

**Town of Round Hill
Planning Commission Meeting
April 6, 2021
7:00 p.m.**

A meeting was held by the Round Hill Planning Commission on Tuesday, April 6, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 Pandemic, this meeting was conducted electronically pursuant to the *Emergency Ordinance to Modify Public Meeting and Public Hearing Practices and Procedures to Address Continuity of Operations Associated with Pandemic Disaster*, adopted by the Mayor and Town Council on April 28, 2020, and re-adopted on December 16, 2020. There was no public access to the Town Office for this meeting. The Chairman, Planning Commission Members, Staff, and the public attended this meeting electronically using the link provided on the Agenda.

Planning Commission Members Present

Manuel Mirabal, Chairman
Peter Buxton
Frank Etro
Michael Hummel
Todd Tschantz

Staff Members Present

Danielle Albright, Town Planner
Maureen Gilmore, Town Attorney
Martha Mason Semmes, Deputy Zoning Administrator

Members of the Public Present

There were no members of the public present.

IN RE: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commission Member Hummel led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

IN RE: CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Mirabal called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m. Chairman Mirabal stated that, with all members of the Planning Commission present, a quorum was established.

IN RE: PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

IN RE: DISCLOSURES AND COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commission Member Etro stated that he has been having discussions with Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes and Town Planner Albright regarding a privacy fence he may install at his property; during these discussions it was determined that a permit to do so is not required.

Town Planner Albright stated that she and Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes will address this issue during their review of ordinances for any changes which may be required.

IN RE: APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Mirabal asked if there were any changes to, or comments on, the Agenda.

Commission Member Etro asked if the Planning Commission was going to review the entire *Draft Parking Study* this evening, or break it down into sections. Chairman Mirabal stated that, as Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes was not in attendance, he was not sure the Planning Commission "will ... be able to go through that with any kind of detail satisfactory to Planning Commission Members," and noted that the entire document would be reviewed at the next meeting. Town Planner Albright stated that the memorandum sent to Commissioners prior to this evening's meeting was intended to provide a breakout of each of the ideas discussed to-date, and that the plan for this evening's meeting was to focus on the information included in the memo. Additionally, Ms. Albright noted, the Planning Commission was to discuss the timeline for completion of the Study, so that the document can go to the Town Council by October; the goal is to provide the document to the Council so that it may be discussed during the next budget season. Commission Member Etro asked if the *Parking Study* must go through the public process; Town Attorney Gilmore stated that a public hearing is not required, but that a public input session could be held. Further, Ms. Gilmore noted, any changes to any Ordinance brought about by the Study could require a Public Hearing, as could action on easements. It was determined that the *Virtual Workshop* item, as included on the Agenda, is notated appropriately, and does not require that the document be reviewed in its entirety.

Commission Member Hummel then moved **to approve the Agenda, as presented**; Commission Member Buxton seconded the motion. A vote was held; the motion was approved 5-0. The vote is recorded as follows:

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>VOTE</u>
Michael Hummel	Aye
Todd Tschantz	Aye
Frank Etro	Aye
Peter Buxton	Aye
Manuel Mirabal	Aye

IN RE: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

a. December 2, 2020 (Special Joint Meeting with Town Council)

Commission Member Hummel noted that the Town Council previously approved its minutes from this joint meeting, as asked that it be ensured any changes they made are included in these minutes, as well.

Commission Member Etro asked that it be ensured that, on page three, in line 101, the comments were made by Vice-Mayor Mary Anne Graham *on behalf of Mr. Thomas Graham*. Chairman Mirabal asked if doing so affects the subject matter (notation of *black tupelo* trees/*black gum* trees). Commission Member Hummel and Town Attorney Gilmore noted that the Planning Commission, at this meeting, did vote to accept the change to the name of the tree. Commission Member Etro clarified that he was not questioning that issue, but wanted to ensure that the minutes correctly reflects what was said, and that there is consistency in them; Mr. Etro then withdrew his suggestion.

Commission Member Hummel then **moved to approve the minutes as written, with it being ensured that the Planning Commission minutes match those adopted by the Town Council for this joint meeting;** Commission Member Buxton seconded the motion. A vote was held; the motion was approved 5-0. The vote is recorded as follows:

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>VOTE</u>
Todd Tschantz	Aye
Frank Etro	Aye
Manuel Mirabal	Aye
Michael Hummel	Aye
Peter Buxton	Aye

b. March 2, 2021

Commission Member Hummel noted that, in the introductory paragraph, the date should be *March 2, 2021*, not *January 5, 2021*.

Commission Member Hummel referenced lines 231 and 232, on page six, which state, *Commissioner Hummel noted that a concern surrounding this request is the County's seeming unwillingness to connect to Round Hill's utility system.* Mr. Hummel stated that he has no knowledge at all right now of the County's intent for this new building, and that, if they go forward with the fire station, they are unwilling to connect. Commission Member Hummel stated that this sentence, as written, implies that he already knows they are unwilling to connect, and that he does not believe he would have said that. It was decided to strike the sentence.

Finally, Commission Member Hummel addressed the final paragraph on page six, in which possible clean-up from plowing during recent snowstorms was discussed, noting that this paragraph could be misleading to residents; Mr. Hummel asked Town Planner Albright to clarify the issue. Ms. Albright explained that Round Hill contracts with a landscape provider who does a yearly spring clean-up, but who would not repair any damage. Commission Member Buxton noted that this discussion was related to sidewalks, clarifying, per Chairman Mirabal's request, that he asked if Round Hill had a plan for cleaning up debris left by plows on sidewalks – not addressing any damage to sod, or repairing damage to any yards. Commission Member Hummel noted that this section of the minutes, as written, does not include that the discussion was about sidewalks. Town Planner Albright stated that the discussion was about the debris left on the sidewalks, and that the Town's landscape contractor cleans up that type of debris in the spring, normally in preparation for the Hometown Festival. Ms. Albright stated that the language in the minutes would be changed to clarify this issue; discussion ensued regarding the most appropriate way to do so, with it being decided to include language that this was in regard to the clean-up of rocks and gravel pushed by plows onto sidewalks on Loudoun Street.

Commission Member Etro asked if it was correct that a vote was not held for the *Approval of the Agenda*, as stated in line forty-two of the minutes. Discussion ensued, with it being determined that the minutes should reflect that *the motion was approved*.

Commission Member Etro referenced page two, lines sixty-two through sixty-five, and ending with the phrase *Ms. Hynes also explained how notice of the interruptions and compensation are provided.* Mr. Etro stated that his concerns regarding this section goes

to the issue of determining of how much detail to include in the minutes, and noted that the section, as written, does not provide to members of the public information on how notification is to be provided. Mr. Etro asked that information be included in the minutes to explain how notice will be provided. Town Planner Albright explained the various methods for providing this notification; these include placing notices on the Town's website and Facebook page, as well as on *Alert Loudoun*, by providing hand-delivered letters to residents affected by the work, and by the posting of signs. Ms. Albright stated that she will refer to the recording of that meeting, to ensure that Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes' statement is correctly included in the minutes.

Commission Member Etro then referenced discussion, found on page two, beginning with line sixty-nine, regarding the Zoom format for meetings, asking if this paragraph references the introductory paragraph of the minutes. Town Planner Albright explained that the introductory paragraph is included in all minutes, as a disclosure that the meeting is being held virtually. Commission Member Hummel added that the discussion noted in this set of minutes was in regard to the need for additional detail in the minutes, due to the fact that meetings are being held electronically. Chairman Mirabal explained that he was calling for the minutes to be clearer, so that, when they are read by a member of the public, those readers have an understanding of the topic under discussion.

Commission Member Etro referenced line seventy-three and forward, located on page two, which reads ... *he also stated it would be helpful to include the applicable Section of the Code. A Commission Member noted that the Code Section was not included in the discussion. Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that Staff will determine the correct Section and will include the reference in these minutes.* Commission Member Etro stated that he did not believe that Code Section was included. Commission Member Hummel asked to clarify that this refers to the information discussed being included in the January 5th minutes, noting that the Planning Commission sometimes requests changes, which are made by Staff, and noting that Planning Commission members do not see the minutes again after a vote to approve is held. Mr. Hummel further stated that the minutes go to Chairman Mirabal for his signature, following changes being made, and then are posted. Commission Member Hummel noted that the information in question may have been added, as requested. Commission Member Etro asked if the January 5th minutes have been posted on-line; Town Planner Albright stated that she did not believe they had yet been posted. Commission Member Hummel asked Town Planner Albright to verify that the addition was made, prior to the January 5th minutes being posted. Commission Member Etro thanked Commission Member Hummel for his suggestion.

Commission Member Etro stated that he would not bring forth some items he noted in the minutes, although he had concerns regarding, "some of the wording," stating that, "different thoughts are jumping ahead of other thoughts."

Commission Member Etro asked, regarding the final paragraph on page two, beginning with line seventy-eight, in which the Planning Commission was discussing a parcel at the Town Park on Loudoun Street, if Staff was able to find documentation regarding the dedication of that parcel, a side lot behind the houses adjacent to the park. Town Planner Albright stated that she and Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes have been looking for the deed, but have not yet found that document.

Commission Member Etro referenced page four, lines 152 and 153 (a bulleted item), which reads, in part, *A memorandum from the Town Attorney providing information regarding various approaches to addressing parking needs in Round Hill...* noting that the memo addressed *Shared Parking*, not *parking needs*. Town Attorney Gilmore agreed, noting that the request made of her was to provide alternatives regarding *Shared Parking*, and that notating it thus in the minutes would be more accurate. Town Attorney Gilmore thanked Commission Member Etro for noticing this error.

Commission Member Etro referenced page four, beginning in line 135, dealing with possible changes to the plan; Mr. Etro read the notation, as follows: *An explanation that, due to the Franklin Park Trail/Main Street Enhancement Project currently underway, there may be unknown items/issues which may arise, and which could impact the Study.* Mr. Etro asked if it is anticipated that changes in the project may arise which could impact sidewalks and parking conditions. Commission Member Hummel stated his belief that there may be a potential for changes only on Main Street. Town Attorney Gilmore stated her belief that the statement in question refers to the fact that there may be a parking spot lost on Main Street, and noted that, while the statement in the minutes is rather vague, "there will have to be a reassessment based on the inventory that was taken during the *Parking Study*, and what it will look like after the project is done." It was reiterated that the loss of any parking space(s) will only occur on Main Street. Commission Member Etro stated, "I guess we don't know what that impact is." Commission Member Hummel noted that the Main Street Project is still under design. Chairman Mirabal asked Commission Member Etro if he wishes to change this portion of the minutes in any way; Mr. Etro stated that he did not, based upon the explanation provided.

Commission Member Etro noted that he had some questions regarding the *Virtual Workshop conclusions*, but would hold those. Mr. Etro did reference lines 165 to 167, which dealt with the number of parking spaces needed during peak business hours, reading the following: *...Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes explained that this number is difficult to ascertain, due to the ebb and flow of traffic during the business day.* Commission Member Etro noted that Ms. Hynes did say that, and asked if the Planning Commission indicated its need for those numbers, or if it was not going to require that type of traffic count. Commission Member Tschantz stated that the new drafts do contain the number of parking spaces available, totaling approximately eighty-five if the parking lots at the churches are included. Mr. Tschantz noted that he had raised the question of undertaking a count, but that inclusion of this information precludes the need for a count to be conducted.

Commission Member Etro then referenced the second bulleted item on page four, which begins at line 169, and reads as follows: *... if there have been instances when all available parking spaces have been in use at one time, requiring the purchase of land for an additional parking lot; Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes stated that this scenario has not occurred.* Mr. Etro asked if this represents the conclusion that there is no need to purchase land. Chairman Mirabal noted that the Town Administrator is not present to answer that question, and Commission Member Buxton noted that the statement points out that the scenario has not occurred, that all available spaces have not been filled.

Commission Member Etro asked if the third bulleted item on page four, which begins at line 174, is a recommendation; the item reads, *... that a reasonable solution is a shared*

parking lot for public use, as the number of spaces available at the proposed parking areas are greater than was expected, and would support the shared parking concept. Commission Member Etro noted that the Planning Commission did discuss this, and asked if all agreed that *Shared Parking* is a viable solution; all Planning Commission Members agreed. Commission Member Buxton asked Commission Member Etro if he felt this section in the minutes should be annotated to reflect the Planning Commissioners' agreement to this concept; Mr. Etro stated that he felt it should.

Chairman Mirabal noted that the Planning Commission has made a number of changes to these minutes, and sought to ensure that Staff has captured all the changes; Town Planner Albright assured the Chairman that she has all the corrections requested.

Chairman Mirabal asked Planning Commission Members if they wished to make any additional changes to the minutes of March 2nd. Commission Member Buxton asked for clarification of the exact location of the property on West Loudoun Street discussed as a possible location for a parking lot, as found on page five, beginning in line 188; Commission Member Tschantz noted that he had raised the possibility of locating a lot at the 15 West Loudoun Street site, and that, following discussion by the Planning Commission, it was removed from consideration.

Commission Member Buxton then made a motion **to approve the March 2nd minutes, as amended**; Commission Member Etro seconded the motion. A vote was held; the motion was approved 5-0. The vote is recorded as follows:

<u>MEMBER</u>	<u>VOTE</u>
Manuel Mirabal	Aye
Michael Hummel	Aye
Frank Etro	Aye
Todd Tschantz	Aye
Peter Buxton	Aye

IN RE: PARKING STUDY VIRTUAL WORKSHOP

a. Staff Updates

Town Planner Albright noted that, based upon feedback received at the last Planning Commission meeting, Staff made the following updates to the *Parking Study*:

- Inclusion of a Table of Contents at the beginning of the document
- Addition of addresses for all properties/businesses referenced
- Preparation of the memorandum provided to Commission Members, which highlights six items requiring further review, and which will be used to guide discussion this evening

Discussion ensued regarding the method by which each item would be reviewed, with it being decided to discuss each of the six items individually.

b. Virtual Workshop

Town Planner Albright began this portion of the meeting by highlighting her memorandum, *Draft Parking Study Recommendations*, and presenting each recommendation for discussion, as follows:

➤ Annual Parking Roundtable or Survey

This would be held by invitation of the Mayor to Round Hill business owners/leaders, and would provide an opportunity for those invited to discuss problems and/or issues they may be encountering, both with Town officials and with one another, and to put forward any recommendations they may have. Town Planner Albright reported that, when the *Parking Study* was undertaken anew, after a period of inactivity, letters were sent to businesses to afford them the opportunity to voice questions, concerns, and/or recommendations; only one response was received.

Commission Member Etro stated that he sees this list as an implementation plan, and noted that this item should be referred to more specifically as "a roundtable to discuss shared parking." Mr. Etro asked if this is really what the Planning Commission is looking for, as the item reads as part of the implementation portion of the plan. Chairman Mirabal noted that he, too, sees this as a long-term portion of the plan, and stated that it has little to do with the subject before the Planning Commission this evening. Commission Member Etro noted that, as he understands the process, a parking plan is to be provided to the Town Council in the near future, so that it may be considered during budget and planning discussions; furthermore, the Planning Commission has already come to the conclusion that shared parking is a viable solution to some of the parking issues faced by Town businesses. Commission Member Etro asked if shared parking would be a specific item Town officials would meet with property owners to discuss, prior to further action by the Town toward shared parking solutions; additionally, Mr. Etro asked if the Town will play a part in this solution, or will leave it to property owners to work out among themselves. Commission Member Etro asked for clarification regarding if this is intended to serve as a "sit-down" to discuss shared parking. Town Planner Albright explained that an annual parking roundtable or survey was intended to be a separate recommendation from the shared parking idea. Ms. Albright stated that Commission Member Etro is correct that introducing shared parking would require its own roundtable with the businesses which would be affected. This recommendation (Recommendation #1) was introduced as an idea that would offer an annual opportunity for businesses to provide feedback to the Town on any recommendations which may be moved forward, as an on-going means of communication. Commission Member Etro stated that he understands this would be part of the implementation of the plan; however, he noted, this Recommendation does not address shared parking, which is key to the whole plan. Chairman Mirabal stated that Mr. Etro's point is well-taken, and has been noted, and requested that the Planning Commission continue its review of the items contained in this list of recommendations. Commission Member Etro stated that shared parking is a critical aspect of the whole plan, and needs to be "priority number one" in these recommendations. Chairman Mirabal stated that these are recommendations to the Planning Commission, which are under review, and which may be changed by the Planning Commission. Chairman Mirabal stated that he concurs that the shared parking concept has been agreed upon by the Planning Commission, and stated that the review of the remaining recommendations should proceed at this time.

➤ *Pedestrian Safety Improvements and Signage*

Town Planner Albright explained that this would include way-finding signage, directional signage, and safety signs, with one goal being to provide direction regarding parking to visitors. Ms. Albright noted that the visual for this recommendation was included in the *Draft Parking Study*.

➤ *Install Bike Racks*

Town Planner Albright explained that the intention is to install additional bike racks, as there currently exists only one rack, located at the Town Park. These additional bike racks would help with bicycle traffic, and would ease parking needs, particularly in light of the location of the Franklin Park Trail in Round Hill, which will soon be under construction.

➤ *Zoning Ordinance Amendments*

Town Planner Albright noted that an addendum to the *Parking Study* contains recommended zoning changes; these would improve wording, and would remove any conflicting language.

➤ *Consolidate, Redesign and Reconstruct Existing Parking*

Town Planner Albright noted that this item should probably be renamed *Shared Parking*, to make it clearer, as this Recommendation puts forth the idea of shared parking in the Town as introduced in the Study. Ms. Albright stated that this could become *Item #1* in this list of Recommendations.

➤ *Pocket Public Parking Lots*

Town Planner Albright noted that this idea was originally suggested for use at the parcel adjacent to the Town Park; however, it was the decision of the Planning Commission to remove that specific parcel from consideration for this use. Ms. Albright stated that this concept could be a means to provide additional parking in the business district without needing to purchase additional property.

Town Planner Albright stated that these Recommendations were made in order to provide a combination of short-term, intermediate, and long-term solutions. Ms. Albright suggested a timeline for completion of the *Parking Study* by the Planning Commission, explaining that the final draft of the Study should be provided to the Town Council for its June 16, 2021 meeting, which would allow for the project to be included in discussions for the FY2023 Budget.

Town Planner Albright stated that her presentation was designed to provide a "quick snapshot" of the six Recommendations which were included in the *Parking Study*. Chairman Mirabal thanked Ms. Albright for her presentation.

Chairman Mirabal asked, in addition to the concerns already voiced, and the very specific recommendation made by Commission Member Etro regarding *shared parking*, if there were any other major items members of the Planning Commission wished to bring forward. Commission Member Buxton stated that, as suggested by Commission Member Etro and Town Planner Albright, the primary purpose of this effort is to discuss with all of the local businesses the concept of *shared parking*, in order to "get everyone on-board with the concept." Mr. Buxton noted that he agrees with moving *Recommendation #5* to be the first

item, as it represents the primary recommendation of the study. Commission Member Buxton noted that the term *Annual Parking Roundtable* seems imprecise; Chairman Mirabal stated his belief that it represents an effort to give the public an opportunity to share their thoughts.

Commission Member Etro stated his belief that part of the confusion exists as a result of the memo representing an implementation plan, and stated that it should be referred to as such. Chairman Mirabal noted that he does not see the document as such, as it is labelled as a *draft*, and that all of its recommendations may or may not go to the Town Council; therefore, Mr. Mirabal noted, he does not see this document as "an end-all, be-all," which will be submitted without further input by the Planning Commission.

Commission Member Tschantz stated that he agrees with Commission Member Buxton regarding moving *Recommendation #5 – Consolidation* to be the first recommendation, and noted that *shared parking* should be emphasized, as the concept is included in four out of the six recommendations provided. Mr. Tschantz stated that it should be noted that the emphasis on shared parking is the direction the Planning Commission wishes to go in its work on this project.

Commission Member Hummel stated that he had no further comment at this time.

Commission Member Etro stated that he is not questioning whether this is a draft or not, or whether the Planning Commission is revising or discussing the document, but rather is just seeking to clarify any confusion regarding if the document is an implementation plan. Mr. Etro stated that the document under review this evening represents the part of the plan which provides for implementation. Mr. Etro noted that the document does need some "word-smithing" and editing; however, he noted, the implementation plan is usually not discussed until the parking plan/study has been completed. Commission Member Etro asked if he is the only member of the Planning Commission who sees this as an implementation plan, and requested that the document be called what it is – an implementation plan.

Chairman Mirabal noted that he understands Commission Member Etro's point, and has no problem calling this a *Draft Implementation Plan*; Mr. Mirabal suggested that the Planning Commission move forward with any changes it wishes to make to this document.

Commission Member Etro stated, "We're double-tracking; it's in the plan, and now it's in a memo – why don't we just fold it back into the plan, and discuss the plan?" Mr. Etro stated that this also goes to the original question of, "shouldn't we break it up into parts, and discuss the parts one-at-a-time?" Commission Member Etro noted that, right now, the Planning Commission is discussing a part of the plan; however, usually the implementation is not discussed until the other parts of the plan have been. Mr. Etro stated that he did not believe the Planning Commission has done that, as yet, and that Planning Commission members "know what the solution is, but we haven't gone through the plan and documented it." Commission Member Etro stated that he had no further comments.

Chairman Mirabal stated that the Planning Commission should review all parts of the plan, and perhaps should start with how the shared parking portion of the study is currently written; Mr. Mirabal stated, "I'm a little at a loss" by not having Town

Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes in attendance, and expressed his belief that undertaking that type of review is limited without Ms. Hynes' input. Chairman Mirabal stated, "Clearly, I see the need to drill a little deeper, when she's back on the line with us." Chairman Mirabal then opened up the discussion, beginning with *Shared Parking*, and noted his belief that no one on the Planning Commission is opposed to starting with a very specific set of recommendations to the Town Council regarding shared parking. Mr. Mirabal asked if it is correct that the members of the Planning Commission see this issue as being largely described in *Item #5* of the document under review this evening, as noted by Commission Member Tschantz. Mr. Tschantz stated that *Item #5* does provide a portion of the information, but that there is more detail regarding shared parking on page four of the *Draft Study*. Commission Member Tschantz noted that it is unclear if the Planning Commission is working from the draft study tonight, as well, or is just working from the memo, reiterating that, if working from the memo, he would like for *Item #5* to be moved to become *Item #1*, with that item being placed last. Commission Member Tschantz stated that that is his only recommendation this evening, and suggested re-prioritizing the discussion.

Commission Member Etro asked if Deputy Zoning Administrator Semmes was still in attendance; she noted that she was. Mr. Etro noted that Ms. Semmes' guidance is very valuable, and asked if, in writing a plan, goals and objectives should be set, studies should be conducted, a conclusion should be written, and then an implementation plan should be devised? Deputy Zoning Administrator Semmes stated that that scenario sounds reasonable, and explained that a *Parking Study* may not require as much detail in goals and objectives as may be found in a Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Semmes stated that the plan may begin with a description of the purpose of the plan, and then continue with the issues to be addressed by the study; Ms. Semmes noted that Mr. Etro was correct, in that the study, with findings gathered, would provide for recommendations, and that those recommendations could be called the implementation plan. Commission Member Etro stated that Ms. Semmes' explanation was helpful, and explained that he was trying to provide order in the Planning Commission's approach to this project, as it seems to him that the Planning Commission has begun with the final portion of the project; additionally, Mr. Etro noted, he was trying to discern what the goals and objectives are. Commission Member Tschantz noted that the goals and objectives are contained in the *Draft Study*; Commission Member Etro stated that he was aware of that fact, but noted that the Planning Commission has not discussed them, and asked if the group shouldn't discuss the goals and objectives and then move through the document. Mr. Etro also noted that there is information in *Recommendation #5* which does not need to be there, as it is included in the body of the report; he stated that recommendations should be brief. Commission Member Etro expressed his belief that the Planning Commission is doubling its efforts under the process presently in place, with there being no order to the effort. Commission Member Tschantz stated that he does not see the Staff Report as a plan, but rather as a means of providing guidance for the Planning Commission's work; he stated that, "the crux of all of this is in the *Draft Study*," and that it is very well laid-out and clearly defines the roles of the Planning Commission, the Town Council, and the Planning Staff. Commission Member Etro stated that he does not see the goals and objectives presented in the documentation before the Commission; Commission Member Tschantz responded by pointing out that the Comprehensive Plan goal is included. Mr. Etro asked, "what is the goal of the plan?" Mr. Tschantz responded that the document represents an economic study, noting that that was what the Planning Commission was directed to undertake.

Commission Member Etro stated that he was sorry if he was derailing the discussions, but that he was "having difficulty with not knowing what is in the plan, not discussing the plan, not coming to conclusions, as a Planning Commission" that we agree "this is what it should say, this is our goal, these are the objectives." Mr. Etro further stated, "I'm sure we're going to agree with all of the information that the Staff has gathered and the studies they've done ... but, we haven't discussed any of that yet, and here we're talking about how we're going to implement the plan."

Commission Member Buxton agreed that the *Draft Study* should be discussed before the *Staff Recommendations*, and noted that the goal is provided on page four of the draft study. Mr. Buxton stated that the process being followed at this time is the inverse of what it should be, that is, that the draft be discussed before the recommendations. Commission Member Buxton asked Commission Member Etro if this summary accurately represents his suggestion; Mr. Etro stated that it does.

Commission Member Buxton asked if the Agenda for this evening's meeting, or for next month's meeting, should be changed. Chairman Mirabal stated that the Agenda for this evening's meeting includes a "*Virtual Workshop*, to review the *Draft Parking Study* document," and asked to clarify if, according to Planning Commission members, the *Staff Recommendations* for implementation were provided prior to full review of the *Draft Parking Study* by the Planning Commission? Commission Member Etro noted that that summary seems correct. Mr. Etro also noted that he has gotten the impression that there is a resistance to conducting a real workshop, where the Planning Commission would go through the *Draft Study* chapter-by-chapter. Chairman Mirabal stated that he had made that recommendation several months ago, but that type of review did not occur due to circumstances outside the control of the Planning Commission and Staff. Chairman Mirabal stated that he is not opposed to holding a workshop, stating, "I think it would be a good exercise," and noting that this type of process was undertaken during the Planning Commission's revision of the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Mirabal stated that the *Parking Study* is just as important, and that he fully supports doing a "deep dive" on the document, as it has been revised, so that all Planning Commission members can come to some agreement on the study. Mr. Mirabal reiterated his support for doing the type of review being discussed.

Chairman Mirabal requested that a Work Session be scheduled, so that the *Draft Parking Study* may be reviewed; brief discussion ensued regarding holding such a session in-person, rather than virtually. Commission Member Etro suggested that a workshop which is not held in conjunction with a regular meeting be scheduled, so that only the *Draft Parking Study* would be discussed. Commission Member Hummel noted that this would still be, technically, a meeting, but that a meeting may be held for that purpose. Town Attorney Gilmore noted that the terms "work session," and "workshop," are used to describe the same thing, and that that type of session, under FOIA laws, would constitute a public meeting, at which a quorum would be required. Town Attorney Gilmore further stated that many entities believe they can better work on big projects by holding work sessions, and that it would be up to the Planning Commission to determine how such a session would be organized, with an entire meeting being devoted to the project being more in-line with a work session; often, action is not taken at a work session, although it may be.

Commission Member Hummel noted that, of the two Town Council meetings held each month, one is a work session; additionally, Mr. Hummel noted, the Planning Commission has, in the past, scheduled extra meetings as work sessions.

The members of the Planning Commission decided to hold a work session, at which only the *Draft Parking Study* will be discussed; Tuesday, April 27th was chosen as the date for the work session, with the meeting to begin at 6:00 p.m. if held in-person, or at 7:00 p.m. if held via electronic means.

IN RE: TOWN COUNCIL REPORT

Commission Member Hummel reported on the following items:

- Routine Utility and Town matters were discussed
- The Tax and Fee Schedules were updated
- At tomorrow's meeting updates on road and utility projects will be provided
- At tomorrow's meeting the Town Council will vote on changing municipal elections to November of odd-numbered years, in response to a new state law mandating that municipal elections be held in November

Town Attorney Gilmore provided additional information regarding municipal elections, noting that the legislature directed that, after January 1, 2022, all town and city elections are to be held in November of even-numbered years; the Town Council was interested in adopting an Ordinance which would change Round Hill's elections to November of odd-numbered years. A Public Hearing will be held at tomorrow's Town Council meeting on this proposal, with an Ordinance drafted for Town Council action, if the Council chooses to institute this change. In response to a question from Commission Member Etro, Town Attorney Gilmore explained that ballots will be provided to voters dependent upon if a voter is a Town resident or a County resident.

Commission Member Hummel reported that he and Town Administrator/Zoning Administrator Hynes were tasked with working to determine the format for the Planning Commission's work on the western boundary line adjustment requested by Loudoun County at the Sheriff's Office Substation/fire department parcel, upon approval of that plan by the Town Council.

IN RE: STAFF UPDATES

Town Planner Albright reported on the following:

- Work continues on the rehabilitation of the pedestrian tunnel under the Route 7 Bypass; this includes installation of lighting and security cameras, painting, and installation of landscaping. This tunnel will eventually be part of the Franklin Park Trail
- The Round Hill Outdoors Committee has reinvented the Community Garden, which will open at the beginning of May; the committee has also organized the Appalachian Trail Art Show, which is underway, and is working on the Appalachian Trail Festival, scheduled for September 11th and 12th at BChord Brewery
- The Round Hill Hometown Festival is scheduled to be held on Columbus Day weekend
- The application for the kayak launch at Sleeter Lake has been submitted to the County

- She and Utility Billing Clerk McGaha worked to develop a *Utility Handbook* for new utility customers; this resource was made available this week.

Commission Member Etro asked if the Town will install the security cameras at the pedestrian tunnel; Town Planner Albright explained that this will be handled in a manner similar to that undertaken at Sleeter Lake Park, with the Town facilitating the installation of electric service by Dominion Energy, and the installation of security cameras to be done by NextGen Security Concepts. Commission Member Etro asked who is responsible for security; Commission Member Hummel and Town Attorney Gilmore explained that the cameras are there for monitoring purposes only, with the Town responsible for maintenance. Commission Member Buxton stated that it may be preferable to refer to the cameras as *surveillance* cameras, rather than as *security* cameras. Town Planner Albright reported that this is being done at the recommendation of the Sheriff's Department, with Officer Fornwalt involved in this effort.

IN RE: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Mirabal at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Manuel Mirabal, Chairman

Debra McDonald, Recording Secretary