

The regular meeting of the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors was held on Tuesday, June 22, 2021, at the Botetourt County Administration Center in Daleville, Virginia, beginning at 2:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Members: Dr. Donald M. Scothorn, Chairman
Dr. Richard G. Bailey, Vice-Chairman
Mr. Steve Clinton
Mrs. Amy S. White
Mr. Billy W. Martin, Sr.

ABSENT: Members: None

Others present at the meeting:

Mr. Michael Lockaby, County Attorney
Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator
(left at 6:00 P. M.)
Mr. Gary Larrowe, County Administrator

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 12:30 P.M.

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Dr. Bailey, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board went into Closed Session pursuant to the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended, to discuss the following: Section 2.2-3711.A. 3, Acquisition or disposition of real property for economic development purposes where discussion in open session would adversely affect the County's bargaining position or negotiating strategy namely concerning the Amsterdam (Greenfield) and Blue Ridge districts; Section 2.2-3711.A. 5, Discussion on prospective businesses or industries or the expansion of existing businesses or industries where no previous announcement has been made of their interest in locating or expanding facilities in the community in the Amsterdam (Greenfield), Blue Ridge, and Fincastle Districts; Section 2.2-3711.A. 8, Consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice pertaining to new Virginia personnel-related regulations and the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA). (Resolution Number 21-06-01)

AYES: Mr. Martin, Dr. Scothorn, Dr. Bailey, Mrs. White, Mr. Clinton

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None ABSTAINING: None

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 2:01 P.M.

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board returned to regular session from Closed Session and adopted the following resolution by roll-call vote. (Resolution Number 21-06-02)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None ABSTAINING: None

BE IT RESOLVED, that to the best of the Board members' knowledge only public business matters lawfully exempt from open meeting requirements and only such matters as were identified in the motion to go into Closed Session were heard, discussed or considered during the Closed Session.

Dr. Scothorn then welcomed those present to the meeting.

Dr. Bailey then led the group in reciting the pledge of allegiance.

Dr. Scothorn then asked for a moment of silence.

Mr. Ricky Dowdy, Maintenance Director, then introduced Mr. Wayne Carter to the Board. He noted that Mr. Carter was hired earlier this month as the County's Turf Manager. He noted that Mr. Carter's background included work as a golf course superintendent and he was employed by a landscape company. He stated that Mr. Carter also served eight years in the Army Reserve.

The Board welcomed Mr. Carter to employment with Botetourt County.

Mr. Dowdy then introduced Mr. Brandon Decker who was recently hired as a Grounds Technician. He noted that Mr. Decker has eight years of experience in lawn maintenance through the State parks system and previously worked for various landscaping companies.

The Board welcomed Mr. Decker to employment with the County.

Mr. Dowdy then introduced Mr. Seth Snead as a new Grounds Technician for the County. He noted that Mr. Snead has a background in construction, landscaping, and vehicle engine repairs.

The Board welcomed Mr. Snead to employment with Botetourt County.

Mr. Gary Larrowe, County Administrator, then introduced Mrs. Tiffany Bradbury to the Board as the County's new Director of Communications. He noted that she began work last week.

Mr. Larrowe stated that the County has spent a lot of time working and not a lot of time telling our story over the past few years. He noted that many activities and great things are happening in the County and the public needs to know about them. He noted that Mrs. Bradbury is a great communicator and a social media expert who lives in Blue Ridge and has a daughter who attends Colonial Elementary School.

Mr. Larrowe stated that she worked for the City of Roanoke from 2019 to 2021 and worked for the City's Department of Fire and EMS as their public information officer from 2004 – 2019. He noted that we look forward for great things from her.

The Board welcomed Mrs. Bradbury to Botetourt County.

Mrs. Mary Blackburn, Human Resources Director, then introduced Ms. Niki Payne to the Board. She noted that Ms. Payne was hired on June 10 as the County's Payroll Specialist to replace Roni Ramsey who is retiring at the end of June.

Mrs. Blackburn stated that Ms. Payne has several years of payroll experience, including working with the Virginia Retirement System and the State-offered Deferred Compensation program and previously worked for the Western Virginia Water Authority.

The Board welcomed Ms. Payne to employment with Botetourt County.

Mrs. Amy White then stated that she also works for Virginia Western Community College which has a mission is to serve their community. She noted that the College's service area extends from Franklin County to Craig County and they value their relationship with Botetourt County.

Mrs. White stated that the College's Education Foundation honors a distinguished school alumna each year. She noted that the recipient of this year's award is Kate Lawrence, Unit Coordinator with the Cooperative Extension Office in Fincastle.

Mrs. Carolyn Payne, representing the Education Foundation, stated that she also works with Virginia Western's Community College Access Program (CCAP). She thanked the Board for all their assistance to this program each year.

Mrs. Payne then presented the 2021 Virginia Western Education Foundation Distinguished Alumna Award to Ms. Kate Lawrence for her career accomplishments and dedication to serving the community.

The Board congratulated Ms. Lawrence for receipt of this award and thanked Mrs. White and Mrs. Payne for this presentation.

Dr. Scothorn then stated that County Administration has been working with adjoining localities over the past several months to arrange for the Ironman competition to be held in the Roanoke Valley. He noted that this swim, bike, and running event, which was delayed one year because of the pandemic, was held on June 6, 2021, with assistance from volunteers from the Daleville YMCA who were lifeguards during the swim portion of the event, students at Lord Botetourt and James River high schools, Sheriff's Department staff, Department of Fire and EMS personnel, representatives from several volunteer fire departments, the Virginia Department of Emergency Management's unified command group, and County dispatch personnel.

Dr. Scothorn stated that we look forward to this competition returning to the County in June 2022. A highlight video of the competition was then played.

Dr. Scothorn thanked everyone who was involved in this successful project. He noted that Botetourt County is a community that gives and it has been fantastic to see everyone who volunteered and participated in this event.

Dr. Scothorn also thanked the Sheriff's Department for their quick response to a recent false alarm call from his office's new alarm system.

Discussion was then held on various consent agenda items.

Mrs. White stated that she had a correction to the minutes from the May 25 Board meeting. She noted that the motion on the last page to table the Aaron Lenk Properties change of proffers request should have her listed as voting "No." Mr. Martin noted that he also voted "No" on this motion.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Dr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following consent agenda items with the revision to the May 25 Board minutes as shown below: (Resolution Number 21-06-03)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Approval of minutes of the regular meeting held on May 25, 2021, with the motion for Resolution Number 21-05-12 (Aaron Lenk Properties) to now read: "AYES: Mr. Clinton, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn; NAYS: Mrs. White, Mr. Martin; ABSENT: None; ABSTAINING: None";

Approval of a Noise Ordinance variance request from Jeter Farms for a Truck and Tractor Pull event in Buchanan on July 17, 2021;

Appointment of Board members Richard Bailey and Donald Scothorn to serve on the American Rescue Plan Act Subcommittee and authorization for the County Administrator and/or Deputy County Administrator to sign documentation required under ARPA upon approval of the Subcommittee;

Approval of a refund to O-N Minerals for overpayment of business personal property taxes; and

Approval of transfer of cell tower and ground space lease from Virginia PCS Alliance (Shentel) to T-Mobile USA, Inc., for the Grove Hill Road (Fincastle) cell tower site.

Dr. Scothorn then opened the public comment period.

Mr. Danny Goad of Read Mountain Road stated that he would like to speak to the issue of racism. He noted that there have been a couple of different issues that have come up recently in the County. He noted that last year it was monuments and most recently it has been the critical race theory.

Mr. Goad stated that children in the school system are taught to have a racist notion toward some people based on their characteristics. He stated that the people of Botetourt County are a Christian people and this is not a racist religion. Mr. Goad stated that we are created by God (Adam and Eve) and everyone in this room is the offspring of Noah and his family. He stated that there is no room to have disparaging thoughts about others because of their race. He noted that Moses married a black woman; God is not racist and he does not tell us to be racist.

After discussion, Mr. Goad stated that the Jews were given God's law before all other nations and now, in all other nations, we have God's law. He stated that, as we consider tearing down/moving monuments because of supposed racism, we should stand firm in our religion. Mr. Goad stated that we should not fund education that will teach children that, because of their race, they are different.

Mr. Dan Phelps of Blake Road in Buchanan stated that Mr. Goad provided good comments about critical race theory.

He noted that the Botetourt Artillery was the most decorated unit in the State of Mississippi during the Civil War and it is critical that we know this. Mr. Phelps stated that, whatever happens with the Confederate Monument in Fincastle, he would request that the monument's signage be enhanced to further explain this unit's place in the war.

He reviewed the Battle of Vicksburg which was under siege by Union General Ulysses Grant for over 80 days.

Colonel Carter Gill of Trinity Road stated that he is retired from the U. S. Air Force and is a 40 year resident of Botetourt County who votes. Colonel Gill stated that he fought in the Viet Nam war, his brother fought in World War 2, and his great, great grandfather fought for the State of Virginia in the Civil War.

Colonel Gill stated that "if you think the veterans are going to allow politicians to denigrate a monument to County citizens who put their lives on the line during the War of Northern Aggression" you are mistaken. He stated that this monument should not be put next to a parking lot; it should be put where these veterans can be monitored and remembered. He encouraged the Board to honor these citizens and have their sacrifice remembered.

Dr. Scothorn then stated that there are several timed items on the agenda that the Board now needed to handle but the public comment period would be continued later in the meeting.

Consideration was then held on approval and appropriation of the FY 21-22 County and CIP budgets and the 2021 tax rate resolution. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that the Board conducted the required public hearings on the proposed FY 22 County and Schools budgets, tax rates, and Capital Improvement Plan on April 20, and the Board adopted the School budget on April 27, 2021.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that no increases in tax rates are proposed for the 2021 calendar year. He noted that the proposed \$111.5 million budget includes an anticipated 7.2% increase in

revenues and expenditures, and includes various personnel-related updates, establishment of a new Communications Department, and adjustments related to employee insurance costs. Mr. Zerrilla stated that the budget as proposed is balanced.

He requested that the Board adopt the four resolutions as included in their agenda packets and that the categorical budget appropriation resolution be adopted in full.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mrs. White, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the 2021 tax rate resolution, the FY 21-22 budget approval resolution, and the FY 21-22 budget categorical appropriation resolution as follows, and adopted the Capital Improvements Plan as submitted.

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Resolution Number 21-06-04

WHEREAS, the County proposed tax levy was duly advertised and a public hearing was held on April 20, 2021, in accordance with the Code of Virginia;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the tax rates per \$100 of assessed value for tax year 2021 are set as follows:

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Personal Property | \$2.71 |
| Machinery & Tools | \$1.80 |
| Mobile Homes | \$0.79 |
| Real Estate | \$0.79 |
| Motor Homes | \$2.71 |
| Wind Farms | \$0.99 |

Resolution Number 21-06-05

WHEREAS, the County proposed budget was duly advertised and a public hearing was held on April 20, 2021, in accordance with the Code of Virginia,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Botetourt County budget for Fiscal Year 2021 - 2022 is:

Revenues:

General Fund Revenues:

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Local | 59,806,310 |
| State | 11,696,092 |
| Federal | <u>1,252,179</u> |
| <i>Total General Fund Revenues</i> | 72,754,581 |

School Fund Revenues:

| | |
|-----------------------|------------|
| Other | 580,284 |
| State | 28,074,568 |
| Federal | 50,000 |
| Self-Sustaining Funds | 4,426,190 |
| School Nutrition Fund | 1,916,285 |
| Textbook Funds | 2,500,519 |
| Capital Reserve Fund | 1,238,063 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|
| <i>Total School Fund Revenues</i> | 38,785,909 |
|-----------------------------------|------------|

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| Total Revenues | <u>111,540,490</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|

Expenditures:

General Fund Expenditures:

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Operations as detailed on the following pages* | 38,863,420 |
| Capital Projects | 2,015,318 |
| Transfer to EDA | <u>629,000</u> |
| <i>Total General Fund Expenditures</i> | 41,507,738 |

Debt Fund Expenditures:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| County/VPSA Fund | 4,777,062 |
| School Literary Fund | <u>28,546</u> |
| <i>Total Debt Fund Expenditures</i> | 4,805,608 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| School Operating Fund Expenditures: | 65,227,144 |
|-------------------------------------|------------|

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Total Expenditures | 111,540,490 |
|---------------------------|--------------------|

* OPERATIONS DETAIL:

| | |
|--|-----------|
| BOARD OF SUPERVISORS | 234,466 |
| COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR | 723,075 |
| HUMAN RESOURCES | 403,444 |
| COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE | 425,011 |
| TREASURER | 560,161 |
| FINANCIAL SERVICES | 460,875 |
| TECHNOLOGY SERVICES | 1,233,080 |
| CENTRAL PURCHASING | 143,529 |
| CENTRAL GARAGE | 99,478 |
| COMMUNICATIONS | 183,491 |
| ELECTORAL BOARD/REGISTRAR | 365,895 |
| CIRCUIT COURT | 70,340 |
| GENERAL DISTRICT COURT | 23,570 |
| MAGISTRATE | 3,000 |
| JUVENILE & DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT | 25,395 |
| CLERK OF CIRCUIT COURT | 739,363 |
| COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY | 853,035 |
| SHERIFF | 5,901,360 |
| DISPATCH | 987,300 |
| CORRECTION & DETENTION | 5,341,803 |
| JUVENILE DETENTION CENTER | 182,000 |
| PROBATION OFFICE | 5,726 |
| ANIMAL CONTROL | 835,449 |
| FIRE & EMS | 6,231,994 |
| EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS | 422,168 |
| DIVISION OF WASTE MANAGEMENT | 892,669 |
| MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS & GROUNDS | 1,865,926 |
| LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT | 340,817 |
| MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES BOARD | 40,000 |
| SOCIAL SERVICES | 1,577,653 |
| CHILDREN'S SERVICES ACT (CSA) | 1,531,048 |
| TOTAL ACTION FOR PROGRESS (TAP) | 1,000 |
| BRAIN INJURY SERVICES | 2,500 |
| CHILD HEALTH INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIP (CHIP) | 2,000 |
| ROANOKE AREA MINISTRIES | 1,000 |
| BOTETOURT RESOURCE CENTER | 10,000 |

| | |
|--|---------------|
| LEAGUE OF OLDER AMERICANS | 11,000 |
| DABNEY S. LANCASTER COMMUNITY COLLEGE | 2,140 |
| DABNEY S. LANCASTER C.C.-PROMISE PROGRAM | 5,000 |
| VIRGINIA WESTERN COMM. COLLEGE-CCAP PROGRAM | 35,000 |
| BOTETOURT COUNTY FFA ALUMNI RECREATION | 1,000 |
| BOTETOURT SPORTS COMPLEX | 669,849 |
| VAN PROGRAM | 374,387 |
| ROANOKE VALLEY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORG. | 131,797 |
| VIRGINIA'S BLUE RIDGE | 2,688 |
| ROANOKE VALLEY BROADBAND AUTHORITY | 153,201 |
| ROANOKE VALLEY GREENWAY COMMISSION | 5,000 |
| BOTETOURT COUNTY MUSEUM/HISTORICAL SOCIETY | 14,710 |
| WESTERN VA. REG. INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES AUTHORITY | 12,500 |
| LIBRARY | 6,188 |
| COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT | 1,302,429 |
| ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT | 1,268,262 |
| PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION | 411,466 |
| ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP | 33,494 |
| ATTIC PRODUCTIONS | 69,333 |
| STANDING ROOM ONLY | 7,000 |
| WESTERN VA. EMS COUNCIL | 7,000 |
| ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT | 6,722 |
| COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAM | 20,111 |
| SALARY ADJUSTMENTS | 66,470 |
| WESTERN VA. WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT BOARD | 1,454,982 |
| WELLNESS PROGRAM | 3,350 |
| | <u>68,720</u> |
| GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES - OPERATIONS | 38,863,420 |

Resolution Number 21-06-06

WHEREAS, the General Fund, School Budgets, and Tax Levies have been approved for Fiscal Year 2021 - 2022,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Supervisors of Botetourt County hereby make the following categorical appropriations for Fiscal Year 2021 – 2022 for the functions, as indicated; and the Treasurer of Botetourt County is authorized to transfer local funds, as needed, not to exceed \$26,441,235 to the School Operating Fund.

| | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| 100-4011100 - 11010 | Board of Supervisors | 234,466 |
| 100-4012110 - 12110 | County Administrator | 723,075 |
| 100-4012220 - 12220 | Human Resources | 403,444 |
| 100-4012310 - 12310 | Commissioner of Revenue | 425,011 |
| 100-4012410 - 12410 | Treasurer | 560,161 |
| 100-4012430 - 12430 | Financial Services | 460,875 |
| 100-4012510 - 12510 | Technology Services | 1,233,080 |
| 100-4012530 - 12530 | Central Purchasing | 143,529 |
| 100-4012560 - 12560 | Central Garage | 99,478 |
| 100-4012600 - 12600 | Communications | 183,491 |
| 100-4013300 - 13300 | Electoral Board/Registrar | 365,895 |
| 100-4021100 - 21100 | Circuit Court | 70,340 |
| 100-4021200 - 21200 | General District Court | 23,570 |
| 100-4021300 - 21300 | Magistrate | 3,000 |
| 100-4021500 - 21500 | Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court | 25,395 |

| | | |
|---------------------|--|------------|
| 100-4021600 - 21600 | Clerk of Circuit Court | 739,363 |
| 100-4022100 - 22100 | Commonwealth's Attorney | 853,035 |
| 100-4031200 - 31200 | Sheriff | 5,901,360 |
| 100-4031400 - 31400 | Dispatch | 987,300 |
| 100-4035500 - 32421 | Western Va. EMS Council | 6,722 |
| 100-4033100 - 33100 | Correction & Detention | 5,341,803 |
| 100-4033200 - 33200 | Juvenile Detention Center | 182,000 |
| 100-4033300 - 33300 | Probation Office | 5,726 |
| 100-4035100 - 35100 | Animal Control | 835,449 |
| 100-4035500 - 35500 | Fire & EMS | 6,231,994 |
| 100-4035600 - 35600 | Emergency Communications | 422,168 |
| 100-4042400 - 42400 | Division of Waste Management | 892,669 |
| 100-4043000 - 43000 | Maint. of General Bldgs. & Grounds | 1,865,926 |
| 100-4051000 - 51100 | Local Health Department | 340,817 |
| 100-4051000 - 52500 | Mental Health Service Board | 40,000 |
| 100-4051000 - 53710 | Total Action For Progress (TAP) | 1,000 |
| 100-4051000 - 53716 | Brain Injury Services | 2,500 |
| 100-4053000 - 53000 | Social Services | 1,577,653 |
| 100-4053500 - 53500 | Children's Services Act (CSA) | 1,531,048 |
| 100-4053730 - 53730 | Child Health Invest. Partnership (CHIP) | 2,000 |
| 100-4081200 - 81200 | Community Development | 1,268,262 |
| 100-4051000 - 53740 | Roanoke Area Ministries | 1,000 |
| 100-4081200 - 69130 | Botetourt County FFA Alumni | 1,000 |
| 100-4051000 - 53775 | Botetourt Resource Center | 10,000 |
| 100-4051000 - 53780 | League of Older Americans | 11,000 |
| 100-4068000 - 00000 | Community Colleges | 42,140 |
| 100-4071100 - 71100 | Recreation | 669,849 |
| 100-4071300 - 71300 | Botetourt Sports Complex | 374,387 |
| 100-4071500 - 71500 | Van Program | 131,797 |
| 100-4072000 - 72240 | Botetourt Co. Museum/Historical Society | 12,500 |
| 100-4072000 - 72241 | Standing Room Only | 7,000 |
| 100-4072000 - 72242 | Attic Productions | 7,000 |
| 100-4073100 - 73100 | Library | 1,302,429 |
| 100-4081200 - 81210 | Planning District Commission | 33,494 |
| 100-4081200 - 81220 | Roanoke Valley Transp. Planning Org. | 2,688 |
| 100-4081200 - 81240 | Virginia's Blue Ridge | 153,201 |
| 100-4081200 - 81250 | Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission | 14,710 |
| 100-4081200 - 81410 | Roanoke Valley Broadband Authority | 5,000 |
| 100-4081200 - 81510 | Economic Devel. Partnership | 69,333 |
| 100-4081200 - 82500 | Environmental Management | 20,111 |
| 100-4081500 - 81500 | Economic Development | 411,466 |
| 100-4081500 - 81520 | Western Va. Regional Ind. Facility Auth. | 6,188 |
| 100-4083000 - 83000 | Cooperative Extension Program | 66,470 |
| 100-4081200 - 81610 | Western Va. Workforce Devel. Board | 3,350 |
| 100-4091000 - 91000 | Wellness Program | 68,720 |
| 100-4091000 - 91000 | Salary Adjustments | 1,454,982 |
| 100-4091800 - 91800 | EDA Transfers | 629,000 |
| 100-4094000 - | Capital Projects | 2,015,318 |
| | TOTAL GENERAL FUND | 41,507,738 |
| | | |
| 100-4095000 - | Debt Service - County/VPSA | 4,777,062 |
| 100-4095000 - | Debt Service - School Literary Fund | 28,546 |
| | TOTAL DEBT SERVICE FUNDS | 4,805,608 |

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| 220-4050000 - | School Operations | 55,146,087 |
| | Self-Sustaining Funds | 4,426,190 |
| | School Nutrition Fund | 1,916,285 |
| | Textbook Fund | 2,500,519 |
| | Capital Reserve Fund | 1,238,063 |
| | TOTAL SCHOOL FUND | 65,227,144 |
| | TOTAL ALL FUNDS | 111,540,490 |

Consideration was then held on approval of transfers and additional appropriations. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance stated that there were 3 transfers, 9 pass-through appropriations, and 10 regular appropriations for the Board's consideration. He noted that these are for recurring quarterly transfers of funds, expenditure reimbursements, receipt of grant funds, program reimbursements, and donations.

Mr. Zerrilla stated that appropriations 10 and 14 are for the purchase of two vehicles for County staff, appropriation 11 is for project costs for a sewer line installation in Greenfield, #12 is to cover FY 21 expenditures in the Social Services Department, #13 is funding for expenses in the new Communications Department through June 30, 2021, and appropriations #14 – 19 are year-end appropriations for various departments.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mrs. White, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following transfers and additional appropriations. (Resolution Number 21-06-07)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Transfer \$1,614 to Central Purchasing – Store Supplies, 100-4012530-12530-6021-000, from various departments as follows for store supplies usage:

\$464.00 Maintenance – Laundry, Supplies, 100-4043000-43000-6005
 \$360.00 Human Resources– Advertising, 100-4012220-12220-3600
 \$246.00 Comm. of Revenue – Office Supplies, 100-4012310-12310-6001
 \$108.00 Treasurer – Office Supplies., 100-4012410-12410-6001
 \$240.00 Registrar – Subsist. & Lodging, 100-4013300-13300-5530
 \$ 36.00 CSA – Office Supplies, 100-4053500-53500-6001
 \$160.00 Econ. Development – Marketing, 100-4081500-81500-5840

Transfer \$1,929.92 to Central Purchasing – Pool Car Transfers, 100-4012530-12530-6020-000, from various departments as follows for fuel usage:

\$ 8.14 County Admin. – Fuel, 100-4012120-12120-6008
 \$ 56.36 Treasurer – Fuel, 100-4012410-12410-6008
 \$ 2.71 Financial Services – Fuel, 100-4012430-12430-6008
 \$ 13.44 Central Purchasing – Pool Car Repairs, 100-4012530-12530-3312
 \$ 10.98 Central Garage – Fuel, 100-4012560-12560-6008
 \$891.33 Maintenance – Fuel, 100-4043000-43000-6008
 \$136.78 Van Program – Fuel, 100-4071500-71500-6008
 \$807.34 Comm. Development – Fuel, 100-4081200-81200-6008
 \$ 2.84 Econ. Development – Fuel, 100-4081500-81500-6008

Transfer \$1,160 from General Fund – Fund 100 – Undesignated Fund to Greenfield Preservation Fund – Fund 240. This provides a current match of recent private donations received into the Preservation Fund.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$33,978.04 to Dispatch – Maintenance Contracts, 100-4031400-31400-3320. This is a VDEM (Virginia Department of Emergency Management) grant which covers the second draw for expenditure reimbursements.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,230.19 to Waste Management – Salaries and Wages, 100-4042400-42400-1100. These are funds received from County Waste as a reimbursement of landfill operational support services performed by County personnel.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$300 to Library – Books & Subscriptions, 100-4073100-73100-6012. These are funds donated by the Mid-Atlantic Library Alliance.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$389.36 to Fire & EMS – Other Operating Supplies, 100-4035500-35500-6014. This is a reimbursement of costs relating to I.M.T. (Incident Management Team) deployment.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$500 to Fire & EMS – Other Operating Supplies, 100-4035500-35500-6014. These are funds received from the International Association of Fire Chiefs to offset costs charged to this expense line.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$6,062.79 to the following Correction & Detention accounts: \$458.33 to Uniforms, 100-4033100-33100-6011; \$4,804.46 to Medical & Lab Supplies, 100-4033100-33100-6004; and \$800.00 to Food Services & Supplies, 100-4033100-33100-6002. These funds are for contract payments, reimbursed medical costs, and Social Security incentive payments, respectively.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$2,855.13 to Sheriff's Department – Various Accounts. This appropriation is for reimbursed office costs, restitution funds, and reimbursed extradition costs.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$7,256.11 to Clerk of Circuit Court – Maintenance Contracts, 100-4021600-21600-3320. These are funds to be received from the State for maintaining the records management system.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$92,000 to Department of Social Services, 100-4053000-53600-9801. This is funding to be received from State and Federal reimbursements.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$33,784.33 to County Administrator – Capital Outlay – Motor Vehicle/Vehicle Equipment, 100-4012110-12110-8005. This is for the purchase of a 2021 Ford Explorer.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$90,649.59 to Transfer to EDA, 100-4091800-91800-3800. This is for Greenfield project costs associated with a sewer pipe installation.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$23,000 to Department of Social Services, 100-4053000-53600-9801. This appropriation of County funds covers total FY21 total expenditures for DSS which is primarily supported by State and Federal reimbursements (see #9 above).

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$10,000 to Communications Department, 100-4012600-12600. This appropriation will cover estimated costs for June 2021 for this new department.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$25,542.50 to Economic Development – Capital Outlay – Motor Vehicle/Vehicle Equipment, 100-4081500-81500-8005. This appropriation is for the purchase of a new vehicle.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$48,000 to Waste Management - Various Accounts, 100-4042400-42400. This covers potential costs paid in July that relate to FY21 activity.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$18,000 to the following departments: \$3,000.00 to Board of Supervisors, 100-4011100; \$10,000.00 to County Administrator, 100-4012110; and \$5,000.00 to Financial Services, 100-4012430. These appropriations would cover potential costs paid in July that relate to FY21 activity.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$750 to General District Court, 100-4021200. This is for potential expenditures in July that relate to FY21 activity.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$56,231 to the following Correction and Detention accounts: \$31,035 to Food Services, 100-4033100-33100-6002; and \$25,196 to Medical and Lab Supplies, 100-4033100-33100-6004. This appropriation will cover projected expenditures in excess of budget.

Additional appropriation in the amount of \$1,200 to Unemployment Claims, 100-4091000-91000-2600. This is for potential additional claims for FY21.

Consideration was then held on approval of the accounts payable and ratification of the Short Accounts Payable List. Mr. Tony Zerrilla, Director of Finance, stated that this month's accounts payable totaled \$1,583,650.21. He noted that this month's large expenditures include \$284,068 to Penn Care, Inc., which is a pre-payment for a new ambulance minus the early order discount; \$98,060 to Civicplus, LLC, for County website redesign; \$33,977 to Deere and Company for a new utility tractor for the Recreation Department; and \$38,331 to Dell Computers for the purchase of personal computer replacements in FY 2022.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the accounts payable and ratified the Short Accounts Payable List as submitted. (Resolution Number 21-06-08)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Dr. Scothorn then stated that the County has been notified by the Governmental Finance Officers Association (GFOA) that it will be receiving the Award of Excellence for the FY 20 audit report. He commended Mr. Zerrilla for this achievement.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Zerrilla stated that this is the 14th year that the County has received this award. Mr. Zerrilla further stated that compiling the audit is a team effort and this report provides information to the public about the County's budget and audit processes. He noted that assistance in compiling the audit information is also provided by the Schools, the School Board, the Department of Social Services, and many other County staff/ departments.

Mr. Zerrilla also thanked the auditors for their work to ensure a successful award submission.

Mr. Ray Varney, Resident Engineer, and Ms. Ashley Smith, Assistant Resident Engineer, were then present to speak to the Board.

Mr. Varney then reviewed VDoT's monthly report. He noted that the Route 220 safety improvement project is progressing and on schedule for completion this fall, and VDoT and its subcontractors will be resurfacing various roads through October as weather permits. Mr. Varney stated that VDoT staff is also conducting as many land development and land use permit reviews in Botetourt County as their other two Residency localities (Roanoke and Craig counties) combined.

He then listed the various site plan reviews currently underway: new Greenfield industrial site (Lots B & C) access road; Daleville Town Center, phase 4; two different sections of The Preserve at Ashley; cell tower site on Spreading Spring Road in Springwood; Roanoke Gas line

construction; Our Savior Evangelical Lutheran Church; Rocky Forge/Dagger Spring bridge and road plans; Avery Row industrial site (Jack Smith Park); and the Advanced Racking Company site plan on Catawba Road.

After discussion, Mr. Varney then reviewed various Residency Projects including the Stone Coal Road Rural Rustic Road project which is expected to begin this summer. Mr. Varney noted that, depending on how construction on this project proceeds, VDoT may be able to begin work on the next Six Year Plan project (Clyde's Run Road) later this summer.

He then stated that a sketch of a proposed crosswalk design at the Route 220 intersection in front of Daleville Town Center was included in the monthly report. Mr. Varney stated that, due to the amount of vehicular traffic at this intersection, VDoT is disinclined to add another timed signal phase to these traffic lights that would allow pedestrians the opportunity to cross the roadway under a dedicated signal phase. He noted that VDoT is also working with a consultant to obtain a cost estimate on an alternate proposal of adding a crosswalk at this intersection using VDoT Safety and Operations funds. Mr. Varney further noted that this project may also be funded with Tele-fees but, if these funds are used, it would delay the Six Year Plan's road improvement projects.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton on whether there is an advocacy for this expenditure, Mr. Varney stated that any time Secondary System funds are proposed to be expended, VDoT coordinates the project with County staff and then the Board of Supervisors. He noted that there is a definite role for the Board in this project.

Regarding the pavement subsidence issues in Hunter's Green Subdivision, Mr. Varney stated that he has reviewed these problems with VDoT's District Materials Engineer. He noted that their determination is that there is little to no base material under the asphalt in the areas where the pavement is subsiding. Mr. Varney stated that there are also various utility lines beneath these roads which may have added to the subsidence problem.

After discussion, Mr. Varney stated that their recommendation is that the pavement on these roadways be milled and repaired with an overlay. He noted that this is extensive work and the County and VDoT will need to determine how to move forward with this project; specifically, the County will need to decide whether this project should proceed and, if so, how the County could participate in its funding. Mr. Varney noted that the Secondary System's Six Year Plan's funding is completely allocated for the next six years and there is little room in the Plan to add additional projects.

Mr. Varney stated that he thinks that there are other locations within Hunter's Green that will also need similar roadway improvements and a determination will need to be made on how to handle this cost as well.

Mr. Varney then noted that various headquarter in-house projects were included in the monthly report. He stated that VDoT is currently working to replace two culverts on Laymantown Road in advance of this route's scheduled repaving. He noted that VDoT staff is seeing a lot of culvert issues at this time and all of them need to be repaired. Mr. Varney stated that they can submit these types of projects to the District Office to obtain additional funding, if available.

Mr. Martin thanked Mr. Varney for the quick response by VDoT to 5 – 6 road-related issues in the Blue Ridge area. He noted that the impacted citizens are very pleased with the results.

Mr. Varney noted that Ashley Smith responds to these types of requests and she does a very good job in getting these projects/issues resolved.

After questioning by Dr. Bailey, Mr. Varney stated that the Route 220 safety improvement project should be completed this fall. After further questioning, Mr. Varney stated that he would check to see what needed to be done to have Martin's Lane (Route 679), which is currently gravel, paved in the future and also request that their maintenance staff mitigate the dust issues that are currently occurring.

There being no further discussion, the Board then thanked Mr. Varney and Ms. Smith for attending today's meeting.

Dr. Scothorn again opened the public comment period.

Mrs. Sherry Smith Crumley of Trebark Road in Buchanan stated that she is present to reinforce her support for the Rocky Forge wind farm project. Mrs. Crumley stated that some of the current Supervisors members took office after the public hearings on this project took place. She noted that these new Board members have not had a chance to see all of the support that this project has from area citizens. She stated that they want this project for the County.

Mrs. Crumley stated that the landowner, Apex Clean Energy, and the County have worked diligently on this project for over five years. She noted that the Covid pandemic slowed down the project's progress in Botetourt County. She further noted that Apex currently has 23 wind projects in the United States and they have a competent, professional group working on this project.

She noted that several citizens in favor of this project are in attendance at today's meeting.

Mr. David Wright of Pinehurst Drive in Daleville then stated that the Confederate Monument in front of the Circuit Courthouse should remain in its current location. He noted that a veteran does his duty. Mr. Wright stated that one million Confederate veterans died during the Civil War and approximately 1/3 of them mostly died of disease. Mr. Wright stated that the Nazis removed monuments and crosses from churches during the Second World War. He noted that this is "cancel culture."

Mr. Wright stated that, if this monument is moved, it should be in a prominent location for all to see. He noted that there is no monument to the Tuskegee Airmen in the County. He noted that hundreds of soldiers from southwestern Virginia spent time at the Camp Chase, Ohio, prisoner of war camp during the Civil War and many are buried in the Camp's cemetery. Mr. Wright stated that the County should move the Courthouse before moving the Confederate monument.

Mr. Rick Harvey of Gillie Lane in Blue Ridge then discussed the "tie-ups" that occur at the Route 11/220 intersection in Daleville. He noted that the new intersection is a vast improvement over the previous roadway design and includes a separate lane for vehicles exiting I-81 northbound going north on Route 220 to Daleville.

Mr. Harvey stated that currently there are 3 lanes on southbound Route 11 from the roundabout to the stoplight. He noted that one lane is for vehicles turning left onto Alternate 220, one lane is for through traffic on Route 11 southbound, and one lane is for through traffic and vehicles turning right onto Route 220 north. He noted that most of the vehicles in the far right lane want to turn right to go north toward Daleville and very few of the vehicles using this lane want to go southbound on Route 11; however, when there is a through vehicle in this lane, it holds up the flow of traffic that could turn right on red when traffic conditions allow.

Mr. Harvey stated that the middle lane should be designated for through traffic on Route 11 southbound and the right lane for right turn traffic only.

Dr. Scothorn thanked Mr. Harvey for these comments and noted that they would be forwarded to VDoT for review.

Mr. John Hull, Executive Director of the Roanoke Regional Partnership, was then present to give their annual report. Mr. Hull stated that he is a Roanoke College graduate and worked for the Partnership for 10 years before being hired as Executive Director earlier this year. He noted that prior to working for the Partnership he worked at the Roanoke Valley/Alleghany Regional Commission.

Mr. Hull stated that the Partnership is partially funded by contributions from its partner localities including Botetourt County's yearly allocation of \$2.07 per capita. He noted that their usual revenue generating events that were developed over the past few years such as the Blue Ridge Marathon, Down by Downtown Music Festival, Talent Solutions Summit, etc., were cancelled due to the pandemic in 2020. He noted that this significantly impacted their revenues.

He noted that the Partnership worked with the region's localities to coordinate response efforts to the pandemic including designing a regional business survey and sending out a post-card mailer to every business in the region to make them aware of assistance that was available to them and to provide leads to local governments on the pandemic's impact on these businesses. He noted that information was also provided to local businesses through the Partnership's social media channels.

After discussion, Mr. Hull stated that they contacted their local economic development partners every Tuesday to share information and to collaborate on the response and how the localities could work together.

Mr. Hull stated that the Partnership did participate in several new project announcements and expansions in the region in 2020 including Mack Trucks, Fleetwood Homes, Traditional Medicinals, Apex Systems in Roanoke City, as well as the Munters announcement in Botetourt Center at Greenfield.

He noted that the Partnership was also not able to participate in the usual trade shows in 2020 due to the pandemic; however, they were able to conduct virtual engagements. Mr. Hull further noted that their economic development project inquiries in 2020 were up compared to the 2019 figures and they had more opportunities and slightly more prospects visiting the region in 2020 compared to 2019 despite the pandemic.

He stated then displayed a comparison of prospect activity in the first one-half of 2020 compared to the second half: January 1 – June 30 project files opened—12 and 2 prospect visits; July 1 to December 31 project files opened—30 and 13 prospect visits. Mr. Hull stated that large site projects increased 300% in 2020 with an average number of jobs at 320 and an average investment of \$150.5 million. Mr. Hull stated that Botetourt County's investment in roads and infrastructure at Greenfield is generating more interest from economic development prospects.

After discussion, Mr. Hull then stated that the Partnership received their third GO Virginia Grant from the State last year and these funds were used to create a Roanoke Regional Recovery Grant program to offer sector roundtables, business coaching, long-term strategy, etc., as part of long-term support of these businesses to ensure that they prosper in a post-pandemic world. He noted that they also have a remote worker campaign to promote the idea that work-

ers can live in the region while working anywhere. Mr. Hull stated that this promotion received almost 4 million impressions and 47,100 “clicks” from people living coast to coast.

He stated they also used their Roanoke Outside program’s contacts to provide important information during the pandemic to residents and visitors. He noted that their Project Outside program has raised \$107,000 from the community to support outdoor capital improvement projects, maintain key outdoor assets, and help launch and support businesses in the outdoor sector. Mr. Hull stated that they are seeking proposals on qualifying outdoor amenity projects to receive these funds.

After discussion, Mr. Hull stated that the Partnership’s vision for the future includes development of a five-year strategic plan, technology/innovation, talent, opportunity zones, outdoors funding, regional site development, and targeted digital campaigns. He noted that all of this is needed to keep the region’s forward momentum. He further noted that talent is key to growth in the region’s technology sector and the Partnership will continue to work with their partners towards this end. Mr. Hull stated that they will continue to focus their marketing efforts on site selectors, will look at outdoor-related funding, and will use digital tools, including the LinkedIn internet site, to attract people to the region.

Mr. Hull stated that the Partnership was tested in 2020 but they did not miss a beat and they are continuing their efforts into 2021.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton on the Partnership’s efforts to counter the effects of the Covid pandemic beyond increased use of social media and calls to their partners, Mr. Hull stated that they have a number of communications channels that are internally focused and some that are focused externally. He noted that these efforts provided information to the region’s citizens and businesses during the pandemic; however, they are mainly a marketing agency.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton regarding the difference between a project and a prospect, Mr. Hull stated that a project is a business that is looking for a location and a prospect sends representatives/consultants to the area for a site visit.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton as to the actual new businesses that resulted from the figures discussed today, Mr. Hull stated that a lot of the project files that were opened in 2020 remain open but four new businesses opened in the region in 2020.

After further questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Hull stated that their focus is on talent and work force recruitment/retention due to a large number of businesses being unable to find workers. Mr. Hull stated that they are implementing a targeted digital marketing campaign on the opportunities available to work in the region remotely. After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Hull stated that the target of this campaign is the worker not the employer.

There being no further discussion, the Board thanked Mr. Hull for his report.

Dr. Scothorn again opened the public comment period.

Mr. Chris McCloud of Cloverdale stated that he is a member of the Sons of Confederate Veterans and is present to again discuss an issue that came up in January 2020—the Confederate Monument in Fincastle. He stated that the “black-faced person in the Governor’s Mansion declared war on our monuments and statues in Virginia.” Mr. McCloud stated that Isis and the Taliban have destroyed monuments.

Mr. McCloud stated that discussion on the Confederate Monument first came before the Board a year ago and resulted in a social justice committee being formed. He noted that the

committee's name was then changed to the Monuments and Memorials Committee. He further stated that this committee was formed in a discriminatory manner and the issue of whether the monument should be removed was not brought to the public for a vote.

Regarding the Circuit Courthouse renovation project, Mr. McCloud stated that this could be solved by one intelligent action—build a new courthouse in a new location and turn the old courthouse into a building that serves the community. He stated that the County could avoid all of this by building a new courthouse in a new location that serves the people of the County, meets the court mandates set by the State and federal governments, and would fiscally and finally serve the needs of the citizens. He stated that the County should “make these improvements elsewhere and leave the historical integrity of Fincastle alone.”

Ms. Anne Bruce of Stayman Road stated that she owns a business in the County. Ms. Bruce stated that she has been increasingly disturbed about how the County treats its historic assets and how its “financial house” is run.

She stated that, in looking at the Courthouse project and relocation of the Confederate Monument, the purpose of government is to grow and not put the burden of taxes on the citizens. Ms. Bruce stated that the sale of bonds to finance the Courthouse project will add debt on an overextended County.

She then stated that the current footprint of the Courthouse should be retained. She noted that the other buildings in Courthouse Square can be used for government offices. Ms. Bruce stated that the proposed site for the relocated Confederate Monument is completely unacceptable and placing it in a park setting does not make its location any better. Ms. Bruce stated that the monument should not be moved; however, if it does need to be moved to protect it during the Courthouse project, it should be moved to a site next to the Old Jail.

Ms. Lynne Bolton of Blacksburg Road stated that she is the President of Historic Fincastle, Inc. Ms. Bolton stated that she agrees with the earlier speakers who said that the County needs to preserve our history. She noted that the County was created in 1770, the Town of Fincastle in 1772, and Mr. Israel Christian provided land for the construction of a courthouse, jail, and church.

Ms. Bolton stated that she was not pleased when she heard that the Courthouse was going to have to be torn down but, as she looked into the situation, she realized that the Courthouse's condition and inappropriate space/layout make the situation untenable and an unworkable situation. She noted that the current Courthouse dates to 1975 so we are not talking about maintaining a “true historic building” but an historical site and she hopes that this is given some weight during the design/construction process. Ms. Bolton stated that she hopes that the building can be changed for the better and the proposal for additional green space/pedestrian area for gatherings is a wonderful idea.

Ms. Bolton stated that she also supports moving the Historical Society's museum instead of tearing down the building. She asked that the Courthouse area be preserved as a beautiful location and encouraged the Board to set aside a memorial park area where everyone can think about all the soldiers who served/sacrificed themselves for the County and the country.

A presentation was then given from the Circuit Courthouse Study Committee along with comments by representatives from the Town of Fincastle and the Botetourt County Historical Society. Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, stated that the Circuit Courthouse was rebuilt in 1975 after a fire in 1970 which destroyed the structure. He noted that the struc-

ture is now experiencing water infiltration issues which have resulted in various and growing environmental concerns that cannot be effectively mitigated. Mr. Moorman noted that the building also does not meet modern safety and security standards/practices, State courthouse guidelines, and does not meet the current/future space needs of the Circuit Court and associated offices.

Mr. Moorman stated that an advisory committee appointed by the Board of Supervisors and consisting of Circuit Court Judge Joel Branscom, retired Judge Malfourd "Bo" Trumbo, Circuit Court Clerk Tommy Moore, Commonwealth's Attorney John Alexander, Board of Supervisors members Richard Bailey and Steve Clinton, Fincastle Mayor Mary Bess Smith, County Administrator Gary Larrowe, Sheriff's Department representative Michelle McCadden, Botetourt Historical Society representatives Weldon Martin and Ed Holt, Building Official Jim Whitten, and Director of Maintenance Ricky Dowdy met between October 2020 and February 2021 with a consulting architectural and engineering team led by Architectural Partners from Lynchburg to review the building's current condition, to project future needs, and consider alternatives to meet the Courthouse's needs for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Moorman stated that he would like to thank the committee members and the consulting architectural and engineering team for their work.

Mr. Moorman then played a video which showed the Courthouse's current condition inside and out. He noted that Circuit Court Clerk Tommy Moore provided the voice over for this video. After the completion of the video, Mr. Moorman noted that Mr. Gary Harvey, Mr. Jim Vernon, and Mr. Ken Jandura from Architectural Partners were present at the meeting to give a PowerPoint presentation on the Courthouse design plan project.

Mr. Harvey stated that the architectural/engineering team on this project includes Architectural Partners (architecture and project management), DLR Group (courts planner), Master Engineers and Designers (structural engineering), Hurt and Proffitt (civil and environmental engineering) and Forella Group (cost estimating and value management).

He noted that this is a "legacy" project and all participants worked to ensure that the Courthouse's new design reflects the County's history. He noted that some of the architectural elements on the current building were requested to be retained in the new design which will include improved accessibility and security for employees and visitors and provision of a healthy building where the safety, comfort, and rights of the building users are not compromised. Mr. Harvey stated that they believe that this project would be a spur for economic development in Fincastle.

After discussion, Mr. Harvey stated that, under the State's criminal justice reform legislation, it is anticipated that additional jury trials will be held in the future. He noted that the project is also anticipated to preserve and enhance Courthouse Square as an easily accessible public space.

Mr. Vernon then reviewed the existing design conditions. He noted that the building does not comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), there are inadequately sized workstations/offices, it is non-compliant with the State's Court Standards, there is no separation of parties, no attorney/client conference rooms, and there are security issues since there is no single public entrance into the building.

Mr. Vernon then reviewed the building's existing physical conditions. He noted that this structure was significantly damaged and rebuilt following a fire in 1970. Mr. Vernon stated that a facility assessment was conducted in 2019 which showed that the building's systems are near

the end of their expected lives, there are water infiltration problems from the roof to the foundation, and there are masonry walls with cracks and movement.

Mr. Jandura then stated that the Circuit Court's caseload history from 2013 to 2019 shows that the number of cases increased from 2,000 to over 2,500 and the number of criminal filings increased from 600 to 800 during that period. He noted that new State legislation is expected to further increase the number of court cases heard each year as well as an anticipated increase in the County's population through 2040.

Mr. Harvey stated that they began their building review process with various stakeholders by viewing the building and site inside and out and conducted site studies on circulation around the site and the Town and within the building. He noted that this resulted in several design concepts being developed for the new structure.

Mr. Jandura stated that the growth of the County's court system was considered using analytical data, the anticipated population growth, and additional need for public services. He noted that they considered data on how the court's cases have increased over the past 10 years (2,100 cases in 2013 versus 2,700 cases in 2019). Mr. Jandura stated that at times there is a need for 2 judges and two courtrooms to hold trials in the County. He further stated that the mathematical models that they developed estimate that there will be an increase to 4,700 court cases annually by 2040. Mr. Jandura stated that, using this data, they estimate that the County will need a second full-time Circuit Court Judge plus additional support staff in the court, Commonwealth Attorney's Office, and in other judicial areas by 2030.

After discussion, Mr. Jandura stated that they also reviewed the court's anticipated space needs based on Virginia Courthouse standards (current space, needed space, and how to accommodate the needs). He noted that the current building has 9,900 Department Gross Square Feet (DGSF); however, the new State standards require 20,703 DGSF for a locality of Botetourt's size and current case load, with an estimate that 35,034 DGSF will be needed by 2040. Mr. Jandura stated that the public, judges, and defendants should be separated from each other; however, this is lacking in the current Courthouse's design.

Mr. Vernon stated that the design team considered whether to work within the existing building or build a new structure. He noted that, if parts of the original building are retained, it will complicate the demolition process; therefore, they are recommending that the current structure be demolished and a new courthouse built on the site. Mr. Vernon stated that this option will result in a less difficult construction project, less construction time, and a less expensive project.

He stated that the logical layout is to expand the existing Courthouse site to the north into the parking lot at the rear of the Courthouse. Mr. Vernon stated that, if the Botetourt County Historical Museum is left in its current location, it will be surrounded on 3 sides by the new Courthouse which would be an inefficient design; therefore, they are recommending that the museum structure be relocated to a site north of the Old Jail and behind the Cooperative Extension Office. He noted that the building would be placed on a new foundation that includes a basement containing restroom facilities, which the existing structure does not have.

Mr. Jandura then reviewed the recommended concept design which replicates the existing Courthouse's front façade and consists of a basement (ground floor), a main floor, and a second floor. He noted that the courtroom layout drives the design of the building. Mr. Jandura stated that the public will enter the building through the same front door location as in the exist-

ing building and enter a 2 story lobby area with security screening staff and equipment and elevators.

Mr. Jandura stated that offices for the Circuit Court Clerk and the Commonwealth's Attorney will be on the main floor and two courtrooms, jury rooms, judge's office, space for lawyers to meet with their attorneys, holding cells, and a secure elevator will be located on the second floor. He noted that there will be a separate elevator for the judge and the second courtroom can be used as a jury room, if necessary. Mr. Jandura also stated that the ground (basement) level will contain a court holding area, a sallyport, and the judge's entrance. He noted that security is the main design element in any courthouse project.

After discussion, Mr. Jandura stated that the State of Virginia requires a minimum of 1,600 square feet of courtroom space which will accommodate 48 people and spaces for wheelchairs. He noted that the building will be ADA accessible.

Mr. Vernon then reviewed the various building elevation designs from all four directions. He noted that the southern elevation shows the main entrance which will have the same face as the current building including the columns, the clock tower, wings on both sides, and consisting of two stories. Mr. Vernon then reviewed the other concept plans for the building's exterior design which showed two stories on the front and three stories on the north elevation.

Mr. Vernon stated that the building will be sustainable and energy efficient as per the relevant Building and State Codes including high-efficiency mechanical equipment with digital controls, LED lights, a reflective roof surface, fresh air modulation, a tight thermal envelope with insulated glass, etc. He then displayed the recommended concept site plan and the Courthouse Green and parking areas. Mr. Vernon noted that the remainder of Courthouse Square from the Old Jail to Route 220 will be designated as parking lots through the use of retaining walls.

Mr. Vernon noted that the Courthouse Green could be used for Town and County gatherings, a farmer's market on weekends, etc. He stated that there are several monuments on the site which will need to be relocated at least temporarily. Mr. Vernon stated that the current site of the Confederate and the World War II monuments is about 15' from the construction area so they will need to be moved to avoid damage during construction.

Mr. Vernon then reviewed the project's estimated cost. He noted that the estimate is based on early 2021 construction numbers of between \$282 and \$387 per square foot. Mr. Vernon noted that the cost estimate includes architectural/engineering fees, geotechnical and third-party inspections, fixtures, furnishings, equipment, temporary rehabilitation for Circuit Court and Clerk locations in the Old District Courthouse (ODC), moving costs, a new foundation and added restrooms for the museum, sewer, underground electrical service costs, paving, stone-faced block for the retaining walls, stormwater costs, and hardscape and landscaping.

He noted that the total Courthouse cost including the new building's construction, rehabilitation of the ODC, and relocation/improvements of the museum is estimated to be \$19.8 million. Mr. Vernon further noted that hardscaping/landscaping, utilities, retaining walls, stormwater, parking lots, etc., will bring the total estimated cost to \$24.3 million. He then reviewed the project's schedule which estimates completion in late 2024. Mr. Vernon stated that this schedule also includes renovation of the Old District Courthouse, relocation of the museum, and relocation of some of the Fire/EMS staff to the ODC.

Mr. Harvey then stated that this project includes the construction of a 35,000 square foot building at a total estimated cost of \$24 million with a construction schedule from July 2021 through December 2024.

Mr. Moorman stated that the Botetourt County Historical Society and the Town of Fincastle have been engaged in this project. He noted that Fincastle Mayor Mary Bess Smith and Historical Society representative Beth Leffel were present to speak on this matter.

Mayor Smith stated that this project is very important to the Town and she appreciates the County working with the Town on this project. She noted that representatives from Town Council, the Town's Planning Commission, and Historic Fincastle, Inc., were also present at this meeting and she asked that they raise their hands (approximately 15 individuals did so).

Mayor Smith stated that they appreciated the opportunity to work with the advisory committee and for the consideration given to their concerns regarding this project, the building's design, future opportunities, and growth for the Town while including 21st century elements in the proposal.

Mayor Smith then read the following resolution in support of the proposed Circuit Courthouse renovation project which will be considered by the Town's Planning Commission and Council members at their July 8 meetings:

WHEREAS, The Town of Fincastle, established in 1772, is the County Seat of Botetourt County, Virginia, and is an historic town with a number of structures of historic significance; and

WHEREAS the entire old Town Limits is on the National Register of Historic Places; and

WHEREAS the Botetourt County Courthouse, Courthouse Complex and adjacent buildings and structures have served multiple roles, including a community gathering place, business and legal center, archive of legal documents, display and storage of historic artifacts, public services facility, and cornerstone of the greater Botetourt County community; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Fincastle has long been identified by the greater Botetourt community as an area of historic, genealogical, governmental and community significance; and

WHEREAS, the Town of Fincastle continues to be a hub for commerce, history, civic needs and uses, and community outreach and social connections, and will continue to be; and increased information

WHEREAS, the Town has identified a number of critical issues and goals in its 2021 Comprehensive Plan, including increasing information, education and preservation for historic resources; working closely with Botetourt County to plan for use and reuse of existing and proposed facilities within the Town to assure any changes or new development meet the goals and objectives of the Town and do not detract from the Historic District; preserving and maintaining the distinct historic identity and character of Fincastle; making wise use of the Town's historic resources, including any natural features that have figured prominently in the Town's history; working to preserve and dedicate historic resources for future generations, through acquisition, easements and other methods; ensuring that any renovations or reconstruction complement the existing historic district; working with Botetourt County and other agencies to plan space and site utilization for County offices that may move from the County Seat; and

WHEREAS, the proposed redevelopment plans for Courthouse Square proposed by DLR group and Architectural Partners for Botetourt County appear to meet the goals and objectives not only for the County, the Courts, the Historic Society, and other agencies, but also appear to meet the goals for the future for the Town of Fincastle,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Fincastle Planning Commission and the Fincastle Town Council do hereby commend the Courthouse Renovation Committee and Board of Supervisors for their thoughtful planning for the redevelopment of Courthouse Square and endorse and support the proposed plan in the Town of Fincastle.

The Board thanked Mayor Smith for her comments.

Dr. Beth Leffel, Vice President of the Botetourt County Historical Society and Museum Board, then noted that the Historical Society and the Daughters of the American Revolution also have members present today and she asked that they raise their hands (approximately 12 individuals did so).

Regarding relocation of the Historical Society's museum, Dr. Leffel requested that the structure not be demolished but relocated during the Courthouse construction project. Dr. Leffel stated that the Courthouse project has been discussed for some time by the County and the Board will make a decision today that will impact the project's future, including the future of the museum. She noted that they appreciate the long-standing and generous support from the County for the Society and its museum for 55 years.

She recommended that both the Breckinridge Law Office (current museum) and the old Western Hotel (ODC) be relocated. She noted that the Breckinridge family had numerous members who played an important role in the founding of the County and the nation. She noted that this included six members of the House of Representatives, two members of the U. S. Senate, a cabinet member, two ambassadors, a U. S. Vice President, and one unsuccessful candidate for President. Dr. Leffel stated that the museum building, which was constructed in 1790, is one of the oldest structures still standing in Fincastle and the old hotel was constructed in the 1860s. Dr. Leffel further stated that both of these structures advocate for and preserve the history of the County.

She stated that the Society's mission is to advocate for and preserve the history of Botetourt County. Dr. Leffel stated that the Breckinridge Chapter of the DAR sponsored the restoration of the Breckinridge law office and received funding from Historic Fincastle to help refurbish parts of the building. She noted that the museum welcomes thousands of visitors each year—both local and abroad—and they teach the County's history through the story of Native Americans, African Americans, oral interviews, and their collection of artifacts.

After discussion, Dr. Leffel stated that they have appreciated the Board of Supervisors' support throughout the years and hope to see that support continue when it is needed most. She noted that to lose this piece of history would be a true loss for the County. Dr. Leffel stated that they realize it is not feasible for the museum to remain in its current location while the Courthouse renovation project proceeds; however, they request that the building be relocated to ensure its survival and for their work to continue and expand. Dr. Leffel stated that she and the Society hope that the County continues to move toward the future while simultaneously preserving the past.

The Board thanked Dr. Leffel for her comments.

Mr. Moorman stated that, following any questions that the Board may have on this proposal, there are recommendations included in the agenda packet for consideration. He noted that, if this project is to proceed, the next step is to authorize the issuance of a request for proposals (RFP) for architectural and engineering design services to develop the Circuit Courthouse's construction plans, authorize an evaluation team (Circuit Court Judge Joel Branscom or his designee, Circuit Court Clerk Tommy Moore, Commonwealth's Attorney John Alexander, Board of Supervisors members Richard Bailey and Steve Clinton, Fincastle Mayor Mary Bess Smith, County Administrator Gary Larrowe, and Building Official Jim Whitten) to receive and evaluate the proposals and conduct interviews, authorize a project oversight team (Dr. Bailey, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Larrowe, and County staff designated by Mr. Larrowe) to negotiate and award a

design contract and provide general oversight to the work, and authorize the County Administrator to execute all necessary documents, contracts, etc., upon approval by the County Attorney.

Mr. Moorman stated that funding for this project will be allocated from the FY 21 and FY 22 Capital Improvement Plans, and an additional appropriation from the FY 22 Undesignated General Fund Balance.

Mrs. White then stated that the 2040 usage model contains a County growth curve which seems very steep. She questioned what led to this determination of square footage for the Courthouse, how confident are the consultants in this model, and how accurate is this population increase going forward. She noted that the County does not want to overbuild or underbuild this project.

Mr. Jandura stated that the County's historical population figures are indicative of a 10 year period and the projected population figures are based on a 20 year period so the scale is not the same. He noted that the Weldon Cooper Center population estimates show an increase of 2,000 County residents by 2040.

Mr. Jandura stated that he had been doing this work for 33 years and uses certain models and details with those events to reach future projection figures. He then gave an example of similar work he did with Queen Anne's County, Maryland, which has a courthouse dating from 1782. Mr. Jandura stated that he estimated that they would need to add a second Circuit Court Judge in 2017 and due to increased population/cases they had to do so in 2018. Mr. Jandura stated that a 20 year period is the most accurate estimate of this type that they can provide with their current calculation models.

Mr. Jandura stated that they want to provide flexibility in their design plans. He noted that the pandemic showed what was needed to impact/affect these projects in the future.

After questioning by Mrs. White, Mr. Jandura stated that the proposed concept plan leaves room for expansion/growth/change in the future. He stated that the jury rooms can be used for hearing rooms, if needed. Mr. Jandura stated that, as more work is handled electronically, flexibility to address future unknowns is essential.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Scothorn thanked Mr. Harvey, Mr. Vernon, and Mr. Jandura for their work on this project and today's presentation.

On motion by Dr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized the issuance of a professional services RFP for construction engineering and architectural drawings and bid documents consistent with the conceptual plan proposed by the Courthouse Advisory Committee (subject to further consideration of the museum relocation by the Board) for the Circuit Courthouse construction project; the scope of work may, at the County's sole discretion and option, include such additional work desired and related to the project including but not limited to bid preparation and administration, construction project oversight and management, and specialty testing. (Resolution Number 21-06-09)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Dr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized that an evaluation team composed of Circuit Court Judge Joel Branscom or his designee, Circuit Court Clerk Tommy Moore, Commonwealth's Attorney John Alexander, Board of Supervisors members Richard Bailey and Steve Clinton, Fincastle Mayor Mary Bess Smith, County Administrator Gary Larowe, and Building Official Jim Whitten receive

and evaluate professional design services proposals and conduct interviews for the Circuit Courthouse construction project. (Resolution number 21-06-10)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Dr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized a project oversight team consisting of Dr. Bailey, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Larowe, and County staff as determined by Mr. Larowe, to negotiate and award a design services contract and to provide general oversight to the work on the Circuit Courthouse construction project. (Resolution Number 21-06-11)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Dr. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized the County Administrator to execute all necessary documents, contracts, and agreements for services regarding the Circuit Courthouse construction project, on the County's behalf, upon the approval of the County Attorney. (Resolution Number 21-06-12)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

The Chairman then called for a 10 minute break.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 4:55 P. M.

A public hearing was then held on proposed amendments to Chapter 25, Zoning, Article IV. Supplemental Regulations, Division 2. Signs, Section 25-462. Sign standards and regulations in accordance with Division 6. Special Development Approvals, Section 25-583 Zoning Ordinance text or map amendment—Owner initiated regarding the height and maximum square footage of signage permitted within one thousand feet of a four-lane, divided, limited access highway.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval of these amendments.

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Director of Community Development, stated that these proposed amendments are for freestanding pole or pole mounted signs on properties within 1,000' of limited-access highways. She noted that the request was authorized after receipt of a request from the owner of the former Country Cookin' restaurant in Troutville. She stated that these proposed amendments would increase the maximum height and size for these types of signs while also instituting a minimum height for such signs.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that the current Sign Ordinance provisions for the Exit 150 area allow pole signs in proximity to the interstate but they prohibit any additional signage on an adjacent roadway. She noted that the proposed amendments also include a minimum sign height (50') and a maximum height of 80' and the sign can be up to 200 square feet (sf) in size. Mrs. Pendleton noted for comparison that the current Shoney's sign is 85' tall and 270 sf in size and the current Hardee's sign is 110' tall and 250 sf in size. She further noted that the signage near

the bottom of the Hardee's sign would not be allowed under the new regulations; however, they could install a monument sign fronting Route 11 or Alternate 220 on their property.

After questioning, it was noted that the Board had no questions regarding these proposed amendments.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, it was noted that there was no one in person or on the telephone who wished to speak regarding these amendments. The public hearing was then closed.

On motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved the following amendments to Chapter 25, Zoning, Article IV. Supplemental Regulations, Division 2. Signs, Section 25-462. Sign standards and regulations in accordance with Division 6. Special Development Approvals, Section 25-583 Zoning Ordinance text or map amendment—Owner initiated regarding the height and maximum square footage of signage permitted in commercial districts within one thousand feet of a four-lane, divided, limited access highway. (Resolution Number 21-06-13)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

BOTETOURT COUNTY CODE

* * *

CHAPTER 25 ZONING

* * *

Article IV Supplemental Regulations

Division 2 Signs

Section 25-461. General Provisions (Same)

Section 25-462. Sign standards and regulations

(a) through (e) (Same)

(1) through (9) (Same)

(10) *Freestanding pole/pole mounted.* ~~Lots or parcels located within one quarter mile of an exit or entrance ramp of Interstate 81, and visible from the center of the right of way at Interstate 81 shall be permitted one (1) freestanding pole sign with a maximum square footage of one hundred fifty (150) square feet and a height of thirty-five (35) feet, in addition to their maximum allowable sign area and number of signs, but no other freestanding signs shall be permitted.~~ Notwithstanding other provisions contained in this section, if a lot is located within one thousand (1,000) linear feet of the centerline of a grade-separated intersection of a four-lane, divided, limited access highway, one (1) freestanding pole sign shall be permitted with a minimum height of fifty (50) feet and a maximum of eight (80) feet, and the area of such sign may be increased to two hundred (200) square feet under the following condition:

~~No other on-premise freestanding signs shall be located upon the property, except one freestanding monument not exceeding 32 square feet in area.~~

(11) through (16) (Same)

Dr. Scothorn then again opened the public comment period.

Mr. Dan Crawford of Kipling Street in Roanoke then stated that he is a member of the local chapter of the Sierra Club. Mr. Crawford stated that the Board has previously heard criticism and opposition to the Rocky Forge wind farm. Mr. Crawford stated that he spends many

hours in outreach on the benefits of this project and the vast majority of people in this area are very supportive and excited about having a wind farm in this part of Virginia.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, it was noted that there was no one else on the telephone who wished to speak.

Consideration was then held on a request to advertise for a public hearing on Zoning Ordinance amendments to allow short-term rentals in the Business B-1 Use District.

Mr. Drew Pearson, Zoning Administrator, stated that this request was initiated by a property owner who owns a home along Route 11 in Cloverdale which is currently zoned for Business B-2 uses. He stated that the owner would like to have additional flexibility in the length of rental periods for this non-conforming dwelling by having Section 25-222 Permitted Uses and Section 24-434(c)(9)b Cabin or cottage of the Zoning Ordinance amended to add "Cabin and cottage, subject to standards of Section 25-434" in the Business B-1 Use District when associated with an existing, non-conforming single family dwelling unit.

Mr. Pearson stated that the property owner would like to have the option of renting out this home for short-term rentals which is not currently allowed in business-use districts.

Mr. Pearson stated that staff can draft and have these amendments advertised for public hearings at the Planning Commission's and Board's August regular meetings.

Mr. Pearson stated that the Board could approve, deny, or table this request and he is willing to answer any of the Board members' questions about these proposed amendments.

There being no discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized staff to advertise for a public hearing by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors on Zoning Ordinance amendments to Section 25-222 Permitted Uses and Section 24-434(c)(9)b Cabin or cottage to allow short-term rentals in the Business B-1 Use District at their respective August meetings at the earliest. (Resolution Number 21-06-14)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Director of Community Development, then gave an update on the Apex Rocky Forge project. Mrs. Pendleton stated that no action is being requested or required by the Board on this issue.

She noted that review comments from all agencies for Apex's March 18, 2021 on-site development plans submittal were issued to APEX on June 4, 2021. She noted that these reviews from Fire/EMS, VDOT, the third-party consultants, and zoning officials identified 101 zoning deficiencies which included three pages of Fire/EMS comments and three pages of VDOT comments. Mrs. Pendleton noted that review comments from these agencies regarding the March 18, 2021 off-site road construction plans were issued to APEX on June 14, 2021. She noted that these reviews identified 8 pages of zoning deficiencies, Fire/EMS comments, and VDOT comments.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that on May 27, a Zoning Administrator determination request was filed regarding the applicability of Va. Code Section 15.2-2209.1:1 to the specific provisions and facts of the Rocky Forge Special Exceptions Permit. She noted that the authority for the Zoning

Administrator to make a determination is in accordance with Sections 25-32 and 25-521(a)3 and (9) of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance and a determination will be issued within 90 days.

She stated that no construction related to the wind farm's SEP has begun. She noted that a construction plan has to be approved by the County before construction can begin on this project. Mrs. Pendleton further stated, however, that tree harvesting on and around the project site is being conducted under a Virginia Department of Forestry harvesting permit granted to the property owner and does not constitute construction activity regulated by the County. She noted that County personnel will continue to monitor the site.

There being no discussion, the Board thanked Mrs. Pendleton for her report.

Regarding a report from the Historic Greenfield Committee, Mr. David Moorman, Deputy County Administrator, then stated that the Committee is requesting consideration by the Board of Supervisors of improvements to the Greenfield Preservation Area. He noted that the Committee is requesting authorization to contract for repair work to the stone and brick chimney on the historic kitchen structure.

Mr. Moorman stated that much of the upper brick on the chimney is missing, many of the lower section's stone are loose and/or missing, and the chimney is in need of a foundation. He noted that the preliminary estimate for this repair work is less than \$40,000, plus consulting services.

Mr. Moorman stated that, if these repairs are authorized, County staff will assist with procurement and project oversight, inspection, and acceptance of the work. He requested authorization for staff to solicit proposals for work to repair the chimney including engagement of an architectural firm to develop the specifications/standards to be included in the request for proposals (RFP).

After discussion, Mr. Moorman noted that this project will be paid with monies raised by the Committee through their fundraising campaign. He noted that this fund has approximately \$70,000 in public/private monies at this time.

Mr. Clinton stated that the Supervisors created this committee approximately 4 years ago and this is the most active and dedicated citizens group he has been involved with. He noted that there have been at least 4 elementary school groups who have visited the Greenfield Preservation Area, as well as other group tours. Mr. Clinton stated that his "hat is off" to the volunteers for the work that they have done to date.

He stated that the chimney will be an attraction to the public when it is stabilized.

Mr. Clinton then noted that Mrs. Ann Layman, a member of the committee, was present at today's meeting.

Mr. Clinton noted that each member of the Board of Supervisors appointed a representative to this Committee when it was created. He noted that the members' terms expire at the end of this year and the Board should reconsider reappointing these members at that time.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board authorized the Historic Greenfield Preservation Advisory Committee to rebuild and restore the kitchen building's chimney in the Greenfield Preservation Area, to be paid for from the Greenfield Preservation Area Fund - Fund 240, with the assistance and under the general oversight of County staff, and authorized County staff to execute necessary documents and agreements consistent with the County's procurement

policies and procedures and upon the review and approval of the County Attorney. (Resolution Number 21-06-15)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

The Chairman then adjourned the meeting at 5:15 P. M. until 6:00 P. M.

The Chairman called the meeting back to order at 6:03 P. M.

Dr. Scothorn then stated that representatives of the Apex Rocky Forge project were present and had requested a few minutes to speak to the Board.

Mr. Ken Young, Chief Operating Officer of Apex Clean Energy, stated that he would like to recognize Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Mr. Gary Larowe, and their staff for the work that is being done to review the Rocky Forge plan submissions. He also thanked those who spoke earlier today in support of this project.

Mr. Young stated that Apex currently has 23 wind farm projects in the country and another 7 projects are underway. He noted that, when completed, these projects will generate a total of 7 gigawatts of power. He noted that the Rocky Forge site is proposed to generate 76 megawatts of power. Mr. Young stated that their staff know how to deliver world-class projects all over the country.

Mr. Young stated that the Rocky Forge project is the first wind farm in Virginia and they have every intention to follow through on this project to completion. He noted that Apex received an extension of their SEP by the Board of Supervisors in May 2020 and they have invested \$11 million in this project to date.

Mr. Young stated that they have been working to improve the project over the past year, even while having to deal with the pandemic, and they plan to obtain site plan approvals and have full construction begin this summer. Mr. Young stated that Apex has a contract with the State of Virginia and Dominion Energy to acquire the power generated by this wind farm and an extension of this contract is being finalized.

He stated that it has been a long, difficult year and Apex is moving forward with the contract. He stated that they have selected the turbines' vendor (General Electric) and a contractor for the project, as well as the long-term owner of the project.

Mr. Young stated that the statute adopted by the Virginia General Assembly (Section 15.2-2209.1:1) in October 2020 is very clear that projects such as Apex are allocated additional time to obtain administrative approvals due to the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic. He stated that they are in the final phases of finalizing a very complex project and have every intention to build this project beginning this summer. Mr. Young stated that they look for the County's support of their efforts.

Mr. John Stone, Senior Vice President of Construction for Apex, stated that they are going through the 101 comments received from Mrs. Pendleton and her office on the site plans' submittals; however, he does not classify all these comments as deficiencies. Mr. Stone noted that 51 of these comments are being addressed by Timmons Engineering who are revising the project's drawings and are coordinating the scheduling of a meeting with County staff on June 28. He further noted that they plan to resubmit the package to the County by July 1.

After discussion, Mr. Stone thanked the Board for hearing their comments and noted that he would like to provide a monthly update to the Board as this project proceeds.

Dr. Scothorn thanked Mr. Young and Mr. Stone for their comments.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Amsterdam District from Aaron Lenk Properties, LLC, for a Change of Proffers in the Shopping Center (SC) Use District to remove Proffer 2C from the Change of Proffers approved January 23, 2018, requiring auxiliary structures to be of the same material and style as the main structures, in association with the Botetourt Commons Development. The properties subject to this request are located 0.12 miles west of the Commons Parkway/Kingston Drive intersection and 0.09 miles north of the Commons Parkway/Kingston Drive intersection, and identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 101(13), Parcels 1, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 4B & 5; Section 101, Parcels 44C, 44E, 44F, 44H, 44J, 44K, & 44N; Section 101 (14), Parcel 7 and 101(15) Parcel 1. These properties are also identified as 125, 133, 135, 137, 180, 186, 220, 228, 234, 245, 270 Commons Parkway (Route 1044) and 5, 6, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 48, 52, 56, 65, 72, 100, 101, 104, 108, 112, 116, 120, 124 Kingston Drive in Daleville.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended approval of this request and the Board had tabled this request at their May meeting to allow the applicant to be present to answer questions.

Mr. Drew Pearson, Zoning Administrator, stated that this request was continued by the Board at their May regular meeting. He noted that the applicant is requesting a change in proffers for the Botetourt Commons property which require accessory structures to be the same style and materials as the parcel's main buildings. Mr. Pearson stated that the applicant would like to place a 12' X 20' storage building on the property on which her dental office is located in Botetourt Commons; however, this structure is not in compliance with the development's proffered conditions.

Mr. Pearson stated that, if this change of conditions request is approved, it will impact all the Botetourt Commons parcels referenced in the public hearing advertisement.

After discussion, Mr. Pearson stated that the minimum setback for this accessory building is 10' from the side and rear property lines. He further stated that the applicant is present at the meeting to answer the Board's questions on this proposal.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton regarding the difficulty in finding an accessory building that meets the development's proffered conditions, Dr. Misty Lenk, applicant, stated that she was unaware of the proffered conditions regarding building style and materials consistency with the parcel's main structure when she purchased the storage building in December 2020. She noted that the company she purchased the accessory building from can put a brick facing on the structure but she does not prefer to do this due to the expense.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Dr. Lenk stated that this is a high-quality building which "looks like a little house." Dr. Lenk stated that she thinks that this building will complement the neighboring structures. She noted that the structure will be visible to her patients from the office's rear window and by the Carrington Place employees. Dr. Lenk stated that the building will be placed behind her office and will not be very visible from Commons Parkway.

Ms. White stated that she visited Dr. Lenk's office for two years as a patient and she is quite confident in Dr. Lenk's ability to keep the site and this building looking nice.

Dr. Lenk stated that this building will be used to store seasonal decorations used in her office. Dr. Lenk noted that the reason she is in need of this accessory building is that another business has moved into the space in her building that she previously used for storage of these decorations.

After questioning by Dr. Bailey, Mr. Pearson stated that this condition was put in place after a public hearing by the Board of Supervisors in 2018. Mr. Pearson then read the proffered condition that Dr. Lenk is requesting to be removed, "Auxiliary structures shall be of the same material and style as the main structures."

Mr. Clinton stated that proffered conditions are usually placed on a request in case of hardship or an aspect of the project does not meet the guidelines. He stated that these 2018 proffers were created to include the entire Botetourt Commons development.

Dr. Scothorn questioned if a small brick façade could be placed on this accessory building so it would be in compliance with the development's conditions.

Mr. Pearson stated that in the Botetourt Commons shopping center district there are some buildings that are not entirely brick.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Clinton stated that he thinks that having a small portion of brick on the front of the accessory building would be a reasonable solution to his concerns with this request.

Dr. Bailey stated that he thinks that Dr. Lenk is very respectful of the situation; however, to Mr. Clinton's point, there were proffers in place for this development that were made for a purpose.

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Director of Community Development, stated that this proffered condition, if removed, will affect the entire shopping center. She noted that this request is not related to this specific accessory building and any changes in the proffered conditions would have to be agreed upon and submitted in writing by the applicant before the close of the public hearing.

After discussion, Mr. Michael Lockaby, County Attorney, stated that a new public hearing could be held to only consider changing this condition for Dr. Lenk's specific parcel within Botetourt Commons.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that, if Mr. Lockaby's suggestion is agreed to by the Board, this issue could be brought up again on another parcel that wants to place an accessory building on their site as every parcel would be held to the same standards. Mrs. Pendleton stated that, if Dr. Lenk's request is approved, it will impact every property in the shopping center. She further stated that the County does not generally prefer to have "parcel specific" conditions as it is very difficult to keep track of which site falls under the provisions of each set of conditions.

After questioning by Mrs. White, Mr. Pearson stated that the Planning Commission recommended unanimous approval of this request.

After further discussion, Mr. Pearson stated that the applicant can be asked to voluntarily proffer that a certain percentage of the accessory building which faces or is parallel to the street would be of brick or brick façade. He noted that the applicant would have to agree to this change in the proffered condition.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Pearson again read the proffered condition that Dr. Lenk is asking to be removed ("Auxiliary structures shall be of the same material and style as the main structures."). Mr. Clinton stated that placing faux brick on this building does not cover the proffered condition's requirements as it is now written.

Mr. Pearson concurred that this is not the easiest type of condition to administer as it mentions “the same material.”

Mr. Clinton noted that Dr. Bailey previously mentioned a façade being installed on the structure that is partially brick.

Mr. Pearson stated that the Board could ask the applicant if she wants to amend the proffered condition to resolve the Board’s concerns with this request. He noted that the Code of Virginia’s provisions in this situation state that this change in proffered conditions will still affect the development’s other property owners since they were included in the public hearing’s advertisement. Mr. Pearson further stated, however, that he thinks that the Board would have the authority to approve Dr. Lenk’s request to remove this proffered condition for her property only.

After questioning, Mr. Lockaby stated that Mr. Pearson is “exactly right in his comments.”

Mr. Pearson stated that, if this is approved, there would be one set of conditions for the other property owners in this development and one set for the applicant. He noted that the staff would work with the applicant to redraft her request.

Mr. Clinton stated that consistency is what is intended with these proffers.

Mr. Pearson stated that consistency might be preferable in most situations. He noted that other buildings in the development do have different building materials and styles of construction.

After questioning by Mrs. White, Mr. Pearson stated that, if this condition is removed, there could be instances where “more variable” building styles and materials are used in this development in the future.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, Mr. Pearson stated that, if this request pertained to a principal building, there would be no standards that would regulate the building’s design/ materials.

Mrs. White stated that Dr. Lenk operates a long-time successful Botetourt County business.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Pearson stated that any new development in the shopping center would be constrained by the proffers put in place in 2018. He noted that in reality someone could have brick on the front and sides of their building and metal on the rear portion and be in compliance with these conditions.

After further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mrs. White, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved a request in the Amsterdam District from Aaron Lenk Properties, LLC, for a Change of Proffers in the Shopping Center (SC) Use District to remove Proffer 2C from the Change of Proffers approved January 23, 2018, requiring auxiliary structures to be of the same material and style as the main structures, in association with the Botetourt Commons Development. The properties subject to this request are located 0.12 miles west of the Commons Parkway/Kingston Drive intersection and 0.09 miles north of the Commons Parkway/Kingston Drive intersection, and identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 101(13), Parcels 1, 2, 3, 4, 4A, 4B & 5; Section 101, Parcels 44C, 44E, 44F, 44H, 44J, 44K, & 44N; Section 101 (14), Parcel 7 and 101(15) Parcel 1. These properties are also identified as 125, 133, 135, 137, 180, 186, 220, 228, 234, 245, 270 Commons Parkway (Route 1044) and 5, 6, 20, 24, 28, 32, 36, 40, 44, 48, 52, 56, 65, 72, 100, 101, 104, 108, 112, 116, 120, 124 Kingston Drive in Daleville with the following proffered conditions unchanged: (Resolution Number 21-06-16)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

1. Any storage space constructed shall not be readily visible from Commons Parkway or US 220.
2. Dumpsters and air conditioning units will be screened so as to not be readily visible from US 220 or Commons Parkway. Use of hedges or screen walls constructed of compatible materials and colors shall be employed.
3. Should the project construction pollute or cause failure to any of the adjacent property owner's existing wells, a water line will be extended to their property at no cost to the adjacent property owner.
4. Leyland Cypress trees will be purchased and installed 15' on center along the southern property line of the Daleville Cemetery, Rachel Hancock, and Jerry Byer properties.
5. The following proffers are to apply to signage:
 - a) All marquee/wall signage shall have individual, back-lit letters. Anchor stores, (larger than 5,000 SF gross leasable area) shall have a maximum letter height of 46". Logos or identification symbols shall have a maximum height of 68". All minor stores (G.L.A less than 5,000 SF) shall have letters with a maximum height of 38". Logos or identification symbols shall be limited to a height of 58".
 - b) Wall signage for each tenant in a multi-tenant building shall not exceed 80SF for minor stores and 95 SF for anchor stores. Square Footage (SF) measurements shall be in accordance with the 2016 Zoning Ordinance sign standards.
 - c) If store front letters are raceway mounted, the raceway shall match the façade color it is attached to.
 - d) When regulations for certain types of signage are not addressed in the proffers for the named parcels, the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance will apply.
 - e) Monument signs with a solid base near ground level, shall not exceed seven (7) feet in height, or ten (10) feet in width. One monument sign is allotted per commercial parcel.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Amsterdam District from CMH Homes, Inc., to rezone, with possible proffered conditions, 1.552 acres from the Business B-2 Use District to the Business B-3 Use District for the continued operation of a modular and mobile home sales business, in accordance with Section 25-581. Zoning map amendment—owner initiated and Article II, Division 12. Business District B-3, Section 25-262. Permitted Uses of the Botetourt County Code, on a parcel located at 1395 Lee Highway (U. S. Route 11), Roanoke (Cloverdale), also abutting Updike Lane (State Route 1001), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 107(8), Parcel C.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended conditional approval of this request.

Mrs. Nicole Pendleton, Director of Community Development, stated that (CMH) Clayton Mobile Homes has a sales lot on 3 parcels located on Route 11 in Cloverdale. She noted that one of these lots (Parcel C) is currently zoned Business B-2 and the other two are zoned for B-3 use. Mrs. Pendleton stated that the applicant cannot expand the business's office because of Parcel C's current zoning.

She stated that CMH would like to replace the existing office building and renovate the site's storage building.

Mrs. Pendleton stated that there were no comments received by the Planning Commission or staff regarding this request. She noted that one condition is being recommended for

approval with this request, "This property, Tax Map 107(8)C, is to be used for modular homes and mobile home sales, to the exclusion of all other Business B-3 Uses."

After questioning by Mrs. White, Mrs. Pendleton stated that there were no issues mentioned by the adjacent property owners regarding this rezoning request. She noted that most of the Business B-2 uses in this area are probably non-conforming uses.

She noted that photographs showing the current and proposed office building and storage building designs had been presented to the Board. Mrs. Pendleton stated that Mr. Daniel Orange, Project Manager, was also present at the meeting to answer questions.

Mr. Orange stated that this request will allow Clayton Mobile Homes to expand and improve their office and storage areas. He noted that the current B-2 zoning would not allow them to rebuild if these structures received 50% or more in damage from fire, flood, etc.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, it was noted that there was no one present to speak either in person or on the telephone regarding this request. The public hearing was then closed.

Dr. Scothorn noted that he had received a call from Mr. Steve Lovell, who owns a business in this immediate area. He noted that Mr. Lovell is in favor of this rezoning request.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors approved this rezoning request with the following condition. Therefore, be it ordained by the Botetourt County Board of Supervisors that the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance and the Botetourt County Real Property Identification Maps be amended in the following respect and no other. (Resolution Number 21-06-17)

AYES: Mr. Sloan, Mr. Clinton, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

CMH HOMES, INC.

In the Amsterdam District to rezone 1.552 acres from the Business B-2 Use District to the Business B-3 Use District for the continued operation of a modular and mobile home sales business, in accordance with Section 25-581. Zoning map amendment—owner initiated and Article II, Division 12. Business District B-3, Section 25-262. Permitted Uses of the Botetourt County Code, on a parcel located at 1395 Lee Highway (U. S. Route 11), Roanoke (Cloverdale), also abutting Updike Lane (State Route 1001), identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 107(8), Parcel C.

1. This property, Tax Map 107(8)C, is to be used for modular homes and mobile home sales, to the exclusion of all other Business B-3 Uses.

A public hearing was then held on a request in the Amsterdam District from Fralin & Waldron, Inc., (Khushbu Patel, contractual purchaser) for a Special Exception Permit, with possible conditions, in the Traditional Neighborhood TND Use District in accordance with Section 25-583. Special Exceptions and Section 25-205(a) Uses permitted by special exception of the Botetourt County Code to permit the use "any drive-through facility" for a fast-food restaurant located at the Daleville Town Center on Town Center Street (State Route 1189), Daleville, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 88(8), Parcel 3B.

It was noted that the Planning Commission had recommended conditional approval of this request.

Mr. Drew Pearson, County Planner, stated that this request is to construct a Dairy Queen restaurant with a drive through on a parcel located in Daleville Town Center (DTC) between the Bank of Botetourt and the Rodeo Chico restaurant. He then displayed photographs of the site and reviewed the concept site plan.

He stated that the restaurant will be 2,663 square feet in size, and as promoting walkability is a concept in this development's Traditional Neighborhood District zoning, the site is proposed to have an outdoor seating area. He further noted that there are two existing driveway entrances to the site from Town Center Street; there would be no driveway entrances from U. S. Route 220 into this site. Mr. Pearson stated that the parking as shown on the plan does meet the minimum Code requirements for this type of business. Mr. Pearson stated that VDoT had no comments regarding this proposed use.

Mr. Pearson then displayed the proposed building's design renderings/elevations. He noted that TND use districts have a minimum of 22' front wall height limits and the proposed design meets that minimum requirement. Mr. Pearson stated that the north elevation rendering shows a cooler that does not have screening to block its view; however, the applicant/contractual purchaser has agreed to screen this area behind a portion of the building's wall section so it is not visible from Route 220 or adjacent properties.

After discussion, Mr. Pearson stated that Daleville Town Center has an architectural review committee. He noted that this group has reviewed this proposal and determined that it meets their standards for structures in this development.

Mr. Pearson then read the three conditions recommended by the Planning Commission for this request: "The fast food restaurant with drive-through shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the Concept Plan, titled Daleville Town Center North Village Dairy Queen Site Special Exception Request, dated 4/29/2021, as prepared by Engineering Concepts, Inc. and included with the background report prepared by staff; The fast food restaurant building shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the building elevations, including the rear building modifications, dated 3/24/2020 and revised through 12/16/20, as prepared by ADQ Design-Architecture-Construction (DAC) Department, and included with the background report prepared by staff; All other specifications and general provisions shall be met as required by the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance and in no instance shall the zoning conditions exempt a project from any local, state or federal development requirements, except where allowed by the Zoning Ordinance."

Mr. Pearson noted that concept plans may not include all of the details that the Community Development Department staff will need to complete their review for compliance with the County's building and zoning ordinances. He also noted that the applicant and the contractual purchaser were present at the meeting to answer any questions.

After questioning by Mrs. White, Mrs. Khushbu Patel, contractual purchaser, stated that the restaurant will serve breakfast from 6AM to 10AM and close at 11PM.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton, Mr. Pearson stated that he discussed this proposal's compliance with the DTC construction standards with Mr. Andy Kelderhouse, President of Fralin and Waldron.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, it was noted that there was no one present in person or on the telephone to speak regarding this request. The public hearing was then closed.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Dr. Bailey, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board approved a request in the Amsterdam District from Fralin & Waldron, Inc., (Khushbu Patel, contractual purchaser) for a Special Exception Permit in the Traditional Neighborhood TND Use District in accordance with Section 25-583. Special Exceptions and Section 25-205(a) Uses permitted by special exception of the Botetourt County Code to permit the use “any drive-through facility” for a fast-food restaurant located at the Daleville Town Center on Town Center Street (State Route 1189), Daleville, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 88(8), Parcel 3B, with the following conditions: (Resolution Number 21-06-18)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

1. The fast food restaurant with drive-through shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the Concept Plan, titled Daleville Town Center North Village Dairy Queen Site Special Exception Request, dated 4/29/2021, as prepared by Engineering Concepts, Inc. and included with the background report prepared by staff.
2. The fast food restaurant building shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the building elevations, including the rear building modifications, dated 3/24/2020 and revised through 12/16/20, as prepared by ADQ Design-Architecture-Construction (DAC) Department, and included with the background report prepared by staff.
3. All other specifications and general provisions shall be met as required by the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance and in no instance shall the zoning conditions exempt a project from any local, state or federal development requirements, except where allowed by the Zoning Ordinance.

A public hearing was then held on the following two requests: a request in the Amsterdam District on amendments to the 2010 Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map and the Water & Sewer Infrastructure Map in accordance with Chapter 25 Zoning, Division 6. Special Development Approvals, Section 25-581.31 Comprehensive plan amendment—Owner initiated and Section 25-581.4 Comprehensive plan amendment and review of the Botetourt County Code. These changes would amend the designation of approximately 82 acres from Rural Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map, and amend the Service Area shown on the Sewer and Water Infrastructure Map to allow for the extension of public water and public sewer between an existing service area that includes the Botetourt County Sports Complex and Greenfield Elementary School on Etzler Road and another existing service area that includes properties within the Dal-Nita Hills Subdivision. The request was initiated by Elizabeth Ann DeMaury and Michael L. & Melinda B. Amos (Family Builders, LLC, contractual purchaser) in support of a proposed rezoning request of 108.58 acres from the Agricultural A-1 Use District to the Residential R-1 Use District at 665 Etzler Road, Troutville, approximately 0.7 miles north of the Catawba Road (State Route 779)/ Etzler Road (State Route 672) intersection and across from the Botetourt County Sports Complex, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87, Parcels 95 and 96; and a request in the Amsterdam District from Elizabeth Ann DeMaury and Michael L. & Melinda B. Amos (Family Builders, LLC, contractual purchaser) to rezone a total of 108.58 acres from the Agricultural A-1 Use District to the Residential R-1 Use District for the development of a maximum of 130 single-family residential lots, with possible proffered conditions, in accordance with Chapter 25 Zoning,

Division 6. Special Development Approvals, Section 25-581. Zoning Map Amendment—Owner Initiated and Article II, Division 4. Residential R-1 of the Botetourt County Code; along with a Commission Permit in accord with §15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia for the construction of new roads and public utilities. This request consists of two parcels: Parcel 87-95 consists 40.03 acres located at the intersection of Etzler Road (State Route 672) and Preston Parkway (State Route 825) across from the entrance to the Botetourt Sports Complex, and Parcel 87-96 consists of 68.554 acres located on and abutting 665 Etzler Road, Troutville. The properties are located approximately 0.7 miles north of the Catawba Road (State Route 779)/Etzler Road intersection and identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87, Parcels 95 and 96.

Mr. Drew Pearson, County Planner, stated that, as these four requests pertain to the same property, he will give a combined presentation to the Board. He noted that the Planning Commission had recommended denial of all of these requests.

Mr. Pearson stated that the first hearing pertains to amendments to the Future Land Use Map and the Water and Sewer Infrastructure Map in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the Future Land Use Map amendment requests to change the designation of 82 acres of these two parcels (which total 108.58 acres) from low density residential to medium density residential. He noted that approximately 26.5 acres of this property is currently identified on the Future Land Use Map for medium density residential uses.

Mr. Pearson stated that the purpose of this Comp Plan amendment is to request the rezoning of this property from Agricultural A-1 to Residential R-1 for 130 proposed residential lots which is scheduled for public hearing later this evening. He then displayed the conceptual lot layout for the proposed Mountain View Subdivision as well as the proposed Comp Plan map amendments. Mr. Pearson noted that the existing low density residential area is shown in yellow on this map and the medium density residential area is shown in orange.

Mr. Pearson stated that the applicants are requesting that the Future Land Use Map of this entire 108.58 acres be designated for medium density residential uses.

He further noted that the Code of Virginia requires that any Comp Plan map amendment which proposes to increase density requires a Traffic Impact Analysis to be conducted. Mr. Pearson noted that this analysis was done for at least six different intersections between the proposed subdivision's entrance on Etzler Road and the Route 220/779 intersection in Daleville. He noted that VDoT's review of this study resulted in comments that the subdivision's traffic impact on these intersections would be minimal. He stated that the study indicated that 90% of the traffic leaving the proposed development would turn right toward Catawba Road and that these 130 proposed homes would generate a total of 1,188 daily trips on Etzler Road. Mr. Pearson noted that this is an approximate 85% increase in daily trips based upon VDoT's 2019 traffic figures which show Etzler Road having an average daily traffic count of 1,400 vehicles.

Mr. Pearson then stated that the applicant is also requesting an amendment to the Comp Plan's Water and Sewer Infrastructure Map so that the Western Virginia Water Authority's (WVWA) public water and sewer lines can be extended to this property from Greenfield Elementary School and Botetourt Center at Greenfield. He then displayed a map showing the utility corridors in this area.

Mr. Pearson stated that his office received an e-mail earlier today from the applicant who indicated that they "might do something differently with the utility connections" to serve this proposed development; however, it appears that the needed utilities would come from the same

direction. He then displayed the Water and Sewer Infrastructure Map which indicates the WVWA and Dal-Nita Hills Subdivision water systems' service areas. Mr. Pearson noted that the Utility Corridors map created by the applicant's engineer, Engineering Concepts, Inc., showed the potential water and sewer connector lines for this project. He noted that these utility connections would have to be installed under Etzler Road to reach this property.

After discussion, Mr. Pearson stated that property developed under the Residential R-1 Use District provisions is required to be served by public water and public sewer. He noted that there is currently no water/sewer corridor that could be utilized to serve the DeMaury/Amos property without first securing an easement across other properties. Mr. Pearson stated that Community Development Department staff have requested letters of commitment from the impacted property owners on which the water/sewer extensions would be constructed; however, nothing has been received from the applicants.

He stated that the WVWA reviewed this proposed water/sewer extension and indicated that they could extend utility services to this development if the utility corridors could be established. He further stated that the WVWA had not been provided any modeling on the water service, which would be needed to ensure that adequate fire protection could be provided to this proposed development.

Mr. Pearson stated that input was also obtained from Botetourt County Public Schools on this project's impact on the student population. He noted that they indicated that, should this request be approved, it would cause some impacts to the schools serving the potential students living in this subdivision both positively and negatively. Mr. Pearson further noted that the school system had concerns about traffic congestion during student drop-offs and pick-ups, and, should there be a large influx of additional students, there may be a need for additional staff.

Mr. Pearson then displayed the proposed subdivision's concept plan which indicates 130 lots which are approximately 20,000 sf in size. He noted that greenspace is proposed along the creek and floodplain which runs through the site as well as along the property's perimeter. He further noted that structures could not be constructed in these greenspace areas, resulting in additional setbacks for some of the properties. Mr. Pearson stated that the applicants would also have to have a comprehensive study conducted on the floodplain areas.

After discussion, Mr. Pearson stated that two entrances are proposed for this property—one off Route 672 (Etzler Road), and a second via an interconnection with Mark Drive in Dal-Nita Hills Subdivision.

Mr. Pearson stated that the Board is being requested to take action on four separate requests: an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan's Future Lane Use Map, an amendment to the Plan's Water and Sewer Infrastructure Map, a Commission Permit for the construction of new roads and utilities, and a rezoning from an Agricultural A-1 to a Residential R-1 Use District.

He stated that the applicant has proffered the following conditions for the rezoning portion of this request: "The property will be developed in substantial conformance with the concept plan included with the rezoning application that is titled: Mountain View Homes, 665 & 915 Etzler Road, Troutville, Va 24175, prepared by Alam Design Group and dated February 24th, 2021; Single-family dwelling lots shall not be accessed from Etzler Road; Prior to final subdivision plat approval, a declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions will be recorded in the office of the Circuit Court Clerk of Botetourt County."

Mr. Pearson further noted that the applicant and their engineer are present at the meeting and their traffic engineer is participating in the meeting virtually.

After questioning by Mr. Clinton regarding proffered condition #3, Mr. Pearson stated that staff wants to ensure that appropriate language is included in the covenants/restrictions regarding the greenspace/buffer areas. He noted that these covenants are public records once they are recorded in the Circuit Court Clerk's Office.

Mr. Husain Alam with Alam Design Group, Mr. Scott Caldwell with Engineering Concepts, Mr. Bill Bynum, developer, and Mr. Bill Wuensch, traffic engineer, were then noted as being present at the meeting.

Mr. Alam stated that they have been working with the Board and County for 1½ years on this project. He noted that their previous proposal was a high-density development containing commercial space, 793 single family dwellings, and over 1,000 apartments. Mr. Alam stated that that project did not include any traffic improvements but it created issues with traffic flow at the Route 220/779 intersection which necessitated the discussion of options to deal with the increased traffic. Mr. Alam stated that they then decided to not proceed with that project.

Mr. Alam stated that they then decided to develop a medium density subdivision similar to Ashley Plantation and Santillane to support the County's housing shortage needs. He noted that many development options were considered; however, only constructing 1 – 4 units on this property would not address the County's housing needs.

Mr. Alam noted that the school system has said that they would like to see more families move into this area. He further noted that the Fire Marshall supported the project as it meets all emergency response requirements. He stated that they also met with the WVWA who also supports this project and its proposal to connect the Dal-Nita water system with the Authority's other service area in this vicinity. Mr. Alam stated that this proposal would also offer better fire flow to the Dal-Nita residents. He further stated that the Authority confirmed that there is adequate capacity to connect this proposed development to the regional sewage treatment plant.

Regarding the designated flood plain on this site, Mr. Alam stated that there will be an on-site water detention pond/infrastructure developed on the property which may reduce the impact of flooding on properties below this site. He noted that this stormwater detention pond will hold the water and slowly release it over time.

Regarding concerns raised at the Planning Commission regarding traffic using Azalea Road in Daleville as a cut through to avoid delays at the Route 229/779 intersection, Mr. Alam stated that their traffic study indicates that an additional 58 vehicles in the morning and 34 in the afternoon would possibly use Azalea Road and an increase of 211 cars per day would use the Route 220/779 intersection. He noted that it is also not anticipated that this development will increase the traffic flow at Greenfield Elementary School during morning drop-offs and afternoon pick-ups. Mr. Alam further noted that their traffic counts were conducted on November 6, 2019, which was before the pandemic shut down schools and businesses.

He stated VDoT's traffic analysis shows that the Route 672/779 intersection is capable of handling the traffic generated by a maximum of 782 residential units per day; therefore, it should be able to handle an additional vehicular traffic from 130 residential units.

Mr. Alam stated that growth will occur in the County and this development is proposing to have nice homes. He noted that this area has amenities to support this development—schools, parks, trails, etc., and the development's water and sewer needs can be met.

Mr. Scott Caldwell with ECI stated that a section of this property is designated as a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100 year flood zone A. He noted that a detailed study of this flood zone will be conducted when this project is approved. Mr. Caldwell further noted that they will also have to address the stormwater quality regulations during the project's design phase.

Regarding the water/sewer corridor, Mr. Caldwell stated that public sewer is proposed to be pumped from the subdivision to the Route 672 intersection and then a 21" gravity line along Route 779 will carry the sewage to the WVWA treatment facility in Roanoke. He further stated that an 8" public water line and a 12" main water line are proposed to serve this development. He noted that the WVWA has indicated that there is adequate flow available for everyday use and 1,500 gallons per minute for fire flow.

Mr. Alam noted that the water/sewer map was modified to show several alternative locations for the development's water line. He stated that they have talked to the School Board and County Administration offices about allowing a water/sewer easement through the Greenfield Elementary School and Botetourt Center at Greenfield properties to extend utilities to this site.

Mr. Bill Wuensch, traffic engineer, via telephone then reviewed the various intersection traffic conditions and the Azalea Road intersection impacts from this project. Mr. Wuensch stated that his calculations show that this development will generate an additional 101 trips in the morning and 136 trips in the evening, which is less than 1.5 cars per minute, on Etzler Road.

He noted that these calculations were extended to the year 2026 and the level of service on Etzler Road is expected to be in the A – D range, based on VDoT's traffic ranking scale, which is good. Mr. Wuensch stated that increased congestion at the Route 220/779 intersection is anticipated. He noted that VDoT has proposed \$14 million to make improvements on Route 220 in Daleville. Mr. Wuensch noted that VDoT's most recent traffic counts for Azalea Road (between Route 220 and 779) show 790 vehicles per day, which is not a "super heavy volume."

After discussion, Mr. Wuensch stated that a traffic study was conducted in November 2019 on the Etzler Road/Greenfield Elementary School impacts from this development. He noted that this study indicates that an additional 101 cars in the morning will drop off students at the school, which is 1.6 cars per minute.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Scothorn then open the hearing for public comment.

Mrs. Stav Borovich of Etzler Road stated that her property is adjacent to this proposed development. She noted that Botetourt County is a fantastic and unique place to live and she has lived here for 12 years.

Mrs. Borovich stated that she uses the Route 220/779 intersection every day. She noted that when making left-hand turns from Route 220 onto 779 there is a short turning lane which, at times, results in turning traffic spilling over into the Route 220 through lane. Mrs. Borovich stated that, after turning from 220 onto 779, drivers then have "to slam on their brakes" because of drivers turning left into Sheetz. She stated that adding cement trucks to this intersection/roadway further complicates the situation.

She asked that the Board consider the long-term consequences of the "traffic nightmare" on Route 220 and 779 in this area. Mrs. Borovich stated that she anticipates additional traffic in this area when Daleville Town Center builds out. She stated that 130 houses are proposed for this development multiplied by at least 2 cars per household means that there will be an additional 260 cars on these roadways in the future. She stated that this increase in traffic will

impact this route and create a myriad of other issues for the area. Mrs. Borovich stated that this proposed development “is not in the right spot.”

Mr. Jeffry Burke of Tinker Mountain Road stated that he has lived in the County for 4 years. Mr. Burke noted that he previously served in the Air Force and chose Botetourt County to raise his family. He noted that this is a desirable place to live.

Mr. Burke stated that the developer and his team have done a good job to address the issues raised at the Planning Commission meeting. He noted that “on paper” you can answer all questions about traffic and water/sewer services but the question is do we want Botetourt County to become like Washington, DC, and other places that he has visited/lived. He stated that the County’s citizens are opposed to this type of growth, density, and sprawl.

Mr. Burke stated that the Board should take the Planning Commission’s advice regarding this request and consider input from the entire community.

Mr. Tim Cooper of Etzler Road stated that he moved to the County from Raleigh, North Carolina. Mr. Cooper stated that he considered many places to live before choosing his Etzler Road home. He noted that this subdivision proposal contradicts everything about that the views of this area offer.

Mr. Cooper stated that he also has concerns about the traffic turning movements on Route 779 at the Sheetz entrance and there are also traffic backups on Route 220 with cars and cement trucks trying to turn left onto 779 westbound.

He requested that the Board follow the Planning Commission’s recommendations on these proposals.

Mr. Steve Pappas of Andrew Drive in Dal-Nita Hills Subdivision stated that he has lived in the County for 40 years. Mr. Pappas stated that he is not in favor of this proposal due to its aesthetics. He noted that this is a beautiful area that should be kept rural or it will “turn into northern Virginia.”

Mr. Pappas stated that the photographs of this area shown during the staff’s presentation were beautiful and this will all be gone if this subdivision is approved. He noted that this project will be an “eyesore from the Sports Complex and the roads adjoining” the property. Mr. Pappas stated that the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to keep a rural atmosphere and this type of piecemeal development is “eating up the entire County.”

Mr. Pappas further stated that he is also concerned about increased traffic. He noted that this development proposes almost the same number of houses as the Town of Troutville or the Town of Fincastle. He noted that, if this project is approved, it will be the same as building a town on this 108 acre parcel. Mr. Pappas stated that there is no fire/EMS station or water infrastructure in “Etzlerville.”

After discussion, Mr. Pappas stated that the Etzler Road traffic counts presented by the developer were taken during the winter when the Sports Complex is closed. Mr. Pappas stated that he agrees with the statements made by other speakers regarding traffic on Routes 220 and 779 being a “nightmare.”

Mrs. Beth Pappas of Andrew Drive stated that there are some significant portions of this project that cause major concerns for her. She noted that over 1,400 acres of land above this proposed development drain through the creek on the DeMaury/Amos property. She noted that the entrance road into Dal-Nita Hills has a 12’ X 6’ arched drainageway which carries water from these creeks/streams.

She further noted that, during the 1985 flood, the water was 10' in this area and the land between the branch (creek) and Etzler Road often floods. Mrs. Pappas stated that additional storm-related backwater will be created by this development and any excavation work conducted in the existing floodplain could cause further problems for the area and downstream properties. Mrs. Pappas stated that another flood study is needed for this creek.

She stated that there are also flooding issues in Dal-Nita Hills and the pavement, roof-lines, etc., in this new subdivision could cause downstream flooding. Mrs. Pappas stated that a separate stormwater management basin should be constructed if this project is approved.

Mrs. Pappas stated that she also opposes tying the street in the new subdivision into a street in Dal-Nita Hills.

Mr. Rodney Pierson of Victoria Drive stated that his property adjoins this proposed development. Mr. Pierson noted that he has an engineering firm in Daleville and has concerns about this project.

Mr. Pierson stated, if public water/sewer are extended to this site, what does it do in the future that might make the problem even worse. Mr. Pierson stated that he is not sure that the County wants high-density development in this area of the County.

Mr. Pierson stated that Mr. Bill Drennan spoke at the Planning Commission meeting and referenced the number of homes in the Town of Fincastle (165) and in the Town of Troutville (197) as a comparison to this proposed development. He stated that "we are looking at taking the Town of Troutville and squeezing it down to fit on 108 acres. He noted that it does not make sense to place this number of houses on this property.

Mrs. Donna Mack of Andrew Drive stated that she chose Botetourt County to live because of the open spaces, excellent schools, etc. She stated that "Botetourt County is not ready" for this development. She noted that the VDoT report is not accurate as this data was gathered after the Sports Complex's season ended.

Mrs. Mack further stated that Greenfield Elementary, Read Mountain Middle, and Lord Botetourt High schools would need to be expanded as they are above their capacity limits. She noted that her son's kindergarten class consisted of 27 students and only one teacher.

Mrs. Mack stated that drivers are taking alternate routes to avoid the backups at the Route 220/779 intersection, and there are already traffic backups during the drop-off period at Greenfield Elementary.

She further stated that the developer is proposing to connect a street in the new subdivision to a street in Dal-Nita Hills so there will be 2 entrances into the development. Mrs. Mack stated the Dal-Nita Hills residents walk and ride bicycles on these streets and having through traffic will create safety concerns.

After discussion, Mrs. Mack stated that a fire station is needed in Daleville as the nearest stations are in Troutville and Fincastle. She also stated that there are existing flooding problems on Etzler Road and the Dal-Nita water system has water quality and water pressure issues.

Mrs. Mack stated that, for those lots parallel to Etzler Road, the rear of those homes would face Etzler Road and the Sports Complex. She stated that homeowners usually place items at the rear of their properties that they do not want visible from the front of the house. She suggested that the Board members take time to view this property from the Sports Complex and imagine how it will look in the future if this project is approved. Mrs. Mack stated that "this group of developers are not just helping the County" with this project.

Ms. Terri Frantz of Catawba Road stated that her property borders this proposed development. She noted that this is the third time that this site has been proposed to be developed for residential and commercial purposes and this large development is not needed in this area.

She then questioned that, if the Board members lived on Etzler or Catawba Roads or in Dal-Nita Hills, would they approve this request. She noted that, by interconnecting the streets in this proposed subdivision with Dal-Nita Hills, it would bring additional traffic through their neighborhood.

Ms. Frantz stated that her family has lived in this area since the 1850s. She asked that the Board listen to the large group of residents who oppose this request versus the three people who are in favor of this project. She noted that there is property available for sale on Route 220 that would be a better location for this development. She noted that traffic on Route 779 is “awful” and this large number of homes on 108 acres is not needed for many reasons.

She requested that the Board listen to the Planning Commission’s recommendation and vote no on this request.

Mr. Alan Bayse of Grandview Drive in Woodridge Subdivision stated that he worked as an insurance consultant for the County for 30 years. He noted that, when they decided to move from Roanoke, they chose Botetourt County to live in but he is now considering moving back to Roanoke City.

Mr. Bayse stated that currently traffic trying to enter Greenfield Elementary School each morning/afternoon backs up down to the Route 779 intersection and when these additional homes are built, the traffic situation will be worse. He also noted that drivers avoiding the congestion at the Route 229/779 intersection use Azalea Road in Daleville and drivers coming from Route 220 turning left onto 779 have issues with drivers turning right into various businesses and into Daleville Town Center as well as vehicles turning left into Sheetz.

Mr. Bayse stated that, if the Board approves this request, he and his family will leave the County.

Ms. Kathy Nemeth of Andrew Drive stated that she has concerns about sewer and water issues. She noted that all of her neighbors have wells and septic tank systems and, because of problems with the water system, some of them are purchasing bottled water.

Ms. Nemeth stated that traffic from the proposed development is proposed to use Tugel and Victoria Drives as a second access to Etzler Road. She stated that the Dal-Nita Hills’ residents do not need this additional traffic flow in their neighborhood.

Ms. Nemeth stated that she was told that Sheetz “put in \$1 million to sweeten the deal” to locate their business at the Route 220/779 intersection. She asked that the Board not bring more homes to this area.

Mr. Teddy Wolford of Andrew Drive then stated that his wife will be showing the Board members photographs of flooding in this area while he speaks. Mr. Wolford stated that this project began approximately 16 – 17 years ago with a proposal for 59 homes. He noted that the County told the developers to come back with a proposal that “meets the area” and the developers said that they would not do so.

Mr. Wolford stated that a developer then designed a project with 1,200 apartments, many single family dwellings, and commercial space which was also denied by the Board of Supervisors. He noted that developers now are proposing 130 homes on this property.

Mr. Wolford stated that, when Greenfield Elementary School lets out each afternoon, the traffic is impacted from Etzler Road to Route 779. He also stated that there are also water and sewer issues and the area has flooding problems.

Mr. Wolford noted that blasting work will be needed on this property due to rock outcroppings in this area. He questioned whose well is going to sink and who will be responsible for repairing any damages that occur to neighboring properties caused by blasting. Mr. Wolford stated that subdividing this property into 5 acre lots would be more consistent with the surrounding area.

Mr. Bill Bynum stated that he currently lives on Patterson Avenue in Roanoke but previously lived on Haymakertown Road in Botetourt County for many years. Mr. Bynum stated that he is aware that people are concerned about the traffic generated by this development but he would like to talk at this time about change. Mr. Bynum stated that his grandfather owned 130 acres in Botetourt County when he died in 1975. He stated that life is about change.

Mr. Bynum stated that, after his and Mr. Alam's meetings with the School Board regarding this project, they lowered the requirements for kids attending County schools who lived in other school districts. He noted that the School Board has said that they needed more children in the County's schools.

Mr. Bynum noted that he understands the citizens' concerns about the traffic and the cement trucks on Route 779 but with this project he and Mr. Alam are trying to do something to help the area. He stated that, if you do not have young people move into the County, the County will die.

After discussion, Mr. Bynum stated that he worked on The Glebe project in Daleville and is familiar with dealing with rock on a construction project. He noted that the developers have a team available that has addressed every issue that they have been questioned about regarding this project.

Mr. John Bowman of Mark Drive in Dal-Nita Hills stated that he is against this project. Mr. Bowman stated that he moved to the County because of the rural setting and the nice building lots and, if he "had wanted to live in the city, he would have stayed there."

Mr. Bowman stated that he has issues about the roads in this area of the County as well as in the area of Sheetz in Daleville. Mr. Bowman further stated that he has a well and is concerned about his water supply if this project is approved. Mr. Bowman noted that he hears noise from the Greenfield industrial park as well as workers speeding out of the park when they change shifts. He noted that no amount of buffer is going to solve these issues.

Mr. Bowman stated that residential building costs have increased by \$30,000 over the last four years. He further stated that his property is downstream from this proposed development and is adjacent to the creek's designated floodplain.

Mr. Bowman requested that the Board follow the Planning Commission's recommendations on these requests.

Mrs. Vicki Cornett of Victoria Drive stated that she attended the Planning Commission's meeting regarding these requests. Mrs. Cornett then stated that her property adjoins the Dal-Nita well lot and questioned, regarding the proposed Dal-Nita Hills water connection for this new subdivision, where will the water line be buried on her property. She also questioned if any blasting will be done on this property.

After discussion, Mrs. Cornett stated that she is aware that the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances require two entrances in and out of residential developments; however, she noted

that there are other subdivisions in the County that only have one entrance/exit. She questioned why these 130 homes are being proposed and asked shouldn't this subdivision be consistent with the other homes in the area.

She then repeated a quote from The Fincastle Herald made by Mr. Clinton in 1999.

Mr. Michael Charden of Etzler Road stated that he is one of the people most impacted by this development. Mr. Charden stated that he was approached by a representative of the developers who requested an easement across his property for the installation of water and sewer service to serve this development. Mr. Charden stated that he asked several questions of this person including how the utility lines would be constructed and how would the easement be planted in grass after construction. Mr. Charden noted that he is not going to grant this easement across his property.

He noted that his home is 250' from the proposed development and he was told that evergreen trees would be planted along the property boundary line as a buffer. Mr. Charden stated that it will take many years for these trees to block his view of these houses.

After discussion, Mr. Charden stated that this development will generate a lot of automobiles and a lot of people on Etzler and Catawba Roads. He noted that the cost of building materials is increasing and questioned what types of houses are the developers proposing.

Ms. Sharon Harris of Etzler Road stated that she purchased her property in 2019 in order to have a few animals. She noted that they chose to live in Botetourt over Roanoke.

Ms. Harris stated that no one denies that change is inevitable. Ms. Harris stated that she has read the County's 2010 Comprehensive Plan and, according to citizen survey data included in the Plan, the respondents felt that the County's population growth was occurring too fast. She stated that this project is not consistent with the direction of the Comprehensive Plan or the existing neighborhood. She further stated that this project will cost the County more than it will benefit.

Ms. Harris stated that she saw a lot of cons in the school report about this project's impact on the school system and questioned where is the financial data that shows the County will benefit from this development.

Ms. Harris stated that she also has environmental concerns about this project. She noted that this is a windy area and trash from this 130-home development will blow into the creek. Ms. Harris stated that flooding also occurs in this area. She noted that increasing the zoning classification for this property will have a "snowball effect." Ms. Harris further noted that this proposal is in direct opposition to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Alam stated that he has lived in the County since 1996 after moving from a congested area. He noted that people were opposed to the Ashley Plantation development when it was first proposed; however, this development is beautiful and has nice, ½ acre lots with beautiful homes. Mr. Alam stated that he and his firm do quality work in their homebuilding endeavors and this proposed subdivision will be similar in makeup to Dal-Nita Hills and Ashley Plantation.

He stated, "let's work together to preserve our community" as growth is going to happen. Mr. Alam stated that they want to make sensible decisions about the development of this property.

After questioning by Dr. Scothorn, it was noted that there was no one else present to speak either in person or on the telephone regarding this request. The public hearing was then closed.

Dr. Scothorn stated that the Board is being asked to take four actions on this request with the first being the requested amendment to the Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map. He noted that if this request is denied they will still need to take action on the other three requests.

Mr. Clinton stated that there are a lot of issues to discuss regarding this request. He noted that two words to consider are "rural character." Mr. Clinton noted that you do not have progress without change and change can take a lot of forms. He stated that there is always opposition to development; however, it is different now.

Mr. Clinton stated that there is a demand for housing that offers a variety of pricing options and he recognizes and appreciates the risk that developers take when deciding on a property's development options.

Mr. Clinton stated that an asset that the County has to offer its new and current citizens is rural character. Mr. Clinton stated that he is reluctant to extend utilities to Route 672 at this time.

Dr. Scothorn stated that one of the County's greatest assets are our neighbors; they are very important. Dr. Scothorn stated that this is a great project but he does not know if it is appropriate for this location. He noted that the County's beauty and its neighbors are important.

Dr. Bailey stated that he agrees with Mr. Clinton's and Dr. Scothorn's comments and he has a lot of concerns about the traffic resulting from this project, especially at the Route 220/779 intersection. Dr. Bailey stated that he has reviewed VDoT's findings about this project's impact on the area's roadways and finds this information surprising.

Dr. Bailey stated that he shares the residents' traffic-related concerns. He noted that when the Sports Complex is open traffic "gets busy" in this area. Dr. Bailey stated that he is also concerned about the quality of life, which is something that should be considered.

Mr. Martin stated that he attended the Planning Commission meeting and 17 people spoke in opposition to this request except for Mr. Bynum. Mr. Martin stated that he appreciates Mr. Bynum's comments about housing needs in the County.

Mr. Martin stated that an 85% increase in traffic on Etzler Road from this development is significant, plus the school traffic, and the Sports Complex traffic. Mr. Martin further stated that he also understands that there might be a capacity problem at the schools serving this area if this project is developed. He also stated that this area is in a flood zone and he viewed a video showing a lot of water flowing across this site.

Mr. Martin stated that people like a rural setting and the proposed subdivision is a lot more dense and is not in character with the homes that are currently located in this area. He noted that this is a rural setting that has a quality of life that people enjoy and he would hate to take this away from them.

Mr. Martin stated that traffic concerns about this development's impact on Routes 672 and 779 have also been expressed. After discussion, Mr. Martin stated that he appreciates all comments received from both sides of this proposal.

Mrs. White stated that she agrees with a lot of the comments made at this meeting. She noted that it is important when dealing with these issues that everyone is heard. Mrs. White stated that the Board has listened to the comments made by all of those present at the meeting.

She noted that growth and change is inevitable but it is very hard and "it is imperative that we get it right." Mrs. White stated that she has concerns with this location. She noted that the surrounding area is zoned for A-1 uses and there is agricultural traffic—tractors and other

farm equipment—that use the area’s roads along with sports teams and visitors to the Sports Complex. Mrs. White stated that “we need to be respectful of the farmers.”

After discussion, Mrs. White stated that she does not think that Lord Botetourt High School could handle this anticipated student population increase. She noted that there is other residential development along Route 220 including Daleville Town Center and the new Fieldstone subdivision across from Ikenberry’s Orchard.

Mrs. White stated that this proposed development would necessitate a complete change and complexion of the landscape for the people that already live in this area and she is reticent about the location of the project.

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Clinton, seconded by Dr. Bailey, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board denied the request in the Amsterdam District for amendments to the 2010 Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map in accordance with Chapter 25 Zoning, Division 6. Special Development Approvals, Section 25-581.31 Comprehensive plan amendment—Owner initiated and Section 25-581.4 Comprehensive plan amendment and review of the Botetourt County Code. These changes would amend the designation of approximately 82 acres from Rural Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential on the Future Land Use Map. The request was initiated by Elizabeth Ann DeMaury and Michael L. & Melinda B. Amos (Family Builders, LLC, contractual purchaser) in support of a proposed rezoning request of 108.58 acres from the Agricultural A-1 Use District to the Residential R-1 Use District at 665 Etzler Road, Troutville, approximately 0.7 miles north of the Catawba Road (State Route 779)/Etzler Road (State Route 672) intersection and across from the Botetourt County Sports Complex, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87, Parcels 95 and 96. This request is denied as recommended by the Planning Commission and on the basis that the requirements of Section 25-581.1 of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance have not been satisfied due to the project’s proposed density being inconsistent with the area, traffic impacts on area roadways, concerns whether the development could be adequately served with public water and sewer, concerns regarding flooding, and impacts on the school system. (Resolution Number 21-06-19)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Dr. Bailey, seconded by Dr. Scothorn, and carried by the following recorded vote the Board denied a request in the Amsterdam District for amendments to the 2010 Comprehensive Plan’s Water & Sewer Infrastructure Map in accordance with Chapter 25 Zoning, Division 6. Special Development Approvals, Section 25-581.31 Comprehensive plan amendment—Owner initiated and Section 25-581.4 Comprehensive plan amendment and review of the Botetourt County Code. These changes would amend the Service Area shown on the Sewer and Water Infrastructure Map to allow for the extension of public water and public sewer between an existing service area that includes the Botetourt County Sports Complex and Greenfield Elementary School on Etzler Road and another existing service area that includes properties within the Dal-Nita Hills Subdivision. The request was initiated by Elizabeth Ann DeMaury and Michael L. & Melinda B. Amos (Family Builders, LLC, contractual purchaser) in support of a proposed rezoning request of 108.58 acres from the Agricultural A-1 Use District to the Residential R-1 Use District at 665 Etzler Road, Troutville, approximately 0.7 miles north of

the Catawba Road (State Route 779)/ Etzler Road (State Route 672) intersection and across from the Botetourt County Sports Complex, identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87, Parcels 95 and 96. This request is denied as recommended by the Planning Commission and on the basis that the requirements of Section 25-581.1 of the Botetourt County Zoning Ordinance have not been satisfied due to the project's proposed density being inconsistent with the area, traffic impacts on area roadways, concerns whether the development could be adequately served with public water and sewer, concerns regarding flooding, and impacts on the school system. (Resolution Number 21-06-20)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Dr. Scothorn, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board denied the request in the Amsterdam District from Elizabeth Ann DeMaury and Michael L. & Melinda B. Amos (Family Builders, LLC, contractual purchaser) for a Commission Permit in accord with §15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia for the construction of new roads and public utilities on two parcels: Parcel 87-95 consists 40.03 acres located at the intersection of Etzler Road (State Route 672) and Preston Parkway (State Route 825) across from the entrance to the Botetourt Sports Complex, and Parcel 87-96 consists of 68.554 acres located on and abutting 665 Etzler Road, Troutville. The properties are located approximately 0.7 miles north of the Catawba Road (State Route 779)/Etzler Road intersection and identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87, Parcels 95 and 96, and based upon Zoning Ordinance Section 25-576, the following items have not been satisfied: the project's proposed density is inconsistent with the area, traffic impacts on area roadways, concerns whether the development could be adequately served with public water and sewer, concerns regarding flooding, and impacts on the school system. (Resolution Number 21-06-21)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

On motion by Mrs. White, seconded by Mr. Martin, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board denied a request in the Amsterdam District from Elizabeth Ann DeMaury and Michael L. & Melinda B. Amos (Family Builders, LLC, contractual purchaser) to rezone a total of 108.58 acres from the Agricultural A-1 Use District to the Residential R-1 Use District for the development of a maximum of 130 single-family residential lots in accordance with Chapter 25 Zoning, Division 6. Special Development Approvals, Section 25-581. Zoning Map Amendment—Owner Initiated and Article II, Division 4. Residential R-1 of the Botetourt County Code on two parcels: Parcel 87-95 consists 40.03 acres located at the intersection of Etzler Road (State Route 672) and Preston Parkway (State Route 825) across from the entrance to the Botetourt Sports Complex, and Parcel 87-96 consists of 68.554 acres located on and abutting 665 Etzler Road, Troutville, and are located approximately 0.7 miles north of the Catawba Road (State Route 779)/Etzler Road intersection and identified on the Real Property Identification Maps of Botetourt County as Section 87, Parcels 95 and 96, due to the project's proposed density being inconsistent with the area, traffic impacts on area roadways, concerns whether the development

could be adequately served with public water and sewer, concerns regarding flooding, and impacts on the school system (Resolution Number 21-06-22)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None

There being no further discussion, on motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Mrs. White, and carried by the following recorded vote, the Board adjourned the meeting at 8:50 P. M.

(Resolution number 21-06-23)

AYES: Mr. Clinton, Mrs. White, Mr. Martin, Dr. Bailey, Dr. Scothorn

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAINING: None