

# Department of Planning & Zoning

County Building Two - 6489 Main Street Gloucester, Virginia 23061

Phone (804) 693-1224 Fax (804) 824-2441

#### MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Supervisors / Planning Commission

**CC:** Carol Steele, County Administrator

George Bains, Deputy County Administrator

Ted Wilmot, County Attorney

**FROM:** Carol Rizzio, Senior Comprehensive Planner

Anne Ducey-Ortiz, Planning, Zoning and Environmental Programs Director

**DATE:** July 24, 2024, for August 1, 2024

**SUBJECT:** Zoning Ordinance Update – Review of Public Comments

At the Planning Commission's July meeting we held the public hearing for the zoning ordinance update and received numerous public comments. At your request, staff has prepared and attached a summary of the public comments identifying the general topics addressed and/or specific ordinance sections that the comments related to. However, many of the comments were general in nature and do not relate to a specific section of the ordinance. The comments that appear to refer to specific code sections are displayed in <u>dark gray</u> on the attached document and are listed in the order presented at the public hearing. If you want more details about any specific comment, please refer to the meeting minutes. Below is a summary listing the specific sections addressed in the comments either in support of or opposed to the changes as best as we could determine.

| Topic   | Section   | Number of individuals in support of                               | Number of individuals opposed to                                 |
|---|---|---|--|
| Village Mixed Use<br>District (B-2)<br>Regulations.             | Section 5-40.1(3) p.79  | 1 – Need more<br>affordable housing                               | 12 – No more<br>growth   |
| Junkyards and salvage yards                                     | Section 5-70.4 Table of<br>Permitted Industrial and<br>Utility Uses p.106 and<br>Section 9B-7.20 Junkyard<br>and salvage yard p.140 |   | 1 – Do not permit in<br>B-1 (proposed to be<br>permitted by CUP) |
| Historic Overlay District                                       | Article 6, Section 6-1 p. 109   |   | 1 – Wants to be included in district                             |
| Sidewalks required by the Highway Corridor Development District | Article 6A, Section 6A-4<br>Access p.111  | 1 – Support<br>sidewalks in our<br>Village areas                  | 1 – Sidewalks are<br>not needed on Rte.<br>17                    |
| Campgrounds and Camping for personal use and enjoyment          | Section 9B-4.10 p.130 and<br>Section 9D-10 p.170  | 1 – Question related     to enforcement     process for violators | 1 – We should be<br>able to camp as<br>long as we want           |

| Topic                                     | Section  | Number of individuals in support of      | Number of individuals opposed to          |
|---|--|--|---|
| Home occupations                          | Section 9B-9.70(c) p.166   |  | 1 – Do not allow two commercial vehicles  |
| Freight containers                        | Section 9D-20(3) p.171   |  | 1 – Do not allow in residential districts |
| Traffic Impact Analysis reduced threshold | Article 14, Sections 14-2(4)(a)(xv) p.216, 14-3(3)(g) p. 224, and 14-4(3)(c)(ix) p. 231. | 1 – Support TIAs for larger developments |   |

In addition to these topics, several comments related to regulations not included in the Zoning Ordinance such as property maintenance and short term rentals. Those are identified in *light gray* on the attached comment summary document. Staff will summarize all this information for you at the August 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and will be prepared to discuss with you any changes you may want to suggest – along with your recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

As mentioned at the public hearing, there is one parcel (RPC 40099) currently zoning Residential Mixed Use (RMX) that is proposed to become Village Mixed Use (B-2) due to the recommendation to combine those districts. Staff has reached out to the property owner for his feedback on the proposed change. He would like the parcel to become B-1 instead of B-2. He has an existing approved site plan for residential development consisting of a mix of 78 apartments and 31 townhouse style rental units. Based on the General Assembly's extension, the approved site plan is valid until 2025. Under the B-2 zoning he could development the site either residentially or commercially once the site plan expires. He owns the parcels to the north that make up the York River Crossing shopping center, all of which are zoned B-1. We will be interested to hear your feedback related to that change.

Staff has also been working on updating the Zoning Ordinance Update web page to include a version of the draft ordinance that contains links to specific sections (from the table of contents) and a version that identifies the changes in **bold** text. We hope to have those changes completed by August 1<sup>st</sup>.

We will be happy to answer any questions you may have about other changes not specifically mentioned.

#### Attachments:

Summary of public comments received

**PC Action**: Listen to staff's presentation and make a recommendation to the Board as to whether to adopt the proposed changes to Appendix B - Zoning of the County Code as presented or with modifications based on public input.

## Planning Commission, July 11, 2024 Meeting

### **Item 4: General Public Comments**

|    | Comments   | Main Topic  | ZO Section and Page Number   |
|----|--|---|--|
| 1  | Poor planning, not considerate, disappointed   | Not happy w/ process  | N/A  |
| 2  | Resident skirting codes and before we change anything we should address this violation. Has campers and rents rooms, basically runs a business. Yard full of trash. Nothing is being done. Works till after 5 pm and property values are being impacted. | Complaint about violations that should be addressed prior to any changes.                                 | N/A  |
| 3  | She expressed that God gives the people sovereign political power to choose the government. She points out that the Planning Commission is subject to the people and should be held liable.  | Planning Commission is subject to the people.   | N/A  |
| 4  | Plans in Hayes, Thomas Landing Road, subdivided. Give up part of her land.   | Civil matter RE<br>Subdivision  | N/A  |
| 5  | Letter was written like a true politician. As elected people we need to give more information.   | Letter not descriptive enough   | N/A  |
| 6  | Recently opened a business in Hayes and wasn't able to cut down any trees. However, all the vegetation was removed on the Dunkin Donuts lot. What is going across the street from Lowes the Barrens. Schools are overrun, need to know what is going on. | Lack of enforcement;<br>regulations not evenly<br>applied – ADO reached<br>out to her about the<br>trees. | N/A  |
| 7  | Developers are parking in their parking lot to survey the woods behind them. They should not be allowed to do that.  | Civil matter  | N/A  |
| 8  | What are we doing about growth in the county? Schools are redistricting. How are we handing all these people moving from Newport News and Hampton?   | Too much growth   | Possibly Village Mixed Use District (B-2) Regulations Section 5-40.1(3) p.79 |
| 9  | *Chevron Deference, unconstitutional action.   | Planning Commission does not have constitutional authority  | N/A  |
| 10 | Repent and Dissolve the Planning Commission. Love and peace of Gloucester County. Pay for them to move to Newport News.  | Planning Commission<br>does not have<br>constitutional authority  | N/A  |
| 11 | Lot in front of her home was cleared. Doesn't want a business there.   | Too much growth   | Possibly Village Mixed Use District (B-2) Regulations Section 5-40.1(3) p.79 |
| 12 | Road is not maintained by VDOT adequately and it is affecting property values.   | Lack of roadway<br>maintenance (VDOT)   | N/A  |

<sup>\*&</sup>quot;Chevron deference" is (was) not applicable to the Planning Commission. It was an old Supreme Court case that held that FEDERAL agencies (like the EPA) had broad authority to interpret the meaning of the regulations they enforced –

especially when they were ambiguous. The "deference" part said that the Courts would/could not substitute their opinion for those of the subject matter experts within those agencies.

Current Supreme Court said no – now we're (judicial branch) going to interpret those ambiguities – or Congress can fix them.

The PC is not a regulatory agency.

Item 5b: CA-24-01 Zoning Ordinance Update Public Hearing Comments

|    | Comments   | Main Topic  | ZO Section and<br>Page Number   |
|----|--|---|---|
| 1  | Asked if Air B&B camping would be regulated as a campground. Yes, it would.  | Camping   | Section 9B-4.10 Campground p. 130 and Section 9D-10 Camping for personal use and enjoyment p. 170 |
| 2  | Letter sent took 12 days to get to him, don't believe we sent it out on the date stated on the letter.   | Letters arriving late.                                    | N/A   |
| 3  | Letter sent. Article 6 Historic Overlay District – wants her property to be added.   | Historic District additions                               | Article 6 Historic<br>Overlay District<br>p.109   |
| 4  | Doesn't like 8 units per acre in B-2. Edgehill Street doesn't like it, no more section 8 housing. Believes the PC and Board members are financed to make such decisions.   | 8 dwelling units by-right in B-2<br>No section 8 housing. | Village Mixed Use District (B-2) Regulations, Section 5-40.1(3) p.79                              |
| 5  | Chevron lawsuit – bill of rights.  | Process   | N/A   |
| 6  | Concern for mom and pop shops  | Support for small businesses                              | N/A   |
| 7  | Need to redo the comp plan. Heard the public.  | No more growth.   | Possibly Village Mixed Use District (B-2) Regulations Section 5-40.1(3) p.79                      |
| 8  | How much did mailing costs? Allowing government to control private property. Agenda 21 – controlling how to use one's private property. No section 8 and no ethnic compounds. Power lines and all roads on six-year plan for improvements. | Private property rights.  No Section 8 housing.           | Possibly Village Mixed Use District (B-2) Regulations Section 5-40.1(3) p.79                      |
| 9  | Property rights – how can the government tell me how many days I can camp on my property? Should be able to camp as long as we want. Eliminate property rights and the ten commandments will take care of it.                              | Property rights and camping.                              | Section 9D-10 Camping for personal use and enjoyment p.170  |
| 10 | In 1984 with zoning took away right to farm – give it back! County said they would sponsor rezonings back to agriculture in areas that farming continued.  | Right to Farm (only applies to RC-1 and RC-2)             | N/A.  |

|    | Comments   | Main Topic  | ZO Section and Page Number  |
|----|--|---|---|
| 11 | Words matter. Letters worked, got everyone here. Wants to downzone for affordable housing (Section 8)  | Affordable housing is needed.   | Possibly Village Mixed Use District (B-2) Regulations Section 5-40.1(3) p.79  |
| 12 | Complemented Carol and thanked the Planning Commission.  | Thank you.  | N/A   |
| 13 | Asked if we could bookmark the PDF. Doesn't like freight containers. They rust. Please don't allow in SC-1 or in B-1 commercial district. Don't allow junkyard / salvage yards in B-1. Only allow in I-1 by a CUP.   | No freight containers.<br>No salvage<br>yards/junkyard in B-1.                          | Section 9D-20 Freight containers p.170; Section 5-70.4 Table of Permitted Industrial and Utility Uses p. 106 and Section 9B-7.20 Junkyard and salvage yard p. 140 |
| 14 | Shipping containers – why allow them in residential districts?  Home occupations – reduced regulations, doesn't think it's a good idea to allow 2 commercial vehicles (would look more like a business)  Nonconforming uses – consider amortization so they can't continue forever | No freight containers. Don't allow 2 commercial vehicles w/ HOPs                        | Section 9D-20 Freight containers p. 171; Section 9B-9.70 Home occupations p. 166  |
| 15 | Thanked Planning Commission. Asked about the camper guidelines. What are the ramifications where people don't follow the regulations?  | Enforcement processes related to proposed camping regulations                           | Section 9D-10 Camping for personal use and enjoyment p. 170   |
| 16 | Concerned about Gloucester Point and doesn't understand why someone is allowed to stack tires up.  | Lack of property maintenance at the point.  | N/A   |
| 17 | Would like to be able to easier see what changed and what didn't.  Noticed that a tower not in use has to be removed after 2 years. There is a tower near him that has not been removed yet (Willis Road) – it's been over 2 years. Would like it removed.                         | Wants to be able to easily see what has changed. Removal of unused communication tower. | N/A   |
| 18 | Housing 8-12 units – why can developers do what others can't, how will more housing help w/ all other issues in the county such as the volunteer fire / rescue and traffic?  Pedestrians don't need to be on Rte. 17 – how would sidewalks make it better?                         | No more growth, no<br>multi-family.<br>No sidewalks.                                    | Possibly Village Business District (B-2) Regulations Section 5-40.1(3) p.79; Article 6A Highway Corridor Development District, Section 6A-4 Access p. 111         |

| 19   Containers on people's properties – how many years till they are grandfathered? Not equal protection under the law.   20   Too many sub-divisions. Too much growth that is causing increased crime, traffic congestion, schools' capacity and lack of appropriate infrastructure.   21   Against zoning changes. No apartment buildings added to my neighborhood. They are a burden for schools and infrastructure   22   Doesn't understand the changes   Wants more information   N/A   District (E Regulatio Section 5 p.79   22   Doesn't understand the changes   Wants more information   N/A   District (E Regulatio Section 5 p.79   23   Concerned about AirBNB in her neighborhood and thinks it should be regulated.   Regulate short-term rentals such as AirBNBs.   Altimotion     | Com  | nments  | Main Topic                 | ZO Section and<br>Page Number   |
|--|--|---|----------------------------|---|
| causing increased crime, traffic congestion, schools' capacity and lack of appropriate infrastructure.  21 Against zoning changes. No apartment buildings added to my neighborhood. They are a burden for schools and infrastructure  22 Doesn't understand the changes  23 Concerned about AirBNB in her neighborhood and thinks it should be regulated.  24 Doesn't want to adopt all the changes at once, agrees with some but not all. Does not want Gloucester to become York or Williamsburg.  25 Update solves no problem specific to our community. It is just an excuse for continued government overreach. Will devalue property assets by continuing to restrict legal use of property.  26 Concerned that the standard review and approval allow new land uses as a matter of right. Landowners, residents, and business owners purchase land with specific expectations. Altering these expectations and uses harms current landowners. Doesn't think localities should push for affordable housing. Let the market determine it. I purchased my home at the end of a long street and don't want multifamily projects in my neighborhood.  27 In favor of the ZO update with the following considerations. Not in favor of allowing use of spray manure fertilizer on farms in Bayside  Conservation. Strongly in favor of ADA compliant sidewalks particularly in village areas. In support of TIAs for large developments.  | years  | rs till they are grandfathered?   |                            | Section 9D-20 (3)<br>Freight containers   |
| added to my neighborhood. They are a burden for schools and infrastructure    District (E Regulation Section 5 p.79  | causi<br>schoo   | sing increased crime, traffic congestion, pols' capacity and lack of appropriate  | Keep Gloucester rural.     | Possibly section 5-<br>40.1(3) p.79 Village<br>Mixed Use District<br>(B-2) Regulations  |
| 23 Concerned about AirBNB in her neighborhood and thinks it should be regulated.  24 Doesn't want to adopt all the changes at once, agrees with some but not all. Does not want Gloucester to become York or Williamsburg.  25 Update solves no problem specific to our community. It is just an excuse for continued government overreach. Will devalue property assets by continuing to restrict legal use of property.  26 Concerned that the standard review and approval process is not proposed to be circumvented to allow new land uses as a matter of right.  Landowners, residents, and business owners purchase land with specific expectations. Altering these expectations and uses harms current landowners. Doesn't think localities should push for affordable housing. Let the market determine it. I purchased my home at the end of a long street and don't want multifamily projects in my neighborhood.  27 In favor of the ZO update with the following considerations. Not in favor of allowing use of spray manure fertilizer on farms in Bayside Conservation. Strongly in favor of ADA compliant sidewalks particularly in village areas. In support of TIAs for large developments.  Regulate short-term rentals such as AirBNBs.  Regulates short-term rentals such as AirBNBs.  Repulatosuch as AirBNBs.  Repulatosuch as AirBNBs.  No more Section 8 hou.10; possibly such and source set it is. No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  Do not adopt ZO update.  N/A  Doesn't agree with by right of up to 8 dwelling units in B-2.  Use District Section 5 p.79 Vilta; Use District of the property assets by continued government even and approval proper | adde   | ed to my neighborhood. They are a burden for  |                            | •   |
| thinks it should be regulated.  Doesn't want to adopt all the changes at once, agrees with some but not all. Does not want Gloucester to become York or Williamsburg.  Do not adopt ZO update.  N/A  Doesn't agree with by right of up to 8 dwelling units in B-2.  Concerned that the standard review and approval process is not proposed to be circumvented to allow new land uses as a matter of right.  Landowners, residents, and business owners purchase land with specific expectations. Altering these expectations and uses harms current landowners. Doesn't think localities should push for affordable housing. Let the market determine it. I purchased my home at the end of a long street and don't want multifamily projects in my neighborhood.  In favor of the ZO update with the following considerations. Not in favor of allowing use of spray manure fertilizer on farms in Bayside Conservation. Strongly in favor of ADA compliant sidewalks particularly in village areas. In support of TIAs for large developments.  Reep Gloucester as it is. No more Section 8 housing. Keep Gloucester as it is. No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  Do not adopt ZO update.  Doesn't agree with by right of up to 8 dwelling units in B-2.  Section 5 p.79 Villague units in B-2.  Agree w/ changes.  Article 6A Corridor Developm District, S 4 Access  of TIAs for large developments.  | 22 Does  | sn't understand the changes   | Wants more information     | N/A   |
| agrees with some but not all. Does not want Gloucester to become York or Williamsburg.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  No more Section 8 housing.  No more Section 8 housing.  Do not adopt ZO update.  No more Section 8 housing.  No more Section 9 propers.  No more Section 19 propers.   | think  | ks it should be regulated.  | _                          | N/A   |
| community. It is just an excuse for continued government overreach. Will devalue property assets by continuing to restrict legal use of property.  26 Concerned that the standard review and approval process is not proposed to be circumvented to allow new land uses as a matter of right.  Landowners, residents, and business owners purchase land with specific expectations. Altering these expectations and uses harms current landowners. Doesn't think localities should push for affordable housing. Let the market determine it. I purchased my home at the end of a long street and don't want multifamily projects in my neighborhood.  27 In favor of the ZO update with the following considerations. Not in favor of allowing use of spray manure fertilizer on farms in Bayside  Conservation. Strongly in favor of ADA compliant sidewalks particularly in village areas. In support of TIAs for large developments.  Doesn't agree with by right to 8 dwelling units in B-2.  Section 5 p.79 Villag units in B-2.  Agree w/ changes.  Article 6A Corridor Developm District, S 4 Access  | agree<br>Gloud   | ees with some but not all. Does not want ucester to become York or Williamsburg.  | No more Section 8 housing. | Possibly section 5-<br>40.1(3) p.79 Village<br>Mixed Use District<br>(B-2) Regulations  |
| 26 Concerned that the standard review and approval process is not proposed to be circumvented to allow new land uses as a matter of right.  Landowners, residents, and business owners purchase land with specific expectations. Altering these expectations and uses harms current landowners. Doesn't think localities should push for affordable housing. Let the market determine it. I purchased my home at the end of a long street and don't want multifamily projects in my neighborhood.  27 In favor of the ZO update with the following considerations. Not in favor of allowing use of spray manure fertilizer on farms in Bayside Conservation. Strongly in favor of ADA compliant sidewalks particularly in village areas. In support of TIAs for large developments.  Doesn't agree with by right of up to 8 dwelling units in B-2.  Use District Regulation  Agree w/ changes.  Article 6A Corridor Developm District, S 4 Access  TIA thresh Article 14 14-2(4)(a)  | comr<br>gover<br>asset   | nmunity. It is just an excuse for continued ernment overreach. Will devalue property ets by continuing to restrict legal use of   | Do not adopt ZO update.    | N/A   |
| considerations. Not in favor of allowing use of spray manure fertilizer on farms in Bayside Conservation. Strongly in favor of ADA compliant sidewalks particularly in village areas. In support of TIAs for large developments.  TIA thresh Article 14 14-2(4)(a)   | 26 Conc<br>proce<br>allow<br>Lando<br>purch<br>these<br>lando<br>for af<br>it. I p | cerned that the standard review and approval cess is not proposed to be circumvented to w new land uses as a matter of right. downers, residents, and business owners chase land with specific expectations. Altering se expectations and uses harms current lowners. Doesn't think localities should push affordable housing. Let the market determine purchased my home at the end of a long street don't want multifamily projects in my | right of up to 8 dwelling  | Section 5-40.1(3)<br>p.79 Village Mixed<br>Use District (B-2)<br>Regulations  |
| and 14-4( 231.  Doesn't want their easement to be changed.  Unclear  N/A   | consi<br>spray<br>Cons<br>sidew<br>of TIA  | siderations. Not in favor of allowing use of ay manure fertilizer on farms in Bayside aservation. Strongly in favor of ADA compliant walks particularly in village areas. In support As for large developments.   |                            | Development District, Section 6A- 4 Access p. 111;  TIA threshold - Article 14, Sections 14-2(4)(a)(xv) p.216, 14-3(3)(g) p. 224, and 14-4((3)(c)(ix) p. 231. |

|    | Comments  | Main Topic           | ZO Section and        |
|----|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
|    |   |                      | Page Number           |
| 29 | Opposed to multi-family in Court House. Opposed   | No multi-family.     | Section 5-40.1(3)     |
|    | to mixed-use due to parking and traffic. Consider | No mixed-use.        | p.79 Village Mixed    |
|    | Building 2 and the amount of parking needed. With |                      | Use District (B-2)    |
|    | these changes the integrity and lifestyle of the  |                      | Regulations           |
|    | small-town Main Street is forever gone.           |                      |                       |
| 30 | RPC 26755 Can we build on this property –         | N/A                  | N/A                   |
|    | property line extends into water                  |                      |                       |
| 31 | Will zoning amendments change taxes? If so, how?  | Impact to taxes.     | N/A                   |
| 32 | Outrageous to change the ordinance. When I        | Colemans Crossing    | Possibly section 5-   |
|    | bought this home, I assumed that zoning would not | development. No      | 40.1 (3) p.79 Village |
|    | change.   | changes to zoning to | Mixed Use District    |
|    | Are you getting money from the federal            | allow more           | (B-2) Regulations     |
|    | government?                                       | development.         |                       |