

LEXINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION

January 13, 2022 - 5:00 P.M
Community Meeting Room, Lexington City Hall
300 East Washington Street, Lexington, VA 24450

AGENDA

- 1. CALL TO ORDER**
- 2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
Minutes from December 9, 2021*
- 4. CITIZENS' COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**
- 5. NEW BUSINESS**
 - A. ZOA 2021-04: Annual Zoning Ordinance Amendments. Planned Unit Development (PUD).
 - 1) Continued discussion of PUD text amendment*
 - 2) Public Comment
 - B. Present VA APA Honorable Mention award to the P.C.
- 6. OTHER BUSINESS**
 - A. Zoning and Planning Report – If applicable
 - B. Catalyst Project Updates – If applicable
 - 1) Bike/Ped Plan: Ongoing
 - 2) Increase Sidewalk Connectivity: Ongoing
 - 3) Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance: Starting soon
 - 4) Jordan's Point Park Plan Implementation
 - 5) Reprogram Traffic Signals Downtown: Complete
 - 6) Assess Stormwater Fees: Tabled until next year
 - C. Key Annual PC Milestones: Ongoing. Remaining items:
 - 1) Zoning Text Amendments: Ongoing. Remaining items:
 - a. Small Cell
 - b. Planned Unit Development
 - c. Accessory Dwelling Unit
 - d. Cottage Housing
 - e. What else, if any?
 - 2) Comp Plan Review: Ongoing
- 7. CITY COUNCIL REPORT**

8. ADJOURN

*indicates attachment

MINUTES

**The Lexington Planning Commission
Thursday, December 9, 2021 – 5:00 p.m.
Community Meeting Room – City Hall
300 East Washington Street**

Planning Commission:

Presiding: Jamie Goodin, Chair
Present: Nicholas Betts
Pat Bradley
John Driscoll
Blake Shester, Vice-Chair
Leslie Straughan, Council Liaison
Matt Tuchler

City Staff:

Arne Glaeser, Planning Director
Kate Beard, Administrative Assistant

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Goodin called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m.

AGENDA

The agenda was unanimously approved as presented. (N. Betts / L. Straughan)

MINUTES

Minutes from the November 11, 2021 meeting were unanimously approved as presented. (J. Driscoll / P. Bradley)

Minutes from the November 17, 2021 Joint Educational Session were unanimously approved as presented. (L. Straughan / B. Shester)

CITIZENS' COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

NEW BUSINESS

A. CUP 2021-01: Application by Thierry Lemercier for a modification of the existing Bed and Breakfast Inn conditional use permit for the Abigail Inn located at 408 S. Main Street, Tax Map #29-1-2.

- 1) Staff Report – A. Glaeser reported the property already has a conditional use permit for a 6 room Bed and Breakfast Inn approved by City Council on October 15, 2020 with six conditions. The recent zoning text amendments approved by Council in July increased the maximum number of allowable bedroom accommodations for bed and breakfast inns to 8. The applicant is now requesting to increase the number of rentable rooms at the property to 7, which would still allow him to remain on the premises in an eighth available bedroom. A. Glaeser led the Commission through the photos included in the staff report, as well as the zoning criteria for bed and breakfast inns. He noted the definition for bed and breakfasts will need to be updated to reflect the recent increase to the maximum allowable bedroom accommodations. He directed the Commission's attention to the use and design standard concerning screening of off-

street parking, the photograph of that portion of the property, and the letter committing to extra vegetation along the property line with 6 Houston Street which was signed by the applicant and adjacent property owners and included in the application. A. Glaeser said staff had received several inquiries about the application but no comments, either for or against, once the application was explained. Staff finds the proposal meets all zoning requirements and recommends approval of the proposed Conditional Use Permit with the six staff recommended conditions included in the staff report. L. Straughan asked if the additional bedroom complied with the Uniform Statewide Building Code and A. Glaeser confirmed that all eight bedrooms had previously been inspected and approved by the City Building Official.

- 2) Applicant Statement – Thierry Lemercier, applicant, 408 S. Main Street, responded to a question from M. Tuchler by clarifying that the fence along the northern property line and visible from Houston Street is owned by the neighbors at 2 S. Main Place. He explained that the existing evergreens along that fence line had recently been planted to replace vegetation which had become wild and unkempt. He anticipates the evergreens will grow to approximately 15 feet in height and expand in diameter to screen the fence within about 5 years. He explained the previously mentioned letter memorializes an understanding he has with the owners of the adjacent property at 6 Houston Street. In it he has pledged to plant similar evergreens along a portion of the property line between the shed and the electric pole with the understanding that the trees may take several years to mature. He confirmed that all the trees are on his property and that there is no fence between his property and 6 Houston Street.
- 3) Public Comment – None
- 4) Commission Discussion & Decision – **L. Straughan moved to approve Conditional Use Permit number CUP 2021-01 with the six (6) staff recommended conditions. B. Shester seconded and the motion passed unanimously. (7-0)**

B. Comprehensive Plan Review:

- 1) Continued discussion of Comp Plan Review – J. Driscoll suggested the discussion begin with the catalyst projects and said the only one he was unclear about was the Jordan’s Point Plan implementation. L. Straughan said City Council had allocated funds for parks-related projects but a conversation about project prioritization had not yet occurred. A. Glaeser said the W&L engineering capstone project focusing on ADA and river accessibility in the outlook area of the park would culminate in a presentation to Council of engineered plans in April or May. The plans would need to receive final approval from an engineer and funding from Council before they could be implemented. J. Goodin offered that, while succinct, he was satisfied with the catalyst project summary. There was discussion about including themes or specific areas of focus for 2022. J. Driscoll suggested that housing be one of the themes. L. Straughan agreed and suggested green infrastructure and the Bike/Ped Plan be another. A. Glaeser pointed out that two of the remaining zoning amendments are housing related. Commissioners Goodin and Shester said the themes should be understood as “branding” rather than an addition or change to what is currently scheduled. P. Bradley

added that the Commission has already made progress on both themes with its involvement with the Green Infrastructure Group and the joint housing session with Threshold. A. Glaeser asked the Commissioners to review the draft annual report provided by staff and forward comments and additions by December 17th. He said staff would then compile the suggestions for final review and editing by Chair Goodin. J. Driscoll asked if the Commission wanted to consider a more comprehensive review of the plan, how the plan could be promoted to community stakeholder organizations, and whether to institutionalize a review process for the future. J. Goodin said he believed that by focusing on the chosen themes, the Commission would be conducting a deep dive into specific chapters of the Comp Plan and that it is unrealistic to attempt to tackle all aspects of the plan simultaneously. L. Straughan noted a number of stakeholder projects were included when the plan was being developed and indicated she believed promotion of the plan was “built in” as many of the strategies are being worked on by other groups. She also pointed out that implementation of the plan is the responsibility of Council and staff, not the Planning Commission. P. Bradley suggested the Commission should be guided by the Comp Plan when choosing themes for “deep dives” in future years. B. Shester noted the Green Infrastructure Group provides an excellent model for working with stakeholders in the future on deep dives into other chapters. J. Goodin requested staff schedule a joint session with the County to touch base about area housing. L. Straughan reported that at its last meeting, Council allocated funds for a regional housing study with the County and Buena Vista. She recommended timing the meeting for after the study has been completed. A. Glaeser added the deadline for the Smart Scale VDOT program is approaching and input from the County would be helpful in pursuing implementation of the Route 60 corridor improvements as a joint application would have a better likelihood for success. There was discussion about state funding for affordable housing. A. Glaeser said he would look into inviting someone from the state to provide information about state programs for the next educational session. N. Betts said he would forward contact information for someone who may be helpful. A. Glaeser said he had hoped to provide the new CIP requests for prioritization recommendations, but the list has not been finalized. Chair Goodin asked if the Commissioners were satisfied with the Comprehensive Plan review. There were no objections.

2) Public Comment – None

C. ZOA 2021-04: Annual Zoning Ordinance Amendments. Planned Unit Development

- 1) Continued discussion of PUD text amendment – A. Glaeser reminded the Commission that the focus is on mixed-use planned unit development criteria for the City’s opportunity areas. During the discussion of the Blacksburg model at its last meeting the Commission appeared inclined to consider an example that allowed for greater flexibility. He acknowledged that the Waynesboro model provided for this meeting represents the opposite end of the spectrum in terms of allowable flexibility and requested the Commission provide some direction about how to proceed. In response to a comment from L. Straughan, Director Glaeser confirmed that the Waynesboro

model is for a planned district, not an overlay, and has very few limitations. He explained that, so long as some general parameters were met, it would allow a developer to write new code for the development which would then be reviewed and either approved or not. He said an application would require a very detailed plan and narrative. L. Straughan said she likes the added flexibility but also feels some constraints indicating what would be acceptable would be helpful to applicants. M. Tuchler said he would find it helpful to know when each of the models were adopted, as Blacksburg has growth constraints more similar to Lexington's than Waynesboro has. J. Driscoll said he had spoken with someone in the Blacksburg Planning Department who recommended that Blacksburg's code not be used as a model. He suggested Director Glaeser have a conversation with that office. He said he believed the focus should be on the tension between achieving flexibility and some prediction of outcome. A. Glaeser asked if it would be helpful to have visual representations of mixed-use development in other locations to narrow down what would be acceptable in terms of form and scale. There seemed to be agreement that visual aids would be helpful. J. Goodin asked what the drawbacks would be to a more flexible model and A. Glaeser responded that it could put Council in the position of having very little on which to base a disapproval. M. Tuchler asked for input from Director Glaeser who responded he would favor something similar to the Blacksburg model but with fewer specific requirements. He said the difficulty lay in finding the sweet spot which would allow flexibility while providing some idea of what would be acceptable. He noted that in most cases, a PUD application in Lexington would be for property that has existing development all around it which would inform appropriate development of the property. He said staff would provide some visual examples to see how that directs future discussion. J. Goodin questioned whether it would be helpful to have input from developers. N. Betts said he believed the Commission should have a clearer idea of its goal before hearing from developers. B. Shester asked if there is a timing element to consider given the potential development of the Spotswood parcel. A. Glaeser answered that proposals have already been submitted and, unless Council does not like any of them, that project was too far advanced to be affected by this amendment. P. Bradley said while the goal is to allow flexibility, the adopted language should also make clear what would not be acceptable. There was discussion about the characteristics and potential of specific opportunity areas.

2) Public Comment – None

D. Joint educational session with Threshold Housing Commission held November 17, 2021 – follow up comments

- 1) Commission Comments – M. Tuchler said he felt it was an excellent conversation. B. Shester said he felt follow up had occurred during the previous discussion. J. Goodin thanked those who were involved for their time and effort.
- 2) Public Comment – None

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Zoning Report – A. Glaeser did not prepare a report.

- B. Catalyst Projects Update – no additional discussion
- C. Key Annual PC Milestones – J. Goodin commended the slow but steady progress.

CITY COUNCIL REPORT

L. Straughan stated her report had been Council's allocation of funding for the regional housing study which was previously discussed.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 6:41 pm with unanimous approval. (N. Betts / P. Bradley)

J. Goodin, Chair, Planning Commission

Mixed Use Development Examples

Planning Commission Meeting, January 13, 2022





























Fore + Aft Ballard Progress Rendering: 03-13-14



copyright © 2014 03/14/2014 A200 - Elevation: Westside.dwg

studio **MENG STRAZZARA**
 201 WESTERN AVE, SUITE 200 SEATTLE, WA 98101
 WA 206.463.1387 / FAX 206.467.0051 / www.studioeng.com
 ARCHITECTURE PLANNING CONSULTING

Scale: 1/8" = 1'-0"

Elevation: EAST

copyright © 2014 Studio Meng Strazzara

03/13/14 **E**





Existing Conditions



Phase 1



Phase 2



Phase 4

Tuckahoe Neighborhood Center Enhancement Plan

The [Tuckahoe Neighborhood](#) Center Enhancement Plan is a proposed series of phased improvements to the Tuckahoe neighborhood center near Richmond, Virginia. The client is Third Church, located on Forest Avenue which serves as the main street in the neighborhood. The Tuckahoe neighborhood is largely suburban in nature. The program addresses the neighborhood as a whole, the church property, thoroughfares, an elementary school and local commercial properties. The charrette, which took place in 2017, was an all-inclusive event, led by MWA and included Judson University students, church members and leaders, county officials, neighbors, local business owners and other architects.

The masterplan includes the addition of more green space, a neighborhood square, a traffic circle, an addition to the church, narrower streets with street trees, improved parking lot circulation at the school, and more beautiful buildings for the neighborhood businesses. The charrette team worked in a three-phase approach, proposing 1-, 5-, and 25-year plans for the process. Short term proposals included restriping parking lots to reclaim space for a green and outdoor seating, adding parallel parking on streets, and building a community garden in front of the church. Long term proposals included fully furnishing the town green, pulling buildings up to the street, repairing the broken sidewalk network, and creating a green next door to the church property.

Location: Henrico County, Va.

Client: Third Church

Acres: 30.75

Type: Urban Design: Revitalization, Retrofit & Infill

Program: Church addition, elementary school addition, office, neighborhood square, multi-family apartments, mixed-use buildings

Transect Zone(s): T3, T4, T5

Website: <http://www.thirdrva.org/strategic-planning-updates/january-update-working-group-4>

B-1 zoning district,