



## DUMFRIES, VIRGINIA

Virginia's Oldest Continuously Chartered Town  
CHARTERED 1749 INCORPORATED 1961

John Wilmer Porter Building  
17755 Main Street  
Dumfries, Virginia 22026-2386  
Tel: 703-221-3400 / Fax: 703-221-3544  
[www.dumfriesva.gov](http://www.dumfriesva.gov)

### Planning Commission Minutes 04/13/2015

#### WORK SESSION 6:00 pm

**Present:** Arshad, Webb, Padberg, Miles, West

#### OFFSTREET PARKING DISCUSSION

**Mr. Ashad:** started a discussion on the definitions of stable, suitable, and durable were as referenced in the proposed language.

**Mr. Webb:** Gravel driveways are suitable and he finds the terms unsatisfactory. Doesn't want a citizen to have to go through DPW or Town Council for a driveway or parking lot surface approval.

**Mr. Padberg:** agrees that author wisely notes that gravel is not approved. Mr. Padberg wants gravel allowed in the R-1 and R-2 Districts. How will this effect current gravel business lots?

PC requested that the Town Attorney review the regulations to see how they would apply to the proposed language changes. Both the Town Attorney and Zoning Administrator agreed that these regulations could not be retroactive and would only effect new development in Town.

**Mr. Webb:** began discussion on Vested Rights in regards to Building DCSM and Zoning. The example of ADA compliance and vested rights was discussed. Also requested interpretation from Town Attorney.

**Mr. Padberg:** discussed civil rights statute. Discussed Building Code applications for properties on whether or not a building has to come to code for ADA compliance, and that it is based on a percentage of cost projections.

**Mr. Arshad:** questioned existing gravel commercial lots. Gravel is encouraged due to water runoff concerns. Wants to see the issue sorted out to prevent a legal issue.

**Mr. West:** says the issue needs to be addressed.

**Ms. Miles:** requested a legal interpretation.

**Mr. Webb:** discussed the benefits to gravel type surfaced driveways, doesn't want too many regulations on private property, and doesn't want to see inoperable vehicles in rear yards.

**Mr. Arshad:** option of having a certain amount of vehicles be the determining factor for which type of parking surface be required, a ratio of vehicles to surface area determining type of surface.

**Mr. Padberg:** wants to figure out how to pave less, not more. Not sure what the problem is and what is broken. What does the PC need to solve?

**Mr. Webb:** agreed to attend the Town Council work session on April 21, 2015, to ask the TC what their objective is with changing the ordinance language. Questioned 30% lot coverage for paved driveways.

**Ms. O'dell:** noted that other localities limit residential lot coverage to 30%, which includes the driveway and all structures on the lot.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. West made a motion to adjourn, Padberg gave the 2nd.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John E. Webb, Chair