

Chairman Miller asked if R-M zoning was previously approved for the nearby proposed apartment development. Mr. Martin stated it has been approved, but not yet developed.

There being no further questions for staff, Chairman Miller opened the Public Hearing portion of the case.

Speaking in favor of the request:

- Alex Sharpe, Applicant – 5205 Shiloh Rd.

Mr. Sharpe made himself available to the commissioners to answer questions. Chairman Miller asked if the purpose is strictly for office use. Mr. Sharpe confirmed.

No one spoke in opposition to the request.

There being no further discussion, Chairman Miller called for a motion. Motion by Commissioner Rountree to recommend approval of the request as presented by staff. Commissioner James Miller second. All voted in favor, no one opposed (7-0). Motion carried.

Agenda Item #8

VA-2025-08

Andrew Duren (417 Brookfield Road)
Rezone 3.27 acres from conditional C-C(c) to regular C-C

Mr. Martin presented the case in which the applicant is requesting to rezone 3.27 acres from “conditional” Community Commercial (C-C)(c) to regular Community Commercial (C-C) with no conditions. The subject property is located at 417 Brookfield Road which is along the east side of the road at the Brookfield and Murray Road three-way intersection. The property is currently vacant and the applicant is proposing to develop it as a planned complex of four (4) commercial buildings which total approximately 40,000 square feet. The largest of these proposed buildings (20,000-sf) will be for the applicant’s local flooring company, which will include a showroom, offices, and storage space. The applicant has the property under contract for purchase from the current owner (Staten Plantation LLP), pending the outcome of this rezoning request.

The subject properties are located within a Neighborhood Activity Center (NAC) Character Area on the Future Development Map of the Comprehensive Plan, which allows the possibility of C-C zoning.

This property was annexed and rezoned 21 years ago (file # VA-2004-05) from county C-H, to city C-C(c) after some very contentious public hearings with opposition from nearby residential properties. According to the meeting minutes, the main issues were traffic and the potential range of uses that C-H or C-C might offer. City Council’s solution to this was a unanimous compromise vote to allow C-C zoning, but to place the condition that this property be allowed to