

PLANNING COMMISSION
August 19, 2015

THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE GREENE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 19, 2015, AT 7:30 PM IN THE WILLIAM MONROE HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMING ARTS CENTER.

Those present were:

- Jay Willer, Chairman
- Victor Schaff, Vice-Chairman
- Frank Morris, Member
- Eva Young, Member
- John McCloskey, Member
- Davis Lamb, Ex-Officio Member
- Bart Svoboda, Planning Director
- Stephanie Golon, County Planner
- Shawn Leake, Zoning Officer
- Dan Ratzlaff, E & S Administrator
- Marsha Alley, Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

The Chairman called the meeting to order.

DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

The Chairman took a roll call vote to determine a quorum. He thanked everyone for attending and encouraged those who wish to speak for the public hearing to sign in on the appropriate sheets. He reviewed the process for a public hearing and explained that the Commission will hear the information and make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. He reviewed the criteria used to make the recommendation.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Ellis Lyle Durrer/Ellis & Virginia Durrer request a special use permit for an Outdoor Shooting Range on approximately 2.0 acres of a 105.37 acre tract which is zoned A-1, Agriculture, located near 15337 Spotswood Trail and identified on County Tax Maps as 61-(A)-6. (SUP#15-001)

Mr. Willer read the request and asked Mr. Svoboda for a report.

Mr. Svoboda reviewed the request and gave a description of the property. He stated that the proposal would offer a twenty lane shooting range. He stated that supplemental information was received today and that all information that was received through noon today has been updated on the web site and forwarded to the Commission. He noted that the applicant has a special use permit on his personal property for a home business for a gun shop. He added that special

use permits run with the property, not the property owner. He reviewed the application process and the need for deferral in order for the applicant to have the property removed from the Agricultural-Forestal District. He reviewed the distances to neighboring properties. He further reviewed the “no-blue sky” range proposal noting that the applicant could provide more information. He reviewed agency comments relating to this proposal as well as buffering and screening requirements. He added that the Comprehensive Plan does not address shooting ranges specifically but does address tourism and development goals. He offered to review the proposed conditions after allowing for public comment if the Commission would prefer.

Lyle Durrer, applicant, addressed the Commission. He displayed an aerial photo of the proposal. He introduced his wife, Tammy, noting that they would like to get approval to operate a new business that is needed in the county. He noted that the range would allow a safe alternative for shooting in the county. He explained that the Economic Development department approached them about their willingness to install a shooting range. He stated that there was interest there and that he contacted other range operators for information. He added that he met with the county departments and agencies to get feedback and information. He added that the range is designed with safety, noise, etc. in mind. He noted that he met with several neighbors and others who wanted to discuss it. He stated that the most important factors seem to be safety, noise, lead, design, bullet containment, etc. He reviewed the “no-blue sky” design, the on-site range safety officer, security, and no-tolerance policy for irresponsible behavior. He reviewed the topography of the property. He added that noise has been tested by companies and the design limits the noise to no louder than background noise. He reviewed bullet containment and lead recycling. He added that they will be responsible for record keeping for these issues as required by the Environmental Protection Agency. He stated that the companies that they are working with build ranges worldwide, noting that they are going above and beyond what is necessary. He noted that parking will be provided at the range. He reviewed the benefits to the county such as tourism, out-of-county money being spent in Greene County, and one day per month free use for Greene County Sheriff’s Office for training. He summarized that the most important issues are safety, noise, lead, design, traffic, and benefits to the county. He added that he has heard of the concerns regarding property value loss. He noted that a licensed realtor in the Commonwealth of Virginia has performed a study and will speak about those findings later. He added that the market conditions drive assessment values and not the actions of neighboring properties. He stated that he has a letter from the Commissioner of the Revenue for Greene County stating that during his years of service he does not remember anything being built in the county that would cause property values to decrease. Mr. Durrer stated that there is also a concern regarding the surface danger zone (SDZ). He explained that the range will be designed with round containment, noting that the SDZ designed ranges are more military related and is a different design. He read a paper from a Facebook page to relocate range, Big Iron Outdoors, that referred to the range design in regard to containment and SDV. He stated that there is a lot of support for the gun range noting that there are

over 800 signatures, over 500 from Greene County. He stated that according to a Greene County Record article from November 2014 which estimated that if a business is privately owned, .75 cents on the dollar stays in county which would be a projected \$880,000 per year in revenue, noting that a conservative estimate of .50 cents on the dollar would be \$600,000 dollars in revenue. He added that the range investment would be over \$500,000 in the county. He noted that he would address the proposed conditions during that discussion time. Mr. Durrer stated that they have gone above and beyond in the design and have invested in getting tests done. He requested that the decision be made not on emotion, "not in my backyard", or falsehoods but based on allowing it in an agricultural area by special use permit and its benefits to the county. He stated that noise, lead, safety, VDOT approval, anything that county has asked has been done. He added that this has turned into an emotional, opinionated, and misinformed case and that is not what this is about. He added that it is about being able to do this in this location and its benefits to the county now and in the future. He stated that they would like a decision tonight, yes or no, instead of a deferral. He made a request for those in support of the gun range to stand.

Mr. Schaff stated that what is being described tonight offers more detail than what was included in the packet and asked when that data would be available for review.

Mr. Durrer explained that he described the design that was viewed when they met on site.

Mr. Schaff stated that they did view that information on site but he had no information to study further and in more detail, particularly the sound information.

Mr. Durrer added that the sound testing results were included on the concept plan. He noted that the plan changed but those results did not change. He added that the Sheriff's Department performed the sound testing.

Mr. McCloskey noted that there has been a change in design but that it was described on site as being done in order to achieve a certain performance standard or a certain decibel range and asked what the achievable range would be.

Mr. Durrer stated that the noise study allowed the range designers and acoustical specialists to determine if, and they can, design this range to be no louder than the background noise during operational hours. He gave a description of how the shooting took place.

Mr. Willer clarified that the test was performed in the pasture with no mitigating design only one firearm at a time.

Mr. Durrer described how the test was performed. He agreed that any efforts made would reduce sound as the shooting test was performed in a wide open field.

There was clarification that the offer for the Sheriff's Department would apply to target shooting, qualifying, etc. but not tactical maneuvers and other similar training.

Mr. Willer stated that over 80 people have signed up to speak. He explained that each speaker will receive three (3) minutes to address the Commission. He asked everyone to be courteous. He added that a speaker's time may be deferred to someone else, noting that one person cannot speak for more than nine (9) minutes. He requested that there be no applause or booing in respect for everyone and to reduce any delays. He explained that there will be no discussion between speakers and the Commission but any questions would be considered during the Commission discussion.

The Chairman opened the public hearing. After the first speaker finished, Mr. Willer clarified the process of deferring minutes to another speaker.

The following citizens addressed the Commission:

- Carolyn Politis (also speaking for John Humphries)
- Nick Guarino (also speaking for Noel Morino and John Glass)
- Mary Saunders
- Suzan Hiller
- Daniel Held
- Meseret Workelul
- Tilahun Goshu (also speaking for Alexis Leys)
- Harold Bare
- Chris Politis (also speaking for Heping Zheng and Angela Hawkins)
- Julie Kuhl (also speaking for Carl Binggeli)
- Susan Bunting
- Christine Wheatley (read a letter from Stephen Birchell)
- Renee Birchell
- Jackie Pickett
- Lance Pickett
- Scott Hiller
- Luke Whitebread
- Cathy Whitebread
- Dwight Webster
- Stephanie Herring (also speaking for Marvin Caish)
- Mike Collins (also speaking for Deborah Collins)
- Thomas Wharton (also speaking for Dinah Page)
- Michael Laukitis (also speaking for Tammy Laukitis and Kathleen Findley)
- Anthony Herring
- Steven Glorieux (At this time, the Commission took a five-minute recess.)
- During the recess, William Saunders notified staff that he was overlooked on the sign in sheet but had to leave as he was not feeling well. Mr. Willer allowed Christos Politis to read a letter from Mr. Saunders.)

- Lori Gore
- Jerry Gore
- Judith Levine
- Hugh Wright
- Kenneth Chace
- Greg Redfern
- Mark Norman
- Louise Gerlach-not present when called
- Ken Gerlach-not present when called
- Lloyd Staples-not present when called
- Wes Wills
- Mark Pulczynski
- James Toliver
- Ronald Padley
- Colin Conrad (also speaking for Sara Conrad)
- Deanna Wills
- Keith Bourne
- Joe Aldridge
- Jeff Goldberg
- Teri Goldberg
- Chris Findley
- Darryl Mesaros
- William Hay-not present when called
- Cynthia Hash
- Steve Smith
- Laila Bare
- Eric Hensley
- Steve Keene
- Drew Taylor
- Gina Morris-not present when called
- Linwood Gibson-not present when called
- Kenneth Collier-not present when called
- David Gonzalez
- John Bishop-not present when called
- Joe Carpenter-not present when called
- Philip Carpenter-not present when called
- Nancy Dixon-not present when called
- Dale Guthiel -not present when called
- Jeremy Shifflett -not present when called
- Mark Wellen
- Trevor Payton
- Mark Haggemaker -not present when called
- Stacy Guthiel-not present when called
- Julian Davidson-not present when called
- Cynthia Davidson-not present when called

- Jeffrey Newby
- Megan Perry
- Wayne Koontz (Mr. Willer offered an opportunity for anyone who had not signed up to speak and added Mr. Koontz's name to the list.)

The citizens asked questions and offered comments and concerns regarding the gun range relating to the following:

- proximity to homes
- no guarantee of bullet containment
- questions regarding installation and design
- no professional acoustic studies have been done, noting a conflict of interest in Sheriff's Department performing the test as they will be benefiting from the range
- lead concerns
- lack of ground water testing
- psychological effects on veterans and families
- school bus safety
- county liability and insurance needs
- review the facts
- the gun range needs to be in the right design and in the right location
- there seems to be a fundamental misunderstanding of the "no blue sky" range design and containment, noting that it is not confined
- the air space over the property where low flying aircraft travel is equivalent to traffic volume on Route 33
- suggests that the FAA be consulted
- a description of bullet-strike investigation process
- identify risks and address the needs
- the Durrers are fine people
- ask the experts in the field for range design
- the range can be done right but is not ready right now
- noise intensity, frequency, etc.
- health impacts caused by noise, impulse sound in humans and animals
- several references to the NRA Range Source Book
- family moved to Ruckersville for the rural small-town atmosphere, adding that they decided to live in this area but not near a gun range
- offered personal reasons for opposing the range such as family visitations would be limited or prohibited due to family member suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, etc.
- refugee family from Kenya experienced situations of gun fire where children were hidden during gun fire, noting that they brought their family to America to get away from this
- there are no safe shots and gun shots are not controllable
- please vote against the range
- family rescued from Ethiopia and moved to America for a better life here for his family and have become citizens
- do not support having a gun range in their backyard

- concerned for children's safety while playing in the yard
- family would have to deal with psychological stress if the gun range is approved
- property in the area is not selling
- questions regarding the signatures of those who have signed up to speak relating to age, employment, property ownership, etc.
- there is a history of special use permits being approved and then the line is pushed regarding compliance with conditions of approval
- the homes were here first
- property values will be negatively impacted
- several references to the Greene County Zoning Ordinance, Article 16-2
- the area would welcome a properly designed range
- there are two properties in the Midway area that would be more appropriate as only 6 homes are located nearby, not 160 homes, noting that this property is owned by other family members also
- proposed location is not suitable and need to work to find a better location
- the proposal violates objectives of Article 16-2
- the range was compared to a more secluded, wooded range location when comparing home values
- tax rates will increase to make up for the loss in property values
- it was noted that a good idea in the wrong location equals failure and encouraged everyone to find a more suitable location
- Greene County is a wonderful place to live
- asked if the gun range offers harmony, what will the county do to attract new development
- respect the need for a safe gun range but not near homes as property values will be negatively impacted
- incessant gun fire is not desirable
- outside of what has been heard and emotions riding high, remember that numbers do not lie and property values will be affected by about 30%
- willing to work together to find a better location
- personal shooting of firearms on the property is expected but not 20 lanes with firing all at one time
- concern for ground water contamination, airborne lead dust, hours of operation and the amount of noise
- this is a bad plan and the stakes are too high to learn on the job
- family chose Ruckersville as a quiet, safe, peaceful area and are now concerned about safety, lead and future clean-up plans, and stray bullets
- construction must be precise
- outdoor living projects are not being followed through due to the pending proposal causing a loss of income and a loss of revenue for stores such as Lowe's, etc.
- support a gun range but in a safer location
- some business owners near Ruckersville are concerned as well
- population is estimated to increase which needs to be in balance with mixed-use or business growth

- much of the mixed use area is near the proposed range
- how strong are the county ordinances
- concern of ricochets
- incessant gunfire causes panic in humans, animals, and especially small children who could flee from the gun fire into Route 33
- there is a need for sufficient sound acoustic testing
- oppose the gun range in this location as it will disturb the tranquility of the area
- alternative locations are available
- an indoor range would be more suitable
- the applicant was not willing to participate in a meeting with a mediator
- an example was given regarding a gun range located near Glenmore that has had some issues and needed acoustics testing by reputable agencies
- would welcome a properly designed and appropriately located range in Greene County
- participating at the range comes with inherent risk, but those risks are being forced on neighboring property owners
- there is no guarantee of 100% containment
- it is unrealistic to expect 100% of adherence to procedure by shooters 100% of the time
- property within the surface danger zones cannot be used effectively by the owners
- what are the procedures and rules for gun range customers
- who will perform safety inspections, etc. and how will that be done
- will the county need additional liability insurance
- safety risks are too great to allow an open air gun range at this location
- if the shot is not safe, do not take it
- thanks to the Commission for their time and attention in this matter
- restrictions were placed on Big Iron Outdoors special use permit approval for a gun shop and conditions were not adhered to, such as hours of operation
- several special use permits have been restricted or denied based on various safety issues
- most ranges are located away from residences
- urge discussions with the Durrers relating to the project
- example given of having used gun ranges which were both open ranges surrounded by homes
- companies have been hired to assure that noise and safety are addressed appropriately
- recently a family was denied a special use permit based on emotions which is unfair
- the overall business objective which is in compliance with the ordinance
- the Durrers have chosen competent companies for construction, etc.
- provision of safety statistics for other ranges
- house is up for sale and cannot sell due to the propose range project, noting that the value is decreasing and cannot generate any interest as a

result of this application

- reiterated previous comments regarding the decrease in property values
- safety is the greatest concern
- this is not an appropriate location
- cannot guarantee (by design) containment
- concerns regarding lead poisoning
- concerns for properties and owners within the surface danger zones
- impacts on economics
- consider deferral to obtain more specific information
- happenings in front of the firing lanes is established but happenings behind the firing lanes has not been addressed and more details are needed
- folks are being personally impacted
- a range at this location should be fully enclosed
- primary concern is that the design impacts too many homes
- it was noted that more time is needed to review the information that was submitted by the applicant today
- applaud the Durrers for what they are trying to do but ask that the appropriate time is taken to review information
- who would be responsible for lead clean-up in the future
- please defer or deny this proposal
- build the right range in the right location
- the Durrers have given a good outline of the plan for the project
- gun fire is the sound of freedom
- please support this proposal
- the EDA approached a citizen about developing a gun range and the citizen then directed them to the Durrers who have more property
- if the EDA approaches a citizen to develop a business, then they should support it more
- the proposed range will not be attractive or similar to other construction in the area
- reference to conflicting information regarding decibel levels
- the range will affect so many properties
- citizens rely on the Zoning Ordinance
- an enclosed range makes more sense
- support the range proposal
- ranges do have noise but there are mitigating efforts to address it
- some comments have been based on hysteria and misinformation
- could support a properly located shooting range
- other areas are better suited
- suggestions for indoor and sound proof range
- previous range was removed when the Community Park was developed
- range alternatives outside of the county are being used to train deputies and scheduling of deputies is difficult when using alternative ranges
- a range is needed but not at this location
- love the county and chose to live here asked the Commission to make

- decisions based on facts not emotions
- let's unite and build in a safe location
- there has been a delay throughout the process
- the Durrers have a legal right to use their own land
- ask the Commission to vote in favor of this range
- commend both sides for expressing concerns
- believe the Durrers will address issues and concerns
- a licensed realtor (previously mentioned by Mr. Durrer) provided statistics relating to home sales and development around two gun ranges in Orange County and a description of those ranges and the environments that surround them
- live near the airport in Earlysville and can see the runways and feel the shake in the house but has grown accustomed to the noise
- raised to avoid firearms but have found the need to take the classes and become a firearms owner
- proud to be a part of the community and anticipate a good outcome
- a long-time firearm enthusiast but oppose this range
- chose to locate in Greene County and oppose the range
- appreciate the Durrers effort and investment but note that homeowners have also made investments
- listen to the facts
- my family deserves more than someone who is figuring it out as they go
- if the range is denied, people will not have as safe options for shooting
- pull together as a community to come up with a solution
- wish the Commission the best in making the decision
- would be nice to have a gun range
- the location is convenient and would bring in revenue
- more killings are going on from drug dealers than by this range.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

There was another five-minute recess.

Lyle & Tammy Durrer addressed the Commission. Mr. Durrer clarified that he was willing to meet with the citizen group but was not willing to pay for a mediator. He stated that a third party acoustic study was performed and that he is working with the NRA. He added that he has hired a professional company to construct the range. He thanked the Commission for their time.

Mr. Willer explained that discussion from this point forward would be between the Commission and the applicant.

Mr. Morris asked if there will be a bullet proof wall behind the shooters.

Mr. Durrer stated that there is a bullet proof wall behind the firing line. He described the wall.

Mr. Morris asked if guns are allowed down range.

Mr. Durrer stated that you will not be able to walk down range except possibly during a cease fire when firearms are laid on the counter.

There was discussion between the Commission and the applicant regarding the cattle in the pasture. Mr. Durrer stated that there are no concerns for the cattle or farm workers at this time.

Mr. Morris asked Mr. Svoboda if Mr. Durrer needs a special use permit because it will be a commercial operation.

Mr. Svoboda stated that a special use permit is required because the use is listed as a use by special use permit under the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Morris asked if Mr. Durrer invited friends over on a weekend and they were not being charged a fee, could they discharge firearms without a shooting facility.

Mr. Svoboda stated that he would need to know the particular circumstances but that private shooting on private land is not regulated by the ordinance.

Mr. Morris asked if Mr. Durrer had twenty friends on a Saturday getting ready to go shooting with the hunt club, could they shoot one-thousand rounds without being in a building.

Mr. Svoboda stated that the ordinance would not require them to be in a building.

Mr. Schaff stated that he would like to see the detailed design for the proposed range that would include sound engineering as well.

Mr. Durrer explained that he would be using Range Systems for the baffling and Troy Acoustics for sound design, noting that it is difficult to have the two companies get the designs together. He noted that the lead containment is 99% effective.

There was discussion among the Commission regarding the need for documentation for sound tests and the need for a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP).

Mr. Durrer explained that he has shown each Commissioner the design, noting that anything that he has turned in has resulted in more requirements from the county or phone calls to the company by outside folks which makes it hard to do business.

Mr. Schaff stated that the issue is that what he looked at on site has possibly changed and that the Commission is charged with studying the information and coming up with a recommendation. He added that he has briefly seen them on site but has not studied them in detail.

Mr. Durrer noted that the design information was available and shown to the Commissioners on site. He added that he had answered any questions and noted that it can be reviewed anytime.

Mr. Schaff stated that another thing that would be needed would be a written operating procedure that is reflective of the design and requirements.

Mr. Durrer stated that the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) is almost completed. He added that he is anticipating restrictions to be applied if approved and that those restrictions would need to be included in the SOP. He noted that the SOP is being written by someone who has written many SOPs for shooting ranges.

Mr. Schaff stated that he understood that the range construction would have to be certified to meet the regulations and was not sure how that could be accomplished if several companies were being used during construction.

Mr. Durrer stated that an engineer will have to draw the plan and place his stamp on it, noting that the range will then be constructed according to those plans.

Mr. Schaff stated that it would be great to see all of that information.

Mr. McCloskey agreed that an engineer would be needed to certify that what is being chosen will work given the different vendors, adding that he understands that Mr. Durrer wants to use the best available features.

Mr. Durrer agreed that he is trying to choose the best features and that the plans must be certified by an engineer. He added that this is hard to accomplish that without knowing what is going to be required by the county in regard to possible restrictions.

Mr. Willer stated that he agreed with his colleagues adding that no one is questioning Mr. Durrer's integrity or his desire to provide a safe facility. He added that the concern is that this is a request for a special use permit to be located on this property not about a permit for the Durrers' specifically as the issue is not about who owns the property but the range being allowed there. He stated that in terms of the design of the gun range, he appreciated Mr. Durrer's understanding that conditions may be applied if approval is recommended but noted that the Commission cannot design the range. He added that having a rough idea of the design plan and having the Commission provide refining points results in the Commission playing a part in designing the range. He stated that he would be more comfortable if by the September meeting the applicant could provide a more precise proposal with the expectations of what the range performance might be so that if approval is recommended it can be referenced to the specific documents that were provided and that it would become a part of the permanent record. He added that the more assistance provided by the applicant as to specific detail of the proposal makes it easier for the Commission to

approve the proposal without designing the gun range themselves.

Mr. Durrer stated that the design that was seen by the Commissioners is the building design that will be constructed. He added that it is also difficult for him because there is no one in the county qualified to let him know what the county wants.

Mr. Willer stated that everyone wants to get this project right.

Mr. Durrer explained that he is hiring professional companies for that reason.

Mr. McCloskey asked Mr. Durrer if the surface danger zones have been identified for this proposal.

Mr. Durrer stated that those zones usually apply to military-type ranges and that this design would be different. He noted that he would be using a total-containment system and that there would be no surface danger zone.

Mr. Willer emphasized that this is not just about the design but also about the health and safety of the community and properties as well. He noted that everyone wants to know that if this is approved that it will be a safe facility in this location. He added that the more clarity achieved prior to making a recommendation would be more helpful. He stated that it would be nice to have more details regarding design, operating procedures, maintenance requirements, etc. in order to make a well-informed recommendation.

As a result of the previous discussion, Mr. Schaff made a motion to defer SUP#15-005 to the September 16, 2015 meeting.

There was discussion regarding the upcoming September meeting agenda.

Mr. Willer informed everyone that if the deferral to the September meeting is approved that there will not be a public hearing at that meeting as that has officially been held tonight. He explained that the Commission will have the opportunity to question the Durrers for clarification of details or that they could provide someone to clarify any questions for them but that there will not be a public hearing.

Mr. Bare respectfully rose in the audience stating that the public should be able to comment on any additional information at the September meeting.

Mr. Willer explained that the public hearing has been held tonight and that from this point on it is the Commission's job to make a recommendation. He added that there will be another public hearing opportunity before the Board of Supervisors but that there will not be another public comment period before this body.

Mr. Svoboda informed the Commission that the Performing Arts Center (PAC)

has not been reserved for September but that confirmation has been received that the PAC is available in October if needed. He stated that the September meeting will be held at the County Administration Building meeting room as routinely done.

Mr. Willer stated that the meeting room would be fine.

Mr. Morris stated that the Code of Virginia does allow for a special meeting to be held if necessary for a time when the PAC would be available before October.

There was discussion regarding the option for holding a special meeting and the criteria that must be met.

Mr. Morris made a motion to hold a special meeting before the regularly scheduled October Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Willer stated that the current motion needs to be addressed first. He restated the current motion on the table to defer consideration of SUP#15-001 to the September 16, 2015 meeting. He reminded everyone that the meeting will be held at the normal meeting place noting that there will be no public comment that night and that it may or may not be a crowded room.

Mr. McCloskey seconded the motion.

The vote was taken.

AYE

NAY

Mr. Morris
Mr. Schaff
Mr. McCloskey
Mrs. Young
Mr. Willer

The motion to recommend deferral to the September 16, 2015 meeting carried by a 5-0 vote.

Mr. Willer thanked everyone for their participation.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

There was no Old/New Business for discussion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Schaff made a motion to approve the July 15, 2015 meeting minutes as submitted.

Mrs. Young seconded the motion.

The minutes for the July 15, 2015 meeting were approved by a 5-0 vote.

Mrs. Young made a motion to approve the July 15, 2015 work session minutes as submitted.

Mr. Schaff seconded the motion.

The minutes for the July 15, 2015 work session were approved by a 5-0 vote.

OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

Town of Stanardsville Information

Mr. Svoboda stated the recent town rezoning request was approved.

Next Month's Agenda

Mr. Svoboda reviewed the agenda for the September meeting. He stated that there will be public hearings for a rezoning request for Harold Phillips and an ordinance revision relating to special use permit language clarifications for recording approvals. He reminded the Commission that the Mt. Vernon Church special use permit request will be reviewed by the Commission under Old/New Business as well as the Ordinance Revision for Tourist Lodging. He noted that the deferral from tonight will also be included under Old/New Business as well.

Mr. Svoboda also reminded the Commission that there will be a Comprehensive Plan work session at 6:30 pm before the regularly scheduled meeting in September.

Mrs. Young asked what meeting date would be considered for the deferral of the Durrer's special use permit.

Mr. Willer and Mr. Svoboda reminded her that the application for the Durrer's special use permit request had been deferred to the September 16, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

Mrs. Young restated the date for clarification.

Mr. Willer stated that the motion was to defer the Durrer's special use permit request to the September 16, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

Mrs. Young stated that there had been the consideration for October.

Mr. Schaff stated that it had been discussed.

Mr. Willer clarified that the motion had been to defer the Durrer's special use permit request to the September 16, 2015 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Svoboda stated that the motion was approved and has been deferred to the September 16, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Morris asked if that will be reviewed under Old Business.

Mr. Svoboda stated that the request would be reviewed under Old Business.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Marsha Alley

Secretary

Planning Commission, Chairman

Date