

**Buckingham County**  
**Planning Commission**  
**April 22, 2024**

At a work session of the Buckingham County Planning Commission held on Tuesday April 22, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. in the Peter Francisco Auditorium located in the Buckingham County Administration Complex, the following members were present: John Bickford, Chairman; Ashley Shumaker, Vice-Chairman Dennis Davis, , Joyce Gooden, Pete Kapuscinski, Steve Dorrier, Calvin Bachrach Also present were Cheryl T. “Nicci” Edmondston, Zoning Administrator and E.M. Wright, Jr., County Attorney, James D. Crews III was absent

**Re: Call to Order**

Chairman Bickford called the meeting to order.

**Re: Invocation and Pledge of Allegiance**

The invocation was given by Commissioner Gooden. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Commissioner Dorrier.

**Re: Establishment of a Quorum**

Chairman Bickford certified there was a quorum, seven of eight members were present and the meeting could continue.

**Re: Approval of Agenda**

**Bickford:** Nicci any changes to the agenda?

**Edmondston:** No sir Mr. Chairman.

**Bickford:** Seeing none Do I have a motion to approve as presented?

**Kapuscinski:** So moved.

**Dorrier:** second.

**Bickford:** Have a motion and a second any discussion? All favor Raise your right hand. It is unanimous. All right, brings us approval of minutes, we had the February 20th work. So if you've managed to have a motion approve as presented, or find any errors.

Commissioner	Yay	Nay
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	
Dorrier	X	
Bickford	X	
Shumaker	X	
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	
Davis	X	

**Commissioner Kapuscinski moved, Commissioner Dorrier seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to approve agenda as presented.**

**Shumaker:** A couple of changes on the work session for February 20. And the intro paragraph is listed as being held on Monday but I believe that was Presidents Day. So that was on Tuesday. And then on the second page of the very first table of votes. I'm listed correctly in the votes with an absent but then I'm listed in the text as the One Who seconded the motion but I was not here for that meeting.

**Bickford:** Okay, any other changes so you're going to have a motion to approve the workstation minutes with the changes.

**Shumaker:** So moved.

**Dorrier:** Second.

**Bickford:** Approved. Okay, that brings us to our regular meeting on February 26 minutes. Any changes from it in the commissioners? Have no none. Do I have a motion and a second, please?

Commissioner	Yay	Nay
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	
Dorrier	X	
Bickford	X	
Shumaker	X	
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	
Davis	X	

**Commissioner Shumaker moved, Commissioner Dorrier seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to approve minutes with changes.**

**Edmondston:** Before you move forward, I'm sorry to interrupt. There are some errors 26 That it's listed as February 25. The meeting actually took place on February 26.

**Bickford:** Okay, any other changes?

**Edmondston:** All the dates on the bottom of the on the footer of each page they're incorrect.

**Bickford:** Okay. I have a motion to approve with those changes.

**Dorrier:** Motion to approve

**Shumaker:** Second.

**Bickford:** Okay. That brings us to our March 18. work session. Any changes? Notice from the commissioners? None. Do I have a motion and a second please?

**Edmondston:** One change, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Commissioner Gooden And it says that you were absent yet you voted on page two? Were you indeed present or absent? March 18.

**Gooden:** That's a work session. I don't have my planner with me. So I can't tell you.

**Shumaker:** I think that was the meeting that she missed. I think we held up waiting for her before we did the code of conduct the next week.

**Gooden:** That was the week that we held up the code of conduct until the next. No, I have not participated virtually. Okay.

**Edmondston:** Couple places for the voting. So we'll have that removed correctly.

**Bickford:** I have a motion and second to approve with those changes.

**Shumaker:** Moved

**Dorrier:** Second.

<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yay</b>	<b>Nay</b>
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	
Dorrier	X	

Bickford	X	
Shumaker	X	
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	
Davis	X	

**Commissioner Shumaker moved, Commissioner Dorrier seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to approve minutes with changes.**

**Bickford:** All right, the March 25. regular meeting those minutes are pending. At those bring us down to the 22nd of January the regular meeting which stated corrections by the planning commission. That's also pending correct?

**Edmondston:** I did receive those today. But that was too late for the packet. So they will be on the next month.

**Bickford:** Okay. Very good. All right. We'll move to old business. But we do need to public comment. Has anyone signed up for the public comment period?

**Edmondston:** I know sir. We actually had one individual sign up. But I've noticed this with our Vice Chairman. Just before the meeting. This individual Mr. Jones meant to sign up for the public hearings public. Okay. No one for public comment.

**Bickford:** All right. All right. I will then close the public comment period. And we'll move to our old business. The public hearing for John George.

**Edmondston:** Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, members of the planning commission, we're holding a public hearing tonight for the case of 24 ZMA 340. The applicant is 3000 West clay LLC with John K. George. The property is tax map 31, parcel eights. Approximately two and a quarter acre is located near 31786. North James Madison highway, New Canton in the Marshall magisterial district. Of course, this case was introduced to you last month the zoning on this particular piece of property is agricultural a one and

the request is to rezone or have a zoning map amendment from agricultural a one to business B, one for commercial use, who have Mr. George available to address changes he has included some other documents that were included in the packet for everyone's review, and I'm sure he would be more than happy to address questions and concerns.

**Bickford:** Okay. Thank you. Before we open up the public hearing. Does anyone commissioners have any questions at this point for Mr. George? Mr. George has anything you would like to tell us prior to a public hearing? would you rather wait till after that, sir? Okay, well come on to the podium, sir. State full name, address.

**John George:** My name is John George. And I'm a builder and developer based out of Richmond, Virginia, and have much love family here in Buckingham County been coming here for 30 years. And, Jamie, can we just go quickly through my presentation I gave to the board last month so I can show the people assembled here, what I'm proposing. We can just start with the photo of the building as it is. That's in the application packet. The PDF. That's great. Thanks.

**Bickford:** Yes, sir.

**Kapuscinski:** Was there an issue as I recall with regard to the title or some other paperwork to bring?

**George:** Yeah, there were questions about the boundaries and size of the parcel. So what I did was sent in the title binder, I had the title search done. And so the title insurance company has confirmed the size of the parcel and the boundaries. And the county has that paperwork now. So when I'm ready to go to closing, there will be everyone in agreement of the size or location.

**Kap:** It's as you described?

**George:** It is. Also, I believe you asked a question about septic last time. And I also sent in to Nicci and Jamie the report by the soils engineer saying that there was ample capacity there for what we're proposing. Great.

**Bachrach:** I was reading the stuff you've added for this meeting. And on your title insurance binder. You've got to exhibit a description of the land. That's calling for a deed from 1944. But it's got a paragraph at the end of it. References Plate it being done in 2024.

**George:** That deed doesn't reference that the title binder does because the title company has the survey that I had done The compiled survey and they recommend that that survey be recorded when I close on the property the title binder does reference the 1944 deed but it also says that the plat is a 2024 plat and they are one in the same

**Bachrach:** I saw where it was added to the 1944 deed.

**George:** Right that's a good one. That's a good one. Let's get that one on the screen. Sorry about all this. Okay, so, to make that any bigger. Okay, is there anyone in the room that is not familiar with this particular building? Everybody's seen it. Can anyone remember the last business that it was? Gas Station. When do you think? So when do you think it lasts pumped gas wave? Okay, so pre eight. So 35 years? Yeah. First time I ever saw this building was when I first visited my girlfriend's parents Chuck and Carol Childress on Valentine's Day, some 30 years ago, and I saw that building and I thought, wow, that is a cool building needs to be made into something. But for a long time it was owned by somebody who wouldn't sell it. And then that person passed on and now I have an opportunity to buy the building. But in the meantime, Buckingham has moved forward and has instituted a zoning code. And so anything that wasn't an operating business, I guess in 1997 became an agricultural zoning. So this particular parcel, it sits on about five acres right there on the side of Route 15 As you come across the James River, it's an agricultural zoning just by default. So it was built as a business. Someone told me that it was a Nash automobile dealership was a new car dealership way back when the big excuse me the big window on the right was a showroom and they had a pretty Nash metropolitan probably sitting up there in the window for ready for y'all to buy. And then he did the auto repair in the bays. And I think it was also the hilltop garage for a while. It's always been automotive related business from the day it was built until the day it stopped, which one very long after that for some reason. So what I wish the commission to do is to put b one zoning in place on that five acre parcel so that this particular building can be made back into a business use. And Jamie if you'll put up the renderings, which are the I had an artist's do pictures of the building, if it were just restored to what it originally looked like. And maybe made into a row of small shops. And so I named that James River Landing because it's basically the second building on the right when you come across the James River. It's right at a major gateway to the county route 15 And I envision it being something very handsome, very nice full of businesses, little flurry of activity. And just good way of saying maybe Buckingham County is open for business. Can you show another

rendering of it? This is the simplest possible thing that could be done to of the building. I actually have ideas to put, you know awnings over them. And but it all remains to be seen at all remains to be seen what kind of businesses would want to occupy the building, once it had the proper zoning, like right now, no, almost no business. I mean, it could be a daycare, it could be a farm and garden store. And that's about it with its current agricultural zoning. Okay, and then if you could go to the PDF that shows what I envisioned for a second story. bottom of the PDF. In the b1, zoning district apartments are allowed as a secondary use if they're above businesses. So I thought I found this beautiful rustic hotel in Pennsylvania, and has kind of the same size and shape as the building. So I wanted to use this as an inspiration for nice apartments that could be built on the second floor of that building. You could provide as many as seven of them. And there is adequate parking available, there's adequate septic, and water, of course, everything that's needed to have some nice apartments there, and those would be one bedroom apartment. So it'd be suitable for, you know, couples or singles, maybe school teachers move into the area, maybe firefighters love to have a policeman in there in that kind of thing. So this is something that would be part of the plan, if we can get the business zoning there is a site plan Jamie, if you could pull that up, I'll point out in the parking and so on. Make that as big as we can. Okay, so basically, the parcels of five acre square with the back line is that meandering creek that's down in the valley. And then the diagonal swath that goes to the upper right corner is the Dominion Power Transmission Line. I guess it goes to brevoort bluff. And so the vast majority of the acreage there is not involved in this particular site plan. What we want to do, the building is the shoe box in the lower right corner. And as you can see, it's very close to route 15 Because that's what they did back in the day, they did put the service stations right on the road. And but there's plenty of flat land to the left of the building, and I drew a 26 car parking lot there. And that parking lot meets all modern parking lot standards, it has LED lighting that has a sharp cut off, so it only lights the lot, it doesn't light the surrounding woods or roadways. It does have landscaping, it's got an enclosed dumpster in the lower left corner. We do show the two original driveway entrances for Rt 15. Going into the establishment. However, we've gotten some feedback since this drawing was made from v dot and they want us to reduce that to the one entrance for less confusion and less and more safety. So we will probably close off the right hand entrance and do something to their satisfaction with the left hand entrance and that brings cars directly into the parking lot. And there's a circulation in the parking lot for cars to come in and out. We show some landscaping out front and our septic system will be directly behind the building and it will be in an amongst to the hardwood that are there there's some really nice big tall trees and our septic engineers told us that we would not have to take down any the nice trees to put the septic system in because it's going to be one of these engineered septic systems that pressurizes the effluent and kind of pumps it out through these soaker hoses. So he said that type of septic system will be basically last a lifetime. And it has more than enough capacity for the businesses and apartments that we're showing in this application. And you can see the area that we have delineated in with those little squiggly lines around that rectangle, that's more than enough area for the septic system. So you can tell there's plenty of room elsewhere on



the property. Should we ever need another one or more. Do the commissioners have any additional questions?

**Kapuscinski:** How many apartments Did you say you'd like to think about putting on top

**George:** Floor plan wise, it works very well to have seven one bedroom apartments.

**Kapuscinski:** And how big is each one of those apartments square footed wise?

**George:** Well, I'm not very good at math, but I've got a calculator. So let me tell you, the building is 31 by 111. So 31 times 111 equals divided by seven 491 square feet.

**Kapuscinski:** Less than five would then include a bedroom and a housekeeping unit, like a kitchen or

**George:** Oh, yeah, so the floor plans for all the apartments would be about the same, you would come in off a big long front porch, that would have like those rocking chairs on it that I showed in the picture. And then you'd have your front door and you walk into your living room, dining kitchen area will be the whole front half of the apartment with a big window out to the front. And then there'll be a set of French doors about halfway down there would open into the bedroom. And then the bedroom has another set of French doors opens to a deck that looks out over that hardwood forest I told you about. To the left, there's going to be a walk in closet in the middle of the unit, and then a full bath in the back left corner, which would have a window out into the woods, and it would have a shower, tub, shower, toilet and sink. So it's it's a whole one-bedroom apartment with all the rooms.

**Kapuscinski:** To your knowledge. Is there some sort of a requirement when you're looking at an efficiency this way? With regard to minimum square feet?

**George:** Well, first it's not an it's not an efficiency because it has a separate bedroom. And no, there's no requirement for either FHA or in the building code for minimum square footage of a dwelling unit. So they're big enough. And I think the floor plan works well enough that it'll seem nice. It'll seem spacious and works. Well won't be cramped. It will have a lot of light in there.

**Kapuscinski:** All right. Thank you.

**Bickford:** Mr. George if I do recall, you indicated at the lower level where you're having planned office space? That if you had a renter that wanted the whole area that you were not opposed to that correct? Economically

**George:** Well, right. But beyond that, it would have to be I mean, I really think the apartments are good idea. I really want to do them. So would have to be a use that is compatible with apartments, the apartments couldn't be something that was noisy or smelly or messy. It has to be something that would people want to live above.

**Bickford:** Understand I was just asking in regards to the space below.

**George:** Yeah, and then see the way the buildings built now that is a possibility to have one tenant and also has so many doors and openings, that it could have as many as I have shown or more.

**Bickford:** Okay. Any other commissioner have any question before I do the public hearing? Okay, Mr George, you can sit down and we'll open up the public hearing for this application.

**Edmondston:** Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, it looks like the first individual signed up to speak is Steve Leusuer and he will be followed by Marie Hill.

**Bickford:** Okay, please come forward to the podium state full name address and you'll have three minutes

**Steve Leusuer:** 38761 James Madison highway new canton I own the property right across the street and according to what I'm looking at the property, all the property that's around. Continue to make a reference to a five acre parcel. Every piece of paperwork I can find two and a quarter acre parcel. I own the rest of that five acres. It transferred ownership in 1966 to HM Watson. Watson held it until the 70s to Charlottesville Well created into Charlottesville reality when it closed. None of the rest of it is a problem. It's just that there isn't five acres.

**Bickford:** So, Mr. Leusuer just asking the question don't mean to interup but if you didn't have any more you're saying the front part is not yours the back part is that my understanding?

**Leusuer:** Yes down to the creek is my 11 acre parcel we use pretty much the entirety of that creek until we get to where Mr. Martin has by the river

**Bickford:** Okay, thank you sir

**Edmondston:** Marie Hill followed by Carol Childress.

**Marie Hill:** I'm Marie Hill and you want my address? Or for physical address or mailing 4419 Penlan road you get in Virginia 23123. And I think all of us have seen this as an eyesore coming into our county. It doesn't say a lot for us when we come into the county to see such a dilapidated building. It's been there. I used to buy gas there in the 70s. And I don't think it operated into the 80s. If we want business here, don't knock this down. Give it a chance. It's workable.

**Edmondston:** Thanks. Next will be Carol Childress followed by Mr. Donald Jones.

**Carol Childress:** I'm Carol Childress and 30435 North James Madison highway, like to speak in favor. Marie Hill and chick Childress and I had been down there and planted Ivy to try to cover it up. And it's been an eyesore, and I think when you come across the James River and you see that pretty slate sign and then the next thing you see is that dilapidated building its something and I think this will be a good opportunity to have something pretty thank you I have people here who agree they if you want them to stand.

**Edmondston:** Donald Jones

**Donald Jones:** I'm Don Jones 31471 North James Madison highway. And it's my property that is adjacent to the platting question for change and I appreciate Mr. George's vision. I don't disagree with Marie or Carol. But I do have some concerns. And again, I'm operating with limited information that I saw was a large structure what's the lights my property is very secluded \*inaudible\* acres, it's all mature hardwoods mixed with old growth trees. And I bought it because of the seclusion, the isolation. And I've

been there for 35 years. I think his eyes his vision is a good vision. But at the same time \*inaudible I think his vision is a good vision And it is an eyesore when you come into Buckingham County and so im not in disagreement but I I do not want my seclusion to be void or or the property value go down because of something that's not gone what that I bought the property for. Thank you.

**Bickford:** Thank you, sir. Do we have anyone else? Okay. Well, I'll close the public comment period. Turn this over to commissioners. Commissioners have any question?

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. George May i?

**Bickford:** Yes, Mr. George would you come forward, sir?

**Kapuscinski:** So I have actually two questions. Let's start with the plant the land itself. When I looked at your plat, it appeared to me that that septic was down the slope.

**George:** It's actually on the slope.

**Kapuscinski:** Down the slope. Is that slope part of the disputed property?

**George:** I don't think so. Everything that I have planned to do. I plan to do on the triangular parcel two and a quarter acres that the city I mean, the county tax map shows everything. Okay.

**Kapuscinski:** So there's really you would never with regard to this construction? And I'm just asking, because with regard to what you plan, the parking lot, the building, the septic, none of that would bleed over into contested land, correct?

**George:** No, It wouldn't. I didn't have any idea of the true size and shape of the parcel until I got the survey done in the title work.

**Kapuscinski:** But if what you really if the rest of this property doesn't belong to you but someone else.

**George:** Wouldn't be a problem for what I'm proposing.

**Kapuscinski:** So you'd be far enough away from that boundary line, you wouldn't be you wouldn't be encroaching and they and that boundary line wouldn't encroach on wouldn't create a problem for you building what you need to build?

**George:** That's correct.

**Kapuscinski:** Okay. Second question is with regard to your second story, are you Are you determined to do that sort of thing?

**George:** I think it's a good idea, and I want to do it, and it helps make the whole project more economically viable.

**Kapuscinski:** Okay, so is your being a builder? I mean, I would obviously encourage you talking to your neighbors, but is there a way for you to? I guess the word is shade? The obvious to help your neighbor remain secluded?

**George:** Oh, yeah. I mean, I love the trees that are on the back half of the property. And I mean, and I've already, I've actually picked out the ones that I think are the most bet the best, the most perfect ones. And they are all going to be managed with proper forestry stewardship, so that they do survive and thrive. Because I think that the view out of the back of the building and the apartments above is greatly enhanced by the hardwood forest that's behind me.

**Kapuscinski:** But there's no way to hide those. The lighting from I guess you're concerned about the lighting from the builder.

**George:** Oh, well, the lighting in the inspiration pictures is the front of a hotel that's on a highway. Right. And I know, it's just an idea. And it's an inspiration. The only lights I show on the site plan are three parking lot lights that are cut off lights, and they're designed to not throw any light beyond the outer curb of the parking lot. And you don't actually see the source of the light. That's not like a street lamp, you know, in the center Goochland, where you see them on their shine in your eyes. They they're

very fancy modern LED boxes that just shoot the light down on the parking lot. And that's what I've that's what I've shown because in a rural area, you only need enough light for safety. You're not trying to advertise or light up your building for any other way. So the inspiration picture is a little misleading because their building is way more lit off. And then those apartments would be built on top of the building. And the back of the apartments and I take it your property is behind. So it'd be dark as pitch in the map. There wouldn't be any lights. Except if someone had a little light on their back porch. And parking lot lights you wouldn't see either, I don't think because it would only light the pavement.

**Kapuscinski:** And I appreciate it. I'm glad you're considering your neighbors. I think what I where I'm at, Mr. Chairman is the main question for me is, is the land still suitable to be used that way? Even if it's two and a half acres? And I think the answer to that question based on the answers we got here is it's fine.

**Bickford:** Okay, well, before we make a decision any other commissioners have any questions for the applicant? Go ahead Calvin

**Bachrach:** Looking at your septic drawn on the tax map, the aerial photo, and parking lot would be on that contested land. I'm in agreeance, anything you can do with this building would be wonderful. And the county needs to grow. I'm not anti growth the contested land. It's bothering me a lot. And I think that needs to get taken care of, or maybe you could have a site, visit a survey, actually done on site to take care of this problem. I think this needs to be tabled until you can figure it out this land discrepancies, the optics on that tax map, but your parking lot wouldn't be.

**Kapuscinski:** Chairman that was the question I was trying to ask is everything in this, I thought everything that was in your rendering, including a parking lot would be on the two and a half acres?

**George:** Well, the problem with the two and a half acres everybody is talking about is that there isn't any kind of a good map of where the two and a quarter acres is in existence, in the courthouse until you go back to the deed that my title company found. And they found that it wasn't two and a quarter acre. And there's some confusion in the county tax records about the size of the parcel, because at one point, Watson had an option to buy two and a quarter acres, which they never exercised. So that option expired. But that's the only time that option listing the land Watson could buy if they chose to do so the only time in the county records is listed as two and a quarter acres.

**Kapuscinski:** But is that is that the is that the contested part? Or is that the part that certain?

**George:** Well, it doesn't. It doesn't actually just it doesn't actually give any metes and bounds of that triangular tuna quarter acre parcel. So I don't know, none of the professionals I've hired can figure out where the tax map became a triangle, because the county and land records don't support that.

**Kapuscinski:** I have to agree, I think it'd be kind of difficult to you don't know what you're building on. And part of your part of what you want to use this land for is a parking lot. But if that lands, not there, that parking lot, can't be built.

**George:** But right. But the thing is, what more can be done? What are you asking me to do to establish the size and shape of the land? What more can be done?

**Kapuscinski:** I don't know the answer to that. I don't know how you get that fixed. I mean, it seems to me there's got to be some agreement between you.

**George:** Oh, yeah, there and there will be for sure. It's just that as part of this rezoning process, it's a requirement that I use a survey produced by a licensed Virginia surveyor, instead of the tax map. So the first thing I did is hire a surveyor to give me something to draw on. And when he came back with a different size and shape as the tax map. I said, Okay, well, I guess I got to use this, but I'm going to get a title search done as well, to see if they agree with the surveyor.

**Kapuscinski:** So really, the question for us, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not we want to rezone this property for the potential of having a bunch of commercial businesses, a few commercial businesses, and the possibility even though it's not certain of having apartments on top, and the question, I guess, becomes, is this land suitable? I mean, we did put it, that is our growth corridor. We've agreed to change 15. So you know, even if it's two and a half acres, and you could not do the apartments on top, you probably have enough area there for a small parking lot to take care of your commercial businesses, I'm assuming, but that's not the question for this commission. Commission is should we go ahead and rezone or agreed to pass on the recommendation to the board to rezone this property? And I don't see an issue here.

**Bickford:** Well, I will. And that's actually the question, is this a good use of the land? Is it back to the land use issue for this tax map? As far as the tax maps you cannot go by them, I can show you that work with them all the times. Sometimes we're not even in the right location. They're a half a mile a mile away. So the question is, it does seem to be conflicting issues here that Mr. Leusuer, feels like you only hold about two and a half acres, but you've indicated that with this composite plant that was drawn, that's what they found a surveyor. And far as you know there is no plat for two and a half acres.

**George:** Nobody has been able to find anything. And there and the title company is satisfied with their research and they recommended We record the new survey. So, but that was all a surprise to me, when I put the property under contract, I believed it to be a triangular parcel of two and a quarter acres, which is plenty of room for septic for some parking, and for that building made into businesses. But if it turns out that all the professionals are wrong, and the parcel is a lot smaller than I haven't drawn, and I can't get 26 parking spaces, then I would revisit exactly what should be done with the building and the space land available. But I mean, I don't think anybody's arguing here that that isn't a commercial building. And it was built as a commercial building. Because route 15 is a major commercial byway and the comprehensive plan that you guys have, you know, so responsibly developed, says that the county needs more business, and heres more locations for business, it needs more services, it needs more jobs. And it needs more stick built housing. And I'm going to give all of you guys that whether it's on two and a quarter acres, or whatever it is, and it'll work. There are plenty of businesses on way less land than that. If you've got a septic, you've got a solution.

**Bickford:** Well, as chairman, I will tell you the Pete is, correct. And that's when Mr. Wright indicated at introduction is a land use issue. Because we questioned about proper acreage, then and he indicated to us that you need to decide whether this was a good fit for the land. So coming from that area, anything that could be done right, there would be a great benefit. Its improvement would be ideal. Its a corridor coming down on 15 from Fluvanna. And it certainly anything you do, there would be a great improvement. Unless we have some other questions for you.

\*inaudible\*

**George:** doesn't, there's a pole on the property. And that pole is drawn on the site plan right in the middle of the parking lot with plants on both sides of it. There's no changes. Okay.



**Kapuscinski:** If there are no others I'll go back to what we said originally, I think with regard to the fact that that is was a commercial building, and we want that whole court order to become a growth corridor. You know, I'm prepared to make a motion.

**Bickford:** Well, hold on just for a minute. Let me make sure none of the commissioners have any other questions for Mr. George. Mr George go ahead and sit down, sir. All right. We don't have any other questions.

**Davis:** I just have one We making this motion its just for that two and a quarter acre. Right? Or will there be a dispute over the rest of it?

**Bickford:** It's my understanding that it will be for the size of the tax map parcel, if I understand if I recall what Mr. Wright said, if that ends up being two and a quarter, that's what gets changed. If it is ends up being what is it almost five, it will be changed for that whole tax map parcel. That will have to be something it'll be settled. If we pass it forward. That'll be settled by a surveyor.

**Shumaker:** My only hesitation is the setbacks both from 15. And whatever the property lines up being in the event that v dot and Mr. George cannot come to an agreement about a commercial entrance or something that is safe for that area of travel, then this application null and void right if there is no agreement with federal and state.

**Edmondston:** That's true, correct. And if you notice, and Mr. Georgia is rendering and he and I've discussed this during the application process, the existing building, that is there is currently in violation. It does not meet the setbacks of the required 50 feet from the front property line. So he understands that, you know, should his request which is specific to the tax parcel of 31 Dash eight to have a zoning map amendment, it does not lend any approval to utilizing the building he understands that there would be an appeal for variance through the board of zoning appeals to be able to utilize that building before a permit can be obtained and of course before a permit could be obtained. The health department would make their ruling and be that would make theirs or whatever the entrance guidelines are with Mr. George.

**Shumaker:** In the county there aren't that many businesses that are close to the road, most of the ones that are in the town of dillwyn where there is a reduced speed limit. That is a major thorough way

through the county and the county, number of accidents heading down towards the bridge, maybe not in that location. But with that secondary road coming out right ahead of it. It is a decent concern of mine.

**Edmondston:** And of course me I had indicated the front setback but after you know, the plat and Mr. George, any other the landowner may are able to ascertain what this tax map truly consists of if it does not meet any of the other setback side or rear, that would, of course, be placed in an application for variance as part of that.

**Bickford:** So to understand even if we would move forward, he would have been clear about our Board of zoning appeals and the highway department, correct?

**Edmondston:** Yes, sir.

**Bickford:** I know, he said he'd moved entrance down, which will give the proper distance. But you still got that issue with, Mr. Leusuer.

**Kapuscinski:** Chairman, that that to me is a building permit issue as far as we're concerned, what my recommendation is if we make a motion here just to move, move this entire issue to the board with the recommendation, that it's rezone to be one. Regardless if the owners have a problem, or if he has a problem with his building permit. That's kind of outside of scope, in my view.

**Bickford:** I don't disagree with you. And that's our decision is whether it's good or good location for the land use. So yes, sir. Any other questions?

**Kapuscinski:** I would move that we would take this particular project and move it whether it's two and a half acres, or five acres or whatever the tax map is, move the entire issue to the Board for their approval, with a recommendation that the zoning be changed to b one.

**Bickford:** Would you make that a motion?

**Kapuscinski:** I am making a motion.

**Bickford:** All right, have a motion. Do I have a second?

**Dorrier:** Second.

**Bickford:** Any further discussion before we vote? Go ahead and vote. Passes Mr. George, you move onto the board of supervisors, Good luck, sir. Thank you. That brings us now to our new business. Introduction of 24 Z... Im not going to read all that. Ivan Petersheim.

Commissioner	Yay	Nay
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	
Dorrier	X	
Bickford	X	
Shumaker	X	
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	
Davis	X	

**Commissioner Kapuscinski moved, Commissioner Dorrier seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to move 24ZMA 340 on to Board of Supervisors.**

**Edmondston:** Just wanted to address Mr. George. Mr. George, that introduction will be Monday, May 13 at 6pm at the Board of Supervisors. The next case for introduction this evening is case 24 ZTA SUP 341. Our applicant is Ivan Petersheim. He resides at 234 Scott's bottom road Dillwyn the property in which the request is made this evening as tax map 53 parcel 45. It contains just under one acre and it's located at 5516 Ridge Road Arvonina in the Marshall magisterial district is zoned a one. The request before you this evening is to add a zoning text amendment for multifamily housing including but not limited to a duplex triplex townhouse to a list of special uses and an agricultural a one zoning district and apply for a special use permit for that purpose. The applicant is asking the Planning Commission to

hold a public hearing for this request I have attached 10 conditions for consideration Please remember that as you see fit and necessary needed you may remove add amend conditions there. Please understand in a one zoning district currently only single family homes are permitted by right. The zoning text amendment this does not currently exist in a list of special uses.

**Bickford:** Would you come forward sir. Give us your full name and restate your address. If you were to quickly give us a overview what you'd like to do.

**Ivan Petersheim:** Evening to board. Ivan Petersheim 234 Scotts bottom Road, Ashley is my district. The proposed duplex is in Dennis Davis district. I would like to turn it into a duplex. I guess there's a text amendment that goes with that. You guys have any questions? I would, you know, I'd be happy to over the course of the next month. You know, I'd be happy to meet you guys out there and You probably know where it is. It's old with whit worth store It would be a commercial location if, if it were still in business. I think it's got good views on in the background. I think it's a good spot. It's got road frontage. Any questions?

**Bickford:** I'll turn it over the commissioners, any other questions for the applicant?

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. Chairman?

**Bickford:** Yes, sir. Go ahead.

**Kapuscinski:** Couple of questions. Number one, your two apartments that you want to put in there. You would have separate septic separate electricity separate?

**Petersheim:** Well, the way I understand it with a health department is they go by the bedrooms. And so it would count on how many bedrooms we're putting in the old septic that's there, it's old. And we are going to have to consider digging a couple new lines or a new drain field.

**Kapuscinski:** So you would have a single septic.

**Petersheim:** Yes.

**Kapuscinski:** And a single drain field. Okay, that's all zoning issues that I guess what I'm saying is that with regard to the property size itself, is there enough there if you intend to have parking and everything else to put a septic in that would handle two full, I guess two residents?

**Peter:** Yeah, again, it would, it would go by the bedrooms? I don't know. That's a question for the health department. I guess, as far as if there's two apartment units or two different units. If they're calculated different for the water use, you know how much water goes in it? Did not get soil engineers, scientists out there to look, see if we have enough. Enough of area for a new drain field, but it looks like it to me. We have we have front yard. One tree that needs to be removed. But and that would that would leave the distance required from the well. It looks very promising. Put a new drain field in if needed.

**Kapuscinski:** Question for Nicci.Miss Edmondson what with regard to read a text change to a one. This would then be a text change that would affect every a one piece of property in the counties. That's correct?

**Edmondston:** It would affect the entire a one zoning district and remember this is not moving this zoning text amendment is not to amend a list of permitted uses this is to amend and add to the list of special uses. So any one and an A one who wanted to obtain a special use permit would have to go through that SUP process. This is not by right.

**Kapuscinski:** I understand that. But if I'm not mistaken, this includes duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, condominiums. So it means that people that have farm property could effectually unless they rezone. Now, if they had to rezone, it would have to be a district 11 rezoning. Right? Because isn't it in district 11? It's allowed in A one.

**Edmondston:** Hold on just a moment Mr. Kapuscinski I want to make sure I understand. So remember, if what makes sense to the Comprehensive Plan and the end, the growth plan overall for the county is not necessarily one zone here in the midst of this zone zone zone. What has historically been viewed as a proper permitting or approval application process has been that special use permits were brought to the county on a application basis to determine if the integrity of the district could be maintained. Right. So anyone in an A one should this amendment this text amendment to the zoning ordinance take place, it would then add it to that list of special uses and anyone in an A one could use it. Someone wanted to amend their zoning district that request now goes to the board of supervisors with an explanation to

determine if it is you know, their wish to move forward with an application but as far as the special use permit to anyone and anyone, including but not limited to just as you read there including multi family housing.

**Kapuscinski:** So the question I'm asking you there is there is a zoning district in our county, not a specific district but a zoning capability?

**Edmondston:** Yes. Village Center.

**Kapuscinski:** It's VA one.

**Edmondston:** VC one.

**Kapuscinski:** Or VC one okay. And with a question I read it but I did not recall it having any specific land mass area does it have to be like 15?

**Edmondston:** Depends on once again Health Department what is it going to be private or package sewer so if it if any thing that requires a private will and sewer septic system and our private well that requires the lot size to be a minimum of two acres. If It is on any type of packaged Water Town, you can, you know, town sewer and water. And it's in the proper district. And that actually could allow for smaller lot sizes. In this case as Mr. Petersheim was brought up the property that that he is, has applied for this text amendment and mess up the well and septic was under the purview of the Health Department. And he is on a grandfathered, non conforming lot.

**Kapuscinski:** Right. And I guess what I'm getting at is if in fact, I looked at the vc, one, the 11, district 11. And I know I knew the buy I saw the by, right? Okay, and there is duplex triplex all these other things. Yes, I know there's a land requirement understand that. But I don't recall that there were any special uses under that particular district.

**Edmondston:** There are special uses comparable to an A one. So if something is allowed by special use in an A one, it would then be allowed by way of a special use permit in a VC one, they do have certain exceptions for businesses and the number of axles and the operating hours as far as that is concerned,

but in a VC one, because that is set aside for clustered neighborhood development along with the retail aspect and in a smaller form not necessarily comparable to a neighborhood commercial because that housing requires a special use permit, but in a VC one that is actually contributing to a very small neighborhood aspect with retail, but that is allowed by right. The multifamily homes.

**Kapuscinski:** And I understand so Mr. Chairman might, what I'm driving at here is if we make this text amendment, it affects every one piece of property. And I guess I'm a little bit shy that I just My concern is, it seems to me and this is just my logic working around in my head, and I don't know if I'm right or wrong. But it would seem to me that it would be smarter to create a to allow Mr. Petersheim to rezone his property, let's say BC One, and then add a special use a text amendment there that says anything under an acre, you could limit it to maybe just two residents or something like that? It would what it would do is it would keep our agricultural property away from townhouses and clustered living, even on a special use because it essentially what I'm, I'm kind of concerned about that with somebody buying, particularly an absentee owner buying a large parcel of property. And then without having it rezone to ask him again, for an SUP and I, I know we have, we have the ability to turn it down. But our ability to turn that down, is also limited. And if somebody wanted to put a large number of clustered housing in on that agricultural piece property, it'd be much more difficult for the county to control that given even if it wasn't in in the in the comprehensive plan. Rather, I would see if we were to have his property, this corner piece of property zoned VC, and if a multi house if a duplex was not allowed on their property, because of land requirement, if you if we wanted to do a text change, it would be to VC one saying anything under an acre, we would allow at least one duplex. I mean, it just seems more logical.

**Bickford:** I understand your concerns and share them. Do we got to also remember this location, I'm very familiar with it. And I was like where it's at used to be there when the store was on. It's not in a growth quarter or so you're in a one and that's what it needs to be. You can avoid all this asking now other than a tax amendment, which still gives you plenty of fallback the same as a special use permit.

**Kapuscinski:** In other words, we could do a special use permit without a text amendment. I mean, I'd be happy to do that.

**Edmondston:** You cannot do a special use permit for a use that is not provided for zoning ordinance, hence the zoning text,

**Bickford:** but you do have the ability to limited with a special use permit.

**Kapuscinski:** What if we did a text amendment and said in a one, we would allow only duplexes with that, as opposed to triplexes you know, clustered housing and all that other stuff, and we keep the integrity, you know, because we already allow single homes in agricultural property. So if you if you had a duplex, I guess it wouldn't bother me either. But what concerns me is a large development on an agricultural piece property that's developed by some absentee owner. I just don't, I don't know that.

**Bickford:** What you're, what you're saying is you want to keep the ability to turn down an application that comes through on a one

**Kapuscinski:** A one for clustered housing.

**Bickford:** Normally as Nicci has indicated, when you talk About clustering and all that is usually I mean it can we went through this years ago, if you have large numbers usually directed towards county water and sewer, because of a number of people, this very does not have that. So you're gonna have to rely on a well and septic that would be large enough, not in his case, because it's just a small, little large cluster somewhere in agriculture would have to rely on their own well, and their own septic being large enough to accommodate all of the number of people household. But I understand your concerns because I have them. I don't like the idea if it was in a growth quarter, or it'd be a little bit different, but it's not it's it's three four miles west on 671, diana mills road, but in a way. I'm not opposed to be honest with you. I'm not opposed to what you're trying to do. But I do want to protect the county in the future, for the A one district to have control. You know. Go ahead.

**Peters:** I would think with the housing, you know, inflation and housing crisis that we're in that that there will be a lot more requests for duplexes, just because they're economical one, they make sense and they can help with affordability. But I see what you're saying, you know, having a way to limit it from a duplex versus a triplex or whatever that you're doing but you guys come up with I guess.

**Shumaker:** I was actually surprised, Mr. Chairman, that it wasn't already included. I mean, we already have some sort of multifamily you know, we have as a special use permit adult retirement community and assisted living essentially that is clustered housing of some sort but it is a special use. So an applicant would still have to come here to get a special use permit for that purpose. If I understand



correctly, Nicci that is what this will also puts in a zoning text amendment but people will still have to come here for a special use permit for a duplex or a triplex so I think we still have that protection. I was actually surprised that multifamily housing was not already on the list of special uses.

**Bickford:** Whats the though of the other Commissioners?

**Davis:** I met with Ivan and he showed me what he wanted to do and I feel like with the lack of affordable housing in the county right now to take that one building to make be able to make two fit for places for two families to stay or I just think it's a good idea I mean, that lane is the way it's designed and the way they will stall was an old it's not really suitable for anything else and he's taking the existing build and pretty much splitting it in half .

**Peters:** Would be like a third probably so it'd be a one-bedroom unit and then a two bedroom that's what I'm thinking

**Dorrier:** I'm still concerned about the septic system and you will if you have enough land your septics got to be certain amount are certain footage away from your home.

**Peters:**100 feet 95 feet.

**Dorrier:** Okay, how many people you think will be living there? So 100 foot per bedroom of septic system? Do you have land to cover that if you have to go over into somebody else's land maybe?

**Peters:** No, so the so the well is opposite side of the store from the road. So that limits me from going over there unless I get an easement or work with the neighbor, whatever, little bit over there. But I would have to go quite a distance I'm unsure about that myself. I don't know how that's gonna work out. But that's where the health department obviously if I can't, if I can't. If I don't have enough room, for a new drain field then I'm limited on what I can do with it.

**Dorrier:** I was wondering how many people how many bedrooms would you actually have because I think it's 100 foot per bedroom?

**Peter:** Yeah, well, so it's three bedroom now and it will probably say that it would just have an additional kitchen and two bedrooms, two bathrooms instead of one.

**Dorrier:** You're talking about four to four to 500 foot drain field.

**Peters:** Right probably four or five hundred foot I mean it's real close. I don't know what the setbacks are for drain field from the road, you know the vdot right away. So I don't know exactly where that is.

**Dorrier:** You'd have to get with the county on that I don't know Nicci might know that. I would think that might be a problem for you. You go through all of this and and get shot down by the Health Department.

**Peters:** It's a good exercise for me. Get to know all yall.

**Kapuscinski:** Chairman, I'm not in opposition of him putting a duplex on that property. I'm just curious. My concern is the text amendment change. That's all. And I, I'm wondering whether or not we can do something with this text change, that would give us a little more control in the event, we have an absentee owner that wants to put in cluster housing. I know you say they still have the ability as Shumaker to come to this, this group and have it approved. But our control, once it's even an sup, our control is less because, you know, let's assume that they get it turned down a couple of times and go directly to the board. So my point is that I just feel I feel the need to maintain our agricultural property. Agriculture, I guess more than anything else, and I don't, I don't have a problem with growth corridors. I don't have a problem with putting a duplex out on a one piece property, I have a problem with putting a townhouse on any one piece of property, that that's just where I'm at. So I mean, it's the it's the Commission's pleasure, I'm just voicing my concern.

**Bickford:** Understand.

**Shumaker:** I think the county could use a few more townhouses.

**Bickford:** We have a shortage of housing cant disagree with you on that. What is the pleasure of the commission? You wish to move forward?

**Kapuscinski:** This just the text change you're talking about?

**Bickford:** Well, next, it would be a public hearing. fOr moving forward. If you want to do that all or you can table it. I don't know how we can address the situation with the if you do the tax amendment it is changing for A one district.

**Kapuscinski:** Is there some way Mr chairman, they would that a recommendation can be made by one of us to limit the text change the amendment to a duplex on a one piece property?

**Bickford:** That's a legal question that Mr. Wright would probably have to answer because I'm not sure whether you can or how restrictive you could be to it. Mr. Wright happen to be here? I would assume we could have some control on that. But I don't know for sure.

**Dorrier:** Ahat about the what about the health department and what I was speaking of?

**Bickford:** Well, technically, it's out of all perview. Because if we move forward. And then he finds that he has to do another septic system and doesn't have the ability to do it. Then he's out. Yeah, they control that part.

**Peters:** Has there ever been any conversation on it on a by right, duplex? Does anyone know of like, you know of any?

**Kapuscinski:** In VC one.

**Peters:** If you do new construction got to go through a special use permit every time? Like if it's conforming lot, whatever certain size, whatever.

**Bickford:** By right is what's allowed in the district and you're in A one district. That's what we're arguing well, not arguing but having trouble with. Mr. Wright, You understand and I assume Nicci filled you in.

**Wright:** The question is about whether you can add a another use to an SUP in an A one, the short of it.

**Kapuscinski:** limit it to a duplex as opposed to a multiple housing.

**Wright:** I mean, the board the Planning Commission has the authority to recommend any change to the zoning amendment to the zoning ordinance that you care to recommend. I think specifically would not not tied to an application, I would do it as a separate action at the planning commission having considered the need of whatever you want to consider if you recommend that the Board of Supervisors add a amendment to the special use conditions in a one to include what have you wanted to include. I would not tie it to an application.

**Bickford:** So we have the ability to put parameters on that recommendation.

**Wright:** Yeah, you can put recommendation. I mean, that is you're charged with that you can make an argument and they're not obliged to follow it. So they can say we don't want to do it. We're going to do it like that, or we're going to add something else. Once you make your recommendation, you shifted to the board a of supervisors.

**Bickford:** Thank you, Mr. Wright. Okay. All right. I don't know if you're ready for a motion or anything if so go ahead and well discuss.

**Kapuscinski:** I'll make two motions. Okay. The first one is to send to the board. Do we need to go through a public hearing if we're going to change the amendment?

**Edmondston:** Amendments to the ordinance require a public hearing.

**Kapuscinski:** So I would recommend we do both of these recommendations would be to move to a public hearing. The first one would be to amend a one to allow duplex housing and limited to duplex housing. The second amendment. The second motion I would make is to move. Mr. Petershiem application on to public hearing.

**Bachrach:** Second.

**Bickford:** Discussion? Does everyone understand the two motions Pete made? They're two separate things they tied together but they are two.

**Shumaker:** Voting on one at a time.

**Bickford:** That would probably be the best route to take. Yes.

**Kapuscinski:** Okay. So the first motion is to move to the public hearing an amendment to a one to allow duplex housing only. Only

**Edmondston:** Mr.Kapuscinski that would be an amendment to a list of special uses in A one zoning district

**Kapuscinski:** Text amendment. Yes, ma'am. For duplex only.

**Bachrach:** Second.

**Bickford:** We have a second any discussion? Seeing none we'll go ahead and take our votes. Alright, passes six to one. Do you have your second motion?

<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yay</b>	<b>Nay</b>
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	
Dorrier	X	
Bickford	X	
Shumaker		X
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	

Davis	X	
-------	---	--

**Commissioner Kapuscinski moved, Commissioner Bachrach seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to add duplex only to list of special uses in an AI.**

**Kapuscinski:** Second motion is to move it to a public hearing Mr. Peters application to put a duplex on his piece of a one property

**Edmondston:** This would be to move the case 24 ZTA SUP 341 to public hearing with duplex only? Correct?

**Peters:** Yeah, I guess I got a question as far as the text amendment. What I understood from you that, you know, one needs to go in front of the other or simultaneously whatever..

**Edmondston:** The governing boards whether it be the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors actually vote twice on these cases for zoning text amendment. The first is for the zoning text amendment. The second would be for your special use permit request.

**Peters:** So if that gets tabled, more time is needed. Can my case move forward or is it going to be left behind because of whatever ongoing conversations of the text amendment for duplex only.

**Edmondston:** So Mr. Peters the action taken by the planning commission thus far This evening is that by Commissioner Kapuscinski was seconded by Commissioner Bacharach and then voted is that the only amendment to move forward to a public hearing to the Buckingham County zoning ordinance is to add a duplex to a list of special uses.

**Bickford:** Which it becomes a by right.

**Edmondston:** It becomes a list of special uses.

**Peters:** It will be included in the list of special use items or whatever.

**Edmondston:** And your request before the planning commission was for multifamily housing including but not limited to, but the amendment to the ordinance is for duplex only. And you're what's on the table right now. And there has not been a motion or second or vote is to move your case. 24 ZTE SUP 341 to a public hearing for duplex only.

**Peters:** That's my case. Gotcha. Yeah,

**Bickford:** There we go. We have a second. All right. Any further discussion on that? Hearing none, we'll vote. Passes unanimously. So you will be going to public hearing

Commissioner	Yay	Nay
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	
Dorrier	X	
Bickford	X	
Shumaker	X	
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	
Davis	X	

**Commissioner Kapuscinski moved, Commissioner Bachrach seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to move case 24ZTA341 on to public hearing.**

**Edmondston:** That will be Tuesday May 28.

**Davis:** Mr. Chairman, if I could Ivan before you go anywhere my suggestion to you is while you wait for public hearing, you probably ought to get with the health department and see what may be

**Bickford:** May save you some time and effort.

**Peters:** I do want to get a soil scientist out there and you know what, what he thinks about new drain field and everything.

**Davis:** yeah talk to the soil scientist so you come prepared.

**Bickford:** Thank you. Very good. Okay, that brings us to our ordinance Article Nine, telecommunications supplemental document.

**Edmondston:** Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, members of the planning commission, a zoning administrator I am requesting of the planning commission to schedule a public hearing at the regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, May 28 2024 at 6pm. In regard to mandatory amendments to Article Nine and Article Nine telecommunications supplemental documents, I have listed the necessary amendments and mandatory amendments to Article Nine section three exempt installations. You'll see Item six antenna support structures antennas and, antenna arrays for AMFM LPTV DTV, broadcast transmission facilities, remove this item, section 10. In definitions for a wireless communication facility, the very last line and antennas and or antenna arrays for am , AM FM LPTV DTV broadcasting transmission facilities remove this item.

**Bickford:** That's your only two changes?

**Edmondston:** Correct.

**Bickford:** Any questions for Nicci from the commissioners?

**Kapuscinski:** Mr. Chairman? Mrs. Edmondson, what is the nature of the change? What prompted the change? Can you explain?

**Edmondston:** Mandatory revisions amendments that need to take place in order for our zoning ordinance to be effective, most effective.



**Kapuscinski:** Is this in reference to any particular antenna, or reparation of an antenna or a modification of antenna that's, that's going on right now,

**Edmondston:** There are no applications.

**Kapuscinski:** So this, and the reason you want these changes, because they're exempted, and you don't want them exempted anymore?

**Edmondston:** We want to remove the items completely from the Article Nine.

**Kapuscinski:** Which means that under all your W A C's, they would then require they would require the same process approval that they have. And again...

**Edmondston:** Yes which fits our telecommunications plan, as indicated by our city scape, the county consultant.

**Kapuscinski:** By having these exemptions here, we do not align with the recommendation of our consultant.

**Bickford:** Any other questions from the commissioners for Nicci? Do I have a motion to approve the deletions of those two statements?

**Shumaker:** So moved.

**Dorrier:** Second.

**Bickford:** If there's no further discussion. We'll take a vote.

**Davis:** Chairman I got confused. Are we scheduling for a public hearing on this?

**Edmondston:** Yes, sir. In order to amend any ordinance, we have to have a public hearing and then a recommendation will go to the Board of Supervisors.

**Davis:** That's what I thought.

**Bickford:** Okay. All right. Well go ahead and vote. Passes unanimously. It brings us Nicci to your reports

<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yay</b>	<b>Nay</b>
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	
Dorrier	X	
Bickford	X	
Shumaker	X	
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	
Davis	X	

**Commissioner Shumaker moved, Commissioner Dorrier seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to schedule a public hearing to amend article 9 of telecommunications supplement documents.**

**Edmondston:** March 2024 building permit is included for informational purposes and I do not have anything further this evening.

**Bickford:** Okay, very good. Thank you. Commissioner matters concerns. Commissioners have anything you need to voice at this time. Seeing none Do I have a motion to adjourn?

**Kapuscinski:** So moved.

**Dorrier:** Second.

**Bickford:** We have a motion and second any further discussion? All favor vote. That passes. We are adjourned. Thank you

<b>Commissioner</b>	<b>Yay</b>	<b>Nay</b>
Kapuscinski	X	
Crews	Absent	Absent
Dorrier	X	
Bickford	X	
Shumaker	X	
Gooden	X	
Bachrach	X	
Davis	X	

**Commissioner Kap moved, Commissioner Dorrier seconded, and was carried by the Planning Commission to adjourn the meeting.**

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Cheryl T. “Nicci” Edmondston  
 Zoning Administrator/Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
 John E. Bickford  
 Chairman