GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
SEPTEMBER 16, 2026

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2026, AT 6:00 PM, HYBRID IN-PERSON WITH REMOTE VIA TELEPHONE AND ELECTRONIC MEANS.

Members present:	John McCloskey, Chairman Mark Kelpe, Vice Chairman David Mastervich, Member Jason Snow, Member
Staff present:	Stephanie Golon, Deputy Planning Director/Deputy Zoning Administrator Cristy Snead, Permit Technician/Planning Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCloskey called the meeting to order.

DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Each Commissioner stated their name to establish a quorum.

Mr. Snow
Mr. Kelpe
Mr. Mastervich
Mr. McCloskey

There was a quorum with four Commissioners present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & MOMENT OF SILENCE

Mr. McCloskey stated that they would start the meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Grange Commons, LLC is requesting a Special Use Permit to establish a church and operate a private school serving grades K–8. The proposal includes the use of the existing 6,557-square-foot building, the construction of a 7,000- to 8,000-square-foot addition, an expanded parking area, a playground, and associated access, in accordance with Articles 4-1-2, 3-1-2.14, and 3-1-2.18 of the Greene County Zoning Ordinance.

The subject property is identified as Tax Map Parcels 40A-(1)-1 and 40A-(1)-2, together with the existing legal access easement across Tax Map Parcel 40A-(1)-3, as shown on Plat Cards 6157–6159, which will provide access to the proposed church and private school. Tax Map Parcels 40A-(1)-1 and 40A-(1)-2 consist of approximately 24 acres and are located on the northwest side of the intersection of Fredericksburg Road and Seminole Trail. The property is zoned A-1 (Agricultural) and is designated as "Rural Area" on the Greene County Future Land Use Map. (SUP26-004)

Mrs. Golon presented the Grange Commons church and school request (SUP 26-004) and opened with a framing reminder about what a special use permit actually is: a use presumed to carry greater impacts than those allowed by right, which makes the commission's job to review the application, identify those impacts, and mitigate them through conditions. She was careful to bound the scope of the evening's decision, noting that several matters sit outside the commission's task and get resolved in later

processes — the site plan review, where staff works with VDOT to determine what the entrance looks like, and the change-of-use process handled by the building official through his permitting review.

On the substance of the request, she explained that the applicant is seeking a facility for up to 400 participants in the church or assembly space and 125 students in the school. The existing structure on site is roughly 6,500 square feet, with a site plan concept proposing an addition bringing it up to about 8,000 square feet of new space. The property is zoned A-1 and falls within the rural growth area of the county's future land use map and comprehensive plan. She flagged an important property detail: there are no division rights associated with the two 10-acre parcels, so the applicant would need to do a boundary line adjustment and abandon the shared property line in order to place the use across both parcels. She walked the commission through the standard set of maps, including the aerial, confirming the site sits in the county's rural area.

Returning to the question of conditions, she stressed that any condition has to be directly attributable to a documented impact rather than simply reflecting what the commission would prefer — screening for noise, full-cutoff lighting for light spillover, and similar measures tied to identifiable effects. She then summarized the agency review. Emergency services had submitted a lengthy list of concerns, many of which she suggested were better handled at site plan, though the commission could adopt a condition requiring that those items be reviewed at that stage. VDOT issued its usual standard letter, and she pointed out that VDOT has no real authority at the special use permit stage and functions more as a recommending body, with its formal involvement coming during site plan review, which will require an amended plan. On utilities, the health department weighed in that the applicant will need a certified engineer to evaluate both the existing septic system, originally sized for a farmers market, and the well, for the intensified use.

She closed by characterizing the draft conditions as a foundation rather than a finished product, inviting the commission to go through them step by step and amend them as it saw fit before making a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.

Justin Shimp introduced himself as the engineer on the project, representing Grange Commons LLC, the current property owner, and began by placing the request in its history. The same church had been before the commission roughly two months earlier on this property, and he had been working with the congregation for several years to find a location in Greene County. The original site was at the Greene–Albemarle boundary, where a special use permit and a rezoning from commercial to mixed residential church and school had already been approved; that site remains close to approval but has proven difficult on overall site work and sewer connections. While that was being worked through, the church explored alternatives and landed on this property, a barn the owner had built as a farmers market that never materialized as the envisioned farm co-op. With the building sitting unused, the church saw an opportunity. Shimp noted the location shifts them from the Greene–Albemarle line to essentially the Greene–Madison line, and that the congregation is enthusiastic about it, calling it a beautiful spot for a church.

On the specifics of the ask, he confirmed the request covers an expected church attendance of 400 and up to 125 students, and acknowledged that the project will have to clear a change of use with the building official to satisfy assembly requirements in the building code regardless of whether a special use permit were required. He noted the school figure matches the size of a school the ministry has successfully run in the past, and that it would be a K through 8 program. Walking through the site concept, he explained that the proposed church addition is about the same size as the existing barn, roughly doubling the structure, with the church and school housed in that same building. He was deliberate about correcting a possible misimpression from his original concept plan: because it showed only a portion of the property rather than the whole, the development can look larger than it is. In reality the buildings and permitted area sit up near the road, and the bulk of the two parcels remains undeveloped farmland, though the church may eventually want a cleared area for children to play ball.

The heart of his argument was that a church fits the rural context. He described churches as part of the fabric of rural areas, typically the largest structures one encounters there, and argued that both the building as constructed and the use itself are consistent with the historic character of rural Greene County and rural areas generally — so the proposal does not pose the kind of threat to the character of the land that a special use permit review is meant to guard against. He pointed out that the barn is arguably one of the most agricultural-looking structures along that corridor. He also displayed a county GIS map with a church layer turned on, showing churches scattered throughout the community, and suggested many predate special use permit requirements for that use, which to him further demonstrated that this is fundamentally a rural-area use.

On traffic — which he identified as the concern folks worry about most — he made the case that Route 29 is about the best place for this kind of facility. While acknowledging there have been issues at that particular intersection, he argued that siting a church and school here avoids pushing congestion back onto narrow back-country roads, where a church would otherwise typically be located, and counted that as a positive for this site. He closed by emphasizing that the structure already exists and the proposal is simply about repurposing it for something beneficial to the community: an assembly and gathering space, and an alternative education choice for families who want it.

In the questions that followed, Shimp confirmed that the main change since the earlier hearing is the larger structure and the inclusion of a second parcel, and explained why they came back voluntarily. Neighbors had raised concerns that the project would expand further, and the church's plans had genuinely shifted — the original arrangement contemplated leasing the building, but the congregation decided to purchase the property and make it a permanent home, which meant proceeding with a full build-out. Rather than proceed on the old submittal, they resubmitted with the complete picture in the interest of transparency. He confirmed the church intends to purchase both parcels, with the special use permit applying to both, and clarified that access comes via an easement over a third parcel to the west. VDOT had wanted the entrance set well back from Route 29 to avoid queuing problems, and although the barn could have had a closer agricultural entrance, the owner permitted and built it as a commercial entrance in anticipation of a larger farmers market, which is why it sits so far back and provides good queuing distance. On the addition's configuration, he indicated it is shown attached, though there could be a ten-foot separation, with the intent being church and school side by side in the same basic structure, extending the barn's ridge line straight back for efficiency. Asked about weekend use, he noted school would not run on Saturdays but cautioned against an unnecessarily restrictive condition, since some churches meet Saturday evenings and the congregation may change its schedule over time. On enrollment, he explained the 125 figure represents a five-to-ten-year build-out rather than opening-day attendance, with the school starting at one grade — perhaps ten or twelve children — and adding a grade each year as the ministry has done before.

The commissioners' questioning of Justin Shimp came in two stretches: an extended round of questions immediately after his presentation, and one follow-up later in the evening when the commission was working through conditions and pulled him back in.

Mr. Kelpe led off by trying to pin down what had actually changed since the applicant's last appearance, summarizing it as the structure simply getting bigger. Mr. Shimp confirmed that directly. Mr. Kelpe then asked whether the earlier application had covered one parcel or both, and Shimp confirmed it had been only one. Mr. Kelpe supplied his own reasoning — that they need the space — and Mr. Shimp took the opening to add context he said he should have included in his opening statement: one reason they came back at all was neighbor concern that the project would keep expanding. When the original submittal was filed, around April, the arrangement under discussion with the church and the owners was that the church would lease the building. The congregation subsequently decided to purchase the property and make it a permanent home, at which point the team concluded they should proceed with a full build-out. Rather than leave the older, smaller picture on the record after changing course, they thought it best, in the interest of transparency, to resubmit so everyone could see the complete plan. Mr. Kelpe also responded to the church-distribution map Mr. Shimp had used to show that churches are

part of the rural fabric, saying he found it interesting and offering his own read of the same data — that what he considers the more remote parts of the county actually have more churches.

Mr. Mastervich pressed on the property and access questions. He asked whether the church intends to purchase both parcels, and Mr. Shimp confirmed they do, with the special use permit applying to both. Mr. Mastervich then noted that the entrance nonetheless sits on a third parcel to the west. Mr. Shimp confirmed that as well, explaining there will be an easement over that parcel to reach the site, and that the entrance was placed well back because VDOT wanted it a long distance from Route 29 to avoid queuing problems. He added a piece of history: although a barn could have had a closer agricultural entrance, the owner had it permitted and built as a commercial entrance in anticipation of a larger farmers market, which is why it is set so far back — and which gives good queuing distance for traffic coming in and out. Mr. Mastervich next asked whether the addition would attach to the existing building or stand separate. Mr. Shimp said the drawing does not spell it out precisely and there could be something like a ten-foot separation, but the intention is for the church and school to occupy the same basic structure side by side. When Mastervich pushed further on the orientation — east-west versus north-south — Mr. Kelpe cut in to point out that the ridge line was the key and that a better image showed it, and Mr. Shimp confirmed that was exactly right: the barn's ridge line would be extended straight back as the efficient way to add on.

Mr. McCloskey raised the weekend-use question that had been left open at the earlier hearing. He noted the first presentation had school running Monday through Friday, that the commission had discussed what happens with weekend events, and that the new application still reads Monday through Friday — then asked whether the applicant was comfortable with no Saturday activity. Shimp said he did not expect school on a Saturday and noted that Robert, the pastor who operates the program, was not present. But he argued for flexibility rather than a tight restriction: he saw no appetite for massive Saturday events at this location, yet some churches meet on Saturday evenings, and if this congregation ever changed its schedule a permit that forbade it would become an unnecessary burden. He turned the question back to the commission, asking whether a condition written with that circumstance in mind would be fair. Mrs. Golon connected it to the same point Mr. McCloskey had raised previously — what if the school wanted to hold a soccer game — and noted the draft conditions were built on a similar foundation that the commission could tweak.

Mr. Snow focused on the enrollment figure, asking whether 125 students was expected on opening day or phased over five to ten years. Mr. Shimp said it was a five-to-ten-year build-out, starting with a single grade of ten or twelve children and moving those students up overtime, and that this ministry had run a school of similar size before and would grow it the same way. Kelpe restated it back as a check — start with the kindergartners and go from there — and Mr. Shimp confirmed they would build up grade by grade. Mr. Snow explained his interest: the commission had spent considerable time at the last hearing on traffic flow coming off Route 29, and a gradual build-out was easier to stomach. Mr. Kelpe agreed, noting that phased growth means any problem can be ironed out while it is still small.

The final exchange came later, after the public hearing had closed and the commission was deliberating on emergency access. Mr. Snow asked about the photograph at the bottom of a staff slide, wondering whether it was taken near the entrance; Mrs. Golon thought the photographer appeared to be standing at the entrance and asked Mr. Shimp to weigh in. Mr. Shimp confirmed that was about right, perhaps slightly inward toward Route 29, and then spoke to the emergency-access concern directly. He noted he could not recall the travelway width offhand but that site plan review imposes minimums for fire apparatus — at least twenty feet so trucks can pass in both directions — so some protections already exist in the fire code. He said his firm does provide second points of access on projects, though usually much larger ones, and that in theory an emergency-only entrance cut might be possible where the travelway splits and wraps around the rear parking area, giving responders a different way into the travel way if something blocked the beginning of it. He was explicit that he was hesitant to commit to anything at that moment, since it would require conversations with VDOT. That framing is precisely what Mr. Kelpe then converted into the motion's added Condition 21 — a secondary, emergency-services-only entrance if permitted by VDOT, to be worked out at site plan.

Three residents signed up to speak once Mr. McCloskey opened the public hearing on the Grange Commons request.

Terry Lawson spoke in support. A two-year Greene County resident who moved from Madison, she is a member and board member of Riverstone Church. She and her husband sold the home they built on family property in Madison in 2012 and relocated to Greene specifically so they could be more involved, having previously driven roughly forty minutes each way; the new site will be a mile from her home. Speaking from her board experience with the church's financial records, she described Riverstone as a congregation of strong stewardship and integrity, and said she hopes it will plug into Greene County through local mission projects. She closed by saying she was not asking the county for anything — the church is there for the community.

Anna Brown, who lives on property adjacent to Grange Commons, spoke in opposition, as she had at the prior hearing. She argued the project keeps growing — more than double the building space, an additional lot, and outdoor recreation areas the applicant apparently didn't need last time — and that this is now the third proposed use for the site. She asked how water and septic capacity will handle the larger building, questions she felt the materials left unanswered, and objected that a commercial venture of this scale is not paying EDUs when the water line runs through its front yard. She also raised the tax-base impact, noting a church designation takes multiple properties off the rolls and lets adjacent land be added as exempt, and asked what happened to growth paying for growth. On rural character, she pointed out that the application's answers addressed only the church when this is a church and a school, and that the new portion, the parking lot, the fencing required for young children, and the lighting together represent a real change to the area. On traffic, she rejected the commission's proximity-to-29 rationale: the intersection is already tight and dangerous, drop-off and pick-up will add backups six days a week, and since most of the county lies west of the site, GPS will route traffic the length of Fredericksburg Road, which is already too narrow and poorly maintained. She urged the commission not to rubber-stamp another Murphy project.

Rick Thomas struck a middle note, offering neither clear support nor opposition so much as a request about how the use should operate. A recent Greene County resident who lives one mile west of the site and who had also spoken at the prior hearing, he said simply that if the project is allowed, he hopes the congregation is given the opportunity to function very much like other churches in the community. He drew on what he had just experienced walking in — hearing the Methodist church next door ring its six o'clock bells — and noted that although he attends Spring Hill Baptist Church, he has thoroughly enjoyed the Saturday morning breakfasts at Westover and in Stanardsville, which might well be a Saturday activity for this church too. His one practical ask was that they be respectful of who is already there and not schedule at the same time as Westover. He added that if they ring six o'clock evening bells, he would count that as a blessing.

Mrs. Golon invited anyone attending on Zoom to raise a hand, no one did, Mr. McCloskey asked once more whether anyone in the room who hadn't signed up wished to speak, and then closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kelpe spoke first and said he thought the application was fine last time and still did. He acknowledged the building is getting bigger but discounted the traffic objection, noting that while the site is not on Route 29 itself it sits right beside it. He liked that the draft conditions require anything above and beyond the approved use to come back for a permit, drawing on his own experience at Spring Hill Church, where an Easter egg hunt draws heavy Saturday traffic. He also made the point that people consistently underestimate how many cars a road already carries, and added that he selfishly liked the inclusion of a second lot because it takes another house off the table — the alternative being that it stays agricultural, where someone could put up a large turkey barn.

Mr. Mastervich remained opposed, as he had been at the prior hearing, and said so on the basis of traffic. He lives off Fredericksburg Road and described pulling out from Vista Heights as dangerous, particularly when VDOT does not keep the shoulder mowed and a low car cannot see oncoming traffic.

He said he had witnessed accidents at Route 29 and Fredericksburg Road, including people badly hurt. He also flagged the EMS write-up's concern about getting in quickly with only one entrance, and objected to the scale — the county has had trouble with anything over 4,000 square feet, and this building goes to roughly 12,000.

Mr. McCloskey shared the location and traffic concern and picked up the single-entrance issue, asking whether a second entrance dedicated to emergency use, separate from school traffic, was possible. Mrs. Golon said staff could certainly ask VDOT, and that the commission could add a condition requiring or approving such an entrance if VDOT allows it. Mr. Snow urged caution on the traffic rationale, noting you could pick any road in Greene County and find heavy traffic — he lives off Beasley — and said his own concern was the weekday operation rather than Sundays, since Sunday traffic does not coincide with commuter volume; on balance he did not expect a large traffic impact.

On the Monday-through-Friday question, Kelpe read Condition 7 — regular activity between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. plus school operations — as broad enough in his view to cover soccer games, a holiday craft bazaar, or a Friday morning men's breakfast. Mr. Kelpe said he was comfortable with the conditions overall, observing that the water and sewer questions raised in the public hearing are handled outside the commission's authority — the Health Department and the building official must sign off regardless, particularly given that the structure was originally built as a barn.

The emergency-access discussion then ran through possible routes, including coming in from the water treatment plant side and driving across the field, with Mr. Kelpe noting a heavy pipeline had been moved through there. Mr. Shimp, asked to weigh in, confirmed site plan review imposes fire-apparatus minimums of at least twenty feet of travelway width, said second points of access are typically provided on much larger projects, and suggested an emergency-only cut might be possible where the travelway splits around the rear parking area — while declining to commit before talking with VDOT. Golon confirmed this would be worked out at site plan.

Mr. Kelpe then moved approval of SUP 26-004 for TMP 48-1-1 and -2 in accordance with the Greene County Zoning Ordinance, public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice, with the listed conditions plus a new Condition 21 for an emergency-use-only entrance if allowed by VDOT. The motion was seconded by Mr. Snow and carried on a roll-call vote with the chair voting aye; Mr. Kelpe – yes, Mr. Snow – yes, Mr. Mastervich – no, Mr. McCloskey – Yes. With a three-to-one vote, SUP26-004 was recommended for approval.

The Greene County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider amending Articles 3 (Conservation District), 4 (Agricultural District), 5 (Residential District R-1), 6 (Residential District R-2), 6A (Senior Residential District), 7 (Planned Unit Development District), 16 (General Provisions), and 22 (Definitions) of the Greene County Zoning Ordinance to revise regulations pertaining to manufactured homes. The proposed amendments are intended to bring the Greene County Zoning Ordinance into compliance with amendments to Virginia Code §15.2-2290 concerning the placement and regulation of manufactured homes. (OR26-001)

Mrs. Golon presented OR 26-001, noting the amendment is state mandated and that the commission had reviewed it in a prior public work session. She advised that the only change since that session appears in the amended definitions, where she struck the provision excluding accessory dwelling units from being mobile homes, as state code does not allow the county to prohibit that for residential use. The remainder of the document is unchanged from the work session draft. Mr. McCloskey noted that all jurisdictions are updating their ordinances to reflect the change in state code, and that manufactured homes are now built to higher standards than older mobile homes. No one spoke during the public hearing, and the chairman closed it. Mr. Mastervich observed that the county is simply falling in line with state code. Mr. Kelpe moved, in accordance with the Greene County Zoning Ordinance, public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice, to recommend approval of OR26-001 as submitted by staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mastervich and carried on a roll-call vote

with the chair voting aye; Mr. Kelpe – yes, Mr. Snow – yes, Mr. Mastervich – yes, Mr. McCloskey – Yes. With a four-to-zero vote, OR26-001 was recommended for approval.

The Greene County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider amending Articles 3 (Conservation District), 4 (Agricultural District), 5 (Residential District R-1), 6 (Residential District R-2), 6A (Senior Residential District), 7 (Planned Unit Development District), 8 (Business Restricted District B-1), 10A (Technology/Flex Research and Development District), 11 (Industrial Limited District M-1), 16 (General Provisions), and 22 (Definitions) of the Greene County Zoning Ordinance to revise regulations allowing Mobile Food Units and establish regulations for Mobile Vendor Units (OR26-002)

Mrs. Golon reported that the commission had held two work sessions on the item and that she made only a few changes following the final session. Applications must now be routed to the Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services and the Fire Marshal's Office, in addition to the Health Department for water and sewer, to ensure those agencies weigh in. She added language making clear that the units cannot be permanent structures in the business and industrial districts, consistent with the prior direction that units may not remain set up in residential districts. The remaining changes require compliance with the sign ordinance and that the permit be kept on location so a zoning officer can verify it on inspection. The balance of the document is unchanged from the work session draft.

No one signed up to speak in the room, and no one attending online wished to comment. The chairman closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kelpe spoke in support of the revisions, noting that requiring Fire Marshal sign-off and visible posting of the permit parallels the practice at conventional restaurants, that prohibiting units from remaining set up in residential areas addresses his concerns, and that limiting the number of units to three per lot avoids the concentration of food trailers seen elsewhere. He also supported allowing longer-term units in agricultural areas to connect to sanitation and power rather than relying on generators. Mr. McCloskey agreed the amendments represent reasonable compromises that remain more controlled than other jurisdictions while still creating opportunity for new businesses.

Mr. Kelpe moved, in accordance with the Greene County Zoning Ordinance, public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice, to recommend approval of OR 26-002 as submitted. Mr. Snow seconded. The motion carried, with Mr. Kelpe, Mr. Snow, and Mr. Mastervich voting aye and the chair voting aye.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Rural Subdivisions

Under comprehensive plan review, Mrs. Golon presented an informational briefing on rural subdivisions, accompanied by a memo and PowerPoint. She explained that the topic surfaced repeatedly in the comprehensive plan surveys and in conversations with community leaders and members, who generally do not understand how these divisions occur. She stressed that the presentation took no position for or against the practice; the purpose was to ensure the commission understands the county's current ordinances before making comprehensive plan recommendations.

She reviewed the framework for A-1 and C-1 zoned property. In 2001 the Board of Supervisors adopted ordinances assigning a calculated number of division rights to each tract in those districts, and the Board, as the legislative body, controls how divisions occur. A division "by right" means the owner may divide the land, provided all zoning and subdivision ordinance requirements are met, through administrative review by staff and the reviewing agencies, without a public hearing before the commission or the Board.

Mrs. Golon then described the mechanisms by which rural land is divided without constructing a public road, noting that a public road is the expensive element on the order of millions of dollars per mile. Family divisions are defined by state code, mirrored in the county ordinance, and allow an owner to convey lots to immediate family members, who must retain the property for five years before transferring it outside the family. Agricultural partitions require lots of ten acres or greater for bona fide agricultural purposes and may be served by a private road; she cited the rear parcels at Grange Commons as an example. A single lot exemption allows each parent tract one division without meeting those criteria and without public road frontage, but the exemption is lost once any family division or agricultural partition is taken. She noted that family divisions and single lot exemptions need only meet the minimum lot size, whereas agricultural partitions must meet the ten-acre threshold. Where additional division rights are assigned to partitioned acreage, those lots remain restricted to the same mechanisms or must be served by a public road.

She also described rural subdivisions developed with public roads, such as Hancock Farms, where developers exercise their division rights but must invest in road construction and meet the minimum lot area and frontage requirements for the A-1 and C-1 districts.

On legacy subdivisions predating or contemporaneous with zoning, Mrs. Golon reported that staff now requires road maintenance agreements for private roads, though she acknowledged that older agreements, such as at Dogwood Valley, lack enforcement provisions. She noted that subdivisions including Wood Drive and Twin Lakes are responsible for their own road maintenance, and that the office receives inquiries roughly annually from residents seeking to bring private roads up to state standards — a process requiring an engineered plan, adequate right-of-way and drainage, at a cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mrs. Golon concluded that she was not seeking feedback or recommendations, but wanted the commission to understand that these are by-right divisions. She recalled similar discussions across localities in 2006 during a comparable growth period, observing that division rights implicate property rights and retirement planning and are therefore a difficult subject — which is precisely why an informed conversation is necessary. She noted that any changes would begin with recommendations in the comprehensive plan.

Mr. McCloskey commented that private road conditions have been a recurring subject throughout his tenure, and that many buyers purchase property unaware of what they are taking on; he suggested a need for greater education or disclosure at the point of sale. Mrs. Golon agreed, noting that staff appreciates when realtors or prospective buyers call the office, and that comparable issues arise with water supply as well as roads in subdivisions such as Green Mountain Lake.

Mrs. Golon advised that the memo had been shared with the RAC, where there was considerable interest, and that she would share it with the Board of Supervisors the following Tuesday so that all parties are working from the same information as these conversations continue.

MINUTES

July 15, 2026, minutes.

Mr. Snow motioned to approve the minutes; Mr. Mastervich seconded. The motion carried, with Mr. Kelpe, Mr. Snow, and Mr. Mastervich voting aye and the chair voting aye.

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

Ruckersville Advisory Committee - Mrs. Golon reported on the Ruckersville Advisory Committee, which she attended. Attendance at the meeting was strong, and she noted Mr. Mastervich's absence, which he explained was due to a conflicting meeting. Mrs. Golon advised that the committee reviewed the

development report, as is customary for those meetings, and that she presented the same rural subdivision PowerPoint given to the Planning Commission. She also promoted the comprehensive plan update, making the committee aware of upcoming pop-up events and encouraging participation in any committees that may develop out of the comprehensive plan process. She characterized it as a good meeting and described the committee as a strong group, a view Mr. Mastervich shared. Ms. Golon noted separately that the rural subdivision memo had generated considerable interest at the Ruckersville Advisory Committee, which prompted her to bring it to the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

Town of Stanardsville – Mr. McCloskey reported on the Town of Stanardsville, advising that he attended the town's meeting on Monday and that the town is working on several ordinances that will eventually come before the Planning Commission.

The town is developing a blight ordinance and is working with the county's building official on a property maintenance code, prompted in part by several properties, including some on Ford, that would be considered blighted. The town has also undertaken landscaping improvements, hiring contractors to clear planting beds and remove weeds growing in the pavement.

Mr. McCloskey reported that the town voted Monday to go live with a new official website. The prior site operated as "Friends of the Town of Stanardsville," which meant agendas were not posted in advance and minutes were not available to anyone other than council members. The new site, developed with an outside developer, is not yet mobile-ready but functions on desktop, and he characterized it as a significant step forward for visibility into town business. The town also adopted policies governing internet use, and materials such as town hall rental information will now be posted online rather than only on paper.

Regarding truck traffic, Mr. McCloskey advised that the town continues to work with VDOT on the Route 230/33 intersection where large trucks turn and travel through town. VDOT has agreed to a sign restricting large trucks to left turns only, though details are still being worked out and the mayor believes the town may have to purchase the sign. The commission discussed the difficulty of restricting through trucks, which Ms. Golon noted would require approval from both the county and Madison County and has been attempted previously without success, and the related need to have routing updated in mapping services so trucks use Route 33 rather than Route 230.

Mr. McCloskey further reported that the town adopted a stormwater ordinance, presented at the meeting by Mr. Leake, mirroring the ordinance the county adopted last September. The town is also pursuing zoning and subdivision ordinance changes, which the county attorney, Mr. Sipe, wishes to bring before the Planning Commission in November — not as a public hearing, but for the commission's review — with a target of adoption by December. Mr. McCloskey and Mrs. Golon both characterized that schedule as ambitious.

Development Activity – The Commissioners had no questions about the development activity memo

Next Month's Agenda - Turning to next month's agenda, Ms. Golon advised that the commission will consider a special use permit for a confectionery home business in Ruckersville. The applicant is seeking to make chocolates in an accessory structure on the same parcel as her residence.

Ms. Golon further reported that she has begun work on accessory dwelling unit regulations, a matter previously raised by both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, and hopes to bring the topic to a work session next month. Mr. McCloskey observed how prominently accessory dwelling units are featured in current news and media coverage.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,
Cristy Snead,
Secretary

_____
Planning Commission, Chairman