GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 21, 2026

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 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 VIA Zoom Peter Wajda, Member VIA Zoom 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 VIA Zoom
Mr. Wajda VIA Zoom
Mr. McCloskey

There was a quorum with three Commissioners present and two Commissioners present VIA Zoom.

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 HEARING

April Martin and Sherry Martin's request for a special use permit to operate a home-based confectionery business at 47 William Road, Ruckersville, on property zoned **R-1** and identified as TMP 65C-1-91. The property is designated as a rural area on the Future Land Use Map. The request was made pursuant to Articles 5-1-2.6 and 22 of the Greene County Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Golon presented the staff review of Martins' request for a special use permit to operate a home-based confectionery business. She explained that the property is in the Wetzel Village subdivision, is zoned R-1, and is designated as rural on the Future Land Use Map. The business would operate from an existing backyard shed, with production and packaging on site and products shipped or sold at off-site pop-up events. Customers would not visit the property, and staff identified no traffic concerns; VDOT also had no concerns.

Mrs. Golon said the proposal appeared consistent with the neighborhood's residential character and the ordinance's home-business requirements. Staff recommended conditions largely reinforcing those requirements, including compliance with health department, and building official approvals and a final zoning review before operations begin. She noted that the Planning Commission could recommend approval with or without conditions, recommend denial, or defer the request.

After asking whether there were any questions for Mrs. Golon, Mr. McCloskey opened the public hearing. No one had signed up to speak, and there were no speakers in the room or online. The public hearing was closed.

Mr. McCloskey said he had visited the property and had no concerns about the site or traffic. He confirmed that the business would operate only in the blue building behind the house, which Mrs. Golon affirmed. Ms. Martin asked about the sink connection. Mrs. Golon said the matter would be reviewed with the Health Department, was addressed in the recommended conditions, and was being worked on by the applicant. Peter Wajda stated that he had no questions and that the recommended conditions appeared appropriate.

Mr. Kelpe moved to recommend approval of SUP 26-005, requested by April Martin and Sherry Martin for a home business on TMP 65C-1-91 at 47 William Road, subject to the following eight conditions:

1. The home business shall be limited to confectionery production and packaging for wholesale orders, delivery, and shipping in the existing accessory building, substantially as described in the applicant's justification letter dated August 31, 2025.
2. Customers shall not visit the property to shop, purchase products, or pick up orders.
3. All products shall be delivered or shipped off site before the business begins operating.
4. Before the business begins operating, the required sewage connection shall be installed and inspected, and the applicant shall provide documentation of the Virginia Department of Health sewage disposal system operation permit authorizing the proposed use.
5. Bathroom access shall be provided as approved by the building official, and all required building permits, inspections, and occupancy approvals shall be obtained.
6. The business shall comply with all Article 22 home-business requirements. Zoning compliance of the accessory structure and operation shall be confirmed before the use begins.
7. Business-related parking and loading shall occur on the property and shall not obstruct William Road. The use shall not create a traffic safety hazard or congestion. Business materials, equipment, and products shall be stored indoors. Business equipment shall not produce exterior noise, glare, odor, or vibration inconsistent with Article 22.
8. Any proposed expansion beyond the approved building or substantial change in the nature or intensity of the approved business shall require an amendment to the special use permit before implementation.

Mr. Mastervich seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously, with all commissioners voting aye.

WORK SESSION

Mr. McCloskey introduced the work session to review proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance provisions governing accessory dwelling units (ADUs), compare the existing ordinance with the proposed amendments and Virginia's statutory framework, and receive Planning Commission direction before staff prepares an ordinance amendment for a future public hearing.

Mrs. Golon provided background on the County's accessory dwelling unit (ADU) regulations and introduced the proposed review. She explained that the County's earlier mobile-home hardship permits were temporary, and that the ADU ordinance adopted around 2013 has since evolved. ADUs are now permitted by right in certain zoning districts, subject to requirements including size limits, a maximum of two bedrooms, parking, and owner occupancy; manufactured homes were not previously allowed.

Mrs. Golon said the County was reviewing its ordinance in light of the comprehensive plan's discussion of affordable housing and changes to Virginia law. Potential topics for revision include allowing ADUs in additional residential districts, adjusting size limits, considering manufactured homes, and clarifying how ADU floor area is measured, including shared spaces. She also raised questions about density limits in senior residential developments, how ADUs are addressed in the permit process, and how to make the requirements clear for applicants and future property owners. She noted that staff would use the work session to gather Planning Commission direction before further review, including consultation with the County Attorney.

The Commission discussed proposed revisions to the County's accessory dwelling unit (ADU) ordinance. Commissioners considered whether to retain the owner-occupancy requirement. Mr. Kelpe supported retaining it, while Mr. Wajda questioned whether it was necessary and suggested a minimum 30-day rental period as a possible alternative. Mrs. Golon noted that state law allows localities to require rentals of thirty consecutive days or longer, but the Commission clarified that short-term tourist lodging regulations were a separate matter from the ADU revisions.

The Commission also discussed ADU size limits. Mr. Kelpe suggested allowing smaller detached units, while maintaining a lower maximum for detached ADUs and a larger maximum for ADUs within the primary residence. Mr. Wajda suggested using a percentage of the primary dwelling's size rather than a fixed square-foot cap, and Mr. Kelpe supported exploring that approach. Mrs. Golon agreed to research size options.

Mr. Snow raised questions about bedroom limits, occupancy, and potential effects on septic capacity. Mrs. Golon said she would consult with the building official about bedroom limits and the permitting safeguards for building and septic capacity. Mr. Kelpe also suggested requiring two parking spaces for a detached ADU.

No ordinance changes were adopted. Mrs. Golon will review the Commission's feedback and bring updated information to a future work session.

MINUTES

September 16, 2026, minutes.

Mr. Snow moved to approve the minutes; Mr. Kelpe seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

Ruckersville Advisory Committee - Mrs. Golon reported that the Ruckersville Advisory Committee had prepared a presentation for the Board of Supervisors requesting funds for a Parks and Recreation master plan and a facilities needs assessment. The assessment would help identify the County's facility needs, given limited space. Mr. Johnson was scheduled to present the request to the Board on November 10.

Town of Stanardsville **–** Mrs. Golon reported that the Town of Stanardsville had revised the format of its comprehensive plan following the Planning Commission's recommendations. The revised format was provided as an attachment. No action was required from the Commission, and Mrs. Golon noted that the Town could make further changes without returning the plan for Commission review. The Town was continuing work toward adoption.

Development Activity – Mrs. Golon reported that the County's GIS system had recently transitioned, causing some links in the development activity materials to stop working. Staff will check and update the links for next month's report.

The Commission discussed a silt fence near Holly Hill and the Arbors. Mrs. Golon said it may have been installed during regrading work to address road issues and stabilize the site. She also noted that a site plan for the proposed VTG grocery store was available for review.

Regarding Wood Park, Mrs. Golon reported that a pre-construction meeting had taken place with the contractor following approval of the subdivision site plan. Groundbreaking was expected soon. She noted that the project would also require off-site infrastructure improvements along Route 29 and Carpenter's Mill Road, which could affect the construction timeline.

Next Month’s Agenda - Mrs. Golon reported that the next month’s agenda would include a discussion of how state cannabis laws affect local zoning, a follow-up work session on the proposed ADU ordinance revisions, and a public hearing on a special use permit for agriculture in an R-1 district. She also said staff would address the distinction between cannabis regulations and the separate regulation of nicotine and vaping products.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted**,**
Cristy Snead,
Secretary

_____
Planning Commission, Chairman