



City of Harrisonburg

City Hall
409 South Main Street
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Meeting Minutes - Final Planning Commission

Wednesday, November 13, 2024

6:00 PM

Council Chambers

1. Call To Order

The Harrisonburg Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Wednesday, November 13, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 409 South Main Street.

2. Roll Call/Determination of Quorum

Members present: Brent Finnegan, Chair; Adriel Byrd, Vice Chair; Richard Baugh; Heja Alsindi; Valerie Washington; and Kate Nardi. Vice Mayor Laura Dent was absent.

Also present: Adam Fletcher, Director of Community Development; Thanh Dang, Deputy Director of Community Development; Meg Rupkey, Planner; Wesley Russ, Deputy City Attorney and Nyrma Soffel, Acting Secretary.

Chair Finnegan called the meeting to order.

Present 7 - Brent Finnegan, Valerie Washington, Richard Baugh, Vice-Mayor Laura Dent, Heja Alsindi, Kate Nardi, and Adriel Byrd

3. Approval of Minutes

3.a. Minutes from the October 9, 2024 Planning Commission meeting

Chair Finnegan asked if there were any corrections, comments or a motion regarding the October 9, 2024 Planning Commission minutes.

Vice Chair Byrd moved to approve the October 9, 2024, Planning Commission meeting minutes.

Commissioner Baugh seconded the motion.

The motion to approve the October 9, 2024, Planning Commission meeting minutes passed (6-0)

A motion was made by Byrd, seconded by Baugh, that this Minutes be approved. The motion carried by a voice vote.

4. New Business - Other Items

- 4.a. Consider a request from PRR, LLC to preliminarily subdivide 1211, 1225, 1245 & 1261 Port Republic Road and for variances from the Subdivision Ordinance (Weston Park)

Chair Finnegan read the request and asked staff to review.

Ms. Dang said on April 9, 2024, City Council approved two requests, which included:

- Rezoning the subject site from R-1, Single-Family Residential District to R-8C, Small Lot Residential District Conditional, and
- A special use permit to allow townhomes of not more than eight units in the R-8 district.

A copy of the approved 2024 rezoning proffers is attached herein. The approved special use permit included the following condition:

- Attached townhomes of no more than six (6) units.

The applicant is requesting to preliminarily subdivide +/- 19.66-acres of property by creating 26 single-family detached dwelling lots, 30 duplex lots, 70 townhome lots, four common area lots, and to dedicate public street right-of-way.

As part of the preliminary subdivision process, the applicant is requesting variances to deviate from requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance (SO).

Note that the applicant has submitted proposed public and private street names that are currently being reviewed by staff for compliance with street naming and addressing standards and will be finalized as part of the administrative final platting process. The street names proposed by the applicant include: Weston, Pioneer, Frontier, Colonial, Serene, Serene Valley, and Starlight.

Land Use

The Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Low Density Mixed Residential and Limited Commercial:

Low Density Mixed Residential

These areas have been developed or are planned for residential development containing a mix of large and small-lot single-family detached dwellings, where commercial and service uses might be finely mixed within residential uses or located nearby along collector and arterial streets. Duplexes may be appropriate in certain circumstances. Mixed use buildings containing residential and non-residential uses might be appropriate with residential dwelling units limited to one or two dwelling units per building. Attractive green and open spaces are important for these areas and should be incorporated. Open space development (also known as cluster development) is encouraged, which provides for grouping of residential properties on a development site to use the extra land for open space or recreation. The intent is to have innovative residential building types and allow creative subdivision designs that promote neighborhood cohesiveness,

walkability, connected street grids, community green spaces, and the protection of environmental resources or sensitive areas (i.e. trees and floodplains). Residential building types such as zero lot-line development should be considered as well as other new single-family residential forms. The gross density of development in these areas should be around 7 dwelling units per acre and commercial uses would be expected to have an intensity equivalent to a Floor Area Ratio of at least 0.4, although the City does not measure commercial intensity in that way.

Limited Commercial

These areas are suitable for commercial and professional office development but in a less intensive approach than the Commercial designation. These areas need careful controls to ensure compatibility with adjacent land uses. The maintenance of functional and aesthetic integrity should be emphasized in review of applications for development and redevelopment and should address such matters as: control of access; landscaping and buffering; parking; setback; signage; and building mass, height, and orientation. It is important that development within Limited Commercial areas does not incrementally increase in intensity to become similar to the Commercial designation. Efforts should be made to maintain the intent as described above.

Transportation and Traffic

The Determination of Need for a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) form (“TIA determination form”) for the proposed development was completed during the rezoning process and indicated that the project would not generate 100 or more peak hour trips, which is the threshold for staff to require a TIA. Know that during review of the rezoning request, staff and the applicant worked together to plan for the public street network including to connect to existing street stubs as well as to stub public streets to neighboring properties for future connections. The proffered public street rights-of-way and accommodations for pedestrian facilities are shown on the preliminary plat. Requested variances from the Subdivision Ordinance requirements are discussed in the *Subdivision Ordinance Variance Requests* section of this report.

Public Water and Sanitary Sewer

As required, all lots would be served by public water and public sanitary sewer. The preliminary plat illustrates where water and sanitary sewer lines would be provided so that each new lot would have access to public water and public sanitary sewer.

Subdivision Ordinance Variance Requests

Section 10-2-42 (c) of the Subdivision Ordinance (SO) requires all parcels to have public street frontage, however the applicant is requesting a variance to allow most of the townhome parcels to not have public street frontage. Most townhome parcels will only have frontage along Private Streets A, B, and C as illustrated on the preliminary plat. This particular variance has been approved multiple times throughout the City for many existing townhome communities and staff has no concerns for this project.

The second variance request is to Section 10-2-61 (a) of the SO, which requires the subdivider to make all improvements to streets in accord with the City's Design and Construction Standards Manual (DCSM). This variance is being requested to allow the developer to dedicate public street right-of-way without building the actual street. This is shown as Public Street C, opposite Westmoreland Drive. Among other things, proffer #5 from the 2024 rezoning requires the applicant to dedicate public right-of-way and temporary construction easements to allow for the future extension of Westmoreland Drive through the northern corner of the property. The staff report for the rezoning described that "[i]t is expected that the applicant will request a variance from the Subdivision Ordinance to not construct the future extension of Westmoreland Drive and that the construction will be the responsibility of future developers." This dedication of public right-of-way sets up a new public street serving future development to be in alignment with existing Westmoreland Drive.

The remaining requested variances are from Sections 10-2-41 (a), 10-2-61 (a), and 10-2-66 of the SO. These sections are associated with public street design standards. Specifically, Section 10-2-41 (a) states that "[p]roposed streets shall conform to the standards and specifications outlined in the Design and Construction Standards Manual (DCSM) except that variances to the standards for streets, alleys, blocks, easements, sidewalks, and all such related features may be approved on a case-by-case basis by the city council" when particular objectives are met. Section 10-2-61 (a) states that "[t]he subdivider is required to make all such improvements to streets, including grading, subgrade, surface, and curbs and gutters, in accord with the requirements of the city's DCSM." And finally, Section 10-2-66 states "[a]ll utility, street and alley improvements shall be provided in each new subdivision lying wholly or partly within the corporate limits of the city in accordance with standards and specifications of the city." The applicant's letter provides further details and rationale of each deviation requested. In particular, the applicant is requesting the following deviations from the DCSM for all proposed public streets:

- Sections 3.6.2.3 and 3.6.2.4, which are associated with vertical curves, and
- Section 3.6.3, which is associated with design requirements for designated street classifications.

The street vertical curves and design requirements will be designed to meet the Virginia Department of Transportation's requirements for local street design, which are less stringent than the City's design standard, and which would allow the development to follow existing topography to the greatest extent possible.

The applicant is also requesting deviation from the DCSM:

- Section 3.6.4.1, which is associated with typical street sections as illustrated in the DCSM Appendix F, and
- Section 3.6.4.3, which is associated with reduction in street width.

These deviations would allow the reduction of vehicular travel lanes on public streets from 15-foot-wide lanes to 10-foot-wide lanes, with the requirement that no on street parking is allowed.

Finally, the applicant is requesting a deviation at the end of Skylark Lane from DCSM Section 3.10.1.3, which is associated with maximum grades within a permanent or temporary cul-de-sac.

In a letter submitted by the applicant, they explain the existing topography at this location exceeds 10% and flattening the cul-de-sac to 5% would create an unnecessary amount of fill should the neighboring property extend the street.

Staff supports all of the variances that have been requested.

Housing Study

The City's Comprehensive Housing Assessment and Market Study (Housing Study) places the subject site within Market Type A. Among other things, this Market Type is characterized by high population growth. The study notes that Market Type A has "above median overall access to amenities such as public transit within walking distance, full-service grocery stores, and multiple parks and recreation facilities." The study also notes that "policies that are appropriate to Market Type A areas include an emphasis on increasing density through zoning changes, infill development and housing rehabilitation to maintain the quality of housing."

Public Schools

Staff from Harrisonburg City Public Schools (HCPS) noted that based on their student generation calculations, the proposed 26 single-family homes, 30 duplexes, and 70 townhomes is estimated to result in 36 additional students. Based on the School Board's currently adopted attendance boundaries, Stone Spring Elementary School, Skyline Middle School, and Rocktown High School would serve the students residing in this development. HCPS staff noted that four of the six elementary schools exceed effective capacity.

For total student population projections, the City of Harrisonburg and HCPS both use the University of Virginia's Weldon Cooper Center for Public Service's projections. These projections are updated annually and are available at:

<https://www.coopercenter.org/virginia-school-data>.

Recommendation

Aside from the variance requests as described herein, the preliminary plat meets all other requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Staff supports the variance requests and recommends approval of the preliminary plat.

Chair Finnegan said I did have a question about that northern part of Skylark Lane. What is on the other side of that property?

Ms. Dang said it is a vacant lot. This is Peach Grove Avenue over here so there is undeveloped land right there [referring to the screen].

Chair Finnegan said if that were to get developed, that street could connect through to Peach Grove Avenue?

Ms. Dang said we would hope so.

Mr. Fletcher said it may not be a direct connection it could be across those intersections.

Chair Finnegan asked if there were any more questions for staff. Hearing none, he invited the applicant or applicant’s representative to speak to their request.

Carl Synder, Valley Engineering and applicant’s representative and, came forward to speak. He said Thanh did a perfect job of explaining our request. A lot of the components on the variances are consistent with what we have done on a number of other projects. I will be here if you have any questions and I will be happy to answer any.

Chair Finnegan said my other question for staff is how this kind of connects into that group.

Ms. Dang said Skylark [Lane] will connect into that. Decca Drive is this one that goes over to Peach Grove Avenue.

Chair Finnegan said it is connecting currently unconnected streets. The grid connectivity, staff has no concerns about...

Ms. Dang said we supported it with the rezoning request. As you saw with the concept plan, what the preliminary plat is showing is consistent.

Chair Finnegan said as someone who rides a bike around town, this is kind of a hard neighborhood to get through. There is only like one viable path through there. I think opening this to more grid type connectivity would be good.

Commissioner Baugh said I move approval of the variances as presented by staff.

Vice Chair Byrd seconded the motion.

Chair Finnegan called for a roll call vote.

Commissioner Nardi	Aye
Commissioner Baugh	Aye
Vice Chair Byrd	Aye
Commissioner Alsindi	Aye
Commissioner Washington	Aye
Chair Finnegan	Aye

The motion to recommend approval of the preliminary plat request passed (6-0). The recommendation will move forward to City Council on December 10, 2024.

A motion was made by Baugh, seconded by Byrd, that this Action Item be recommended to full council to the City Council, due back on 12/10/2024. The motion carried with a recorded roll call vote taken as follows:

Yes: 7 - Finnegan, Washington, Baugh, Vice-Mayor Dent, Alsindi, Nardi and Byrd

No: 0

4.b. Consider a request from Park Apartments to preliminarily subdivide 204 Rocco Avenue and for variances from the Subdivision Ordinance (Park Apartments)

Chair Finnegan read the request and asked staff to review.

Ms. Rupkey in April 2020 the subject site was rezoned to R-5C giving Park Apartments the ability to build additional units. The now existing 2020-approved proffers include the following:

- Dwelling units may be occupied by a single family or no more than two (2) unrelated persons.
- Townhouse and multi-family dwelling units shall provide 1.5 parking spaces per unit.

In 2022, the property owner received approval of an engineered comprehensive site plan (ECSP), which shows the transfer of land between tax map parcels 10-C-5A and 10-C-5C. (The ECSP Site & Utility Layout Sheet is attached herein.) The ECSP demonstrated the construction of eleven new two-story apartments buildings on the subject site as well as the construction of a new parking lot on the neighboring parcel (tax map 10-C-5C) for the Faith Community Free Methodist Church.

The applicant is requesting to preliminarily subdivide a +/- 11.01-acre parcel addressed as 204 Rocco Avenue (tax map number 10-C-5A). The purpose of the subdivision is to create two separate lots, one of which will not have public street frontage. The lots will both continue to be owned and operated by Park Apartments.

Land Use

The Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Commercial and High Density Residential and states:

Commercial:

Commercial uses include retail, office, professional service functions, restaurants, and lodging uses. Commercial areas should offer connecting streets, biking and walking facilities, and public transit services. Interparcel access and connections are essential to maintaining traffic safety and flow along arterials. Parking should be located to the sides or rear of buildings.

High Density Residential:

These areas have been developed or are planned for development that have the highest residential density ranges outside of the downtown area and properties designated Mixed Use by the Land Use Guide. Density is planned to allow up to 24 dwelling units per acre. While a number of existing multifamily developments and areas adjacent to such developments are identified as High Density Residential, residential land use could include small-lot single-family detached and

single-family attached neighborhoods. In special circumstances, non-residential uses may be appropriate.

Transportation and Traffic

The Determination of Need for a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) form (“TIA determination form”) for the proposed development was completed during the rezoning process and indicated that the project would not generate 100 or more peak hour trips, which is the threshold for staff to require a TIA.

Public Water and Sanitary Sewer

As required, all lots would be served by public water and public sanitary sewer. The preliminary plat shows how proposed water and sanitary sewer lines will serve each new lot.

Subdivision Ordinance Variance Requests

Section 10-2-42 (c) of the Subdivision Ordinance requires all parcels to have public street frontage. The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 10-2-42 (c) to create one lot that would not have public street frontage. The preliminary plat illustrates private access easement through the parcel identified as “Parcel 1”. This easement would allow for access to and from Rocco Avenue and across the private property. Staff does not have concerns with this variance request.

The second variance request is to deviate from the requirements of Section 10-2-43 of the Subdivision Ordinance (SO). This section requires a 10-foot-wide public general utility easement along front lot lines and any lot adjacent to public right-of-way and requires at least a 10-foot-wide public general utility easement centered on the sides or rear of lot lines. Public general utility easements are provided for utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, electric, natural gas, television cable, telephone cable, and others deemed a utility by the City. Rather than dedicating the easements as required, the applicant is dedicating a 10-foot easement along Rocco Avenue and along the side and front property lines of “Parcel 2,” adjacent to tax map parcel 10-C-5-B and 10-C-5-C. In this case, staff does not have concern with the proposed development deviating from this section of the SO.

Note that the applicant is proposing a number of additional easements throughout the property. The remaining public water easements, public sewer easements, and public general utility easements (that are not related to SO Section 10-2-43) will be recorded during the site development process.

Housing Study

The City’s Comprehensive Housing Assessment and Market Study (Housing Study) places the subject site within Market Type B, which has “neighborhoods [that] are characterized by high income earning households, large volumes of housing sales and lower population growth.” The Housing Study further notes that houses in these markets are quick to sell and that “[p]riorities and policies that are appropriate to Market Type B areas include the preservation of existing

affordable housing while at the same time working to increase access to amenities.”

Recommendation

Aside from the variance requests as described herein, the preliminary plat meets all other requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Staff supports the variance requests and recommends approval of the preliminary plat.

Chair Finnegan said occasionally the plats do not necessarily go to Council but in this case they are.

Mr. Fletcher said this body is looking at this because it is a subdivision that proposes a parcel that would not have access to the public street frontage and the variance to the easements. You will be giving a recommendation, one way or the other, and then City Council will review it.

Chair Finnegan said I am not mistaken that there have occasionally been plats that have become before us that do not go to...

Ms. Rupkey said there was one a couple months ago along Mount Clinton Pike, that preliminary plat was purely coming to you all because of the size of the lot; not based on the variance request.

David Mitchell, the applicant, came forward to speak to the request. He said Meghan did a great job explaining it. The variance request, I think we covered the fact that it is a little bit of a unique issue [unintelligible] we have access easements to get us from the public road to the new parcel and we have already installed and are putting easements on for all the utilities that are necessary to serve those apartments, it is all apart of the site plan process.

Chair Finnegan asked if anyone had any questions for the applicant.

Vice Chair Byrd said I make a motion to recommend approval of the preliminary plat and variances as requested.

Commissioner Baugh seconded the motion.

Chair Finnegan called for a roll call vote.

- Commissioner Nardi Aye
- Commissioner Baugh Aye
- Vice Chair Byrd Aye
- Commissioner Alsindi Aye
- Commissioner Washington Aye
- Chair Finnegan Aye

The motion to recommend approval of the preliminary plat request passed (6-0). The

recommendation will move forward to City Council on December 10, 2024.

A motion was made by Byrd, seconded by Baugh, that this Action Item be recommended to full council to the City Council, due back on 12/10/2024. The motion carried with a recorded roll call vote taken as follows:

Yes: 7 - Finnegan, Washington, Baugh, Vice-Mayor Dent, Alsindi, Nardi and Byrd

No: 0

4.c. Consider a request from the City of Harrisonburg to preliminarily subdivide 450 Mount Clinton Pike with variances from the Subdivision Ordinance (Fire Station #5)

Chair Finnegan read the request and asked staff to review.

Ms. Rupkey said the City is requesting to preliminarily subdivide +/- 15.23-acres of property by creating two lots and to dedicate public street right-of-way. Proposed Lot 1 would contain Fire Station #5, which is currently under construction. At this time, the residual +/- 12.8-acre lot would remain undeveloped. As part of the preliminary subdivision process the City is requesting to deviate from requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance, which are all associated with public street design standards.

Land Use

The Comprehensive Plan designates this site as Industrial and states:

These areas are composed of land and structures used for light and general manufacturing, wholesaling, warehousing, high-technology, research and development, and related activities. They include the major existing and future employment areas of the City.

Transportation and Traffic

The Determination of Need for a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) form (“TIA determination form”) for the proposed preliminary plat is attached. The TIA determination form indicated that the project will not generate 100 or more peak hour trips, which is the threshold for staff to require a TIA. Therefore, a TIA was not required for the preliminary plat request.

Public Water and Sanitary Sewer

As required, all lots would be served by public water and public sanitary sewer. The preliminary plat shows how proposed water and sanitary sewer lines will serve each new lot.

Subdivision Ordinance Variance Requests

The three variances being requested are from Sections 10-2-41 (a), 10-2-61 (a), and 10-2-66, which are associated with public street design standards. Specifically, Section 10-2-41 (a) states that “[p]roposed streets shall conform to the standards and specifications outlined in the Design and Construction Standards Manual (DCSM) except that variances to the standards for streets, alleys, blocks, easements, sidewalks, and all such related features may be approved on a

case-by-case basis by the city council when particular objectives are met.” Section 10-2-61 (a) states that “[t]he subdivider is required to make all such improvements to streets, including grading, subgrade, surface, and curbs and gutters, in accord with the requirements of the city's DCSM.” And Section 10-2-66 states “[a]ll utility, street and alley improvements shall be provided in each new subdivision lying wholly or partly within the corporate limits of the city in accordance with standards and specifications of the city.”

In particular, the City is requesting to deviate from the Design and Construction Standards Manual (DCSM) Sections 3.1.4 and 3.6.4.1.

- Section 3.1.4 (Right-of-Way Widths) requires that street right-of-way shall be as shown in Appendix F of the DCSM, which illustrates that local street public right-of-way width is 50-feet. The preliminary plat proposes for the public street right-of-way to be 44-feet. This width is acceptable to the Department of Public Works who describes in a letter that “it allows all City maintained infrastructure to be located within the provided right of way, and it is allowed per State code.”
- Section 3.6.4.1 (Street Design - General) requires that street widths shall be as shown in Appendix F of the DCSM, which illustrates that local public street width is a minimum of 34-feet measured face of curb to face of curb. Rather than 34 feet, the City is proposing to construct a street that is 28 feet wide. This width is acceptable to the Department of Public Works because the width is consistent with the VDOT approved with for a local street.

Staff supports all of the variances that have been requested.

Recommendation

Aside from the variance requests as described herein, the preliminary plat meets all other requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Staff supports the variance requests and recommends approval of the preliminary plat.

Chair Finnegan asked if there were any questions for staff.

Vice Chair Byrd said is this because the City sees this only as a street to service the fire station?

Mr. Fletcher said can you repeat your question?

Vice Chair Byrd said it sounds like the width is smaller than the manual....

Ms. Rupkey said the DCSM [Design and Construction Standards Manual] requires a wider width that is the standard for a local street. However, VDOT has a different standard that they use for their local street designs which is smaller than what our DCSM requires.

Chair Finnegan said it meets VDOT standards but not City standards.

Ms. Rupkey said yes.

Vice Chair Byrd said since the City only needs it to service the station.

Mr. Fletcher said no that is not the only reason. This street will likely continue north in some shape or fashion. Either ending in a cul-de-sac somewhere and sometime in the future or it may deviate

east or west and head towards Acorn Drive. What the variance requests are for is for the right-of-way width that is needed to be dedicated in actual physical construction of the street. What you have heard us talk about quite a bit recently over the past couple of years is that our DCSM standards basically require wide streets, and we are looking at sort of deviating from that. Rather than dedicating fifty feet of right-of-way, we are dedicating 44 feet. And rather than building 34 feet of pavement face of curb, it is 28 feet. You have reduced costs with construction but then you also have these opportunities when you have narrow streets to have reduced traffic speeds. What is on the books come with it for the variance request. It does not have anything to do with it being a short stub for a short period of time or that it is only serving the Fire Department. The plan is at some point in the future, like all other undeveloped land in the City, something will likely get built there and this would be a service to those other lots.

Chair Finnegan said I support narrowing lane widths if it slows down traffic.

Vice Chair Byrd said in light of that extra information, and I remember reading about the standards to create really wide streets and how that is not practical to do traffic calming, I make a motion to recommend approval of the preliminary plat and variances as requested.

Commissioner Baugh seconded the motion.

Chair Finnegan called for a roll call vote.

- Commissioner Nardi Aye
- Commissioner Baugh Aye
- Vice Chair Byrd Aye
- Commissioner Alsindi Aye
- Commissioner Washington Aye
- Chair Finnegan Aye

The motion to recommend approval of the preliminary plat request passed (6-0). The recommendation will move forward to City Council on December 10, 2024.

A motion was made by Byrd, seconded by Baugh, that this Action Item be recommended to full council to the City Council, due back on 12/10/2024. The motion carried with a recorded roll call vote taken as follows:

Yes: 7 - Finnegan, Washington, Baugh, Vice-Mayor Dent, Alsindi, Nardi and Byrd

No: 0

5. Public Comment

None.

6. Report of Secretary & Committees

6.a. Rockingham County Planning Commission Liaison Report

Commissioner Nardi said I went to that meeting I thought it started at 6:30pm it actually started at

5:00pm. It was a stakeholder meeting as a result of discussion at the October meeting about staff having proposed an ordinance amendment as well as a Comprehensive Plan amendment to address phasing of development. It started based on discussions around schools and capacity. In August, they started discussing capacity and increased development and the effect on infrastructure. Staff had, for discussion, put a number out there that in a 12-month period there may be 30 building permits approved. I got there at 6:30 and the meeting was about over, but there were builders and other stakeholders having that discussion. The notes are not out yet, but to be continued on that. It is timely in that when we talk about all of the housing development occurring the infrastructure, public facilities, and such. The amendments were not passed because the body wanted to have the stakeholder meeting. I took a couple of notes to try and capture the discussion. One comment from the builders was the challenge around upfront costs and a discussion on mandates versus incentives. They talked about minimum lot sizes. They talked about companies coming in and what effect phasing of development would have that developers can not meet demand if there is a threshold for building permits. Also, what are the pros and cons and what may be the outcome from putting something such in place. I will certainly bring back notes from the meeting. I called the County and the planner said the minutes are not available yet. In fact, they were not recorded. It was just a handwritten stakeholder meeting. They talked about just in general what is the implication of zero growth. Someone said "well look at Shenandoah County zero growth is happening." They talked about the number of residential units in pipeline which it was commented that the potential to build 3,000 units in five years. What impact growth or no growth would have on the County.

Commissioner Baugh said I guess they just did not have anything else to amount to. This got talked about in September and I think they talked generally about this. If they made a decision to do that then, I missed it.

Commissioner Nardi said they tabled it. I think it started back in August.

Commissioner Baugh said I was in the meeting when they were talking about this, but I do not think when I was there it got beyond we should have a stakeholders meeting. I think there may have a conversation asking if the County do it before the regular meeting.

Chair Finnegan said maybe they had no agenda items.

Commissioner Nardi said you went in October.

Commissioner Baugh said I think that developed after that. The reservation was that even then you had substantial interest from the development community. Who guess what, they want these things to go away. The flip side of it was I think they discovered that it is something they tried that no one else is doing. There does seem to be an element of it is a great argument to say we only want so many units to come online. But there is an aspect of you are actually building them that does not really work really well. You build them in phases and to say we are going to develop this and only do so many per month is not the way the developers and the builders are...

Chair Finnegan said that is not the way the market works. The other piece at the other end of this is the market capacity issues. When you look at the trend of building permits issued for the County and City it is just the idea that we would jump from this many building permits to this many in the City and the County. There is not enough construction workers. There are market conditions that stop that from happening.

Commissioner Nardi said it would be interesting because I do not think people would go for it in the end.

6.b. Board of Zoning Appeals Report

Vice Chair Byrd said the BZA did not meet.

6.c. City Council Report

Mr. Fletcher said there really is no update. The meeting that was to be held last night has been postponed and the items will be reviewed on November 26.

8. Other Matters

Chair Finnegan said this is unfortunately Vice Chair Byrd's last meeting with us. You have been with us since 2020 and I just wanted to thank you for your community service. We will also need to fill the BZA appointment.

Vice Chair Byrd said I was thinking about it on my drive here tonight from DC. I was going it does not feel right to spend five days of the week in another City and two days in Harrisonburg and speak about City issues here if that is going to end up where I am going to be most of the time for the foreseeable future, especially if certain projects get approved by Congress. I have not actually moved, nor do I know when I will be moving, but I just felt it would not be appropriate for me to be here for much longer.

Commissioner Nardi said I have interacted with you for that long that I appreciate your thoroughness as you review the proposals and comments.

8.a. Review Summary of next month's applications

Ms. Dang said on the screen we have eight items, there are actually seven sites. Two of them are ordinance amendments and items number three and four are for the same sites. Our recommendation is to have one meeting in the month of December.

9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 6:41pm.

NOTE TO THE PUBLIC

Staff will be available at 4:00 p.m. on the Tuesday before the next Planning Commission meeting for those interested in going on a field trip to view the sites on the next agenda.

INTERPRETATION SERVICES

Language interpretation service in Spanish, Arabic and Kurdish is available for Planning Commission meetings. To ensure that interpreters are available at the meeting, interested persons must request the accommodation at least four (4) calendar days in advance of the meeting by contacting the City Clerk at (540) 432-7701 or by submitting a request online at: www.harrisonburgva.gov/interpreter-request-form

El servicio de intérpretes inglés-español está disponible para las reuniones públicas de la Comisión de Planificación. Para asegurar la disponibilidad de intérpretes, cualquier interesado deberá solicitar la presencia de un intérprete al menos cuatro (4) días calendarios antes de la reunión comunicándose con la Secretaría Municipal al (540) 432-7701 o por medio de la página por internet al:

<https://www.harrisonburgva.gov/interpreter-request-form>

NOTE TO THE PUBLIC

Residents/Media will be able to attend the meeting.

The Public can also view the meeting live on:

- The City's website, <https://harrisonburg-va.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>
- Public Education Government Channel 3

A phone line will also be live where residents will be allowed to call in and speak with Planning Commission during the Public Hearings and the Public Comments portion of the night's meeting. We ask those that wish to speak during the public comment period to not call in until after all the public hearings and public comment on those have been heard. This will avoid anyone calling on any other item from holding up the queue and then being asked to call back at a later time.

The telephone number to call in is: (540) 437-2687

Residents also may provide comment prior to the meeting by visiting this page: www.harrisonburgva.gov/agenda-comments