



**AMHERST COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING**



MINUTES

July 18, 2024

Administrative Office Complex
153 Washington Street
Public Meeting Room
Meeting Convened - 7:00 PM

1. Call to Order

Members Present: Beverly Jones (Chair), Michael Bryant (Vice Chair), Jim Thompson, Michael Martineau, Derin Foor and Catherine Gamble.

Members Absent: David Pugh (Board of Liaison Non-Voting Member)

Staff Present: Tyler Creasy (Director of Community Development), Sarah Nichols (Assistant Zoning Administrator) and Stacey Stinnett (Administrative Assistant).

Chair Foor called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. Invocation & Pledge of Allegiance

Planning Commission led the invocation and then the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion to approve the agenda.

Motion made by: Jones

Second: Thompson

Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

4. Election of Officers

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: Motion to elect Beverly Jones as Chair

Motion made by: Foor

Second: Martineau

Motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (Jones abstained)

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: Motion to elect Michael Bryant as Vice Chair

Motion made by: Martineau

Second: Jones

Motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (Bryant abstained)

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: Motion to elect Tyler Creasy as Secretary

Motion made by: Foor

Second: Martineau

Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

Jones took her seat as chairperson and led the rest of the meeting.

5. Citizens Comments

A. Comments

John Bullington, a resident of Amherst County, as well as an adjoining property owner, spoke in opposition to the Special Exception request 2024-222 for Shimp Engineering. Mr. Bullington expressed his concerns for safety.

Scott Camm, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Camm felt that this use was not intended for this type of neighborhood and that it would bring people that aren't from this area to their quiet community and that could disrupt their lifestyles and destroy their quiet and safe community.

Nancy Davis, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Davis stated that she was skeptical due to the constant changes that the owner has regarding what he is going to do with the property, as well as the increase in traffic and safety that could affect this community if this request is passed.

Josh Batman, an architect with Shimp Engineering and speaking as a citizen, stated that he was in favor of the request. Mr. Batman spoke referencing the property owner, Marco Stilli's, character, stating that he was a good and honest man, and that he did not want to disrupt the community by adding a campground that consisted of tents and recreational vehicles. Mr. Batman stated that he was raised on this property and coming from a big family, this request would not generate anymore traffic than it did when his family resided there.

Mark Stilli, property owner of 295 Burford Farm Road, spoke in favor. Mr. Stilli stated that he

wants to improve the property and use it as a working farm with no development intentions but only to build three (3) small cabins and rent them as short-term tourist rentals. Mr. Stilli stated the county suggested he apply for a campground with set conditions so that he could utilize the limited road frontage, and it would allow him to have the three (3) cabins on his property. Mr. Stilli informed the Planning Commission that he wanted to do the right thing and take all the necessary legal steps through the county. There would be no federal funds involved, the cabins would be luxury cabins rented out to "high-end" clientele, friends and only a maximum of two people were allowed to stay per cabin. Mr. Stilli reiterated that this would not be a campground that consisted of tents and recreational vehicles.

Don Morris, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Morris briefly mentioned how the Job Corps and the Sugar Mill Subdivision have given this community problems before with trespassing and nuisance issues and that allowing this request would only add to the community's concerns.

James Dodd, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Dodd stated that he was pro-business. However, allowing a campground in this area would not be a wise move by the county because of safety concerns, traffic and road maintenance. Mr. Dodd asked the Planning Commission the question: "Although Mr. Stilli right now, is asking for three (3) cabins, could he come back to the county and ask for more? What are the restrictions on that?"

Linda Bullington, a resident of Amherst County and an adjoining property owner, spoke in opposition to the request. Mrs. Bullington expressed concern as to what the applicants future intentions are for this property. Mrs. Bullington stated that although the property and the area is beautiful, there are no main attractions nearby for campgrounds, like rivers, recreational activities and tourist locations. Mrs. Bullington was curious about the true intentions and the future of this property.

Harry Stinnett, Jr., a resident of Amherst County and an adjoining property owner, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Stinnett informed the Planning Commission that the community was told at first by Marco Stilli and the Engineering Firm that there would be anywhere from six (6) to twenty (20) cabin rentals with an event barn to host weddings and special events. Mr. Stinnett stated that all of a sudden, now that has changed, or it possibly just hasn't been presented to the County yet. Mr. Stinnett stated that this is not the dream farm that Marco Stilli wants you to believe that he has always envisioned himself having one day. This is a business venture for Mr. Stilli that will only be a weekend getaway for him as he continues to reside out of town. Mr. Stinnett expressed concerns over how the property would be maintained and how the cabins would be managed. Would there be someone to monitor the property when out-of town guests and strangers are staying in these cabins? Other concerns Mr. Stinnett addressed were safety, road conditions and public safety access to the cabins due to the topography. Mr. Stinnett enclosed his comments to the Planning Commission asking them to please listen to the community of Burford Farm Road and

their concerns and ask themselves would you like this in your backyard?

Janell Stinnett, a resident of Amherst County and an adjoining property owner, spoke in opposition to the request. Mrs. Stinnett stated that she had spoken with the applicant, employed with Shimp Engineering, at the "meet in greet" and was informed that this would be a venue that would host a few weddings per year. Mrs. Stinnett informed the Planning Commission that there is currently a barn there now that has been renovated to accommodate entertainment. Mrs. Stinnett asked, "If Mr. Stilli is such an honest man, then why hasn't a venue been included in this special request, yet it was discussed at the owners' meet and greet with the community?"

Janell Stinnett also read a letter from Allison Swede, a Burford Farm Road property owner, who could not be present at the meeting tonight, but was in opposition to the request. Mrs. Stinnett read from the letter which emphasized safety. Ms. Swede, who has small children is concerned that strangers from out of town constantly traveling through their quiet neighborhood could impose danger and threaten the safety of their children and community.

Ronnie Unrue, a resident of Amherst County and an adjoining property owner, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Unrue is concerned that if this request is approved, it could open the door in the future for more uses that are not in harmony with this neighborhood in the Agricultural District. Mr. Unrue stated that many children play basketball in the quiet street, families walk their dogs, and couples walk up and down the road daily. Increased traffic would be dangerous and impose a safety threat to the neighbors that live here. Mr. Unrue reminded the Planning Commission that sixty (60) people signed a petition against this special exception request.

Brooke Shober, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Mrs. Shober stated that the letters that Mr. Stilli had been giving the community on what his intentions were was not the same information that he is giving the county and that really should be enough reason to show concern.

Josh Shober, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Shober stated that the purpose of zoning is the intent to comply with certain zoning districts, so that such things like this do not occur in areas such as this, that cause undue hardship to the surrounding property owners. Mr. Shober stated that the narrative for the overall intent with Mr. Stilli seems to continuously change.

Hunter Stinnett, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Stinnett stated that this is a family centered neighborhood and Mr. Stilli's definition of a lifelong dream to own a farm, yet constructing and renting cabins on his farm as a payback for buying the property, is not farming. Ms. Stinnett stated that this request is encouraging development and this area is zoned agricultural, where people live and work on their farms to utilize for their families. Ms. Stinnett emphasized that there aren't

many opportunities in today's world to create more farm land.

Don French, a resident of Amherst County, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. French would like to see the applicant put this property into a conservation easement, but it doesn't feel like this is something Mr. Stilli is interested in doing at this time. Mr. French was concerned that public safety vehicles would not be able to access this property due to the grade at the property's entrance.

John Wimer, a resident of Amherst County, spoke in opposition to the request. His concerns were that if this property was being rezoned, this was considered illegal spot zoning.

Brenda Burton, a resident of Amherst County, spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Burton didn't think the Burford Farm Road area was a suitable location for a campground and that Mr. Stilli should find a more suitable location where he could include this request and make his money.

Adam Staton, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request.

Hope Stevens, a resident of Amherst County in the Burford Farm Road community, spoke in opposition to the request. Ms. Stevens stated that this project did not represent family, safety or the community and this is a neighborhood that looks out for one another.

6. Public Hearing

A. 2024-338 Accupoint Surveying & Design (Rezoning Request)

Request by Accupoint Surveying & Design for a rezoning of approximately 4.3 acres from the R-2, General Residential District to the B-2, General Commercial District. The purpose of the rezoning is to allow for self-storage units. The property is located at 4416 S. Amherst Highway (a portion of) and is further identified as Tax Map Parcel 155-A-100 (a portion of).

The request includes an amendment to the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) of the Amherst County Comprehensive Plan from medium-density residential to commercial in the area identified on the proposed rezoning map.

Mr. Creasy presented the staff report.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

Amy Siepp, Engineer at Accupoint Surveying, spoke in favor of the request. Ms. Siepp stated

that she had received written approval from American Electric Power (AEP) and that this would be a gated storage facility. Ms. Siepp answered the Planning Commissions questions.

No one spoke in opposition.

There being no further speakers, Chair Jones closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: I recommend approval of rezoning 2024-338 and an amendment to the future land use map of the Amherst County Comprehensive Plan from medium density residential to commercial to the Board of Supervisors.

Motion made by: Foor

Second: Thompson

Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

B. 2024-343 Ebenezer Road Solar 1, LLC

Request by Ebenezer Road Solar 1, LLC for a special exception request in the A-1, Agricultural Residential District for a solar energy system, utility-scale. The parcel is located at 719 Ebenezer Road and is further identified as tax map number 111-A-3. This request also requires a review for compliance with the Comprehensive Plan, in accordance with Virginia Code Sec. 15.2-2232, for a proposed solar facility, on Tax Map Parcel 111-A-3, zoned A-1, Agricultural Residential District.

Planning Commission Member Michael Bryant recused himself due to his employer, Hurt & Proffitt's, involvement with the project.

Mr. Creasy presented the staff report and gave staff's recommended conditions:

1. Site Plan: The use shall be in general conformance with the conceptual plan dated 6/28/2024.

2. Lighting: If exterior lighting is provided, all proposed lighting shall be glareshielded and directed so as to prevent illumination across the property line.

3. Outdoor storage: No miscellaneous items shall be stored outside other than the solar panels and ancillary equipment that is part of the approved use.

4. Entrances: The applicant will be responsible to obtain all necessary permits from the Virginia Department of Transportation.

5. Parking: No more than thirty (30) vehicles (including trailers, campers and similar units) may

be parked on the lot at any one time in relation to the construction or operation of the solar facility.

6. All necessary environmental approvals shall be obtained prior to the issuance of the zoning permit. These approvals, if required include the following but are not limited to:

- a. Wetland disturbance / impacts – US Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Environmental Quality and any other applicable agencies.
- b. Storm water – Department of Environmental Quality
- c. Erosion and Sediment Control

7. Reimbursement for Third Party Reviews; Inspections.

a. Third Party Experts and Consultants, Reimbursement: During the development of the Project, Applicant agrees to refund the County for any costs associated with the provision and/or employment of outside experts and consultants necessary to review specific technical issues related to the Project outside the County's expertise or for which the County has inadequate full-time staff, in the County's sole discretion. This provision shall commence upon submission of a Final Site Plan for approval by the Planning Director and continue through the date of commencement of commercial operation (the "Commercial Operation Date") for the Project, at which point this condition shall be deemed satisfied and the obligation will terminate.

b. Building Plan Review and Inspections. The county shall hire a third-party building plan reviewer and inspector to review plans and inspect the project. This position will provide the County with bi-weekly status reports and coordinate with the County Building Official to address any issues associated with the construction of the Project. This position shall commence upon issuance of Building Permits for the Project and continue through the date when the Project achieves commercial operation.

c. Erosion and Sediment Control Inspector. The county shall hire a certified third-party erosion and sediment control inspector to perform inspections during construction. This individual will provide the County a bi-weekly status report and coordinate with the County Erosion and Sediment Control inspector, the local Soil and Water Conservation District, and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality as necessary, to resolve any stormwater and erosion and sediment control issues that occur on site. This position shall commence upon issuance of Land Disturbance Permits and continue through the closing of the land disturbance and SWPP permit(s).

8. Construction Management Plan (the "Construction Management Plan"). The applicant will submit the Construction Management Plan prior to issuance of the building permit, including the following items:

- a. Proposed construction schedule and hours of operation;
- b. Project access planning for each entry to the Project and any required road improvements;
- c. Project security measures to be implemented prior to the commencement of construction of the Solar Facilities;

d. Dust mitigation and any burning operations;

9. Construction Traffic Management Plan/Traffic Mitigation Plan (the "CTMP") and Road Repair Plan (the "Road Repair Plan"). Applicant shall:

a. Develop the CTMP in consultation with the County Planning Staff, the Virginia Department of Transportation ("VDOT"), the Amherst County Sheriff's Office, and the Virginia State Police to identify and expeditiously resolve or mitigate traffic issues that arise during the construction or decommissioning of the Solar Facilities, including but not limited to (A) lane closures, (B) signage, and (C) flagging procedures. Employee and delivery traffic shall be scheduled and managed so as to minimize conflicts with local traffic. To minimize dust and impacts to adjacent properties, permanent access roads, and parking areas will be stabilized with gravel, asphalt, or concrete. Traffic control methods shall be coordinated with VDOT prior to initiation of construction. The CTMP will identify on-site areas suitable for parking for construction workers and for trucks to be unloaded and to turn around without having to back onto public roadways during construction and decommissioning. A condition of approval of the CTMP shall be documentation of satisfaction by VDOT that all entrances to the Project satisfy their requirements and all necessary VDOT permits have been obtained.

b. Develop the Road Repair Plan in consultation with VDOT and the County to document the pre-construction condition and provide for repair of damage to public roads occurring within one half mile (1/2) of any entrance to the Project and any other damage attributable to construction or decommissioning of the Solar Facilities along haul routes designated in the Road Repair Plan. The Road Repair Plan shall provide that such repairs to the roads be at least comparable to their conditions before the commencement of construction or decommissioning. With respect to any road repairs necessitated by the Operator's use of the roads during construction, the Road Repair Plan shall require any such repairs shall be made within a reasonable period of time after obtaining approval from VDOT.

10. Public Safety Training. The Applicant shall arrange a training session with the Amherst County Public Safety Department to familiarize personnel with issues unique to a solar facility before building permits are issued and shall repeat such training on an as-needed basis not to exceed once per year.

11. Emergency Response Plan. The applicant shall provide a detailed Emergency Response Plan to the County. The Plan shall address emergency response procedures and other technical information applicable to the Project, including specific information on responding to emergencies associated with the solar facility. This plan shall be reviewed and updated every five (5) years, as necessary by Applicant or Project Owner. This plan will be reviewed and approved by the Amherst County Department of Fire and Emergency Medical Services prior to issuance of the Final Site Plan.

12. Shared Solar: Special Exception 2024-343 shall enroll in Appalachian Power's shared solar program.

13. Landscaping: The Applicant shall maintain all existing trees and proposed trees as shown on the Conceptual Site Plan dated 6/28/2024. Should any portion of the Visual Buffer either be removed or become diseased such that the visual effect of the buffer is compromised during the life of the Project, such trees shall be replaced at the start of the next planting season.

14. Grading Plan. The Project shall be constructed in compliance with all local, state and federal regulations prior to the commencement of any construction activities and a bond or other security will be posted for the grading operations. The Grading Plan shall:

- a. Clearly show existing and proposed contours;
- b. Note the locations and amount of topsoil to be removed (if any) and the percent of the site to be graded;
- c. Limit grading to the greatest extent practicable by avoiding steep slopes and laying out arrays parallel to landforms;
- d. In areas proposed to be permanent access roads which will receive gravel or in any areas where more than a few inches of cut are required, provide that topsoil within those areas will be stripped and stockpiled onsite to be used to increase the fertility of areas intended to be seeded; and
- e. Take advantage of natural flow patterns in drainage design and keep the amount of impervious surface as low as possible to reduce stormwater storage needs.
- f. The grading plan shall include a sequence for grading and be separated into at least three (3) phases in which the applicant must temporarily stabilize each phase (as defined by the Virginia Erosion and Sediment Control Handbook) before progressing to the next phase of grading.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

Claire Habel, project manager and representative with New Leaf Energy, gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Randy Lichtnberger, Director of Cultural Resources, with Hurt & Proffitt, spoke in favor of the request and answered the Planning Commissions questions.

Gretchen Clark, Engineer with Hurt & Proffitt, spoke in favor of the request and answered the Planning Commissions questions pertaining to Erosion and Sediment Control and Stormwater on site.

Mr. Scott, an adjoining property owner, spoke in opposition to the request. Mr. Scott was concerned that the lease agreement was not detailed enough to protect the watershed.

Mr. Harvey, a neighbor, stated the current landowners do not reside here, and they were turning this property into a business.

Ed Wilkes, adjoining property owner, spoke in opposition of the request. Mr. Wilkes asked

how long the construction process would take because his concerns were about the increased traffic and noise during the construction process.

There being no further speakers, Chair Jones closed the public hearing.

The Planning Commission discussed the Comprehensive Plan and conditions regarding this special exception.

Planning Commission's Recommendation:

Motion: I would like to make a motion in accordance with Virginia State Code section 15.2-2232, that special exception 2023-369 is consistent with the Amherst County Comprehensive Plan due to:

1. Land Use section, Goal #1, Objective #1, Strategy #8 states: Promote solar generation facilities that are located in areas that do not have a negative impact on adjacent property or Amherst County residents.
2. Economic Development section, Initiative #1, Goal #1 states: Create first-class business sites and buildings to attract and retain existing businesses.
3. Economic Development section, Initiative #1, Goal #1, Strategy #3 states: Support infrastructure investments aligned with product development goals.
4. Land Use section, Goal #2, Objective #3 states: Provide and/or support economic incentives to encourage the preservation of open space, agricultural and forestal lands.
5. Transportation Goal #4 objective #2 states: Protect view-sheds along primary corridors.

Motion made by: Foor

Second: Gamble

Motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (Bryant recused himself)

Planning Commission's Recommendation:

Motion: I find that the use will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent properties, that the character of the zoning district will not be changed thereby, and that such use will be in harmony with the uses permitted by-right in the zoning district, and public health, safety, and general welfare of the community. Therefore, I move to recommend approval of the applicant's request for a special exception use permit to allow for a solar energy system, utility-scale, in accordance with subsection 1003.03 of the Code of the County of Amherst, with staff's recommended conditions, amending condition #7 (a) Reimbursement for Third Party Reviews; Inspections to read:

The County may retain qualified third-party consultants to review portions of the site plan and to inspect the constructed facility as to any matters that may be outside the County's areas of expertise. The reasonable out-of-pocket costs incurred by the County for such review by qualified third-party reviewers and the estimated costs will be submitted to the applicant for approval before the costs are incurred. The County may, in the alternative, accept reports of such a review by third-qualified third-party consultants selected, retained, and paid by the applicant.

and

add condition #15 to read:

Any owner of the leased facility shall notify Amherst County within 48 hours of the lease being transferred to a new owner.

Motion made by: Jones

Second: Foor

Motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (Bryant recused himself)

The Planning Commission took a recess at 9:30 pm.

The Planning Commission reconvened at 9:34 pm.

C. Ordinance 2024-5 Confined Livestock Facilities

Amending and reenacting §§ 702 of Article VII – Use Requirements by Zoning Districts, of Appendix A – Zoning and Subdivisions Ordinance to the Code of the County of Amherst, Virginia. The purpose of this ordinance is to update the setback requirements and other regulations relating to confined livestock facilities.

Mr. Creasy briefly reviewed the proposed ordinance and went over amended changes with the Planning Commission.

Chair Jones opened the public hearing.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition.

Chair Jones closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: Motion to recommend approval of Ordinance 2024-5 to the Board of Supervisors.

Motion made by: Thompson

Second: Bryant

Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

7. Special Exception - Non Public Hearing

A. 2024-222 Shimp Engineering

Planning Commission member Michael Bryant recused himself because he had family that were adjoining property owners.

Mr. Creasy stated that the Commission at their May 16, 2024, meeting made a motion of recommendation for denial and that motion was defeated by a 2-2 vote. The special exception, 2024-222, was then sent to the Board of Supervisors for a vote at their June 18, 2024, meeting. The Board of Supervisors passed a motion at their June 18, 2024, meeting to

send the request back to the Commission as a non-public hearing to garner a motion.

Mr. Creasy presented his staff report and gave staff recommended conditions as follows:

1. Lighting: All outdoor lighting will be glare-shielded and directed so as to prevent illumination across the property line.
2. Sewerage Facilities: The applicant shall follow all regulations prescribed by the Virginia Department of Health.
3. Parking: Guests shall be required to park on the property and not park on neighboring lots or on any right-of-way outside their property unless they have written permission.
4. Public Safety: The owner shall meet all requirements set forth by the Director of Public Safety as it has to do with access to all cabins, trails, and recreational areas.
5. Number of Sites: The campground shall not exceed three sites.
6. Type of Habitation: Only cabins are allowed for use on the campground. All other accommodations are prohibited, i.e. travel trailers, motor homes, tents, etc.

The Planning Commission had a brief discussion regarding:

- The strict conditions that staff has added to the case and that type of habitation is for only three (3) cabins and that travel trailers, motor homes and tents are prohibited.
- The Planning Commission discussed how Mr. Stilli has followed the rules of the county and went through the correct process in obtaining this use for his property.
- If Mr. Stilli decides to increase the number of exceeded cabins to more than three (3) or make any changes to his request, he would have to re-apply and go through the public hearing process again, in which there is no guarantee that his additional request would be approved.
- Do not see this request impacting safety and increasing traffic on Burford Farm Road.

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: I find that the use will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent properties, that the character of the zoning district will not be changed thereby, and that such use will be in harmony with the uses permitted by-right in the zoning district, and with the public health, safety, and general welfare to the community. Therefore, I move to recommend approval of the applicant's request for a special use permit to allow a campground in accordance with subsection 1003.03 of the Code of the County of Amherst, with staff's recommended conditions.

Motion made by: Gamble

Second: Foor

Motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (Bryant recused himself)

8. Site Plan Review

A. Site Plan Review

Mrs. Nichols updated the Planning Commission on the current siteplans.

9. Old/New Business

A. Rules of Procedure; Planning Commission

The Commission received information from staff at their June meeting regarding the process of a tie vote among Planning Commission members. Staff is now proposing a second option:

Options

1. The first tie vote on any motion to approve or deny an item will result in no action having been taken on the item and a second motion must be presented and voted on. If no other motion is passed on the item, the item will automatically be deferred to the next Commission meeting for further consideration and vote. If another tie vote occurs at the second Commission meeting, then the item is defeated, and, if it requires a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, the tie vote will be the reported recommendation.

2. The Board of Supervisors Liaison serves as the final vote when a tie among the planning commission members takes place.

The Planning Commission had a discussion.

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion to direct staff to draft code change to read:

The first tie vote on any motion to approve or deny an item will result in no action having been taken on the item and a second motion must be presented and voted on. If no other motion is passed on, the item will automatically be deferred to the next Planning Commission meeting for further consideration and note. If another tie vote occurs at the second Planning Commission meeting, then the item is defeated, and, if it requires a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, the tie vote will be the reported recommendation.

Motion made by: Jones

Second: Bryant

Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.

B. Battery Storage

Sean Millot with Kimley-Horn presented a potential code change to allow for the use of Battery Storage. Mr. Millot stated that the definition of an energy storage facility is energy

storage equipment or technology that is capable of absorbing energy, storing such energy for a period of time, and redelivering energy after it has been stored.

Mr. Millot presented a PowerPoint presentation.

C. Planning Commission Training

Mr. Creasy briefed the Planning Commission on additional training that was available if the Planning Commission was interested and informed the Commission that there was enough money in the budget to cover the costs.

Staff stated that the County Attorney could give the Planning Commission a refresher course.

10. Approval of Minutes for May 16, 2024 & June 20, 2024

A. May 16, 2024 Minutes

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: Motion to approve the May 16, 2024 Meeting Minutes as submitted.

Motion made by: Thompson

Second: Gamble

Motion carried by a 4-0 vote. (Bryant & Martineau abstained)

B. June 20, 2024 Minutes

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: Motion to approve the June 20, 2024 Meeting Minutes as submitted.

Motion made by: Gamble

Second: Martineau

Motion carried by a 5-0 vote. (Foor abstained)

11. Adjournment

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:32 pm.

Planning Commission Recommendation:

Motion: Motion to adjourn.

Motion made by: Thompson

Second: Jones

Motion carried by a 6-0 vote.


Chair: