GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 18, 2025

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025, AT 6:00 PM HYBRID IN-PERSON WITH REMOTE VIA TELEPHONE AND ELECTRONIC MEANS.

Members present:	John McCloskey, Chairman Mark Kelpe, Vice Chairman Angela Hawkins, Member David Mastervich, Member Peter Wajda, Member
Staff present:	Jim Frydl, Planning Director/Zoning Administrator Earl Keys, Zoning Officer

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCloskey called the meeting to order.

DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Each Commissioner stated their name to establish a quorum.

Mr. Kelpe
Ms. Hawkins
Mr. Mastervich
Mr. Wajda
Mr. McCloskey

There was a quorum with five Commissioners present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE & MOMENT OF SILENCE

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Dasia Tompkins requests a special use permit for a Child Care Center, as required through Articles 4-1-2.12 and 22 of the Greene County Zoning Ordinance. The parcel identified as TMP# 49A-3-T-32, located at 919 Morning Glory Turn, is zoned A-1 (Agricultural), approximately 0.73 of an acre. The Greene County Future Land Use Map designates it as a “Rural Area” (SUP25-002)

Mr. Frydl presented a comprehensive overview of Dasia Tompkins' special use permit request for a child care center. He explained that the proposed center would serve up to 12 children in a home-based setting, located on a wooded lot with good privacy and buffering from neighboring properties. Mr. Frydl emphasized that this was a zoning review, distinct from the state licensing process, and highlighted the center's compliance with local regulations. He detailed the location's characteristics, noting its agricultural zoning and alignment with the county's comprehensive plan's encouragement of community services. Mr. Frydl discussed the potential impacts, particularly traffic, noting that 12 children would generate minimal additional vehicle trips. He outlined recommended conditions, including operating hours from 6 am to 7 pm, Monday through Friday, and requiring the center to be the principal residence of the operator. The Health Department had already reviewed and approved the septic system, and the homeowners' association supported the project. Mr. Frydl stressed that the special use permit process allows the commission to place conditions specifically related to mitigating potential impacts, ensuring the child care center would be harmonious with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. McCloskey asked Ms. Tompkins if she would like to speak.

Ms. Tompkins shared her professional background and motivation for establishing the child care center. She initially planned to open a center near Dunkin Donuts, but was delayed. With a professional background from Bright Horizons and three years of experience as a child care director, she aims to fill a critical community need. Her center will focus primarily on infant care, addressing a gap in local childcare services for children under 16 months. Ms. Tompkins explained that she will have two staff members, aged 21 and 25, who come from her previous workplace. She is prepared to operate with the 12-child limit, understanding that this restriction is driven by state licensing requirements for a family day home. Her two personal children would not count against the 12-child capacity. Ms. Tompkins has not yet widely advertised the center, wanting to secure zoning approval first. She expressed openness to potentially expanding weekend hours if there is community demand, recognizing the broader need for flexible childcare options. Her approach reflects a professional, community-focused strategy to provide high-quality, accessible childcare in Greene County.

During the discussion, the planning commissioners and Ms. Tompkins explored the details of the child care center's capacity and operational days. Mr. Wajda specifically inquired about the viability of the business with a 12-child limit, to which Ms. Tompkins confidently responded that the center would still be financially feasible. Mr. Frydl clarified that the 12-child limit was driven by state code and building regulations for a family day home, and Ms. Tompkins confirmed her understanding. Mr. Kelpe proposed extending the operating days beyond the initial Monday through Friday proposal, suggesting Saturday hours might better serve the community's needs. Ms. Tompkins was receptive to this idea, acknowledging that the community could benefit from additional childcare options. The commissioners were interested in understanding how the 12-child limit would impact her business model, and Ms. Tompkins explained that she was prepared to operate with this constraint, using two staff members to support the children. Ultimately, the discussion reflected a collaborative approach to understanding the practical and regulatory aspects of establishing a home-based child care center, with both the commissioners and Ms. Tompkins focusing on meeting community needs while adhering to regulatory requirements.

Mr. McCloskey opened the public hearing. There was no one signed up to speak, and no one online to speak.

Mr. McCloskey closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kelpe made the motion, in accordance with the Greene County zoning ordinance, public necessity, convenience, General Welfare and good zoning practice, I move to recommend approval of SUP25-002, with the following conditions, the child care center shall comply with all local, state and federal regulations applicable to early childhood care, the facility shall serve no more than 12 children under 13 years of old, excluding the provider's children. Hours of operation are limited to between the hours of 6 am and 7 pm the child care center shall only operate Monday through Saturday. The home shall be the principal residence of the child care center and operator.

Mr. Mastervich seconded.

Mr. Kelpe – Aye
Ms. Hawkins – Aye
Mr. Mastervich – Aye
Mr. Wadja – Aye
Mr. McCloskey – Aye

The Greene County Board of Supervisors is requesting a revision to the Greene County Zoning Ordinance to include amendments to Article 22, Definitions. These amendments pertain to restricting the use of repurposed manufactured homes as accessory structures in all zoning districts, except for Article 4, Agricultural (A-1**)**—with a 5-acre minimum requirement—and Articles 11 and 12, Industrial (unrestricted)**.** (OR25-001)

Mr. Frydl presented a detailed explanation of the proposed zoning amendment regarding accessory structures, specifically focusing on repurposed manufactured homes. He outlined the current challenges with such structures and the proposed restrictions, which would limit their use primarily to agricultural zones with at least five acres and industrial districts. Mr. Frydl emphasized that the amendment aims to prevent visual deterioration and maintain the county's aesthetic standards while providing clear guidelines for property owners. He explained that the building code allows for the conversion of manufactured homes to accessory structures, provided they are properly anchored and modified. The proposed amendment seeks to prevent confusion about dwelling units and maintain the integrity of residential and rural areas. Mr. Frydl noted that each potential use would still require individual review for impacts, ensuring that the county can assess the specific circumstances of each proposed conversion. The goal is to create a balanced approach that allows property owners some flexibility while protecting the visual character of the community. By establishing clear definitions and restrictions, the amendment aims to provide guidance for repurposing manufactured homes as accessory structures, balancing property owners' needs with the county's comprehensive plan for rural aesthetics.

Mr. McCloskey opened the public hearing. There was no one signed up to speak, and no one online to speak.

Mr. McCloskey closed the public hearing.

The commissioners and Mr. Frydl discussed accessory structures. They had varied perspectives.

Mr. Frydl explained that there are about half a dozen such structures in the county. He noted building code requirements for converting mobile homes. He then discussed challenges like potential visual confusion about dwelling units and highlighted the need to prevent structures from looking like two homes on one parcel.

Commissioners ultimately agreed to the ordinance revision with the 5-acre minimum in agricultural zones, balancing property owners' needs with maintaining community aesthetics.

The discussion revealed differing views on property use, visual impact, and practical property management.

Mr. Kelpe made the motion, in accordance with the Greene County zoning ordinance, public necessity, convenience, General Welfare, and good zoning practice. I move to recommend approval of OR25-001, as submitted by the applicant.

Ms. Hawkins seconded.

Ms. Hawkins – Aye
Mr. Wadja – Aye
Mr. Mastervish – No
Mr. Kelpe – Aye
Mr. McCloskey – Aye

The Greene County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider amending Article 22, "Definitions," by revising the definition of Indoor Recreation Facilities and adding a new definition for Health and Fitness Centers. Health and Fitness Centers are proposed to be added as a by-right use in the following zoning districts: Article 7 (PUD), Article 8 (B-1 Business), Article 10A (TFRD), Article 11 (M-1 Industrial), and Article 12 (M-2 Industrial). (OR25-003)

Mr. Frydl explained the proposed ordinance revision for health and fitness centers, highlighting the current ordinance's limitation of treating all retail uses uniformly. Previously, health and fitness centers required a special use permit, unlike other retail businesses like Walmart. The revision aims to make the zoning process more business-friendly by creating a clear definition for health and fitness centers and allowing them as a by-right use in several zoning districts. Mr. Frydl sought to distinguish these centers from larger venues such as concert halls or ice skating rinks, emphasizing the need for a more equitable approach to zoning that supports small businesses like local gyms. The proposed changes would simplify the approval process, remove unnecessary bureaucratic barriers, and provide a more straightforward path for fitness center establishments.

Mr. McCloskey opened the public hearing. There was no one signed up to speak, and no one online to speak.

Mr. McCloskey closed the public hearing.

The planning commissioners had a brief but supportive discussion about the health and fitness center ordinance revision. They expressed enthusiasm about potentially having a gym closer to the community, indicating a positive reception to the proposed changes. The commissioners did not raise significant concerns about the potential impacts of health and fitness centers in various zoning districts. They seemed to appreciate the proposed ordinance revision's goal of making the zoning process more business-friendly and simplifying the approval for such establishments. The commissioners appeared to have viewed the ordinance revision as a practical and beneficial update to the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Kelpe made the motion in accordance with the Greene County zoning ordinance, public necessity, convenience, General Welfare, and good zoning practice. I move to recommend approval of OR25-003, as submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Wadja seconded the motion.

Mr. Kelpe – Aye
Ms. Hawkins – Aye
Mr. Mastervish – Aye
Mr. Wadja – Aye
Mr. McCloskey – Aye

The Greene County Planning Commission will hold a public hearing to consider amending Article 22: Definitions by updating the definition of Solar Energy Generation Facilities and adding required performance standards. New definitions have been created for Rooftop Solar Facilities and Ground-Mounted Solar Facilities. Rooftop Solar Facilities and Ground-Mounted Solar Facilities are proposed as by-right uses in the following zoning districts: Article C-1 Conservation, Article A-1 Agricultural, Article 5 Residential, Article 6A SR Residential, Article 7 PUD, Article 8 B-1 Business, Article 10A TFRD, Article 11 M-1 Industrial**, and** Article 12 M-2 Industrial**.** (OR24-002)

Mr. Frydl detailed the proposed ordinance revision for solar energy generation facilities, emphasizing that it does not make large-scale solar farms a by-right use. Instead, the ordinance revision creates clear definitions distinguishing between personal solar use and commercial power generation. He explained that solar generation facilities would still require a special use permit, with the adding performance standards to guide potential applicants. Mr. Frydl clarified the difference between personal solar installations (like rooftop panels or ground-mounted systems for individual or farm use) and large-scale solar farms intended to generate and sell power. The proposed changes would allow rooftop and ground-mounted solar as by-right uses in various zoning districts, while maintaining the special use permit requirement for large commercial solar generation facilities. Mr. Frydl stressed that each potential solar project would still be reviewed individually for impacts, and the county retains the ability to add specific conditions based on the unique characteristics of each proposed site. The goal was to provide clarity, establish performance standards, and maintain the county's ability to carefully evaluate and potentially mitigate the impacts of solar energy projects.

Mr. McCloskey opened the public hearing. There were two that signed up to speak Tina Merrill and Carol Schmidt.

Tina Merrill and Carol Schmidt's concerns about solar energy generation facilities included:

1. Potential large-scale solar developments in residential, agricultural, and conservation districts

2. Impact on scenic views

3. Potential damage to fragile agricultural soils

4. Concerns about 24/7 lighting

5. Noise from inverters

6. Potential glare from solar panels

7. Confusion about the language in the meeting agenda suggesting by-right use

8. Fear of unrestricted solar farm development without proper review

9. Preservation of neighborhood character

10. Ensuring comprehensive site-specific evaluation of solar projects

Mr. Wajda explained that the ordinance revision is essentially splitting the current definition of solar generation into three distinct categories. The first two categories - rooftop mounted and ground mounted solar systems - are intended for personal or small-scale use and would be considered by-right uses. The third category, which involves utility-scale or industrial solar farms, would continue to require a special use permit. This approach allows homeowners, businesses, and farmers to install solar panels for their own energy needs without extensive zoning restrictions, while maintaining the county's ability to carefully review and potentially restrict large commercial solar generation facilities. By creating these clear definitions and categories, the amendment provides more clarity about where and how solar installations can be implemented, balancing individual property owners' interests with the community's broader zoning goals.

Mr. Frydl explained that the ordinance revision aims to create clear distinctions between personal solar power use and commercial solar generation. The revision introduces separate definitions for rooftop solar, ground-mounted solar, and solar energy generation facilities. Currently, any solar installation over half an acre requires a special use permit, and this remains unchanged for large-scale solar farms. The new definitions clarify that personal solar installations - such as rooftop panels on homes, solar panels powering a farm's operations, or covered parking with solar panels - would be allowed by-right in various zoning districts. Large corporate solar farms that involve paving over forests or agricultural land to generate power for sale would still require a comprehensive special use permit process. Mr. Frydl emphasized that each potential solar project would continue to be reviewed individually, allowing the county to add specific conditions based on the unique characteristics of each proposed site. The goal is to provide clarity, establish performance standards, and maintain the county's ability to carefully evaluate and potentially mitigate the impacts of solar energy projects while supporting personal and small-scale solar energy use.

After Mr. Wadja and Mr. Frydl's detailed explanation, Tina Merrill confirmed her understanding that the solar energy generation facilities would continue to require a special use permit, and not become a by-right use. She appreciated the clarification that each site would receive a unique, comprehensive review. Carol Schmidt similarly expressed her understanding, noting that while she supports allowing individuals to install solar panels on barns or for personal use, she strongly opposes the idea of large 200-acre solar facilities being approved without thorough scrutiny. Both women thanked the commission for clarifying the ordinance's language, which had initially seemed confusing in the meeting agenda. They were satisfied that the proposed revision would maintain the planning commission's ability to evaluate potential solar projects on a case-by-case basis, ensuring that community and environmental concerns could be addressed through the special use permit process. Their initial concerns were effectively addressed by the detailed explanation of the proposed zoning ordinance revision.

James Henshaw shared two primary topics during his discussion. First, he recounted being approached by an Israeli solar company about selling or leasing his property for a solar project. After initial interest, he ultimately declined the proposal. He supported the planning commission's approach of maintaining special use permits for solar projects, believing it was important to allow neighborhood involvement in such decisions.

Mr. Frydl asked if the commissioner had looked over the written comment that was sent regarding this ordinance revision.

Mr. McCloskey closed the public hearing.

The conversation briefly shifted to discussing the written comment from James Higgins, which Ms. Hawkins noted would be addressed through the emergency management system's review process. Mr. Frydl reinforced that any solar energy project would be sent to all relevant departments, including emergency services, and that specific conditions could be added based on their recommendations. The commissioners acknowledged that each application would receive a comprehensive review, similar to previous projects like the glamping site that had numerous conditions added after departmental input. Mr. Wajda mentioned that the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would review utility-scale solar applications, and Mr. Kelpe noted that state-level regulation would also play a role in overseeing large solar projects. The discussion highlighted the multi-layered review process for significant development projects, emphasizing the county's commitment to thorough evaluation and mitigation of potential impacts.

Ms. Hawkins made the motion in accordance with the Greene County zoning ordinance, public necessity, convenience, General Welfare, and good zoning practice. I move to recommend approval of OR 24-002 is submitted.

Mr. Kelpe seconded the motion.

Mr. Kelpe – Aye
Ms. Hawkins – Aye
Mr. Mastervish – Aye
Mr. Wadja – Aye
Mr. McCloskey – Aye

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Mastervich proposed conducting a study on the county's aquifer to understand its water resources. He expressed concern about the lack of knowledge regarding the aquifer's capacity and its ability to support existing homes and farms. Mr. Kelpe supported the idea, noting the frequent concerns raised during development hearings about well water. Mr. Frydl explained the complexities of the local aquifer, describing it as a collection of numerous small water pockets in rock formations, with water storage varying significantly between locations. The commissioners discussed the geological challenges of water storage in the region, with Mr. Frydl and Mr. Kelpe providing insights into the porosity and permeability of local rock formations.

Mr. Kelpe also raised the issue of vape shops in the county, suggesting a review of existing ordinances to address these newer businesses. Mr. Frydl explained that current retail ordinances do not specifically differentiate vape shops from other retail establishments.

MINUTES

May 21, 2025, County Planning Commission minutes.

Mr. Kelpe motioned to approve the May 21, 2025.

Mr. Mastervich seconded.

Mr. McCloskey asks that all commissioners who approve state' aye' with the one correction.

May 21, 2025, minutes were approved 5-0.

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

Ruckersville Advisory Committee – Mr. Frydl provided an update on the Ruckersville Advisory Committee's recent Citizens Academy, which featured a presentation by Mrs. Beigie on grant preparation and securing funding. He highlighted her remarkable success in obtaining grants, particularly noting her recent achievement of securing $3 million from the state budget for a water supply project. Mr. Frydl explained that the state budget has set aside $25 million for water projects, with priority given to Greene County and the Town of Bowling Green. The presentation by Mrs. Beigie was well-received, with attendees appreciating her expertise in navigating the grant application process. Mr. Frydl praised her contributions, mentioning that she has been instrumental in bringing in nearly $30 million in grants for the county. The Citizens Academy event provided an opportunity for community members to learn about the complex process of grant acquisition and the potential financial benefits for local government. The commissioners expressed admiration for Mrs. Beigie's skills and her significant impact on the county's financial resources.

Town of Stanardsville – Mr. McCloskey provided an update on the Town of Stanardsville's recent meeting, highlighting several key points. The town held a public hearing about the budget, making a minor adjustment by shifting $25,000 between planning and BCA allocations. The Stanardsville Fire Department requested funding for new apparatus, specifically a trailer with pumping and hose capabilities, which the town agreed to support. Mr. McCloskey noted progress on the William Mills house project, mentioning that the town now has an architect and engineer involved and has received guidance from Mr. Frydl on soil erosion requirements. He also discussed the town's plans for the Black Bear Festival, which was successful and larger than in previous years. The festival's entry fee structure was modified, changing from a flat $20 per car rate to $5 per person (with children under 12 free). Additionally, McCloskey mentioned discussions about a potential town meals tax, which would potentially replace the county's meals tax, though the details and implementation were still being explored.

Next Month's Agenda – Mr. Frydl outlined the upcoming agenda for the next month's planning commission meeting. The primary focus will be a rezoning request for a commercial property located at the corner of highways 29 and 33, adjacent to the Wawa site. The current R2 multi-family zoned land is seeking rezoning to a business district. Mr. Frydl noted that one of the staff report's key points will be addressing the misalignment of zoning and parcel lines, recommending a site plan to ensure proper alignment. He also mentioned an ongoing resolution from the board regarding water and sewer connection requirements, which the planning commission has been working on and may be ready to move to a public hearing. Additionally, Mr. Frydl highlighted an important upcoming joint work session on agri-tourism scheduled for July 22nd at 4:30 PM, which will focus on wineries, breweries, small distilleries, and agri-tourism. He suggested this session would provide an opportunity to understand the board's expectations and potentially guide future discussions and work sessions on these topics.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

Cristy Snead,
Secretary

____
Planning Commission, Chairman

Mark Keppe