

**TOWN OF ABINGDON  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2022 5:30 PM  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

A meeting of the Abingdon Planning Commission was held on Monday, October 24, 2022,  
at 5:30 PM in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

- A. Kenny Shuman - Chairman called the meeting to Order**
- B. Roll Call – Mayana Rice, Community Development Director**

**Members Present:**

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Mr. Chad Pennington</b>	<b>Present</b>
<b>Mr. Scott Wilson</b>	<b>Present</b>

**Members Absent: Michael Weaver**

**Comprising a quorum of the Commission – Yes**

**Administrative Staff Present:**

Mrs. Mayana Rice – Community Development Director  
Mr. Gabe Cristofari – Planner/GIS  
Mr. Nick Howard – Planning Tech

**Guests: None**

- C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: REGULAR MEETING, SEPTEMBER 26, 2022.  
(VIDEO 0:00 – 0:00)**

- September 26, 2022, Regular Meeting

**On a motion by Mr. Johnson seconded by Mrs. Quetsch, the Planning Commission approved the Regular Meeting Minutes for September 26, 2022, as presented.**

The roll call vote was as follows:

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Michael Weaver</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Aye</b>

**D. PUBLIC COMMENTS: None**

**E. CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATNESS**

**1. *Certificate of Appropriateness; 1<sup>st</sup> Franklin Financial, Stacey Estes, 135 Cook Street, Abingdon, VA 24210; Owner. Brenna Olvera, Bristol Sign Company; Representative. Certificate of Appropriateness for Signage. Located at 135 Cook Street, Abingdon, VA 24210. Tax Map (021-8-2)(VIDEO 5:45 – 9:50)***

**A. Staff report**

**B. Applicant presentation**

**C. PC discussion and decision**

Mr. Gabe Cristofari provided the staff report.

Stacey Estes (Owner) and Brenna Olvera of Bristol Sign Company Walden LLC (Representative) have requested approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new wall sign, and six digital logo prints attached to existing open spaces on the tenant monument sign structures associated with the shopping plaza, located at 135 Cook Street, Abingdon (Parcel 021-8-2). The proposed wall sign will consist of channel letters mounted on a raceway, and be internally illuminated using LED lighting modules.

The property is within the General Business District (B-2) and is under the Meadows Restrictive Covenants and Reciprocal Access Easement Agreement. 135 Cook Street is one of many structures housed within the 10.595-acre parcel. Other structures within the parcel include a Food City and various restaurants and retail stores. There has been no previous sign at the proposed location. The area is a newly developed part of town and is currently in development still.

The proposed wall sign will be one set of 25.5" x 28" channel letters (1<sup>st</sup>) mounted on a 7" raceway. One set of 19.3" x 190" channel letters (Franklin Financial) mounted on a 7" raceway. The raceways will be painted to match the color of the brick used to construct the structure. Both sets of lettering will have black returns, 1" 2050 dark blue trim caps, white acrylic plex faces, and be internally illuminated. Illumination of the sign will consist of LED lighting modules. The total square footage of the proposed wall sign is 39.84 sq. ft. The total length of the primary elevation is roughly 20 ft. making the allowable square footage 40 sq. ft. The square footage for the proposed wall sign meets both the Meadows Restrictive Covenants and Reciprocal Access Easement Agreement, Section 2-A-3 and the Abingdon's General Sign Standards.

Additionally, the type of lettering used and the method of illuminating the proposed wall sign meets the required/appropriate means outlined in the Meadows Restrictive Covenants and Reciprocal Access Easement Agreement:

*All signs shall be channel letters, or a similar application. The use of LED lighting is encouraged.*

There will be six digital print logo signs, attached to open tenant panel spaces found on the existing tenant monument structures associated with the shopping plaza.

**On a motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mrs. Quetsch, the Planning Commission votes to approve the COA as submitted.**

**The roll call vote was as follows:**

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Chad Pennington</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Scott Wilson</b>	<b>Aye</b>

- 2. *Certificate of Appropriateness; Doug’s Super Car Wash, Turnhart Acquisition Corporation, 2506 South Front Street, Richlands, VA 24641. Owner. Jeremy Fields, Appalachia Design Services; Representative. COA. Located at 140 Cook Street, Abingdon, VA 24210. Tax Map ID (021-8-9A) (VIDEO 9:51 - 50:17)***

**A. Staff report**

**B. Applicant presentation**

**C. PC discussion and decision**

Mrs. Mayana Rice gave the Staff Report

Turnhart Acquisition Corporation (Owners) and Jeremy Fields with Appalachia Design Services (Representative) requested approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for a new commercial carwash (Doug’s Super Carwash), located at 140 Cook Street, Abingdon VA (Parcel 021-8-9A).

- **February 2022** The project received original approval on February 28, 2022 with a brick façade and red trim.
- **May 2022** The project was submitted with an amendment to the approved COA to paint the brick façade a Classic Red color and to allow for a brick cement board panel versus real brick. This was determined to not be appropriate by the Planning Commission on May 23, 2022. The applicant indicated they would be amenable to the real brick façade and that they’d like to

return to the Planning Commission with an alternative red color that would be more muted and request to paint the entirety of the structure.

- **June 2022** The project was submitted with a request for a new red (2000-10) to paint the brick façade. The Planning Commission indicated they were not in favor of this and voted to not amend the current COA on June 27, 2022.
- **August 2022** The applicant appealed the Planning Commission decision to the Town Council. The Town Council upheld the Planning Commission’s decision on August 8, 2022.

The applicant has submitted an alternative request to amend the original COA approval.

- Paint the brick Sherwin Williams “Real Red” (SW 6868)
- Change metal panels at the top from originally approved red color to silver
- Replace brick above top of window elevation on 2nd floor to red metal panel

The applicant has indicated by providing minutes and information that the Planning Commission can make an alternative decision to their previous decision and approve the amendments to the COA.

When the Meadows Development went through the original review process the project was part of a public private partnership. This allowed for certain aspects of development to be paid for with tax dollars (infrastructure) in exchange for other aspects of the site to be provided for public investment (land for the sports complex).

Within this partnership an agreement was formed that indicated that that the overall development would follow a process called the Certificate of Appropriateness.

Meadows Development Restrictive Covenants:

*6.3 Certificate of Appropriateness. Before physical development of each Tract, the Owner of said Tract shall apply for and **receive a Certificate of Appropriateness (“COA”)** from the Town of Abingdon Planning Commission and/or the Town of Abingdon Town Council.*

Within the Town of Abingdon’s Zoning Ordinance there is one definition of a Certificate of Appropriateness: *Refers to a permit issued by a board created by the Town pursuant to Code of Virginia § 15.2-2306 to administer the provisions of the Town's historic architectural design control, **or entrance corridor overlay district regulations.***

The Entrance Corridor Guidelines:

*The commission shall consider the following matters in passing on the appropriateness of a particular project:*

**(a)** *Landscaping.*

**(1)** *Landscaping shall be used to soften the visual impact of development and enhance the appearance of the area.*

*(2) Landscaping shall be sufficient to soften the visual effects of parking lots, reduce the effective visual mass of large buildings, and provide screening between the development, the street and surrounding lots.*

*(3) Landscape buffers, shall be provided adjacent to public streets of sufficient size to permit street trees and plantings to be installed to reduce the visibility into parking lots.*

*(4) Landscaping shall be compatible with landscaping on adjacent properties.*

*(5) Landscaping shall be of a high quality and designed in a professional manner.*

**The applicants provided a landscape plan that was approved on February 28, 2022.**

*(b) Signage. In addition to the limitations on the numbers and sizes of signs imposed under Article 21 of this ordinance are the following:*

*(1) Each parcel shall have an overall sign plan which reflects a consistent style and specifies the size(s), and color scheme for proposed signage.*

*(2) Materials used in signs and their support structures should reflect the building served by the sign.*

*(3) Sign colors should be harmonious with the building which they serve.*

**The applicants have NOT provided a signage plan and indicated they would return for a future COA.**

*(c) Architecture and general building characteristics. The following recommendations are provided for architectural styles and general building characteristics:*

*(1) Materials, colors and general style of buildings within a development should be coordinated.*

*(2) Heating and air conditioning units, ventilation units, and mechanical equipment shall be screened from view from public streets.*

*(3) Loading docks, trash containers, mechanical equipment and any sites for storage facilities shall be screened from view from public streets.*

*(4) The effective visual mass of large buildings should be reduced by variations in roof line, building angles, dimension, relief, color, architectural detailing and landscaping.*

**The applicants provided an architectural plan that was approved on February 28, 2022.**

**(d) Design review guidelines.**

*(1) New buildings or exterior alterations to existing structures should include one or a combination of the following materials/methods of construction:*

*(2) Wood frame, (or fiber cement board), with brick, stone, or concrete foundations; brick construction or brick facing; finished concrete block; roof materials of standing seam metal, asphalt shingle, and rubber membrane/parapet for flat roof forms.*

*(3) Windows should be used to provide interest and surface variations on building elevations. Blank building walls are discouraged for most commercial applications.*

*(4) The design of gas station canopies, building canopies and other accessory structures should be compatible with the scale, color, materials, and detail of the buildings they serve.*

*(5) Site walls and retaining walls should be comprised of brick, or concrete; brick facing on a concrete or concrete masonry unit wall. The use of segmental/modular concrete block is discouraged. Site walls should be considered as part of site terracing in increments; site walls out of proportion with building foundations or the human figure are discouraged.*

*(6) Roof forms may be single gable, cross gable, gambrel, hip, parapet, or flat forms. Mansard roof forms are not recommended on modern-styled buildings.*

***(7) Site materials shall be limited to local stone, asphalt, concrete, and exposed aggregate concrete.***

***(8) Facade colors preferably shall be of low reflectance white, earth tone, muted, subtle, or neutral colors. Building trim may feature brighter colors as an accent material. The use of high-intensity, metallic, fluorescent, day glow, or neon colors are discouraged.***

***(9) Trademark buildings and related features including signs shall be modified to meet these design standards.***

**The applicants provided a design that was approved on February 28, 2022. The amendments to the original approval were deemed to not meet the standards of d.7, d.8 and d.9 at the previous meetings in May, June and August. The applicant's new design needs to be reviewed for compliance with the preferred design review guidelines. The design review guidelines allow the Planning Commission to consider the project for appropriateness with the above standards.**

*(e) Site planning. In addition to the requirements of Section 18-2 et seq., the following standards are required in the entrance corridor overlay district:*

- (1) Parking lot layouts shall respond to the topographic characteristics of the site.*
- (2) The number of access points to parking lots from a street will be minimized and shall relate to other existing curb cuts whenever possible.*
- (3) Parking lots will be interconnected on adjacent parcels whenever possible.*
- (4) Small, landscaped and interconnected parking lots, rather than large, central parking lots shall be encouraged.*
- (5) Parking lots shall not dominate the image of a site.*
- (6) Where sidewalks exist adjacent to individual project sites pedestrian access from the sidewalk into individual project sites as well as within sites and between sites shall be provided.*
- (7) The Planning Commission is permitted to reduce the parking space requirement when the interests of the Town are better served.*

**The applicants provided a site plan that was approved on February 28, 2022.**

*(f) Lighting.*

- (1) Lighting should be in keeping with the design of the complex.*
- (2) Lighting should be of uniform style for each project site.*
- (3) Lighting should be contained within the site and designed to limit spillover to streets and adjacent properties and to minimize the amount of light that is directed to the sky.*
- (4) Light poles shall not exceed 24 feet in height.*

**The applicants provided a lighting that was approved on February 28, 2022.**

**Meadows Development Restrictive Covenants**

*6.2 Minimum Design Requirements.*

*A minimum of fifty percent (50%) of 1st floor front and side exterior building elevations, excluding glass, that are visible from the public right of way shall be comprised from the following materials: natural clay brick; and /or natural quarried stone products.*

*Secondary façade materials, which may be used up to forty percent (40%) on exterior building walls include: hard coat stucco, concrete materials (not limited to architectural split face block, tilt up concrete, or precast concrete); synthetic stucco (EIFS); fiber cement siding; and/or other materials as approved by the Abingdon, VA Planning Department, or their designee.*

*Painted smooth faced concrete block, wood, architectural metal, and/or other materials differing from those used as primary and secondary materials may be utilized, in an amount not to exceed ten percent (10%).*

**The applicants are meeting the standards of the Meadows Development Restrictive Covenants.**

Mr. Jeremy Fields (Representative) addresses the board.

Mr. Fields states that the building design cannot support real brick above the windows, therefore he is requesting cement board paneling for the area above the windows.

Mr. Fields is also requesting the color of the brick be painted a different color red.

All of these requests will be separate motions voted on by the Planning Commission.

**On a motion by Mr. Pennington seconded by Mr. Johnson, the Planning Commission votes to approve the red metal panel above the windows as long as the color matches the powder coating on the other sections of the building.**

**The roll call vote was as follows:**

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Chad Pennington</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Scott Wilson</b>	<b>Aye</b>



**On a motion by Mr. Pennington seconded by Mr. Sproles, the board motions to approve the grey metal panels at the top of the structure as presented.**

**The roll call vote was as follows:**

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Chad Pennington</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Scott Wilson</b>	<b>Aye</b>

**On a Motion by Mr. Wilson seconded by Mrs. Quetsch, the board votes to deny painting the brick of the structure because it would not comply with Section 7 of the Overlay District Ordinance.**

**The roll call vote was as follows:**

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Chad Pennington</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Scott Wilson</b>	<b>Aye</b>

**G. OLD BUSINESS/MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA (VIDEO 50:55 – 1:18:25)**

- **COA Waiver, Amber McMillin, 329 Cummings Street**
- **Discussion of Zoning Code**

Mr. Jeff Johnson begins the zoning code discussion by stating that this is just a rough draft of ideas for the zoning code.

Mr. Johnson states that his research into cottage housing is from multiple areas of the country.

He states that he did not find any smaller towns or municipalities that offered cottage housing. It was only found in larger cities.

Mr. Johnson states that he wishes for the entire board to look over his notes for the ordinance and offer their thoughts on the subject.

Mr. Sproles states that he would like the commission to look over Mr. Johnson's notes over the next two weeks and send any notes to Mayana Rice in time to draft the changes for the Planning

Commission public hearing at the end of November.

Mrs. Rice brings up an issue not on the agenda. Abingdon Olive Oil Company would like to put up fencing around their parking lot. Mrs. Rice is seeking the advisory of the commission on if the owner should apply for a certificate of appropriateness or if fencing would be covered under a waiver application.

KC St. Louis addresses the commission.

PC states that the request should come before the commission as a COA so that the record could reflect that the public had an opportunity to voice any concerns about the fencing around the building.

## **H. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **I. ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Johnson motions to adjourn. Mrs. Quetsch seconds the motion.**

**The roll call vote was as follows:**

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Chad Pennington</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Scott Wilson</b>	<b>Aye</b>

**Adjourn Time 6:50 P.M.**

---

Kenny Shuman, Chairman

---

Mayana Rice, Director of Community  
Development

Commission public hearing at the end of November.

Mrs. Rice brings up an issue not on the agenda. Abingdon Olive Oil Company would like to put up fencing around their parking lot. Mrs. Rice is seeking the advisory of the commission on if the owner should apply for a certificate of appropriateness or if fencing would be covered under a waiver application.

KC St. Louis addresses the commission.

PC states that the request should come before the commission as a COA so that the record could reflect that the public had an opportunity to voice any concerns about the fencing around the building.

## **H. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

## **I. ADJOURNMENT**

**Mr. Johnson motions to adjourn. Mrs. Quetsch seconds the motion.**

**The roll call vote was as follows:**

<b>Mrs. Donna Quetsch</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Jeff Johnson</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kirk Sproles</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Kenny Shuman</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Chad Pennington</b>	<b>Aye</b>
<b>Mr. Scott Wilson</b>	<b>Aye</b>

**Adjourn Time 6:50 P.M.**



Kenny Shuman, Chairman



Mayana Rice, Director of Community  
Development