



PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

July 7, 2025

2:00 PM

I. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. NEW BUSINESS

1. Rezoning application PZ25-00322 filed by Mark Wayne Matherly to rezone Parcel 55167 (363 Central Blvd.) from PSC-O, Planned Shopping Center Overlay District to PS-C, Planned Shopping Center Commercial.

IV. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Annual Plan Danville Event

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Minutes from June 9, 2025

VI. ADJOURNMENT

STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 7, 2025
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Renee Burton, Division Director of Planning
RE: Rezoning application PZ25-00322 filed by Mark Wayne Matherly to rezone Parcel 55167 (363 Central Blvd.) from PSC-O, Planned Shopping Center Overlay District to PS-C, Planned Shopping Center Commercial.

SUMMARY

Located near the fork of Piney Forest Road and Central Boulevard, Parcel 55167 (363 Central Boulevard) measures approximately 0.4 acres with a 4,000-square foot building occupied by Security Zone, Inc. Zoned PSC-O Planned Shopping Center Overlay, the applicant is requesting to rezone 363 Central Boulevard to PS-C Planned Shopping Center to consolidate with an adjacent parcel. The zoning classification of PSC-O was placed on the subject property during the development of the Coleman Market Place. The applicant is requesting to rezone the subject parcel to PSC, removing the overlay from the property.

A rezoning and removal of the overlay from the zoning classification alters the regulations of 363 Central Boulevard, but does not create a non-conformance. A rezoning from PSC-O to PSC will facilitate the combination of Parcel 55167 with a portion of the adjacent Parcel 52754. The combined parcels will allow the applicant more on-site parking.

This application aligns with Chapter 3 Land Use (LU.3.2) of the Comprehensive Plan by enhancing mixed-use corridors and improving site designs to “minimize the visual impact of parking lots from the street.” It also supports improvements to the Piney Forest Corridor, named as an impact area in LU.3, by providing streamlined access and rear parking.

Twenty-seven (27) notices were sent to surrounding property owners within three hundred (300) feet of the subject property. Three unopposed responses were received.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of PZ25-00322 filed by Mark Wayne Matherly to rezone Parcel 55167 (363 Central Blvd.) from PSC-O, Planned Shopping Center Overlay District to PS-C, Planned Shopping Center Commercial.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Application
2. 363 Central_Aerials Map
3. 363 Central_Owners Zoning Map



CITY OF DANVILLE
Community Development
Division of Planning and Zoning

REZONING APPLICATION

1. An application for rezoning shall be made by the owner, contract purchaser with the owner's written consent, or the owner's agent, of the property on which the proposed use is to be located. The application shall be submitted to the Director of Planning/Zoning Administrator and shall be accompanied by the filing fee as established by the City Council.
2. The application shall include the following information:
 - a. A description of the proposed use and, where applicable, the hours of operation and the proposed number of employees/patrons.
 - b. A written statement of proposed project compatibility with the following:
 1. The Comprehensive Plan.
 2. The applicable zoning district.
 3. The surrounding properties.
 4. Current and future neighborhood conditions.
 5. Pedestrian and vehicular traffic patterns, on-site and off-site.
 6. Adequate public facilities.
 - c. When requested by the Director of Planning/Zoning Administrator, the Planning Commission, or the City Council, the following information shall be provided by the applicant: 1. The architectural elevations and floor plans of proposed building(s). 2. Traffic impact analysis. 3. Fiscal impact analysis. 4. Parking and site circulation analysis. 5. Photographs of property and surrounding area. 6. Environmental impact statement. 7. A preliminary site plan in accordance with the Site Plan Regulations.

PLANNING DIVISION PROVIDED INFORMATION

Application #: PZ25-00322 PC Meeting Date: 7/7
 Date Received: 6/6 Received By: Williams
 Parcel ID: 55167 Address: 363 Central
 Existing Zoning: PSC-C Proposed Zoning: PS-C

APPLICANT PROVIDED INFORMATION

Applicant: Mark Wayne Matherly
 Applicant's Address: 363 Central Blvd, Danville VA 24540

Applicant's Phone Number: 434 203-0209

Applicant's Email: mark@securityzoning.com

Purpose for Proposed Amendment: To allow for adding the rear portion of 369 Central Blvd to 363 Central Blvd to provide much needed parking spaces

Property Address: _____ Gross Area/ Net Area: _____

Property Location: N S E W Side of: _____

Between: _____ and _____

Proffered Conditions: _____

Mark W Mathews 6-6-2025
Applicant's Signature Date

Same
Property Owner's Signature (if not applicant) Date



2025 AERIAL IMAGERY OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

Prepared by:
Planning Division
6/9/2025



Disclaimer: Information contained on this map is to be used for reference purposes only. The City of Danville is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained. The City of Danville makes no representation of warranty as to this map's accuracy, and in particular, its accuracy in labeling, dimensions, contours, property boundaries, or placement or location of any map features thereon. No responsibility is assumed for damages or other liabilities due to the accuracy, availability, use or misuse of the information herein provided.



SURROUNDING PROPERTY OWNERS AND ZONING WITHIN 300 FEET OF SUBJECT PROPERTY

Prepared by:
Planning Division
6/9/2025



Disclaimer: Information contained on this map is to be used for reference purposes only. The City of Danville is not responsible for any inaccuracies herein contained. The City of Danville makes no representation of warranty as to this map's accuracy, and in particular, its accuracy in labeling, dimensions, contours, property boundaries, or placement or location of any map features thereon. No responsibility is assumed for damages or other liabilities due to the accuracy, availability, use or misuse of the information herein provided.



STAFF REPORT

DATE: July 7, 2025
TO: Planning Commission
FROM:
RE: Annual Plan Danville Event

ATTACHMENTS

None

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 9, 2025

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Petrick
Mr. Townes
Ms. Evans
Mr. Kahn
Mr. Ranson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mr. Dodson
Mr. Jones

STAFF

Renee Burton
Renee Burton
Shanika Williams
Stefanie Jackson

I. ITEMS FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. *Rezoning application PZ25-00250 filed by Danville Ventures, LLC to rezone Parcel 55063 (West Main Street) from OT-R Old Town Residential to HR-C Highway Retail Commercial.*

Mr. Petrick opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Calhoun stated. Hello, my name is Evan Calhoun. I'm with WT Group. We're the civil engineering staff representing the applicant. Just here to answer any questions if you have any.

Mr. Petrick stated. Does anyone have any questions, Commissioners? Fairly straightforward I thought. Ms. Evans, do you have anything?

Ms. Evans stated. Do you need this overflow parking?

Mr. Calhoun stated. The parcel currently serves as a parking lot. So really, it's just reconstruction of the existing parking lot. And in order to do that we're consolidating the parcels.

Mr. Petrick stated. What else? Thank you, Mr. Calhoun.

Mr. Calhoun stated. Yes, sir.

Mr. Petrick stated. Anyone else who'd like to speak in favor of this item, please step forward and state your name. Anyone opposed?

Mr. Petrick closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Evans made a motion to approve Special Use Application PZ25-00250 with the condition that Parcel 55063 with Parcel 57238. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

2. *Special Use Permit application PZ25-00262 filed by Latasha Fitzgerald to allow a daycare center in accordance with Article 3.M Section C at Parcel 52203 (2420 North Main Street).*

Mr. Petrick opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Hello, my name is Latasha Fitzgerald. I am the owner that filed the paperwork. So, in regards to it being suitable for a daycare, the parking – well the rear of the building is fenced in and that's where the play area would be going for the children that you have a concern in regards to lack of green space. So we will be using that area. It's actually fenced in.

Mr. Petrick stated. Is that a part of the rear parking lot?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes.

Mr. Petrick stated. So, you intend to take up the asphalt and put down grass?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. It wouldn't. It would be the mulch and the turf grass that would be put down.

Mr. Petrick stated. So, any artificial surface? Is that what you're saying.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes, sir.

Ms. Evans stated. It doesn't look very large that fenced in area. Do you know how large it is?

Ms. Pyles stated. Excuse me, I am Jo Ann Pyles, I am the owner of the building. I would estimate it is about, almost as big as the building itself. I have a picture here if you all would like to see. It's a pretty large size so I'm estimating it's about 2,000 square feet.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yea, I have the picture. Do anybody want to see the picture? Ok.

Ms. Pyles stated. But as she earlier stated, she has plenty of space to put the proper material to turn that fenced in area into what need to for the daycare.

Ms. Evans stated. Do you plan on having playground equipment?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes.

Ms. Evans stated. And that – I mean, I understand that you think its large, but by the time you get equipment in there and turf and mulch...how many children do you anticipate?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Well, the Certificate of Occupancy allows up to forty-eight (48) people. So, with the forty-eight (48) people there will probably be forty (40) children. So, the space is actually suitable enough for 40 children even if there were all to go out there at one time. But the way playtime works, the age groups they don't play all at the same time. It's different times that they actually go outside. It's a schedule that is followed. But like I said, even if all forty (40) children went out there, the space is actually large enough.

Mr. Ranson stated. Since you're going to use that space, are you going to have adequate parking then?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes. We've already met with the inspector for the Certificate of Occupancy and he advised what we needed to do even with regard to the handicap parking and everything that needed to be taken care of inside the building itself.

Mr. Ranson stated. I guess one of the comments was that its a high traffic area and I assume that your parents will be leaving off the children about the same time every morning, how is that going to work?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Well, the drop-off time is – the daycare will open actually at 6 o'clock, so they can drop-off between 6 and 9. I'm sure there will be parents coming in at the same time but we do actually have – they can drop off bringing their children in the door, but also we have...you can explain the circle area.

Ms. Pyles stated. The building previously was a bank. So, the way that it is, we do have additional space which was utilized as the drive-through which we still will utilize that. So, we will have a space

set up where the parents, at specific times, will have drop-off points and pick-up points where we will assist the children from that point into the building. So, they will actually go around the drive-through area to drop the kids off and to pick them up, in the same order as your public schools do.

Mr. Ranson stated. Ok, so, hopefully that will mean a minimal disruption of traffic.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. I'm sorry, was that a question?

Mr. Ranson stated. Hopefully that will mean a minimal disruption of traffic on North Main?

Ms. Pyles stated. Yea, well, the drive-through is consistent and its large enough to where there is a flow where no one has to stop and go. And where our point is...when you go around, the drop-off is not here, its centered catty-corner, if I could show you.

Mr. Petrick stated. It's on the north side of the building, isn't it? I mean, you've got an entrance from the south side.

Ms. Pyles stated. So, you can kind of see here, you can come around this part, our drop-off point would be here, so it would be a constant flow.

Mr. Ranson stated. So, you'd go behind the playground area?

Ms. Pyles stated. Not behind it, but you would meet right here at the playground area and drop the children off. And then at that point you could open these doors, these gates up here and bring the children in this way as opposed to going to the front.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. And the front is actually on the side of the building, as well, it's not in the actual front of the building where the sidewalk is at. It's at the side of the building.

Mr. Townes stated. So, you all would still come in where the old Gina's Restaurant coming around?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes.

Mr. Townes stated. You know the restaurant? You'll still be coming between the daycare and the restaurant coming around?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes.

Ms. Pyles stated. What you actually have is, you have a parking lot and then you have like a cement border here.

Ms. Evans stated. Fence?

Ms. Pyles stated. No. The cement border is on this side. And the cars go around this way. On this side the building where you actually go into the building is a parking area.

Ms. Burton stated. Excuse me, I need you to speak into a mic so that everyone can hear you.

Ms. Pyles stated. Oh.

Ms. Burton stated. You can use Ms. Evans, but you need to. That way we can capture what you're saying.

Ms. Pyles stated. Ok. If you can follow me – I should've gotten a better picture. When you come off North Main here, your door is here. You have a brick border that borders the parking lot itself. So, on

the left side of the brick border is the actual entrance that served as the drive-through, which we will still use it in that capacity. So, as you go around the drive-through you will not stop right at that front door you'll continue to go around which borders the fence of the play area. So, the children will be dropped off here. And it's enough space there for you to get at least four or five cars in there, so there's no backup in the actual North Main traffic. And it'll continue to go around and the children will exit through the back of the building.

Ms. Evans stated. So, then the cars, through this drive-through, what used to be the drive through, so they drop off their child and keep on driving. Do they drive around the fenced area that's going to be next to the playground?

Ms. Pyles stated. Yes. And they continue on through what used to be the drive-through, but we will now utilize it as a pickup and drop-off point.

Mr. Petrick stated. I'm assuming there's nothing specific to green spaces that required in the code for this particular use.

Ms. Burton stated. It is under the state licensing. I know there are playground requirements, but not under the zoning code.

Mr. Petrick stated. Ok.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes sir. I'm sorry. So, with the state licensing, I did have somebody come out to kind of like walk through the building and they are aware of what we plan to do with the parking lot, existing parking lot in the back that's fenced in. She was the one that actually mapped out, kind of like mapped out everything with me to make sure that it would be suitable for the state.

Ms. Evans stated. The state doesn't require live plants, grass, trees?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. No, no, no.

Ms. Evans stated. But is there a certain kind of mulch you have to use?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. It depends on the actual playground equipment. If its playground equipment that they are climbing up on, the mulch, what you put down it has to be, it has to meet certain requirements. But if not then, if it's not playground equipment they're actually climbing up on, it's no set requirements for that.

Ms. Pyles stated. And it's not, if I'm not mistaken, it's not your typical mulch we put in our houses.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. It's the rubber.

Ms. Pyles stated. It's the rubber, turf type of mulch.

Ms. Evans stated. So, have you figured out what type of playground equipment you're going to have?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Yes. So, very simple. Nothing where they have to climb up on that's going to be a significant height. So based upon what we will be getting, that's the type of mulch, the type of turf we will be putting down for this to make sure that we meet the requirements for when they come in to inspect for the state licensing.

Ms. Evans stated. And what ages are you talking about?

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Seventeen (17) months to five (5) year olds for the actual academy itself. And then five (5) to twelve (12) for the afterschool.

Mr. Petrick stated. Staff, have any other comments?

Ms. Burton stated. Yes, I would like to make note that the Certificate of Occupancy that she is referencing has not been issued. That is a change of use and cannot be issued until, excuse me, the special use permit has been approved. So, it does note that under current circumstances it will be forty-eight (48), but that has not been issued. Also, given forty-eight (48) being forty (40) children and eight (8) staff, that will require eighteen (18) parking spaces for this particular use. So, that is something else that needs to be taken into consideration.

Ms. Evans stated. Do you have eighteen (18) parking spaces?

Ms. Pyles stated. Well, we don't. Our staff is going to be fairly small.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. It would be probably about, that's what she was saying, probably like five (5), she said eight (8) staff members, but it'll probably be about five (5) to six (6) just depending. Because some of them will be part-time and then with the forty (40) kids, so, you're saying about eighteen (18), right?.

Ms. Burton stated. Right. Zoning code requires one space per employee as well as one space per four (4) children.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Ok.

Mr. Ranson stated. Even if we accept that fact that that's going to be the playground area, then they would not have eighteen (18) parking spaces.

Ms. Burton stated. Not on site. No sir, I do not believe they would have eighteen (18). No. Not based on what I'm seeing in an aerial.

Mr. Ranson stated. Yea, I would agree with that.

Ms. Pyles stated. Now, in the event that, this is just something we considered, in the event that we don't have the parking spaces to accommodate the staffing that we have, we are in talks with the lot that is across the street and probably getting some spaces from them even if we have to rent so many spaces, say well the employees will have ten (10) parking spaces over where the Old Dutch parking lot is and just walk back through the back breezeway to come to the facility.

Mr. Ranson stated. And that would be acceptable?

Ms. Burton stated. Yes, if there is a lease agreement that can be shown that there are adequate spaces within three hundred (300) feet of this particular property, then yes, that is acceptable. We would just need to see that agreement.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Ok.

Mr. Petrick stated. Any other questions or comments? Thank you, ladies.

Ms. Fitzgerald stated. Thank you.

Ms. Pyles stated. Thank you.

Mr. Petrick closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick stated. Commissioners?

Ms. Evans stated. I have a question for staff. This is zoned Highway Retail Commercial. What is the normal zoning of daycare centers? Or does it vary?

Ms. Burton stated. It does vary. In every zoning classification it is a special use permit but we typically see those in residential areas or in those that may be TO-C, something that is a residential commercial zoning. Generally, it's integrated with a neighborhood. So, this is just a little different.

Ms. Evans stated. Based on her description of the playground area, what are your feelings now about the green space?

Ms. Burton stated. If it meets state specifications, then that is adequate for us. And if that area is going to be used for a playground area, then we need to address the parking. And until I see the agreement, I can't state that that's been addressed at this point.

Mr. Petrick stated. So, all of this is contingent upon approval by state. As far as the licensing is concerned because aren't they, don't they have, obviously – do they have issues with parking?

Ms. Burton stated. They do not address the parking. They will address the outdoor space. Zoning code will address the parking.

Mr. Petrick stated. So, any consideration of a vote to approve would have to contain a condition for parking?

Ms. Burton stated. Correct.

Mr. Petrick stated. And also, for landscaping play areas?

Ms. Burton stated. That would be addressed by the state and until she, she cannot receive her state license until that's been taken care of.

Mr. Petrick stated. Ok. Well, the parking then is covered under code, right?

Ms. Burton stated. Correct.

Mr. Petrick stated. Ok. So, we don't have any added conditions that need to be made. Is that what you are saying?

Ms. Burton stated. I mean, you could add the condition, yes, because at this point it would be off-site parking. That would be necessary for her to provide some type of lease agreement stating that she does has off-site parking that is adequate.

Mr. Petrick stated. Ok. Because it doesn't appear like there enough room there for that many, how many of them?

Ms. Burton stated. Not if the fenced-in area is going to be their playground.

Mr. Petrick stated. Especially if they have a playground, so, ok, so just keep that in mind with your motion. Any other questions? Comments? What's your pleasure?

Mr. Ranson made a motion to approve Special Use Application PZ25-00262 with the condition that the applicant provides the City with a lease agreement providing adequate off-site parking. Mr. Khan seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

3. *Special Use Permit application PZ25-00293 filed by Brayán Daniel Guardado Ortega to allow three, attached residential townhouses at Parcel 77618 (203 Ash Street) in accordance with Article 3.E Section C.*

Mr. Petrick opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick stated. Anyone in favor of this item, please come forward. Is the applicant here? Applicant is not here. Anyone else who would like to speak in favor of this item? Anyone else opposed to this item? Please come forward. Give us your name and speak right into that mic there.

Ms. Gentry stated. My name is Sarah Gentry.

Mr. Petrick stated. Ok, Sarah, Move right up so we can hear you on that mic.

Ms. Gentry stated. Oh, I'm sorry.

Mr. Petrick stated. And it's adjustable. You can just move it any way you want to. There you go.

Ms. Gentry stated. How's that? Ya'll hear me good now?

Mr. Petrick stated. That's excellent.

Ms. Gentry stated. Alright, I live at 204 Ash Street. My house sits in between two rental properties. Our street is not large enough in order to have any traffic. If you're talking about putting two townhouses there, you're talking at least four (4) more vehicles on our road. As it stands right now, the City has to back down the road on Dan Lane and on Ash Street. Dan lane doesn't have a turnaround at all and Ash Street doesn't have a turnaround. And where the City has to turn around, if the person that's renting that is, on a good day, she doesn't say anything, but sometimes because of that kennel being there, you know, it causes the dogs to bark and fuss. And then you've got a mess in the kennel that the owners have to clean up. But there's just absolutely no room for the traffic. And I'm just being nice saying two (2) per household but then you've got visitors coming in. Plus, you're talking about Piney Forest Road where several people have already been killed on the street pulling out into Piney Forest Road. I just don't see how you could put townhouses down there at all. There's not enough room. You can't even pass. Two cars can't even pass on the street together. So.

Mr. Petrick stated. Commissioners, any questions? Comments?

Ms. Evans stated. I have a question – I thought that kennel closed.

Ms. Gentry stated. Well, we can always pray.

Ms. Evans stated. Did it not?

Mr. Khan stated. Is it closed or not?

Ms. Gentry stated. There are animals down there. The person who is renting the property, supposedly buying the property, that's where she keeps the animals at, so. m trying to be very PC today, I'm sorry.

Ms. Evans stated. I understand. We can chat afterwards.

Mr. Petrick stated. Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Gentry stated. I mean, I don't think the kennel is not operating as a kennel. Does that make sense?

Ms. Evans stated. That's my question.

Ms. Gentry stated. No, it's not acting as a kennel. No. It's just her personal animals. There are no animals that are being boarded down there or anything. All the animals are hers.

Mr. Petrick stated. It has no bearing on this so.

Ms. Evans stated. I know it doesn't. I was just curious.

Ms. Gentry stated. Right, she was just asking the question, so I was just trying to answer it.

Mr. Petrick stated. Ok. Anything else?

Ms. Gentry stated. No sir, I think that's about it.

Mr. Petrick stated. Alright. Thank you, ma'am. Appreciate it. Anyone else like to speak in favor or in opposition to this particular item? If not, we will close the public hearing.

Mr. Petrick closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick stated. Commissioners?

Ms. Evans made a motion to postpone Special Use Application PZ25-00293 until the applicant can attend the meeting. Mr. Khan seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

4. *Rezoning application PZ25-00302 filed by Cedarbrook Partners, LLC to rezone Parcel 59803 (439 Cedarbrook Drive) from TO-C, Transitional Office to M-R, Multi-family Residential District.*

Mr. Petrick opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick stated. Anyone who'd like to speak in favor of this item, please come forward. State your name. Yes, sir?

Mr. Vaught stated. How y'all doing? My name's Adam Vaught. I'm here on behalf of Cedarbrook Partners. We're looking...

Mr. Khan stated. Your name sir?

Mr. Vaught stated. Adam Vaught.

Mr. Khan stated. Ok, thank you.

Mr. Vaught stated. We're looking to do thirty-one (31) apartments in the old school, so that would be composed of eight (8) one-bedrooms, twenty-two (22) two-bedrooms, and one (1) three-bedroom. And that would include a gym for the residents, as well as an amenity space in the old cafeteria, which is the front left if you're facing the front of the building. Outside of that, it's really...there's sixty-three (63) parking spaces designed right now, that will be going through, with Renee, based on, you know, that's way more than is required. I think it's 31 is required. So, have plenty of parking. Other than that, here to answer any questions. We held a community input meeting and there was a lot of

good feedback. Parks and Rec came and showed some exciting plans for their space next to the building, so, I think it will be a really good finished product.

Mr. Petrick stated. Commissioners, questions? Comments?

Ms. Evans stated. How many parking spaces did you say?

Mr. Vaught stated. Sixty-three (63) is what we have on what you see in the slideshow that's on this computer here.

Mr. Townes stated. Are you talking about that parking lot that's adjacent to the building?

Mr. Vaught stated. It's all three, total. So, all three of those that you see there make up the sixty-three (63). So, the left side. And it shows the number of spaces in each lot. And there's a decent chance that the one on this screen that's on the bottom would actually shift a little bit closer to the building. We're working with utilities on getting everything we need in there that kind of has, plays a part in where those spots can be.

Ms. Evans stated. Who gets the spots up front? First come, first serve?

Mr. Vaught stated. That's the best way I know how to do it.

Mr. Townes stated. I was just curious because I live not too far from that area and I just did a U-turn not too long ago in that parking space that I see is the one off to the right. Where this design is in here on the opposite side is where the softball field is. That's just a driveway. There's no...

Mr. Vaught stated. Yeah, so the property line is just on this side so, basically, if you look at the front of it. The softball field is one parcel which belongs to the City and Parks and Rec and then the rest is our parcel. And so, basically, we would be on our side, of course, which that drive, that gravel drive lane is pretty close to where the line is.

Mr. Petrick stated. Thank you, Adam. Anyone else like to speak in favor of this particular agenda item? Anyone in opposition to this particular agenda item, please come forward.

Mr. Petrick closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Evans made a motion to approve rezoning application PZ25-00302 as submitted. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

5. *Code Amendment Request to amend Chapter 41 entitled "Zoning Ordinance" of the City of Danville, 1986 as amended. Specifically, amend Article 2.Y.*

Mr. Petrick opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick stated. Commissioners, questions?

Ms. Evans stated. Questions. Alright so, I understand Number 4.

Ms. Burton stated. Ok.

Ms. Evans stated. Number 6, I believe our discussion in the meeting was two (2) adults per bedroom and then one (1) minor total. Not one (1) minor per bedroom. Is that doable?

Ms. Burton stated. So, it would be two (2) adults per bedroom...

Ms. Evans stated. And one (1) person under the age of eighteen (18).

Ms. Burton stated. So, if there were two (2) bedrooms, it would be four (4) adults and one (1) minor?

Ms. Evans stated. Yes. That's my understanding from our discussions. I could have misunderstood.

Ms. Burton stated. Right. I mean, it can be done that way if that's the Code Amendment that you would like to move forward. We would need to make that change and that does then, of course, limit anyone that has more than one (1) child from ever using a short-term rental because you would only be allowing one (1) minor. So, that would be rather restrictive. I mean, that's up to the Commission at this point if that's a Code Amendment that you would like. But that's in essence what would happen if you made that Amendment.

Mr. Petrick stated. And just to clarify, the Zoning Code update should address all of these items that are necessary to be addressed. Is that correct?

Ms. Burton stated. It may. We may be able to recommend them now and then we will put them in the new, the Zoning Code update.

Mr. Petrick stated. What issues do you see in any approval today ahead of the update? Would it be confusing to the update?

Ms. Burton stated. No, at this point it would just be an additional step that is then happening again in December. So, what happened then in July and then, we would bring it again to the City Council again in December for the same thing. So, we would be doing it twice.

Ms. Evans stated. In the meantime, does...if you don't want to do it twice, does BZA have the option to continue on limiting as we have been limiting?

Ms. Burton stated. Yes, you would be able to place that condition at any time that you see suitable. Yes.

Mr. Petrick stated. How does that work? That work, ok?

Ms. Evans stated. Yes, that works ok.

Ms. Burton stated. If this is an amendment that the Planning Commission would like to see in the zoning code update, you may make that motion and state that you would like to see that in the zoning code update and we will make those changes as we're prepping that.

Mr. Ranson stated. Renee, I don't want to be frivolous but say there were a family of five (5) and the two (2) parents were in one (1) room and could they, could...how many...it says two (2) adults and one (1) child, but it doesn't say how many children.

Ms. Burton stated. Correct. That was the recommendation from the Board of Zoning Appeals. Yes.

Mr. Ranson stated. Well...But to me that's a little bit confusing. Because, like for instance, my daughter has four (4) children and she might want to rent a house and put all four (4) children in one (1) bedroom. Would that be against the law?

Ms. Burton stated. Under this recommendation of two (2) adults and one (1) child per bedroom, yes.

Mr. Ranson stated. So, you can't have more than one (1) child in a bedroom no matter what?

Ms. Burton stated. Per bedroom. Correct. So, if it was a two (2) bedroom occupancy, you would be able to have four (4) adults and two (2) children. So, then you would have an occupancy of five (5).

Ms. Evans stated. And we were talking about, at the meeting, two (2) adults per bedroom and say they've got a seventeen (17) year old on a sleeper sofa. I think we need to discuss it further at BZA. Do we have time?

Ms. Burton stated. We can put that on an agenda to do that, yes.

Mr. Ranson stated. I really think it...I mean, most...a lot of families have more than one (1) child and it's saying....basically...I don't know. That just seems odd to me. The way people really use space. Children in one (1) place and adults in the other.

Ms. Burton stated. The Planning Commission can make a motion to send it back to the Board of Zoning Appeals for more review.

Mr. Petrick stated. Any other comments?

Ms. Burton stated. You're sending it back to yourself.

Mr. Petrick stated. Any other comments? Do I hear a motion?

Ms. Evans stated. I like to talk about Number 7. Do we need to talk about these...make a motion on these separately?

Ms. Burton stated. It's completely up to you. If you want to discuss 7 and if this come out with the same outcome, then you may do that in one motion.

Ms. Evans stated. Ok.

Ms. Burton stated. Otherwise, you will need to do two (2) separate.

Ms. Evans stated. Alright, you said we...we could do it. We could create the requirement for off-street parking at the rate of one space per bedroom. The way I understand it, this is going to create work for staff because then you have a list of legal non-conforming short-term rentals.

Ms. Burton stated. It will create a list of legal non-conforming because we do have those that are operation, or in operation right now that do not have off-street parking. It will also limit the areas that the short-term rental may operate. For instance, the inner city, Virginia Avenue, College, Marshall Terrace, lot of those homes do not have off-street parking available. So, it would limit. They would no longer be able to operate short-term rentals.

Ms. Evans stated. Would the ones already in existence be able to continue?

Ms. Burton stated. Yes, they would continue in a legal non-conforming status. When they renew their short-term rental permit, we would likely then make a separate note then moving forward that they're operating legal non-conforming based on that code change.

Ms. Evans stated. I think, since we already have to – I think we need to discuss the bedroom requirement further. If we're going to discuss one, we might as well discuss another. And if the BZA – but we cannot do it at the June meeting because this has not been advertised, correct?

Ms. Burton stated. Correct. We would place that on the July agenda.

Mr. Petrick stated. So, are you putting that in a motion?

Ms. Evans made a motion to refer Code Amendment Request to amend Chapter 41 entitled “Zoning Ordinance” of the City of Danville, 1986 as amended, specifically, amend Article 2.Y back to the Board of Zoning Appeals for further discussion. Mr. Townes seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

6. Request for approval of the City of Danville’s Environmental Stewardship Plan

Mr. Petrick opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Petrick stated. Commissioners?

Ms. Evans made a motion to approve the adoption of the City of Danville’s Environmental Stewardship Plan. Mr. Ranson seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

II. ITEMS NOT FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. Approval of a Master Subdivision Development Plan for River Oak Drive

Mr. Petrick stated. Any further comments by Commissioners? Questions? If not, do I hear a motion?

Ms. Evans made a motion to approve the Master Subdivision Development Plan for River Oak Drive with the condition of submitting a secondary emergency egress plan before review by City Council. Mr. Townes seconded the motion. The motion was approved by a 5-0 vote.

III. MINUTES

The May 12, 2025 minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

APPROVED