

PRESENT: R. Harris, Chairman
W. Schindler, Vice Chairman
C. Bragg
L. Howdlyshell
R. Thomas
K. Leonard
K. McComas

J. Hensley, Planner II
D. Wolfe, Director of Community Development

ABSENT:

VIRGINIA: At the Called Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, June 11, 2024 at 3:00 p.m. in the Community Development Conference Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

* * * * *

The Planning Commission reviewed four (4) ordinance amendments up for public hearing:

1. Section 25-4
2. Section 25-54.1
3. Section 25-382
4. Section 25-384

The Planning Commission also reviewed the following request for a substantial accord determination, and traveled to the following site which will be considered at the public hearing:

15.2-2232 Substantial Accord Determination
Elm Spring VAB, LLC
2129 Jefferson Highway
Fishersville, VA 22939

Chairman

Secretary

PRESENT: R. Harris, Chairman
W. Schindler, Vice Chairman
C. Bragg
L. Howdyshell
R. Thomas
K. Leonard
K. McComas

J. Hensley, Planner II
D. Wolfe, Director of Community Development
K. Keffer, Assistant County Attorney

ABSENT:

VIRGINIA: At the Regular Meeting of the Augusta County Planning Commission held on Tuesday, June 11, 2024 at 7:00 p.m. in the Board Room, Augusta County Government Center, Verona, Virginia.

DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

Mr. Randy Harris stated that there was a quorum.

* * * * *

MINUTES

Mr. Larry Howdyshell moved to approve the minutes of the called and regular meeting held on May 14, 2024.

Mrs. Carolyn Bragg seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0.

* * * * *

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Harris stated that there were five (5) public hearings that evening.

Chapter 25. Zoning. Division A. In General. Article I. General Provisions. Section 25-4. Definitions. Companion pigs.

Ms. Julia Hensley introduced the first item as an ordinance to amend Section 25-4 of the Augusta County Code. This amendment adds the definition of companion pigs as breeds of swine known as Miniature Potbellied Pigs, Vietnamese Potbellied Pigs, Juliana Pigs, or veterinarian-certified similar breeds.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss or had questions for staff.

Mr. Harris opened the public hearing asking if anyone wished to speak for or against the amendment.

Ms. Arielle Carroll, of 111 Skyview Circle, Verona, VA 24482, the owner of a potbellied pig, spoke in favor of the amendment. Ms. Carroll cited her passion for and experience in animal rescue and rehabilitation. Ms. Carroll continued by sharing images of her and her family's potbellied pig, expressing its likeness to other domestic pets, like dogs. Ms. Carroll argued that the breeds of pigs that would fall under the Companion Pig definition are different from commercial hogs.

Nathan Carroll, of 111 Skyview Circle, Verona, VA 24482, the owner of a potbellied pig, spoke in favor of the amendment. Mr. Carroll clarified the difference between commercial hogs and miniature pigs, stating that miniature pigs are domesticated pets, not swine. Mr. Carroll cited the City of Chesapeake, Virginia and other localities in the U.S. as having recognized miniature or companion pigs as acceptable pets in residential districts. Mr. Carroll compared miniature pigs to other domestic pets, explaining their ability to be trained and leashed.

Mr. Harris asked if anyone else wished to speak for or against the amendment. Seeing none, Mr. Harris closed the public hearing.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss the amendment.

Mrs. Bragg recognized the speakers' interests. Mrs. Bragg stated that the County is largely made up of General Agriculture, where the miniature pigs are permitted, and that pigs should not be in residentially-zoned districts.

Mr. Howdyshell expressed concern with what this amendment will encourage as it relates to the domestication or companionship of all animals. He expressed concern with animal shelter capacity and preserving land maintenance in residentially-zoned districts.

Mr. Howdyshell made a motion to recommend denial of the amendment.

Ms. Kristy McComas seconded the motion, which carried 6-1.

Chapter 25. Zoning. Division A. In General. Article V. Accessory Buildings and Uses.
Section 25-54.1. Uses accessory to single-family residences.

Ms. Hensley introduced the second item as an ordinance to amend Section 25-54.1 of the Augusta County Code. This amendment adds the keeping of companion pigs in single-family residences and regulations including the type of companion pig that is permitted, the number of companion pigs that can be kept, and the requirement for a licensed veterinarian certification to verify the type of pig that is allowed as a companion pig.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss or had questions for staff.

Mrs. Bragg made a comment to clarify the types of homes that would be impacted by this ordinance amendment, stating that this amendment would apply to single-family homes, attached residential homes, and other types of housing.

Mr. Harris opened the public hearing asking if anyone wished to speak for or against the amendment.

Ms. Tammy Lockridge, of 29 Kenwood Place, Verona, VA 24482, spoke in opposition of the amendment. Ms. Lockridge stated that individuals choose to live in certain districts based on the amenities or characteristics that come with it. Ms. Lockridge referred to Mr. Howdyshell's concern with what this amendment would encourage as it relates to the domestication or companionship of all animals.

Mr. Harris asked if anyone else wished to speak for or against the amendment. Seeing none, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss the amendment.

Mr. Kyle Leonard stated that pigs are intelligent and share a likeness to other household pets. He expressed that, as is the case with all animals, the behavior and actions of a pig are the result of the owners' decisions and training. Mr. Leonard commended Mr. and Ms. Carroll and stated his differing sentiments from the rest of the Commission.

Mr. Harris asked if any other Commissioners had comments.

Mr. Howdyshell made a motion to recommend denial for the amendment.

Mr. Bill Schindler seconded the motion, which carried 6-1.

Chapter 25. Zoning. Division F. Industrial Districts. Article XXXVIII. General Industrial (GI) Districts. Section 25-382. Permitted uses.

Ms. Hensley introduced the third item as an ordinance to amend Section 25-382 of the Augusta County Code. This amendment adds item V. to allow for recycling of plants without the use or storage of explosives or hazardous substances as a principal use.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss or had questions for staff.

Mr. Harris opened the public hearing asking if anyone wished to speak for or against the amendment. Seeing none, Mr. Harris closed the public hearing.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss the amendment.

Mrs. Bragg made a motion to recommend approval for the amendment.

Mr. Leonard seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0.

Chapter 25. Zoning. Division F. Industrial Districts. Article XXXVIII. General Industrial (GI) Districts. Section 25-384. Uses permitted by Special Use Permit.

Ms. Hensley introduced the fourth items as an ordinance to amend Section 25-384 of the Augusta County Code. This amendment adds recycling of explosive or hazardous substances to item C. of uses allowed in General Industrial districts with a special use permit.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss or had questions for staff.

Mr. Harris opened the public hearing asking if anyone wished to speak for or against the amendment. Seeing none, Mr. Harris closed the public hearing.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss the amendment.

Mrs. Bragg made a motion to recommend approval for the amendment.

Mr. Howdyshell seconded the motion, which carried unanimously, 7-0.

Elm Spring VAB, LLC

Ms. Hensley introduced the fifth item as a request for a substantial accord determination pursuant to Virginia State Code Section 15.2-2232 for Elm Spring VAB, LLC to construct and operate a small solar energy system (3MWac) on property owned by Elm Spring,

LLC (TMP 067 78J and 067 78L) located at 2129 Jefferson Highway (US-250) in Fishersville in the Wayne Magisterial District. The total parcel acreage is approximately 81.13 acres and the proposed acreage to be developed is approximately 23 acres within the fenced project area. The parcels included in this request are located within an Urban Service Overlay District in an Urban Service Area of the Comprehensive Plan, planned for Community Mixed Use.

Ms. Hensley introduced the applicants, who prepared a presentation on the project.

Kevin Comer, 144 Diamond Court, Harrisonburg, VA, 22801, and Bryan Jake-Schoffman, Florida, introduced themselves to the Commission.

Mr. Comer began the presentation by providing background on the land owner and the land owner's motivations for leasing a portion of the property for the proposed solar project. Mr. Comer stated that the land owner sees the solar project as a means to improve and diversify the farm's income, as well as secure the farm's legacy for familial successors of the landowner.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman identified the company he is representing and their experience working in Virginia on projects of greater scale. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that RWE Clean Energy is a well-integrated company in this market with the experience to properly manage this specific 3MW solar project.

Mr. Comer explained that in regards to Elm Spring, the proposed project is a 3MW facility that would sell its power to Dominion Energy. He also indicated that this project would participate in a shared solar program where local customers are offered a discount rate on their electricity bill. Mr. Comer stated that this solar project has low visibility, but continued to share that to be in substantial accord with the Augusta County Comprehensive Plan, the proposed project would have extensive buffering.

Mr. Comer stated that the specific location of the project was due to its proximity to a power line and its location on a VEPCO easement. Mr. Comer added that the location of the project on the subject parcels is the least valuable location for other types of development.

Mr. Comer stated that the project will use specific solar equipment meant to minimize grading. He stated that due to the small size of the project, any noise pollution will be low. Mr. Comer continued by visually showcasing the site plan for the project, highlighting the vegetative buffers that will be planted.

Mr. Comer stated that due to the VEPCO easement on the property, parts of the property line would not have a vegetative buffer and instead would have a wooden fence to confront concerns with the visual effects of the project.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman spoke on the maintenance of the project, highlighting its 35-year operational life span. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that this project would add

approximately \$340,000 in revenue to the County. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that this project would give back to the community rather than be an additional cost to them.

Mr. Comer addressed the concern of rural viewshed, highlighting the terrain of the proposed location and its minimal requirement for grading. Mr. Comer reiterated the motivation for the choice of location as being minimal visibility from other properties and the owner's economic and familial goals for the land.

Mr. Comer shared a series of photographs from different viewpoints to visualize the extent in which mature vegetative buffering would reduce visibility of the project. Mr. Comer reiterated that only on the VEPCO utility easement would there be an opaque wooden fence. Mr. Comer stated that cattle grazing would continue outside of the fencing and that sheep grazing could take place inside.

Mr. Comer stated that the project would have zero impact on prime farmland. Mr. Comer reiterated the use of all-terrain trackers and the low-visibility of the project. Mr. Comer addressed Policy 6 of the Comprehensive Plan, Balanced Land Uses, and stated that the land use determination was to minimize slope, avoid developable areas, and minimize visual impact. Mr. Comer stated that the project will take up only 15% of the landowner's farm and highlighted its adjacency to the power line.

Mr. Comer introduced Ray Burkholder.

Mr. Burkholder highlighted the land owner's perspective and gave insight into the project's relation to the Augusta County Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Burkholder explained the development patterns of the area as well as the future land use for the location of the property. Mr. Burkholder shared that this project is temporary and could be replaced with new technology to address current and future energy challenges.

Mr. Comer addressed compact interconnected development and recognized the project's positioning in an Urban Service Area. Mr. Comer shared the timeline of the project and application, stating that it was before the December 13, 2023 ordinance change. Mr. Comer stated that the project will take up less than 0.4% of the land in the Urban Service Area in Fishersville.

Mr. Comer reiterated the land owner's desires. Mr. Comer stated that Policies 8 and 9 of the Comprehensive Plan are not applicable to this project per staff conversations and reports.

Mr. Comer addressed Policies 10 and 11 of the Comprehensive Plan and stated that wetlands and prime farmland are not expected to be impacted by the nature of the project. Mr. Comer continued by stating that there are minimal habitat impacts and that wildlife-friendly fencing would be considered by both the applicant and the landowner.

Mr. Comer addressed Policy 12 of the Comprehensive Plan, clustering and colocation, and stated that this project is intended to preserve the character of the community. Mr.

Comer reiterated the support of the neighboring residents and cited the similarity between the proposed project and the Wayne Avenue project that was approved.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman provided details on the environmental, health and safety report that was conducted by RWE Clean Energy. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that there will be no negative impacts associated with the project on the health and safety of neighboring community members. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that there will be no glare hazards or increase in temperature. Mr. Jake-Schoffman continued by stating that there will be no noticeable noise pollution for neighboring residents.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman provided a summary of the economic and community benefits associated with the development of the project. Such benefits included powering more than 500 homes, increasing tax revenue, low-visibility, neighbor support, and job opportunities. Mr. Jake-Schoffman concluded the presentation.

Mr. Harris asked if any Commissioners had questions or comments for the applicant.

Mrs. Bragg asked the applicants if there were other options alternative to a wooden fence for the screening of the project on the VEPCO utility easement.

Mr. Comer cited the ordinance's requirement for an opaque fence.

Mrs. Bragg asked about the landowner's preferences.

Mr. Comer cited the ordinance's standards for acceptable buffering and the requirements for the VEPCO utility easement.

Mrs. Bragg asked about the maintenance that would be associated with a wooden fence.

Mr. Comer stated that that would be included in the maintenance and upkeep of all other components of the project.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that the applicant made a certain amount of funds available for replacement costs. Mr. Jake-Schoffman reiterated the reduced visibility associated with the project but stated that should it be an issue, the applicant accepts full responsibility for its maintenance and aesthetics.

Mr. Comer stated that the applicant is willing to consider other screening alternatives if they are available.

Mrs. Bragg referred to the Dominion Shared Solar Program. Mrs. Bragg cited the applicant's proposal and its goal to provide discount rates to low-income residents. Mrs. Bragg cited other projects that proposed the same program for residents, but did not end up participating. Mrs. Bragg asked the presenters how this project would be different.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that the process under which they operate has a 30% minimum requirement for low-to-moderate income customers to receive breaks or discounts. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that the company, however, decided to have 100% of the discount rates apply to low-to-moderate income customers. Mr. Jake-Schoffman indicated that this is not required of them.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that the applicant cannot economically promise that discount goal because that falls under a separate department, but that it is an objective for the project. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that it is the goal of the project to get into the queue and into Dominion's market, but that they are years away from that part of the process. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that there is a process that takes place that disallows the applicant to fully predict the success of that subscription process.

Mrs. Bragg expressed concern with the possibility and predictability of the Dominion Shared Solar Program and its ability to grant County residents discounted energy rates.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman and Mrs. Bragg shared remarks to clarify the unpredictability of the Dominion Shared Solar Program.

Mrs. Bragg made a statement to clarify and applaud the shared solar program's goal at providing discount rates solely to low-income residents.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that Mrs. Bragg's previous comment is accurate.

Mr. Leonard stated that once projects similar to this are approved, they become a commodity to the company. Mr. Leonard asked the applicant how the County would know if the project were to be traded to another company that shares the same values as the applicant. Mr. Leonard asked what happens if another developer takes over and the promises are not met.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that any developer is bound to the requirements within the permit. He stated that any change associated with production rates, equipment, etc. are not regulated under the Special Use Permit. Mr. Jake-Schoffman continued to state that the application is approved based on the characteristics and considerations outlined in the text and cannot be changed. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that any other developer is still bound under the conditions outlined in the Special Use Permit.

Mrs. Bragg stated that Special Use Permits are under one name. Mrs. Bragg asked if that Special Use Permit would be passed down to the next developer or would there need to be a new application.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that the Special Use Permit is under Elm Spring VAB, LLC and assigns. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that developers working under that entity operate under the same Special Use Permit with the same conditions and requirements.

Mr. Leonard stated that he would assume the SCC would only be concerned with how much power is generated.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman made clarifications to material versus major modifications that protect minor changes to the project without having to apply for another Special Use Permit or stop operations. If the applicant were to transfer the project to another developer, that developer would be bound by the same conditions as the proposed Special Use Permit conditions for Elm Spring VAB, LLC. If major modifications were done, the utility has license to cancel a project's interconnection agreement.

Mr. Leonard stated that the other developer could agree with those major modifications are feasible.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that another study process would have to be done again, which would take several years.

Mr. Leonard mentioned pole farms that this project is trying to avoid using, and how modifications of that type of design could be an option for another developer.

Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that if an interconnection agreement or permit were to be signed, then that would not be the case. He stated that there is a total project estimate available, but that the final agreement is not finished or signed.

Mr. Leonard stated that there are benefits associated with the project that do not have protections available to enforce that such benefits are met.

Mr. Comer stated that that could be written into the permit conditions along with other staff concerns. Mr. Comer stated that RWE Clean Energy has pre-committed certain technologies that were outlined in the presentation. Mr. Jake-Schoffman stated that conditions under the permit also carry through to future developers should that be the case.

Mr. Harris thanked the presenters. Mr. Harris asked if any other Commissioners had questions or comments. Seeing none, he opened the public hearing.

Mr. Harris stated there are three presenters signed up to speak.

Dr. Virginia Reynolds Badgett, PO Box 103 Greenwood, VA 22943, introduced herself as the granddaughter of the Morris family who owned and operated Elm Spring Orchard in Fishersville. Dr. Badgett is the manager of Elm Spring, LLC. Dr. Badgett spoke in favor of the request. Dr. Badgett stated that the farm operates largely as a cattle grazing farm. Dr. Badgett stated that sheep grazing on the solar panel portion of the property would provide a balance to the land. Dr. Badgett stated the attractiveness of the location as it relates to solar, citing its topography, visibility, and adjacency to transmission lines.

Dr. Badgett stated that the application is required to be submitted under the ordinance prior to December 13, 2023. Dr. Badgett stated that this project maintains the agricultural nature of the land and does not hinder or lessen the County's tax revenue. Dr. Badgett stated that this solar project is beneficial to both the community and her family, citing an approximately \$300,000 generation of tax revenue to the County. Dr. Badgett cited Mr. Jake-Schoffman's iteration of the economic impact this project will have, stating the project will drive roughly \$3.8 million.

Ms. Nancy Sorrells, of 3419 Cold Springs Rd, Greenville, VA 24440, spoke in favor of the request and strongly endorsed it as being in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Sorrells reminded the room of the Augusta County seal. Ms. Sorrells highlighted the County's history and culture in agriculture and family farms. Ms. Sorrells stated that the family farm in question is like many others in the County trying to preserve its agricultural nature and maintain its existence in the family for generations to come. Ms. Sorrells cited Virginia Code 3.2-301, the Right to Farm Act. Ms. Sorrells stated the text of the Code and suggested that the diversification of the farm in question is no different than rotating crops. Ms. Sorrells' comment on the diversification of farm use included a comment on energy, to which she added that 45% of Virginia's corn crop goes to the production of ethanol but is not moderated by the Commission under the same lens. Ms. Sorrells stated that the rights and decisions of the farmer are business decisions and should not be mediated by the County. Ms. Sorrells concluded her comments by asking that the Commission find the request of the applicant in substantial accord with the County's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Andrew Wenner, of 2001 Jefferson Highway, Fishersville, VA 22939, owner of Metal and Wood Technologies, Inc., spoke in favor of the request as a principal viewer of the solar project. Mr. Wenner recalled the lack of development in Fishersville when he first began his business. Mr. Wenner stated that if this land were to be developed in a different capacity, then the culture of Fishersville would be greatly affected. Mr. Wenner stated that this project would preserve the land and overall agricultural nature of the community.

Mr. Wayne Nolde, of 210 Cider Mill Rd, Mt. Sidney, VA 24467, spoke in favor of the request. Mr. Nolde spoke to the significance of agriculture and farming in Augusta County. Mr. Nolde stated that the solar project is in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and that solar panels are just another structure existing on farms. Mr. Nolde commended the developer's initiatives to preserve the land and benefit the community. Mr. Nolde highlighted the importance of keeping farms operational.

Jack Barber, of 169 Windsor Dr, Fishersville, VA 24467, spoke in favor of the request. Mr. Barber lauded Mr. Leonard for recognizing the solar project as a commodity. Mr. Barber stated that the generation of power, especially for farmers, is a commodity and generates a stream of revenue. Mr. Barber recognized RWE Clean Energy's efforts to satisfy the Comprehensive Plan's Policies 2, 3, 4, and 5. Mr. Barber stated that such policies should be or should have been applied to the development of commercial facilities on Route 340. Mr. Barber concluded his statement with the request that the Commission keep such developments in mind.

Mr. Harris asked if anyone else wished to speak. Seeing none, Mr. Harris closed the public hearing.

Mr. Harris asked the Commissioners if they would like to discuss the request.

Mrs. Bragg opened the discussion, stating that the Planning Commission is tasked with evaluating the request's compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. The twelve solar policies in the Plan were developed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors as a means to assist in determining a solar request's compliance with the Plan. Mrs. Bragg indicated that this project is not in substantial accord with the following Comprehensive Plan policies: Policy 1, Policies 2 and 5, Policy 3, Policy 6, Policy 7, and Policy 12.

In regards to Policy 1, Economy, she indicated that this project would not be as lucrative when compared with the type of development the Comprehensive Plan intends for these parcels. She also noted that Augusta Water has focused their efforts and resources on expanding infrastructure in Urban Service Areas. In addition, Mrs. Bragg stated that the request does not meet Policies 2 and 5, specifically regarding rural viewsheds, and noted that she believes the project would be visible by car on US-250.

Mrs. Bragg also stated that Policy 3, Agricultural landscape and economy, was not met by this project. She noted that future development is planned for Community Mixed Use, and that the subject property is located in one of the County's main growth areas. Because of this, future growth on these parcels is expected. Mrs. Bragg also stated that the project is not aligned with Policy 6, Balanced land uses, citing the approval and development of three other solar projects in the Fishersville area.

Mrs. Bragg stated that the project was not in compliance with Policy 7, Compact, interconnected development, which strongly discourages the siting of solar projects in Urban Service and Community Development Areas of the Comprehensive Plan. Lastly, she indicated that the project is also not compliant with Policy 12, Clustering and colocation, due to that policy's strong discouragement of siting in close proximity to existing solar facilities. Mrs. Bragg noted that the staff report recommended the project was not in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Robert Thomas stated that the substantial accord determination does not require 100% conformance. Mr. Thomas noted that the map illustrating the potential for development surrounding the project is indicative of balanced land uses, and leaves room for future commercial and residential development fronting US-250 and surrounding the project. Mr. Thomas also noted that the maintenance of farming operations would retain jobs, in addition to the jobs being created directly because of the project. He noted the distance between this project and existing projects is irrelevant due to this project being considered under the old ordinance. Mr. Thomas reiterated his positive impression in the ability for future development to surround the project, and noted that there are still around 250 acres on the parcels that could be developed. Lastly, Mr. Thomas noted that landowner's rights should be considered when determining their recommendation, and

that the owner should be allowed to choose what type of development occurs on the property.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to find the request in substantial accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Howdyshell seconded the motion, which failed, 3-4.

Mr. Harris moved on to Matters to be Presented by the Commission. Ms. Kathleen Keffer interjected and recommended that the Commission entertain another motion so that the Commission can send forth a recommendation.

Mrs. Bragg made a motion to deny the Special Use Permit request, and to find that the request is not in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, including the following Policies: Policy 1, Policy 5, Policy 6, Policy 7, and Policy 12.

Mr. Leonard seconded the motion, which carried, 4-3.

Mr. Thomas stated that he found the preceding events to be irregular and unusual, specifically referring to having two separate votes.

Mr. Leonard stated that the Commission is tasked with providing a recommendation to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Thomas noted that there was a previous motion.

Mr. Leonard stated that the first vote did not result in a recommendation.

Mr. Thomas reiterated his previous point.

Ms. Keffer stated that, per the Commission's Bylaws, a majority vote is required in order to take any action. Because the first vote was defeated, this resulted in no action being taken. She therefore recommended the Commission take another vote so as to send a recommendation on to the approving body.

* * * * *

MATTERS TO BE PRESENTED BY THE COMMISSION

Mr. Harris asked if there was anything anyone would like to present this evening.

Mr. Howdyshell asked if staff could provide the Commission with a report detailing the results of the Board of Zoning Appeals meetings.

Mrs. Bragg concurred, noting it would be useful to receive that information.

Ms. Hensley noted that she could provide a summary of the Board of Zoning Appeals meetings.

* * * * *

STAFF REPORTS

Ms. Hensley reviewed the agenda items with the Commissioners for the July 2024 Board of Zoning Appeals regular meeting.

Mr. Leonard asked for staff, in regards to Nu-Valley Enterprises, to provide comments to the Board of Zoning Appeals to consider implications of outdoor storage of boats and vehicles.

* * * * *

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Mr. Howdyshe made a motion to adjourn.

The motion was seconded and carried unanimously, 7-0.

Chairman

Secretary