman Bryan – Second.
Chairman Pack – A motion has been made and properly seconded. Is there any further discussion? Roll call vote.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Vice Chairman Bryan voted aye, Mr. Davidson voted aye, Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, and Chairman Pack voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Pack – Our next item is the Entrance Corridor Overlay District Design Review – 200 Vincents’s Crossing – Smithfield Hotel, LLC and Michael Pisa, Alliance Signs of Virginia, LLC, applicants. Could we have a staff report please?

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – We heard this application last month. They brought us some sign renderings as well as architectural accent lighting for the structure. The Planning Commission approved the signs and tabled the application for the architectural accent lighting for more information related to light spillage onto adjacent properties. You wanted more information on how much the frequency was for the LED lighting at the cornice. Mr. Pisa provided several pieces of information related to those things. In the staff report, there are several sections of the Entrance Corridor Design Guidelines as well as the Entrance Corridor Ordinance as they relate to architectural lighting for you to refer to. In some of the attachments, they have some pictures of the cornice on a similar building which is illuminated. The data sheet shows the actual product of the LED lights and how they are in series. There is an email from Mr. Pisa that shows the wattage per unit and the lumens per foot to show exactly how much light they have. One thing, that may not even be possible to do, is a photometric plan of adjacent properties because this is a reflective light rather than direct light. I will let Mr. Pisa speak more on the technical aspects of that. Thank you.

Chairman Pack – Would the applicant like to speak? Please state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Michael Pisa – I am with Alliance Signs of Virginia. This project is the Hampton Inn & Suites. We are looking at doing cornice lighting for them. There are a few pictures in your packets as to what the cornice lighting will look like. I just want to make sure that everybody understands that this is actually an ‘up’ lighting. It will not be a ‘down’ light. It does not spread out. In the pictures, if you look at the daytime photo,
the top of the cornice curves at the peak the LED actually sits down in, in the bottom section and shoots up. It is angled in so that it does not portray past that top angle. It just illuminates the outside band. It is not something that is on the top and shooting down. It is literally angled inside of the cornice just up to the peak.

Chairman Pack – Are there any questions for Mr. Pisa?

Mr. Davidson – Does this lighting go all the way around the building?

Mr. Pisa – It does not. I noticed that when the drawings went out it did not show where these are. I have a couple of copies I can pass around.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – They have the sheets that show the yellow highlighted areas.

Mr. Pisa – In the front, you will see that there are six sections. On the back rear side, there will be three on the peaks. On the left side that faces Food Lion, it will be on those three peaks. The side that runs parallel with Josephine Crossing will have it on the three peaks as well.

Chairman Pack – So, essentially, anything with a peak will have the lighting?

Mr. Pisa – Yes.

Vice Chairman Bryan – The only lettering is on the main sign that is being illuminated. Is that correct?

Mr. Pisa – As far as signage, yes, just the Hampton Inn & Suites.

Vice Chairman Bryan – The rest of the lighting is just to light up the structure itself?

Mr. Pisa – Correct.

Vice Chairman Bryan – I went by there and looked at it that night. It is a little difficult to see from the road. It is not lit very well. I can understand their concern.

Chairman Pack – Mr. Saunders, did we not also have additional signage that was on the building that was lit with the previous application?

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – The signage was approved previously; only the lighting was tabled.

Chairman Pack – Are there any other questions for Mr. Pisa? Hearing none, thank you Mr. Pisa. We went through this at the last meeting and had some questions and concerns. Mr. Pisa is here tonight and has addressed those.
Mr. Davidson – The one thing I remember was regarding the apartments in the rear of the building as far as the lighting interfering with them. Has that been addressed?

Chairman Pack – I think what you are looking for is the down lighting survey.

Mr. Davidson – Since this is up lighting there would not be a down lighting survey. Is that correct?

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – Without it being direct lighting, I do not know that you can even assume what the photometrics would be away from the building. This is just reflecting off the cornice. It is kind of an unknown I would think.

Mr. Pisa – As far as exactly how far it would extend, I could not tell you. I know that standing in the parking lot of others that have been done already it does not even bring light out into the parking lot. With the three sections on the back towards Cattail Lane, I do not see an issue with it. The reflection can only go so far. It barely comes out of the soffit that it will be sitting in.

Dr. Pope – I think it is better to have it at the peaks as opposed to the picture which is continuous. Continuous would be a little monotonous and certainly asking for trouble; but there will only be three peaks illuminated on the rear of the building.

Mr. Pisa – All sides add up to be 429’ total.

Dr. Pope – There is probably only about 75’ on the back then. I personally do not think it is going to interfere. I would have concerns if it ran the whole length of the building.

Mr. Torrey – Just out of curiosity, how will they be controlled?

Mr. Pisa – We will have them set on a timer.

Mr. Torrey – Will it be all or nothing?

Mr. Pisa – These will be on a timer.

Ms. Hillegass – Will they be on from sundown to sunup?

Mr. Pisa – No, ma’am. They will be on a photocell so that when it gets dark they will come on.

Vice Chairman Bryan – Do you know the lumens?
Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – There is a chart in the email. It lists the lumens for this particular application. It is right after the picture of the building. They are eighty-six per foot.

Ms. Hillegass – I move to approve as presented.

Mr. Davidson – Second.

Chairman Pack – A motion has been made and properly seconded. Roll call vote.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Mr. Davidson voted aye, Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, Vice Chairman Bryan voted aye, and Chairman Pack voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Pack – Our next item is an Entrance Corridor Overlay District Design Review – 1613 S. Church St. - Jimmy Auvil, applicant. Could we have a staff report please?

Planning and Zoning Administrator – Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Planning Commission. The applicant, Mr. Jimmy Auvil, has acquired the former police department location and wishes to turn it into office space. ECO design approval is sought for several exterior changes. Firstly, the applicant wishes to replace the existing brown roofing shingles with slate/charcoal architectural asphalt shingles. Additionally, he wishes to replace the existing windows with beige vinyl windows of a 9/9 pattern with beige trim. All other existing trim on the building is to remain white. He also wishes to add a detached multi-tenant sign in the same location as the previous detached sign. Staff has several comments on this application. Firstly, staff notes that the design and materials proposed are in keeping with both the ECO Design Guidelines and the Zoning Ordinance. An additional strength is that the proposed changes will improve the façade of the building bringing it more into conformity with the district. The multi-tenant detached sign will meet the ordinance in regards to size, location, and landscaping. In fact, this sign is the preferred type of sign in this district for multiple tenant buildings. The applicant also proposes to keep the multiple tenant individual small sign panels a consistent font type and color. The applicant also proposes to keep the existing landscaping around the building but does propose to replace the existing mulch with
Chairman Pack – Would the applicant like to speak? Please come to the podium and state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Jimmy Auvil, Jr. – I live at 208 Mariner Circle in Smithfield. We acquired the building at 1613 S. Church Street. Basically, we are just giving it a cosmetic upgrade on the outside. The shingles are in need of replacement. We will remove those and replace them with architectural shingles. The Courthouse is kind of the look we are actually going for which is why there is a picture of the Courthouse in there. We are going with the grid style windows. As far as the sign goes, there is a picture in the packet. The sign company proposed this to us. Thank you.

Chairman Pack – Are there any questions for Mr. Auvil? Hearing none, are there any Planning Commission comments?

Vice Chairman Bryan – I have no issues with it. It is an improvement upon an existing structure that is vacant at the moment. This will make it useful.

Mr. Torrey – I have a question. With the sign, is that just a description of the sign or will there actually be space for twelve tenants?

Mr. Auvil – We are keeping the space for that many tenants. We advertise all-inclusive office space. We have the Carrollton Business Center also. We have quite a few tenants there. It is usually small office space that we rent. There will be eighteen offices in that building. Our real estate company will be using the building also.

Mr. Torrey – There is a good size pad for parking in the front. I am sure you will need to do some new lines.

Mr. Auvil – There will be twenty parking spots in the front according to our estimates. The lines do not exist anymore. We will re-paint them. There is still a driveway that goes along the side of that building. There is a parking area there with gravel along the back. It is overgrown now. The town is telling us that we can clean that area up and keep the gravel and use that little area also.

Vice Chairman Bryan – They are changing the use of that building. Would that affect parking requirements?
Town Attorney – They are not changing the use. It has always been an office building.

Mr. Davidson – Mr. Chairman, I would move that we approve this application as proposed.

Vice Chairman Bryan – Second.

Chairman Pack – A motion has been made and properly seconded to approve as presented. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, roll call vote.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, Vice Chairman Bryan voted aye, Mr. Davidson voted aye, and Chairman Pack voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Pack – Our next item this evening is a Discussion Item – Amendments to Article 3.R of the Zoning Ordinance – Entrance Corridor Overlay (ECO) District – Town of Smithfield, applicant. Could we have a staff report please?

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – This is one of the things that we discussed in the work session in August. I had mentioned that we were administratively approving signs in the entrance corridor. When the entire sign plan or whenever there was a sign change at the same time as an exterior change to the building, those always came to the Planning Commission. You all needed to see that the sign design and the building design were congruent with one another. Since John Settle has come on board, we are doing more delving into the ordinance and showing him the way to do things. While doing that, we uncovered the fact that for the entire time I have been at the Town of Smithfield, which will be twelve years in February, the Town Manager had been administratively approving the designs of signs in the ECO District. I do not know how it ever started. It was always done that way; but the actual language states: “all proposed development activities located within the Entrance Corridor Zoning District shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.” Somehow, along the way, the previous Director and the Town Manager came up with an idea to expedite individual signs without there being changes to the site or a new construction site. It is usually used with a new business that is going into an existing site where they may not be changing anything on the building but they need to put a new sign face on an
existing sign frame. The vast majority have been that. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider codifying our policy. This would ensure consistency between the language of the ordinance and our precedent to avoid possibly overwhelming the Planning Commission with an influx of sign applications. We would be able to maintain this permitting avenue that has been cherished and praised by applicants by not having to wait a month for a meeting if they just need to reface an existing sign. It would not be exactly the same. We would recommend that the Planning and Zoning Administrator be the one that would do the administrative review not the Town Manager. We have made several revisions. In the Entrance Corridor Overlay District Ordinance, several items are just housekeeping items. The meat of it is in Section L.2.a. It states: “Applicants for new or replacement signs in the District shall apply to the Zoning Administrator for review at the time of development plan review or as a separate submittal.” This language already exists. The new language would be: “The Planning and Zoning Administrator may approve any sign permitted in a residential district and any permitted sign not exceeding 150 square feet in area in a business or industrial district, if, in the opinion of the Planning and Zoning Administrator, such sign will not impair the character of the district.” Of course, if he feels that it would impair the character of the district then he would bring this to the Planning Commission for their review. In the case that the Planning and Zoning Administrator would have any question about his ability to review it or have any concerns about it, he may bring that to the Planning Commission at that time. There is just a typo that was fixed in section L.5.a. We also added the Planning and Zoning Administrator to section L.6.a which is the list of those that review entrance corridor signs. All of the other references are just housekeeping items directing you to that one section. The meat of the changes is in L.2.a. It has been done like this for almost twelve years. We have not had a problem with it other than the fact that we were not following the ordinance. Before I got here, Bill Hopkins and Peter Stephenson had worked that process out possibly with a previous Planning Commission. We want to do it the way the ordinance reads. If you want all the signs for approval, which is how the ordinance reads right now, then we will bring them to you. If you all think that this has weight then it is something we recommend that you consider as an alteration to the ordinance.
Chairman Pack – Mr. Riddick, in order to change this ordinance we would need to make a recommendation to Town Council. Is that correct?

Town Attorney – No. We would publish it for a public hearing for the Planning Commission. You would then make a recommendation to the Town Council after the public hearing?

Chairman Pack – If we were to take action on this tonight, it would be to initiate a public hearing.

Town Attorney – You cannot act on it tonight.

Chairman Pack – We would just discuss it and if it sounds good then recommend a public hearing.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – Or you can recommend any changes and we can make those and then have a public hearing.

Chairman Pack – To summarize, the way the ordinance reads now is that all sign changes would have to come to us. The way you have been doing it for the last twelve years is that they are administratively approved.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – But if they are doing anything to the building and the sign, then we are still bringing it to the Planning Commission.

Town Attorney – Many years ago, one of the big issues was Advance Auto. There was a question about the colors and that sort of thing. It was clearly a legitimate subject for the Planning Commission to consider and debate. When somebody comes along and just wants to make a minor change, it is appreciated by the business community that they do not have to wait a month for approval.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – Of course, anything that exceeded the ordinance, in any way, would also continue to come to you all.

Dr. Pope – I have a question about it. Does the “and” in there change the definition versus an “or”? It says: a residential district and a business or industrial district. Does it have to meet both of those criteria for that or can it be an “or” there? To me, it means that it has to meet both of those criteria to give the Planning and Zoning Administrator the ability to change it.
Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – Given how it is worded since it lists both scenarios, it would be fine. We can ask the Town Attorney.

Town Attorney – We could change it to “and/or” and that would take care of it.

Director of Planning, Engineering and Public Works – That is what we will do.

Chairman Pack – Since we are making other changes, we should just change that. This seems to be a reasonable process. I think we should proceed with the public hearing. We cannot do anything on it tonight.

Town Attorney – We will put this on the agenda for next month as a public hearing since we have a general consensus on the changes.

Chairman Pack - Our next item is Approval of the October 9th, 2018 Meeting Minutes.

Town Attorney – I recommend the minutes be approved as presented.

Ms. Hillegass – So moved.

Mr. Davidson – Second.

Chairman Pack – A motion has been made and properly seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye, opposed say nay.

On call for the vote, six members were present. Vice Chairman Bryan voted aye, Mr. Davidson voted aye, Ms. Hillegass voted aye, Dr. Pope voted aye, Mr. Michael Torrey voted aye, and Chairman Pack voted aye. There were no votes against the motion. The motion passed.

Chairman Pack – Is there anything else to come before the Planning Commission this evening? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 7:14 p.m.