

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 12, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Wilson
Mr. Dodson
Mr. Garrison
Mr. Jones
Mr. Petrick
Mr. Searce

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mr. Bolton

STAFF

Lisa Jones
Ken Gillie
Clarke Whitfield
Bryce Johnson

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Searce at 3:00 p.m.

I. ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. Request to amend Chapter 41 entitled "Zoning Ordinance" of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia 1986 more specifically Article 3.U entitled "PSC-O Planned Shopping Center Overlay District", Section M entitled "Sign Regulations" by adding Item 10 for directory signs, The purpose of the amendment is to address directory signs in the PSC-O District*

Mr. Searce opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Ariel Levy stated I'm Director of Leasing & Management for Madison Properties. The reason that we have made this request of the additional wall signage, and directory signage, was to help improve visibility for the center. Right now the center has a few pylon signs, which only has spots for the big bucks tenants, mainly Target, Home Depot, Ross, Old Navy and Marshall's. We have additional space available for the former Dicks and Petco. Even though it is good signage for the big bucks it does nothing at all for any of the mom and pop tenants. They are in the center and we have quite a few of them. Over the past year or so I have spoken with our other tenant's numerous times, and they have all complained and asked us to see if there was anything that we could do on their behalf to get that exposure out there. The exposure from the main streets the directory signage we felt would also help a lot in helping direct traffic to several different buildings there. As people are driving down they will know where they can turn in by which shop they want to go to. We have one building for example that we called the one hundred building which is at the bottom of the hill right now. I believe Health Nutrition and Edward Jones are the only two tenants in the building. That particular building is extremely difficult for us to lease out, there is absolutely no exposure over there from the street. If you are coming down the hill you completely pass by it and if you are coming up the hill you may capture a glimpse of the building. There is also a speed limit sign there that tracks your speed and it is right in front of our entrance and people now have their eyes on that sign instead of looking at the building. A directory sign over there would greatly add recognition to the building and would also help us in leasing out the rest of it. We are currently negotiating with a food use tenant and that was a main concern that we had. As far as the other buildings while you are driving up the former Dick space is the one that commands the exposure but if you are driving again from down the hill

going up if you are not bothering to turn into Dicks, you are not going to even know the other tenants that are there. A directory sign would absolutely help that. As you continue to drive up the hill you have what we call a 500 building. There is A side which is at the bottom of the hill and B side which is at the top of the hill and again the directory signage would help give recognition to the drivers as to where and what shops are in there. The proposed building signage that we are asking for are on the Dicks building and the 500 building is to help give exposure from the main street so when people driving by and they see the pylon signs tenants in there not just these big bucks tenant's. I did bring copies of our proposed signage and it will give you a good idea of both the directory signs and building signs and it gives you a picture of where the signs will go.

Mr. Searce closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Garrison made a motion for approval for the recommended Code Amendment. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

2. *Request to amend Chapter 41 entitled "Zoning Ordinance" of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia 1986 more specifically various sections and subsections of Article 3.K entitled "CB-C, Central Business District" and Article 3.L entitled "TW-C, Tobacco Warehouse District". The purpose of the amendment is to address permitted uses within the CB-C, and TW-C Districts.*

Mr. Searce opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Searce closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick made a motion for approval for the Code Amendment. Mr. Garrison seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

3. *Request to amend Chapter 41 entitled "Zoning Ordinance" of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia 1986 more various sections and subsections of Article 3.D entitled "NT-R, Neo-Traditional Residential District". The purpose of the amendment is to address permitted uses within the NT-R District.*

Mr. Wilson opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Gary M Wasson I am the CEO Executive Director of the Danville Redevelopment Housing. Mr. Wasson stated:

THE PROJECT WE PROPOSE TO BUILD, MANUFACTURED HOUSING, WAS BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE HOUSING AUTHORITY AND THE DANVILLE NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT BY VIRGINIA HOUSING DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, OR VHDA, AND CITY OFFICIALS.

THIS IS A DEMONSTRATION PROJECT TO BUILD FIVE MANUFACTURED HOUSES THAT WILL BE MARKETED TO BUYERS WHOSE FAMILY INCOME IS AT 120 PERCENT OR LESS OF DANVILLE'S MEDIAN INCOME LEVELS. THIS IS NOT TRADITIONAL LOW-INCOME OR AFFORDABLE HOUSING, WHICH GENERALLY TARGETS FAMILIES AT 80% OF MEDIAN INCOME AND BELOW. THIS IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD HOMES THAT WOULD BE ATTRACTIVE TO MIDDLE-INCOME PEOPLE WHO ARE

LOOKING FOR THAT STARTER HOME, BUILT WITH MODERN MATERIALS AND ARE ENERGY EFFICIENT.

OUR PLAN IS TO BUILD A MODEL HOME FIRST AND SEE WHAT INTEREST IS GENERATED BEFORE MOVING TO BUILD A SECOND UNIT AS WELL AS UNITS THREE, FOUR AND FIVE. WE WANT TO BE SURE THE HOUSES WILL SELL BEFORE DEVELOPING MORE.

VHDA HAS APPROVED A GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$26,000 TO PAY FOR UPFRONT DEVELOPMENT COSTS. THERE IS ALSO AN OPPORTUNITY FOR A \$25,000 GRANT FROM FREDDIE MAC TO HELP LOWER COSTS.

THE PROPOSED SITE OF THE LOTS WHERE THE HOMES WILL BE BUILT IS IN OR NEAR THE MONUMENT-BERRYMAN CONSERVATION AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA. THIS PLAN WAS DEVELOPED BY AN OUTSIDE CONSULTANT IN 2014 AND APPROVED BY THE DRHA'S BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AND THE CITY COUNCIL IN THE SAME YEAR.

AT THE JUNE 10 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING THERE WERE SOME OBJECTIONS RAISED AS TO THE PLACEMENT OF THE PARCELS WHERE NEW HOMES WERE PROPOSED. THE PARCELS INCLUDED IN THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL WERE IN A SECTION THAT THE MONUMENT-BERRYMAN PLAN HAD DESIGNATED AS REDEVELOPMENT SUB-AREA A. IN THE PLAN IT WAS PROPOSED THAT SUB-AREA A BE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT, WHICH WOULD INCLUDE HOUSING BUT ALSO COMMERCIAL AND LIGHT INDUSTRIAL.

AS A RESULT OF THAT DISCUSSION, ALL OF THE PROPOSED PARCEL SITES WERE MOVED OUT OF SUB-AREA A. ACTUALLY OF THE CURRENT EIGHT PARCELS THAT THE ZONING AND SPECIAL PERMITS ARE BEING REQUESTED FOR, ONLY THE TWO PARCELS ON FRANKLIN STREET ARE IN THE MONUMENT-BERRYMAN PLAN. SIX PARCELS ARE OUTSIDE THE PLANS BOUNDARIES. ALL OF THE PARCELS ARE FURTHER AWAY FROM THE RIVER DISTRICT THAN THE FIRST PROPOSAL.

AT THE JUNE 10 MEETING, THE PLANNING COMMISSION ASKED IF DRHA AND DNDC WOULD BE WILLING TO MEET WITH THE INDIVIDUALS OBJECTING TO THE PROJECT. WE SAID WE WOULD BE WILLING TO MEET AND TWO SEPARATE MEETINGS WERE SET UP ON JULY 31 AND AUGUST 5 TO SEE IF WE COULD REACH SOME COMMON GROUND.

AFTER MEETING WITH A NUMBER OF PEOPLE, INCLUDING TWO WHO WERE RESIDENTS IN THE AREA, I BELIEVE THAT THERE WAS A CONSENSUS THAT THE PLACEMENT OF THE NEW LOTS WAS MORE SUITABLE THAN THE ORIGINAL LOTS. THERE WAS GOOD DISCUSSION ABOUT A CONSIDERATION OF SHARED ACCESS DRIVEWAYS TO REACH CARPORTS IN THE REAR OF THE HOUSES. LOT SIZES WERE DISCUSSED AND THERE SEEMED TO BE SOME LEVEL OF FLEXIBILITY BY THE RESPECTIVE PARTIES. WE ALSO SAID THAT WE WOULD WORK TO HAVE

PORCHES THAT WILL BE REMINISCENT OF PORCH STYLES IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.

WHILE NOT EVERYTHING WAS AGREED UPON I BELIEVE THE MEETINGS WERE POSITIVE AND HELPFUL IN UNDERSTANDING EACH SIDES POSITION.

AS A NOTE, DUE TO SOME ASSUMPTIONS, I WANT TO BE CLEAR THAT THERE ARE NO FEDERAL FUNDS BEING USED ON THIS PROPOSED PROJECT. TI HAD BEEN STATED THAT THE USAGE OF FEDERAL FUNDS WOULD TRIGGER A SECTION 106 REVIEW REGARDING HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE. HOWEVER THAT WILL NOT OCCUR SINCE NO FEDERAL FUNDS ARE BEING USED.

TO SUMMARIZE, THIS PROJECT REPRESENTS AN OPPORTUNITY TO ACTUALLY CREATE NEWLY CONSTRUCTED HOMES IN DANVILLE, GIVE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR A FIRST TIME HOMEBUYER TO PURCHASE A BRAND NEW HOUSE AND BEGIN AN IN-FILL OF THE MANY VACANT LOTS LOCATED IN THE MONUMENT-BERRYMAN AREA THAT WILL HOPEFULLY TRIGGER MORE INTEREST IN BUILDING IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD IN THE FUTURE. ADDITIONALLY, IF THIS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT CAN BE SHOWN TO BE SUCCESSFUL HERE IN DANVILLE, IT IS HOPED THAT THE DEVELOPMENT CAN BE MODELED FOR OTHER AREAS OF THE STATE. THANK YOU. ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS.

Mr. Petrick stated just to clarify here are we still talking about the same eight plots from Franklin Street, Garden to Lee Street Right?

Mr. Wasson stated yes sir.

Mr. Petrick stated which ones have you been talking to the people about that were opposed?

Mr. Wasson stated there was discussion about that, but that's why we moved them off Monument and Cabell Street. Those were all taken off. They were opposed last time but not this time.

Mr. Petrick stated so it's just in the 19 area 1 through 5 and 7, 15 and 16?

Mr. Bryce Johnson stated yes they are the only ones being considered right now.

Mr. Wilson stated you said one home would be built as a model home. What is your plan for that?

Mr. Wasson stated I plan on building that first model home to serve as a place to take people who are interested buying homes and to see what they can buy, and with manufactured housing there is a lot of options that you can do both on the inside and outside. A model home can be used to show people what can be done and then they will get the ability to get a mortgage. We are not going to build these houses unless we have a buyer for them.

Mr. Jones stated what are some of the options that the buyer would have some choice in when it comes to the house?

Mr. Wasson stated they can have a carport, asphalt, tin roof and inside they can have granite counter tops and they can change the size of the house. There are a lot of different options that they can have.

Mr. Randy Grumbine stated I represent the Virginia Manufactured and Modular Housing Association. I wanted to come today to throw our support behind this project and make myself available for any questions that you may have that go unanswered that I can answer. I'm very familiar with the homes and with the project program that is being proposed here. I want to applaud you for considering this open minded proposition in affordable workforce housing. I like to call it housing that is affordable because that is what is. Some of the qualities with these homes is not like your first perception is with manufactured housing. This program requires a higher level of home which many of you have discussed before. They must have a higher pitch roof and they must have a covered front porch, and they must have finished sheet rock throughout, and they must have a good grade of quality cabinets in the home and they must be energy efficient. The requirements are steep and the idea is that these homes will, when completed, be appraised and look like the homes in the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Garrison stated you talked about the high pitched roof and I noticed with the pictures and they are pretty high pitched down the center of it is that going to create any storage space in the attic?

Mr. Randy stated no, you would not have storage in the attic.

Mr. Gus Dyer stated as Mr. Wasson mentioned we had a nice meeting with them on July 31, 2019. Just on behalf of myself and the other people that were there and I think that we came to an consensus that this project should probably move forward with the modifications that they are willing to make. Can we go back to the illustrations that were presented and none of those elevations were suitable and we were given two options. I don't have a picture of those options. If this ever comes back on us I want to say what they showed us in the meeting was not what we agreed to.

Mr. Jones stated what was the difference?

Mr. Dyer stated primarily there was no front loading for garages and that was one of the concerns that we had. Also, we discussed about putting parking in the back. We are hoping that maybe the City will come up with some credible solutions to parking in the area so we can get the cars off the street. What we were trying to do is to preserve the character of the neighborhood even though the house has been torn down. The character of the neighborhood has been preserved by the lots themselves. Based on the plans these are 50 foot lots and so you can't really put any standard ranch style houses with a garage on a 50 foot lot. We are hoping that maybe they could preserve the narrowness it all goes back to the original character neighborhood for historic preservation purposes that is what we were looking for. We agreed if they were willing to do the things that they said they were going to do then I'm speaking on behalf of myself and consider the other people that didn't bother to

show up to object I'm assuming that there is a situation and we don't necessarily have any objections to the project itself.

The reason I'm here today is because I have great concerns about what we are proposing with this manufactured housing into the NT-R District. The NT-R District is by nature of the fact that it is the least restrictive as far as lot sizes and front yard setbacks. It also the most creative zoning category that the City has. It would allow most of our creativity in creating new styles of housing in new types of neighborhoods. The reason that I was given for putting this in the NT-R District as opposed to the OT-R was that nobody has used the zoning category so far that it has been on record for 15 years. I would like to counter that in fact we haven't had any residential zoning additions to the City for probably the last 10 years. I was probably involved in either the last one or the second one with the project on 360. I'm really concerned about putting the manufactured housing into the NT-R zoning category and I would like to see the NT-R zoning category by myself or with someone else be used at some point and I think you all know that when you come before Council or come before Planning Commission and try to get a piece of property rezoned that people in the neighborhood automatically go to the lowest common denominator. I have \$200,000 +s condo's that I built off of Riverside Drive and I had people accusing me of trying to put in Section 8 housing. If someone would come to you whether it be myself or someone else and they say hey I would like to do a project in the NT-R category and people are going to stand behind me and say that is going to be a mobile home park. I want you all to keep that in mind and I'm really hear to just get things on the record that at some point in the future, that in fact if it does come up seriously take that into consideration that you did not oppose this manufactured housing into this zoning for convenience and its apparently easier than coming up with a new zoning category. I suggested that it be applied to all residential zoning categories in the City and of course that didn't suit the folks anyway. I'm here to just get on the record to make this statement that when you oppose this NT-R Zoning category with this manufactured housing that you are going to stigmatize that zoning category and so when someone comes up here and tries to get a project going approved for NT-R, I want you to keep that in mind. Why we are up here setting the record straight I would like to also get on the record that will be in the minutes that we had a very productive meeting with Mr. Wasson and the folks. I did come to the Planning Commission work session where I was told that I would be able to be in the decision making process and I was denied that opportunity. I just want to get that on the records if that ever comes up if the City ever get audited by the Department of historic Resources that this noted that I did show up and was not allowed to speak.

Mr. Wilson stated you begin with things that you discussed with the group as to what you would like. All I got was no front loading garage were there other things?

Mr. Dyer stated these designs we considered as inappropriate because they have front loading garages and they provided us with two other pictures with Victorian craftsman style designs that we found more acceptable. We also discussed the issue of trying to issue the parking in the rear of the houses so they won't have a garage facing the street and that it would get the cars off the street. There only solution of no parking on the street is to put a garage. I came up with the solution maybe parking could be in the rear of the house. They could have garages but they would be on the rear of the house. The stipulations that they made and I trust them and let them try and see what happens. If they will do what they say that they are going to do I personally don't have a problem with them.

Mr. Wilson stated if my understanding is that we're getting a pilot project and that they all are special use and if we were to see that something like styles were different it does allow for that.

Mr. Dyer stated I know that is the point that you are trying to make but my point was why don't you apply the manufactured housing to the OT-R because these lots are already zoned. I was told that would be problematic because that would allow open through the City. I don't think we can have the argument both ways that this is only through special use permit but it allows it everywhere else.

Joy Wood stated resident of the City of Danville. Mrs. Wood stated Thank you for hearing my remarks. My purpose for being here today is to share definitions, and clarify that a manufactured home remains different from a site built home even after being converted to real property.

I love the way this home looks. I have been in the residential lending industry for over 20 years, and I have never seen a manufactured home look so good.

Traditionally, there have been limited financing options for a manufactured home. Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, the Veterans Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, and USDA – Rural Development are the 5 primary sources of lending guidelines for residential real estate financing. When a consumer wants to buy a manufactured home, they are often subject to stricter guidelines, more out of pocket costs, and higher interest rates. For manufactured homes that meet the ChoiceHome minimum standards, Freddie Mac is lifting some of the traditional loan level price adjustment (rate increases) and matching the low down payment options that exist for site built homes.

This is from Freddie Mac: ChoiceHome is our innovative and affordable mortgage initiative, offering conventional site-built financing for a real-property manufactured home with the features of a site-built home. When a manufactured home meets certain prescribed specifications, it is granted choice Home certification and is eligible for Choice Home financing. Plus, in appraising these homes, you can use comparable site-built sales for appraisals when no ChoiceHome sales are available.

These homes are more expensive than traditional manufactured homes, but they are less expensive than site-built homes. In 2016, the national average for cost per square foot of site built homes was \$107.18, and \$51.26 for a manufactured home. For a 1400 square foot house that equates to \$150,052 for site built, and \$71,764 for manufactured. For a 1400 sq foot home that cost \$122,000, the price per sq ft is \$87.14. So, these ChoiceHome may save a consumer \$20 per square foot.

What lenders have learned over time is that manufactured home are not the same as site built homes even after converting them to real estate. The risk of asset depreciation and owner default are unfavorably skewed in portfolio performance when a manufactured is used as collateral. The ChoiceHome pilot project will probably have an element of portfolio evaluation which will inform the decision on the part of lenders to keep the less strict lending guidelines or not. This may mean resales in the future would be more challenging than today's financing options. And even today, not all lenders can offer Freddie Mac's ChoiceHome lending option.

Lenders always know a home is a manufactured home, even after the home is converted to real property. When a home is being evaluated for financing, an appraiser physically visits the home and assesses the home's general condition to discern its marketability. HUD requires that a seal be permanently affixed to every home that meets its manufacturing standards of construction. When the seal is present, an appraiser must consider sales that are manufactured homes as comparable to the subject property. The lender is also informed through public records. The improvement type is usually identified as MANUFACTURED. In this way, the lender knows the home is a manufactured home and may overlay the stricter guidelines for financing.

Types of construction are defined in the real estate industry as follows:

Mobile Home: A factory built housing structure constructed before 1976 that is able to be moved – typically via towing to a permanent location – on a chassis.

Manufactured Home: A factory-built housing structure constructed after 1976 that is able to be moved – typically via towing to a permanent location – on a chassis. (Formerly known as mobile homes, pre-HUD Code.)

Site-Built Home: A house that is completely constructed on the lot where it will reside, as compared to manufactured homes, which are built in a factory and then transported to their location.

Stick-Built Home: A somewhat outdated, but still occasionally used, term for site-built homes.

Modular Home: A prefabricated dwelling constructed in a factory setting (much like manufactured homes) then transported to a location in pieces and installed on-site (more like a site-built home). Modular homes must conform to the same local, state, and regional building codes as site-built homes.

1976 HUD Code: THE HUD Code – officially known as the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 – became law in June 1976, and set national standards with regards to energy efficiency, quality, durability, fire safety, and transportability for all manufactured homes built after this date. Prior to this, factory-built homes had no uniform regulations surrounding construction practices. The HUD Code is the only federally regulated national building code. This means that manufactured homes in Montana and Maine both have to be built to the same quality standards, while comparable site-built homes in these states follow different, local laws.

1994 HUD Code Update: This update provided serious overhauls to the efficiency and environmental requirements of the original HUD Code, resulting in marked improvements in the quality of manufactured homes. I am happy to answer any questions.

Sonya Ingram resident of Danville. Mrs. Ingram stated this issue is about affordable housing but also historic preservation. When it was originally presented, it was said there were two sides- those opposed and those against. But we could not be opposed because we had no idea what it was about to be opposed.

There are many benefits to historic preservation but often times they are ignored until someone needs to use historic tax credits to develop a property. To use HRTC, a property has to be in a historic district or listed on the National register. So there needs to be a

diligent group to protect historic districts in Danville because they can lose the historic district designation. If enough buildings are demolished or street scenes altered, the HD designation can be taken away. That is one reason we – the preservation community- is here because so often we see a lack of real understanding of value of protecting historic districts and properties in Danville.

Historic districts in the last 20 years or so now have another missing- to provide homes for the young, new immigrants, those of limited means, retired citizens or affordable housing. Preservation Virginia has a session on this at our preservation conference held in Danville last year. But creating affordable housing should not stop efforts to maintain the architectural harmony and protect historic districts. People who need affordable housing should have nicely designed homes that flow with the community, not be separated from the community in houses that do not match the other houses.

This is a big issue. For a project like this. There should be community design charrettes to determine the best designs for new houses and include neighbors, preservationists and the manufactured housing representatives.

We met with the housing authority and Kim and Ernesia and agreed this could be a great project if everyone can work together with real input from preservationists.

As Gus said, the houses shown on the slides today are not the ones shown to us when we met. We looked at examples of houses that are much more in line with the historic neighborhood.

There is today almost universal agreement that the Urban Renewal type demolition of downtowns was misguided, and self defeating. The sustained success stories in downtown revitalization are found in those cities that maintained and reinvested in their historic building and districts.

Danville has improved in the last 10 years on this but what is crucial to moving forward is to see public input for people in town that have experience and want to help.

Mr. Scarce closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick made a motion for approval for Zoning Ordinance as submitted. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

4. *Rezoning application PLRZ20190000274, filed by Danville Redevelopment and Housing Authority requesting to rezone from OT-R Old Town Residential to NT-R Neo-Traditional Residential District Parcels on Franklin St., Beauregard St., and Lee St., otherwise known as Grid 2718, Block 019, Parcels 000001 through 000005, 000007, 000015 and 000016 of the City of Danville, Virginia Zoning District Map. The applicant is proposing a planned residential development involving manufactured housing.*

Mr. Wilson made a motion for approval for PLRZ20190000274 as submitted. Mr. Dodson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

5. *Special Use Permit application PLSUP20190000276, filed by Danville Redevelopment and Housing Authority requesting a Special Use Permit for*

Manufactured Home Dwellings in accordance with Chapter 41, Article 3.D, Section C, Item 18 the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia 1986 as amended at parcels on Franklin St., Beauregard St., and Lee St., otherwise known as Grid 2718, Block 019, Parcels 000001 through 000005, 000007, 000015 and 000016 of the City of Danville, Virginia Zoning District Map. The applicant is proposing a planned residential development involving manufactured housing.

Mr. Petrick made a motion for approval for Special Use Permit PLSUP20190000276 as submitted subject to conditions by staff. Mr. Jones seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 6-0 vote.

6. *Special Use Permit application PLSUP20190000277, filed by Apple Tire Inc. on behalf of Pamela G. Burnett, requesting a Special Use Permit for a waiver of yard requirements in accordance with Chapter 41, Article 3.M, Section C, Item 21 of the Code of the City of Danville, Virginia 1986 as amended at 2264 N Main St., otherwise known as Grid 2810, Block 002, Parcel 000016 of the City of Danville, Virginia Zoning District Map. The applicant is proposing to expand an existing building to provide additional storage for a tire retail store.*

Mr. Scarce had to abstain due to a conflict of interest.

Mr. Wilson opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Steve Mize resident of Danville. Mr. Mize stated I got into the tire business almost a year ago because I do Home Health Care now and the tire store in South Boston that is what we primarily do. I want to address some concerns that some of the folks will have. Normally with a tire store or any kind of store that makes repairs as you have probably seen in the past there is a lot of old cars out there. The tire trucks make a delivery twice a day the reason that we need extra space is that we don't do things that way. Most of the people that come into to us are people that the inspection sticker has been denied and they come there for their tires and we have everything in stock. Less than 1% of the time do we not have the tires in stock that they are looking for. We don't have the huge number of cars sitting in the parking lot that's not really our moto of business. I talked to the neighbor south of us there is an old garage there and he said that he was not opposed to it. I did go to the Old Dutch supermarket and I have been there a couple of times I missed the gentleman there. There is enough room for parking and I do own a lot of commercial and residential property. I have 3 in Danville already. We have them all over the state from Roanoke to Virginia Beach this is something that I am very familiar with and I'm just trying to expand. I don't think some of the problems will be there that some people have anticipated because we try to fix up the spaces. We really feel like we know how to be a good neighbor and could be a good thing for this property as well.

Mr. Dodson stated are you going to sell new and used tires?

Mr. Mize stated we don't sell used tires just new.

Mr. Jones stated do you have any problem with these conditions set by staff?

Mr. Mize stated no sir and I think there is plenty of room for parking. We don't have any problem with the conditions. I think it is a needed thing for here we can beat Walmart prices on a set of tires by \$50.00 to \$60.00 dollars.

Mr. Wilson closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Dodson made a motion for approval for Special Use Permit PLSUP20190000277 as submitted with conditions by staff. Mr. Garrison seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote. (Mike Searce Abstained)

IV. MINUTES

The July 8, 2019 and August 5, 2019 minutes were approved by unanimous vote.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

APPROVED