

Scottsville Planning Commission

Regular Meeting
Tuesday, July 6, 2004, 7:00 p.m.
Victory Hall
401 Valley Street
Scottsville, Virginia

Members:
Susan Carol Browning
Richard Hansen
Dolores Rogers
James Svetich

Minutes

1. Call to order – In the absence of a chair, Mr. Svetich called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. Establish a quorum – All members were present. Also in attendance were Town Administrator Barry Clark, Town Attorney Lindsay Dorrier, Town Clerk Amy Moyer, Councilmember Jeannette Kerlin, Mayor Stephen Phipps, James Kerlin, Heinz Gadiant, Jim Boyd, and later Jewel King and Angela Kreider.
3. Review and approval of minutes of June 7, 2004 meeting – The minutes were duly approved by voice vote.
4. Election of chair – Upon a motion by Mr. Svetich, seconded by Ms. Rogers, Mr. Hansen was elected chair by voice vote.
5. Matters not on the agenda from the public – No one rose to speak at this time.
6. Old business
 - a. Discussion of parking lot setback requirements at 977 Valley Street
Heinz Gadiant, representing property owner Gadiant Enterprises, and Jim Boyd, architect, presented new plans for a veterinary clinic on TMP 130A1-00-00-004B0. Mr. Gadiant related that the building was repositioned at the request of the Planning Commission to better comply with parking and setback requirements, and he intends to seek a zoning text amendment to lower the parking required for this use. Mr. Boyd explained that the plans now call for a retaining wall and a more compact building (3,100 square feet, with 650 square feet for boarding) next to the property line and facing B&B Auto. The plan shows 16 parking spaces, which would be adequate if the parking requirement is amended to 1 space per 200 square feet. Mr. Boyd also presented conceptual plans for a building to replace B&B Auto in future. Mr. Gadiant noted that the addition of a retaining wall is very expensive, with additional costs to be incurred because of the proposed building's proximity to the storm drain.
Ms. Browning commented that the property line would need to be moved and

recorded prior to approval of the site plan. She stated that it would not be any faster for Mr. Gadiant to pay for a zoning text amendment, as it was already planned for the Zoning Ordinance review committee to begin with the parking section in August. Planning Commission members generally found this to be a much better plan than the one discussed at the June meeting.

7. New business

- a. Review of Jefferson Area Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Plan, at the request of the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission

Commission members reviewed the Scottsville section of the Jefferson Area Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Greenways Plan.

- b. Discussion of revisions to appeals process (Zoning Ordinance Section 24.5)

Mr. Clark initiated discussion as to whether the time period could legally be extended for filing an appeal to Town Council of a Planning Commission decision. Mr. Dorrier found no state code reference mandating the time period for appeals; he recommended that it be extended to not more than 20 days. Ms. Browning pointed out that the current 10-day limit may be based in the court system. Mr. Svetich commented that Town Council members need more time to review. Ms. Kerlin spoke from the audience that she was not notified of the change from apartments to townhouses in the River View Bluff plans until it was too late to review the decision. There was discussion of whether the 10-day appeal time applies only to the applicant or to any aggrieved person.

Mr. Svetich made a motion to amend Section 24.5 to 20 days, rather than 10. Ms. Browning voiced reluctance to vote without further research of the legality of such a change. Mr. Dorrier agreed to prepare a memo for the next meeting. Discussion ensued as to the manner of communication between the Planning Commission and Town Council. Ms. Browning stated that interested parties should attend meetings and read the agendas and minutes to stay informed so that matters are not revisited months down the road; Mr. Hansen concurred. Ms. Rogers commented that it is reasonable to extend the appeal period to the date of the next Council meeting. Ms. King spoke from the audience as to an issue where the appeals process was misrepresented to her. Mr. Dorrier noted that most local governments do not review site plans and that it has to be an extraordinary issue for the legislative body to become involved.

Mr. Svetich restated his motion that the appeals process be extended from 10 to 20 days, provided that Mr. Dorrier indicates that this is legal. Ms. Rogers seconded the motion. With Mr. Svetich and Ms. Rogers in favor, and Ms. Browning voting against, the motion passed 2-1.

8. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.