MINUTES

JAMES CITY COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

REGULAR MEETING

COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER BOARD ROOM

101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23185

September 8, 2026

5:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McGlennon called the meeting to order at approximately 5:06 p.m. following the James City Service Authority (JCSA) Board of Directors Regular Meeting.

B. ROLL CALL

Tracy L. Wainwright, Powhatan District
Barbara E. Null, Stonehouse District
James O. Icenhour, Jr., Jamestown District
Ruth M. Larson, Vice Chair, Berkeley District
John J. McGlennon, Chair, Roberts District

Scott A. Stevens, County Administrator
Adam R. Kinsman, County Attorney

ADOPTED

OCT 27 2026

Board of Supervisors
James City County, VA

Mr. McGlennon reported that the meeting commenced with a moment of silence, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance. He recognized Dr. Crystal Haskins, a member of the Planning Commission, had the honor of leading the Board and citizens in the Pledge of Allegiance.

C. MOMENT OF SILENCE

D. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Haskins led the Board and citizens in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. McGlennon reported recent changes to this evening's Agenda, noting that the Cardinal Ridge application (Public Hearing Item No. 2) had been withdrawn by the applicants. As a result, the scheduled Public Hearing for this item had been canceled and would not take place.

Members of the audience applauded.

Mr. McGlennon stated that the applicant for Public Hearing Item No. 3 requested a deferral. He announced that Public Hearing Item No. 1, regarding a land use designation, had been properly advertised. Mr. McGlennon noted that while the Board would formally open the Public Hearing, no staff presentation would be given this evening. He stated that the Board would entertain a motion to defer the case.

E. PRESENTATION

1. Proclamation - September is National Service Dog Month

Mr. McGlennon requested Supervisor Icenhour to read the proclamation.

Mr. Icenhour proclaimed September 2026 as National Service Dog Month, highlighting the presence of Ms. Leslie Neely of Canine Companions and two young puppies: five-month-old Coby and eight-week-old Brady. Mr. Icenhour began reading the official proclamation aloud. He called upon all County residents to recognize the vital role of service dogs and to respect the public access right of adults, children, and veterans who depended on these animals to lead independent lives.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT

1. Ms. Peg Boarman, Chair of the Clean County Commission, 17 Settlers Lane, addressed the Board to talk trash. She emphasized that waste management remained an ongoing challenge and called upon the community to ensure proper containment. Ms. Boarman announced that September 10 was the deadline to RSVP for the Clean Business Awards Breakfast. She stated that the event was scheduled for Wednesday, September 16 at 8:30 a.m. at the James City County (JCC) Recreation Center. Ms. Boarman recognized this quarter's winner: College HUNKS Hauling Junk & Moving. She encouraged the public to nominate a qualified business for the award on the County's website. Ms. Boarman reported that on November 14, the Clean County Commission would host its fifth Annual Repair Fair & Recycling Expo at J. Blaine Blayton Elementary School from 9 a.m. to 1 p.m. She recognized America Recycles Day on November 15. Ms. Boarman outlined the additional activities scheduled for the event. She encouraged the community to keep JCC litter-free.

G. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Grant Award - $35,000 - James City County Community Naloxone Access and Overdose Prevention Initiative

A motion to Approve was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

2. Initiation of Consideration of Required Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance for Replacement of Valid Nonconforming Mobile or Manufactured Homes

A motion to Approve was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

3. Grove Convenience Center Construction Contract Award

A motion to Approve was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

H. PUBLIC HEARING(S)

1. LU-20-0003. Eastern State (Parcels A, B, and D) - Land Use Designation Change

A motion to Defer Consideration of this Item until the Board's January 26, 2027, Regular Meeting, was made by James Icenhour, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Mr. Icenhour indicated that the Board would defer consideration of this item until the Board's January 26, 2027, Regular Meeting, to allow sufficient time for discussion with State legislators.

2. Z-23-0008. Cardinal Ridge (Eastern State) Rezoning

Mr. McGlennon reported that the Cardinal Ridge application had been withdrawn by the applicants. As a result, the scheduled Public Hearing for this item had been canceled and would not take place.

3. Z-26-0001/MP-26-0001/SUP-26-0002. 5299 John Tyler Highway The Promenade Proffer Amendment for Self-Storage

A motion to Defer to the Board's October 13, 2026, Regular Meeting, was made by Barbara Null, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 4 NAYS: 1 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., McGlennon, Null, Wainwright
Nays: Larson

Mr. McGlennon noted that the applicant had requested a deferral of this item.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing and announced that no staff presentation would be given.

Ms. Larson asked about the size of the Agenda for the October 13, 2026, Regular Meeting. While she was aware of a land-use case on the schedule, she was unsure of the meeting's overall volume.

Mr. McGlennon noted that the Board faced a highly demanding Agenda for the remainder of the year.

Mr. Paul Holt, III, Director of Community Development, informed the Board that approximately six legislative land-use cases were tentatively planned, while the larger Croaker Road case had been postponed until the Board's October 13, 2026, Regular Meeting.

Mr. McGlennon indicated that the Public Hearing would remain open until the Board's October 13, 2026, Regular Meeting. He stated that any individuals who signed up to speak would be allowed to do so, but only one opportunity to speak during the Public Hearing process was allowed.

1. Ms. Gina Clayton, 104 Highland, requested that the Board implement a moratorium on all unapproved new home construction until the County addressed five specific areas of concern. She highlighted that JCSA operated under a federal and state Consent Order from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) due to ongoing stormwater challenges. She noted that managing sewer overflows during heavy rainfall had been a persistent issue for over 15 years. Ms. Clayton emphasized that a definitive solution was required to protect local aquifers and waterways from further damage. She questioned why developers were not contributing to efforts to improve stormwater runoff. Ms. Clayton noted the urgent necessity for new fresh water resources in light of DEQ limitations on aquifer withdrawals and recent widespread drought conditions. She stated that proactive measures must be taken immediately to address these looming shortages. Ms. Clayton asked how developers were contributing to the search for new water sources. She proposed that the County petition the State to upgrade the roads ahead of time to accommodate upcoming development. Ms. Clayton argued that taxpayers should not have to foot the bill for repairing roads repeatedly damaged by new construction. Ms. Clayton highlighted critical school capacity

issues, stating that redistricting would not solve the problem. She questioned why developers were not building the schools necessary to support the communities they were creating. As a specific example, she pointed to Stonehouse Elementary School, which was already overcapacity despite continued residential development in the surrounding Stonehouse subdivision. Ms. Clayton highlighted that the growing and aging community required an increase in Fire, Emergency Medical Services, and Police personnel to handle a rising volume of service calls. She questioned whether current response times met acceptable standards or if more fire stations, staff, and equipment were needed. Ms. Clayton urged the Board to prevent JCC from repeating the mistakes of neighboring communities, where rapid development outpaced essential infrastructure. She highlighted her deep roots in the community since 1988, noting that recent local expansion had reached an unsustainable pace.

4. SUP-26-0006. 496 McLaws Circle Dutch Bros Coffee

A motion to Approve the Resolution Excluding SUP Condition Nos. 12 and 13 was made by James Icenhour, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Ms. Allison Jackura, Senior Planner, addressed the Board noting that the applicant in this matter was Mr. Patrick Colliflower, representing Foresite Group. She indicated that the property sat along Pocahontas Trail and McLaws Circle. Ms. Jackura noted that the front of the property was located in York County, and officials there had been informed and consulted during this process. She stated that the property was zoned M-1, Limited Business/Industrial District, had a Future Land Use Designation Map designation of Mixed Use, and was located within the Primary Service Area (PSA). Ms. Jackura noted that the property was a former bank with a drive-through, which was proposed to be repurposed as a coffee shop with a drive-through. She stated that the proposed use required an SUP due to an estimated 120 morning peak-hour trips. Ms. Jackura explained that the plan was to convert the existing 2,100-square-foot building into a coffee shop while retaining the current drive-through. Although the canopy structure would be removed, the rest of the site improvements would largely remain intact. She also noted that parking would be reduced to 13 spaces, alongside a reduction in the drive-through pavement. Ms. Jackura displayed a Master Plan excerpt on the PowerPoint presentation to illustrate the proposed land use, entrances, parking, and drive-through layout. She noted that the proposal involved removing a section of the impervious surface next to the adjacent property, The Whaling Company, and enhancing the existing buffer along that property line. She reported that The Whaling Company property was under contract for sale and redevelopment. She mentioned a proposal to build a Sheetz gas station on the site that was currently under review. Ms. Jackura added that the applicant proposed to plant vegetation within all buffers as part of the project. She displayed the elevations for the proposed site on the PowerPoint slide; one faced Pocahontas Trail and the other faced McLaws Circle. Ms. Jackura highlighted several key staff considerations regarding the application, noting that the project successfully repurposed a vacant building within the PSA. While the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) recommended a right-turn taper to handle traffic impacts, the applicant disputed this and omitted it from their proposal. Consequently, staff included the right-turn taper as a mandatory SUP condition. Additionally, Ms. Jackura emphasized required stipulations for a cross-access connection to The Whaling Company property, site screening, signage, enhanced lighting, intercom noise mitigation, and outdoor storage restrictions. She stated that staff found the application compatible with the surrounding development and the Comprehensive Plan under the proposed conditions. She noted that staff recommended approval of the application and welcomed questions from the Board.

Mr. Icenhour asked where the right-turn taper was to be located.

Ms. Jackura stated the right-turn taper would be along McLaws Circle.

Mr. McGlennon asked Ms. Jackura if the recommendation included the request for the cross-access connection and right-turn taper.

Ms. Jackura confirmed that staff had recommended both the cross-access connection and the right-turn taper. However, during its meeting, the Planning Commission requested adding a stormwater criteria condition while removing the requirements for both the right-turn taper and the cross-access connection.

Dr. Crystal Haskins, Planning Commission representative, presented the SUP request for Dutch Bros Coffee located at 496 McLaws Circle, explaining that the project adapted a former bank into a drive-through coffee shop. She noted that the proposal improved the site by reducing paved surfaces and adding a landscape buffer to screen the drive-through menu board from Pocahontas Trail. Dr. Haskins highlighted two deviations from County staff's initial recommendations. The Planning Commission recommended approval (7-0) with the following adjustments: Removal of Condition No. 12 (Cross-access connection) and Condition No. 13 (Right-turn taper), as both the Commission and the applicant deemed them unnecessary due to the site's minimal net traffic increase. Formal designation of Condition No. 11 (Stormwater Criteria) as an official SUP condition.

Ms. Null inquired about the distance between the proposed gas station and the proposed coffee shop.

Ms. Jackura clarified the property's location using the PowerPoint presentation, noting that a more detailed diagram would be shared later. She explained that the proposed cross-access connection would link both properties.

Ms. Null inquired whether staff recommended excluding the cross-access connection and right-turn taper from the SUP requirements.

Ms. Jackura stated that the Planning Commission rejected staff's recommendation for a cross-access connection and a right-turn taper.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

1. Mr. Patrick Colliflower, Applicant Representative, 1190 NW Overlook Drive, Corvallis, OR addressed the Board and requested approval of the application with the Planning Commission's amended conditions, specifically the removal of SUP Condition Nos. 12 and 13. He referenced a PowerPoint slide displaying a large diagram of the proposed Sheetz gas station property to the north and the proposed Dutch Bros Coffee site to the south. Mr. Colliflower identified alternate routes not intended for cross-access. He explained that the magenta lines illustrated vehicles entering the Sheetz gas station from Pocahontas Trail via a one-way route, noting that fueling patrons would view the cross-access connection as the most direct path back to Pocahontas Trail. Mr. Colliflower stated that the green lines demonstrated a vehicle traveling toward the Sheetz gas station while highlighting a shortcut across the Dutch Bros Coffee property to the gas station. He expressed concern over the cross-access connection due to structural and engineering disparities. Mr. Colliflower noted that while the Sheetz gas station was engineered from the ground up for heavy vehicle loads and high-volume traffic, the former bank site was not, concluding that the connection would place an undue burden on the Dutch Bros Coffee property.

Mr. McGlennon noted that although Mr. Colliflower did not represent the proposed Sheetz gas station, the PowerPoint diagram illustrated a direct entrance from Pocahontas Trail, which he warned could be problematic. He asked Mr. Colliflower whether this entrance might worsen the connectivity issue or cause any negative impact.

Mr. Colliflower noted that the impact could go both ways. He stated that while direct access

from Pocahontas Trail (indicated by the green arrows on the PowerPoint diagram) would yield a similar result, he highlighted a specific concern with the magenta route. Mr. Colliflower noted that this route allowed vehicles to pull straight from Pocahontas Trail into the Sheetz gas station pumps. He explained that because there was a direct line of sight from the pumps to a potential exit, drivers would be steered directly toward the Dutch Bros Coffee property, which he believed could increase potential traffic conflicts.

Mr. McGlennon asked if this facility was larger than a typical Dutch Bros Coffee facility.

Mr. Colliflower confirmed that while most new-construction Dutch Bros Coffee facilities were approximately 986 square feet, this project was an adaptive reuse. Consequently, the building footprint would remain unchanged, but the interior build-out would mimic the layout of their standard smaller facilities. Mr. Colliflower explained that the space would feature an approximate 1,000-square-foot commercial kitchen alongside a pedestrian entryway. He stated that customers would be able to access the interior to place orders, but the facility would operate strictly in a takeout format with no interior seating. The remaining square footage would be utilized for this customer access area and storage.

Mr. McGlennon asked if this facility would generate the typical standard of customers as there would be at a normal Dutch Bros Coffee property.

Mr. Colliflower stated that the business initially expected a normal peak rate of approximately 40 vehicles per hour during peak times, which equated to one customer every 90 seconds. He noted that the 120 peak-hour trips estimated by the TIA would require handling approximately one customer every 30 seconds, a volume he believed was unfeasible.

Mr. McGlennon closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Larson agreed with Mr. Colliflower's concerns regarding connectivity, citing the Wawa location as a prime example of existing traffic and access challenges. She expressed firm reservation regarding the cross-access connection.

Ms. Null agreed with Ms. Larson's point.

Mr. Icenhour supported the application but recommended removing SUP Condition Nos. 12 and 13, aligning with both the Planning Commission and the applicant. He agreed that the cross-access connection (SUP Condition No. 12) would cause significant conflict. Additionally, Mr. Icenhour noted that a right-turn taper (SUP Condition No. 13) was unwarranted due to the area's 25 mph speed limit and low traffic volume.

Ms. Larson suggested removing Condition No. 11 (Stormwater criteria), in addition to Conditions Nos. 12 and 13.

Mr. McGlennon praised the building's adaptive reuse and thanked the applicant team for their efforts. He voiced his support for the application, provided the specified conditions were removed.

Mr. Holt clarified that the Board desired the removal of SUP Condition No. 12 (cross-access connection) and SUP Condition No. 13 (right-turn taper). He noted that SUP Condition Nos. 10 and 11 were standard staff requirements which ensured compliance with the Board's adopted policy on Special Stormwater Criteria. Mr. Holt pointed out that the resolution before the Board was not the version originally recommended by the Planning Commission; based on Board feedback, the final motion would exclude SUP Condition Nos. 12 and 13 while retaining Condition Nos. 10 and 11.

The Board agreed.

5. SUP-26-0018. 6266 Richmond Road Short-term Rental

A motion to Approve was made by Barbara Null, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Ms. Jackura addressed the Board regarding the SUP application, explaining that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting. She highlighted, however, that the applicant's written statements were already included in the Board's Agenda Packet. Ms. Jackura stated that the proposal was to allow for a tourist home in the existing single-family dwelling located at 6266 Richmond Road. She cited the specifics of the application included in the staff report in the Agenda Packet. Ms. Jackura indicated that the dwelling was approximately 1,110 square feet with two bedrooms and an extra room that was not suitable for a bedroom, but was suitable for an office space. She noted that the applicant had remodeled the property as displayed on the PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Jackura stated that both interior and exterior renovations had occurred in addition to a new driveway to provide sufficient parking. She noted that in reviewing the application staff found that one of the criteria for short-term rentals within the Comprehensive Plan was not met, and that was the land designation. It was found that he property was designated Low Density Residential which was not one of the land designations listed in the Comprehensive Plan's short-term rental criteria. Ms. Jackura added that because one of the criteria was not met, staff could not recommend approval. She stated that should the Board approve the application, staff provided proposed conditions. Ms. Jackura concluded her presentation and welcomed questions from the Board.

Ms. Null supported the application, noting that the property looked excellent despite being in a busy area between the Route 199 off-ramp and The Villages at Westminster subdivision.

Dr. Haskins addressed the Board with the Planning Commission report. She noted that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the application due to its direct location on Richmond Road, located on a major corridor outside of any platted subdivision, and the significant renovation to the home. Dr. Haskins stated that the application carried the standard short-term rental conditions which included a limit of two bedrooms and a maximum of four occupants, one rental contract at a time, no signage, and adequate on-site parking. She reported that the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend approval, subject to the proposed conditions. Dr. Haskins concluded her remarks and welcomed questions from the Board.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. McGlennon closed the Public Hearing as there were no public speakers.

6. 2026 Agricultural and Forestal District (AFD) Renewals

A motion to Approve was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Mr. Jose Ribeiro, Senior Planner, informed the Board that State Code required the County to review all Agricultural and Forestal Districts (AFDs) before they expire. He stated that during this mandatory review, the County must decide whether to continue, modify, or terminate each district. Mr. Ribeiro noted that 13 of the County's AFDs were scheduled to expire on October 31, 2026. He stated that the Board's Agenda Packet contained staff reports for each AFD renewal. Mr. Ribeiro noted that eight of the 13 AFDs had no proposed changes or withdrawal requests. He reported several property withdrawal requests across multiple AFDs. First, a request was submitted to remove 9300 and 9240 Barnes Road totaling approximately 57 acres from the Barnes Swamp AFD, leaving that district with approximately 1,875 acres. Mr. Ribeiro advised that following the August 5, 2026, Planning Commission meeting, staff received a

subsequent request to withdraw four properties totaling 195 acres from the Gordon Creek AFD, bringing its total down to approximately 2,862 acres. He noted that later in the review, subsequent withdrawal requests were made for two properties (107 acres) in the Cranston's Pond AFD and five properties (396 acres) in the Croaker AFD. Following these final removals, Cranston's Pond AFD was left with approximately 836 acres and Croaker AFD with 919 acres. Mr. Ribeiro reported that approximately 17,386 acres of land remained under the AFD umbrella. He noted that staff found all AFDs remained compatible with State Code requirements and consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Ribeiro reported that at its July 16, 2026, meeting, the AFD Advisory Committee voted 8-0 (with two members absent) to recommend the renewal of all 13 AFDs. Mr. Ribeiro further reported that during its August 5, 2026, meeting, the Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend the renewal of all 13 AFDs. He noted that staff recommended that the Board of Supervisors renew each AFD for an additional four years, with the exception of the Wright's Island AFD, which was recommended for an eight-year extension. Mr. Ribeiro concluded his presentation and welcomed questions from the Board.

Mr. Icenhour requested clarification on whether the Barnes Swamp AFD was located inside or outside the PSA.

Mr. Ribeiro noted that information was not immediately available, but assured him that he would obtain it.

Mr. Icenhour inquired about the two additional parcel withdrawals omitted from the Board's original Agenda Packet, requesting clarification on the exact number of properties involved.

Mr. Ribeiro clarified that the request included two parcels totaling 107 acres from the Cranston's Pond AFD, alongside five properties from the Croaker AFD totaling 396 acres.

Mr. Icenhour asked if those AFDs were located outside of the PSA.

Mr. Ribeiro replied that to his knowledge yes.

Mr. Icenhour sought clarification on the reasoning behind the withdrawal of these properties.

Mr. Ribeiro expressed uncertainty regarding all the reasons behind the AFD withdrawal requests. However, he noted his awareness that the five properties removed from the Croaker AFD were intended for planned development, leading him to presume that the remaining withdrawal requests were similarly connected to development activities.

Mr. Icenhour sought clarification from Mr. Holt regarding the guidelines for AFD withdrawal requests during the renewal period.

Mr. Holt explained that because the AFD request was by-right, the property could be withdrawn during the renewal period without having to meet any specific criteria or stipulations.

Mr. Icenhour noted that property withdrawal only presented difficulties mid-cycle and sought clarification from Mr. Holt on that point.

Mr. Holt noted that while mid-cycle adjustments were governed by stipulations in the Board's adopted policy, an AFD withdrawal request remained permissible at any point throughout the renewal period prior to the Board's vote.

Mr. McGlennon asked Mr. Holt if he knew what the most recent AFD addition was.

Mr. Holt noted that a few AFD additions had been made since the previous four-year renewal cycle.

Mr. McGlennon asked if those were additions to existing AFDs or new AFDs.

Mr. Holt clarified that these were additions to existing AFDs, rather than new ones. He noted that while it had been a long time since a new district was established, these specific additions fell within the legally prescribed distance to be absorbed into an existing district.
Mr. McGlennon emphasized the importance of informing the public that districts may sometimes be disjointed, provided they are within a reasonable proximity.

Mr. Holt explained that under State Code, a baseline "core" distance must first be established, after which various allowable distance increments could be added.

Mr. McGlennon explained that AFDs were land management tools. He emphasized that participation was voluntary for landowners who chose to place their property into an AFD in exchange for favorable tax treatments. Mr. McGlennon indicated that the land was assessed and taxed based on its agricultural or forestal value rather than its potential development value.

Mr. Holt noted that landowners had other ways to preserve their property instead of developing it. He stated that a few Comprehensive Plan update cycles ago, the Planning Division compiled all available tools into a comprehensive decision tree. Mr. Holt explained that this resource helped landowners evaluate their options based on specific goals, such as short-term or long-term plans and tax credit advantages. He emphasized that the Planning Division had this information readily available and was happy to assist landowners through the decision-making process. Mr. Holt indicated that more information could be obtained by contacting the Planning Division at 757-253-6685.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Ribeiro to send an email detailing the property address, acreage, designated AFD, and its status regarding the PSA boundary.

Dr. Haskins addressed the Board with the Planning Commission report. She noted that the County reviewed 13 AFDs scheduled to expire at the end of October 2026. Dr. Haskins confirmed that staff found every AFD compliant with State Code requirements and aligned with the Comprehensive Plan. Dr. Haskins reported that the AFD Advisory Committee voted 8-0 to recommend renewal. She further reported that the Planning Commission voted 7-0 to recommend renewal of all AFDs to the Board.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

1. Mr. Alex Balke, 3332 News Road, representing property owners Mr. Payne Richardson and Ms. Sharon Dunn, spoke against withdrawing the parcels located at 4092, 4176, and 4130 Centerville Road from the AFD. He urged the Board to renew the entire AFD, arguing that the withdrawal application for the 169-acre area was legally invalid because the applicant, Mr. Richard H. Richardson, lacked the authority to represent all co-owners and had filed without their consent. Mr. Balke stated that processing the withdrawal violated basic procedural governance and the Board's own policies, rendering the application incomplete. Furthermore, he noted that removing these parcels, which made up 47% of the Gordon Creek AFD land within the PSA, prematurely violated Land Use Action 6.1.1 of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Balke asserted that the withdrawal's underlying intent was to launch a major residential development. He noted that while developers often assumed PSA inclusion guaranteed high-density utility extensions, he reminded the Board that A-1, General Agricultural Zoning District inside the PSA functioned as a low-density holding district rather than an automatic green light for high-density sprawl. Mr. Balke emphasized that sacrificing irreplaceable greenspace for housing inventory was an unacceptable tradeoff. He discussed land-use data which demonstrated that residential developments on A-1 land created a permanent fiscal deficit, costing local governments $1.16 to $1.32 in public services or every dollar generated in tax revenue As an example, Mr. Balke noted that a 100-unit subdivision would generate

approximately $600,000 in total revenue, but the operating costs for Williamsburg-James City County (WJCC) Public Schools alone would consume that entire amount, leaving County taxpayers to subsidize the additional costs for public safety and roads. He urged the Board to deny the request for AFD withdrawal and invited questions from the Board.

Mr. McGlennon noted that the Board typically did not ask questions to public commenters. He then asked the County Attorney whether the Board had the authority to deny the withdrawal request.

Mr. Kinsman explained that his research into the Code of Virginia confirmed a cotenant's legal right to withdraw property. Specifically, the State Code allowed a surviving cotenant to withdraw land within two years of another cotenant's death, which applied directly to this case. After consulting with the cotenant's attorney, Mr. Kinsman verified that they were legally entitled to take this action.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Kinsman if the contested properties were essentially owned by two cotenants, one of whom had passed away.

Mr. Kinsman noted that multiple cotenants were involved and that one cotenant had requested the removal of the specified Code section.

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Kinsman for clarification on whether a cotenant held the statutory right to do so.

Mr. Kinsman confirmed that the cotenant had the legal right to do so.

Mr. McGlennon asked Mr. Kinsman to confirm that any future development of the property by the landowner would require Board approval.

Mr. Kinsman replied that it would not be necessary, provided it was permitted by-right.

Mr. McGlennon noted that under the State Code the Board lacked the authority to stop a cotenant from withdrawing the property.

7. SUP-26-0008. 9301 Croaker Road Manufacture and Sale of Wood Products

A motion to Approve was made by Barbara Null, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Ms. Roberta Sulouff, Senior Planner, addressed the Board noting that Mr. Christopher McCarron had applied for an SUP to permit the manufacture and sale of wood products located at 9301 Croaker Road. She cited the specifics of the application included in the staff report in the Agenda Packet. Ms. Sulouff stated that the proposed operation would produce small wooden craft items and furniture and would also offer specialty S4 lumber on-site. She noted that the applicant was not proposing any sawmilling activities. Ms. Sulouff further noted that the proposed use would take place in a 24-foot by 24-foot accessory structure with an attached eight-foot pole barn that already existed on the site. She indicated that the applicant would continue to reside on-site and was not proposing any changes to the residence in reference to this request. Ms. Sulouff noted that staff had proposed SUP conditions which would mitigate potential impacts of the proposed use which included landscape buffering, restrictions on outdoor operations, restrictions on hours of operation, and requirements for the improvement of the driveway. She advised that the Planning Commission recommended height limitations for future signage noting that recommendation was reflected in SUP Condition No. 5 which was included in the resolution before the Board. Ms. Sulouff noted that with the proposed conditions staff found the proposal to be compatible with surrounding zoning, development, and consistent

with the Comprehensive Plan. She reported at its July 1, 2026, meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval of this application by a vote of 6-0. Ms. Sulouff noted that staff recommended approval of the application, subject to the proposed conditions. Ms. Sulouff concluded her presentation and welcomed questions from the Board.

Ms. Larson requested clarification from Ms. Sulouff regarding the staff report's phrasing. Specifically, she noted the report stated the proposed pole barn would otherwise be permitted by-right, which left her confused about whether the structure was actually allowed.

Ms. Sulouff clarified that the applicant was permitted to build the pole barn as a shed alongside the 24-by-24-foot accessory structure, provided it was not used for any specially permitted activities.

Dr. Haskins presented the Planning Commission's report regarding an application for a home-based woodworking business on rural agricultural land. She stated the proposed 24-foot by 24-foot workshop would produce small craft items and furniture with specialty lumber sold on-site with no sawmilling activities. Dr. Haskins noted that a neighbor had raised concerns regarding noise and signage, adding that the Commission had fully reviewed the site's buffering. She indicated that the Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend approval with conditions. Dr. Haskins noted that the Commission forwarded two signage options for the Board's consideration: The first option allowed a sign up to seven feet to match prior precedent. The second, revised option restricted the sign to a smaller scale intended only for customer navigation rather than soliciting drive-by traffic. She noted that the Commission had preferred the smaller signage but left the final decision to the Board.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the Board had questions for Dr. Haskins.

The Board had no questions.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

1. Mr. Chris McCarron, Applicant, 9301 Croaker Road, addressed the Board to clarify that the woodworking operation was a part-time hobby business run by him and his daughter. He explained that the permit was solely required to comply with regulations for selling products at the Toano Farmer's Market and similar venues. Mr. McCarron noted that the business had no retail hours, generated no residential traffic, and that all dimensional lumber was strictly delivered. While the proposed operating hours were 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., he emphasized that these were incremental and part-time hours due to their primary, full-time employment elsewhere. Regarding noise control, he stated the workshop equipment was no louder than a garden tractor, and the metal accessory structure was lined with one-inch pine, the manufacturing industry standard for sound baffling. Mr. McCarron concluded by reiterating that there were currently no deliveries or traffic, and the permit was intended purely to ensure legitimate compliance with local market requirements.

Ms. Larson expressed her appreciation for the application, noting that it fondly reminded her of a former Toano craftsman who made wooden toys. She shared that she still owned some of those original toys purchased for her son years ago. She commended the applicant and his daughter for embarking on this joint venture and wished Mr. McCarron much success should the application be approved.

Mr. McCarron questioned the need for an SUP since he held a permit for the same activity over the last two years.

Ms. Larson deferred that question to Ms. Christy Parrish, Zoning Administrator.

Ms. Parrish stated that while most home-based businesses were easily approved, the County's

strict definition required a home occupation to be fully contained within the main dwelling. She explained that because this specific wood manufacturing activity would take place in a detached accessory structure, it did not qualify for a standard home occupation permit. Instead, based on the County's Ordinance, the business must be approved through an SUP.

Mr. Icenhour inquired if the SUP with went the land.

Ms. Parrish confirmed that was correct. She recalled speaking with Mr. McCarron and noted that he was initially granted a home occupation permit because his business operated out of the home's attached basement.

Mr. McCarron clarified that it was an attached garage.

Inaudible discussion.

Ms. Larson suggested discussing the situation offline.

Mr. McGlennon advised that the Board was nearing a final determination on the application.

Ms. Wainwright asked Ms. Sulouff if a Site Plan was necessary for the application under the SUP provision.

Ms. Sulouff confirmed the statement's accuracy, explaining that an SUP required specific oversight to ensure all approved conditions were met. She clarified that while a Site Plan was being used, it functioned essentially as the project's Master Plan rather than a standard, large-scale Site Plan that demanded engineering and extensive technical requirements. Ms. Sulouff noted that this approach fulfilled the Master Plan criteria and granted the Planning Division the necessary authority to inspect the site.

Ms. Wainwright inquired whether staff were aware of the costs for the driveway improvements, screening, and landscaping.

Ms. Sulouff explained that staff could not provide an estimate. She noted that the driveway's specific surface type was directly required by the County's Fire Department to ensure emergency vehicle access.

Ms. Wainwright asked about the current driveway material.

Ms. Sulouff confirmed that the material was gravel. She noted that the Fire Department could conduct a site inspection and if the existing driveway met the current standards then no further action would be required.

Ms. Wainwright expressed strong concern over the burden placed on the County's small businesses. She noted that while the business activity remained identical, changing the location triggered an entirely new set of conditions for the applicant. Consequently, she requested clarification on this point from Ms. Sulouff.

Ms. Sulouff explained that she could not provide an answer because the Planning Division did not review the initial permit.

Ms. Wainwright asked if this requirement was via County Ordinance.

Ms. Parrish clarified that under current regulations, a home occupation must be entirely contained within the principal dwelling. She noted that because the proposed business would operate out of a detached accessory structure, it failed to meet this criteria, thereby necessitating an SUP.

Ms. Larson noted that while the applicant could conduct the activity at his residence, selling the products from his home was prohibited. She then turned to Ms. Parrish to clarify this point.

Ms. Parrish confirmed that this was correct pursuant to a County Ordinance. She clarified that while the applicant was permitted to manufacture, deliver, and sell the product off-site, operating a retail stand in the front yard was prohibited under the home occupation definition.

Ms. Larson inquired if this applied even within the A-1, General Agricultural Zoning District.

Ms. Parrish agreed, noting the exception of a wayside stand cultivating crops on-site.

Mr. McGlennon closed the Public Hearing.

Ms. Wainwright inquired whether Mr. McCarron had determined the costs associated with the SUP conditions.

Mr. McGlennon asked Mr. McCarron to come to the podium.

Mr. McCarron stated that the Fire Department could access the gravel driveway, which had always been unpaved. He noted that the business generated $4,000 last year, highlighting that the SUP application alone cost $1,000.

Ms. Wainwright inquired about the 20-foot-wide screening buffer requirement, asking Mr. McCarron if his property contained 20 feet of vegetation.

Mr. McCarron confirmed the statement, noting that he maintained 50 feet of trees and vegetation. He added that he installed pine wood walls inside the detached accessory structure to ensure he was being a good neighbor.

8. Ordinance to amend James City County Code Chapter 20, Taxation, Article II, Exemption of certain persons from real estate taxes, Section 20-11, Amount of exemption

A motion to Approve was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Mr. Richard Bradshaw, Commissioner of the Revenue, updated the Board on proposed changes to the elderly and disabled property tax exemptions. He noted that the current Ordinance exempts the first $150,000 of a qualified property's value, and the proposed amendment would increase this exemption to $200,000. Mr. Bradshaw then opened the floor to Board questions.

Mr. McGlennon asked for the estimated impact on tax revenue.

Mr. Bradshaw presented preliminary calculations for both exemption thresholds based on this year's 403 qualified applicants. He noted that retaining the $150,000 exemption resulted in a maximum benefit of $1,170 per person, totaling approximately $472,000. Mr. Bradshaw further noted that increasing the exemption to $200,000 raised the maximum benefit to $1,560 per person, with a total projected cost of up to $628,000.

Mr. McGlennon noted that the Board previously discussed whether to update the income limits and home value thresholds. He asked Mr. Bradshaw to clarify if the focus was specifically on home values.

Mr. Bradshaw noted that this applied to the size of the benefit rather than the eligibility

requirements.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Bradshaw when the changes would take effect.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that the County could implement this immediately within this fiscal year.

Mr. Icenhour asked Mr. Bradshaw if that would be reflected in the County's December bill.

Mr. Bradshaw verified that a credit would be issued on the December bill.

Mr. Icenhour thanked Mr. Bradshaw.

Ms. Larson asked Mr. Stevens if the County budget could absorb the additional exemption funds.

Mr. Stevens expressed confidence in the County's capacity to absorb the specified amount. He acknowledged the inherent tension between revenues and expenditures but maintained that the budget could be amended to accommodate the additional exemption.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. McGlennon closed the Public Hearing as there were no public speakers.

9. Ordinance to amend County Code sec. 13-4.1

A motion to Approve was made by Ruth Larson, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

Mr. Kinsman informed the Board that James City County Code Section 13-4.1 currently required bicycle helmets for individuals aged 14 and under on highways, sidewalks, and public paths. Following the Board's directive during the May 26, 2026, Business Meeting, the attached Ordinance had been updated to extend this safety requirement to motorized bicycles, skateboards, and scooters for the same age group. He then opened the floor to questions from the Board.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. McGlennon closed the Public Hearing as there were no public speakers.

10. ORD-26-0002. Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Variable Message Display Signs

A motion to Approve was made by James Icenhour, Jr., the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 3 NAYS: 2 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon
Nays: Null, Wainwright

Ms. Parrish reported that the Board adopted an Initiating Resolution on March 24, 2026, to consider zoning amendments regulating variable message display signs. She explained that the review stemmed from an internal inconsistency: Section 24-74 exempted temporary, non-commercial signs on private property for up to 90 days annually, while Section 24-75 strictly prohibited electronic and flashing signs. Ms. Parrish noted that this created ambiguity over whether the exemption overrode the prohibition. She acknowledged that temporary electronic signs were vital for public safety, such as emergency alerts or traffic control. She warned that the current loophole could allow non-safety electronic signs to remain on private property for

extended periods. Ms. Parrish noted that this outcome could compromise community character and create driving distractions. She stated that to ensure clear and consistent enforcement, staff proposed specific amendments detailed in the memorandum included in the Board's Agenda Packet. Ms. Parrish reported that the Policy Committee voted to endorse the proposed changes on June 11, 2026. Subsequently, on July 1, 2026, the Planning Commission recommended approval to the Board with a 5-1 favorable vote. Ms. Parrish noted that staff recommended adopting the resolution and Ordinance change provided in the Agenda Packet. She then welcomed questions from the Board.

Ms. Larson inquired whether WJCC Schools could use electronic display signs for notifications and special events, citing Jamestown's electronic message board as an example.

Ms. Parrish clarified that Jamestown's electronic message board predated the adoption of this Ordinance.

Ms. Larson inquired whether other entities would be authorized to utilize the electronic message board.

Ms. Parrish clarified that it must fall within specific guidelines, which required it to be located on private property or erected and maintained by a local government entity.

Ms. Larson emphasized that schools served as vital communication channels for parents.

Mr. McGlennon stated his belief that schools qualify as governmental entities.

Ms. Parrish expressed her belief that the information was correct but referred the final determination to the County Attorney.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the Board had questions.

Ms. Wainwright stated she had no questions but identified as a pro-property rights, free-market advocate. She expressed concern that the County was imposing unfair burdens on residents compared to other entities. Ms. Wainwright noted that the issue stemmed from complaints over an intermittent electronic message board. She argued against enacting broad Ordinances for everyone just because a few individuals disliked a specific sign's message.

Mr. McGlennon asked Ms. Parrish whether the County had existing restrictions on illuminated signage.

Ms. Parrish confirmed that was correct.

Mr. McGlennon noted that the primary challenge was deciding whether the County should allow a proliferation of illuminated signage, which would detract from the area's overall appearance. He stated that while he was unfamiliar with the specific sign mentioned by Ms. Wainwright and would not base his decision on it, he emphasized that signs can provide useful information through subtle illumination methods without relying on flashing lights or large-scale private displays.

Ms. Parrish noted that the County had previously overhauled its Sign Ordinance and explained that the current change was intended solely for clarification. She stated that the County had permitted digital signs for gas stations because it was updating the sign regulations to ensure content neutrality. However, the removal of all digital signs had been taken out of the Ordinance; because an exemption existed, it had created a conflict regarding whether those private signs would be permitted as electronic displays, or whether the County could enforce the removal of electronic signs.

Dr. Haskins presented the Planning Commission report to the Board, explaining that the amendment resolved a conflict in the current Ordinance regarding temporary non-commercial signs and the prohibition of electric or flashing signs. She noted that under the proposed amendment, temporary non-commercial signs could not be illuminated or use electronic and digital displays. However, limited exceptions were carved out for government traffic control or emergency signage, as well as certain non-residential signs that were not visible from public areas or adjacent properties. Finally, Dr. Haskins reported that the Policy Committee recommended the changes by a 5-0 vote, while the Planning Commission approved them by a 5-1 vote.

Ms. Null asked why one Planning Commissioner opposed the proposed amendment.

Dr. Haskins noted that Mr. Vincent Passero voted against the proposed changes, though she did not record his rationale.
Ms. Parrish addressed Ms. Null's question regarding the dissenting vote. She explained that Mr. Passero voted against the proposed changes because the sign regulation should be amended to lessen restrictions for businesses.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. McGlennon closed the Public Hearing as there were no public speakers.

11. ORD-26-0006. Landscape Ordinance Reorganization

Ms. Sarah Propst, Principal Planner, reminded the Board that at its April 28, 2026, meeting, it adopted an Initiating Resolution directing staff to update the Landscaping Ordinance. She noted that the goal of this update was to provide more flexible options, clarify requirements, and make the text more concise. Ms. Propst stated that the draft Ordinance contained multiple updates, which were outlined in the memorandum. Ms. Propst explained that the revised Landscaping Ordinance consolidated rules there were previously scattered across various sections of the Zoning Ordinance and individual zoning districts. She noted that centralizing these regulations would make it easier for applicants and reviewers to find and understand the specific landscape requirements for each project. Ms. Propst further noted that the sections were reorganized into a more logical sequence with clearing headings. She added that language was updated to ensure consistent terminology and now included definitions. Ms. Propst advised that the minimum square footage for tree and shrub buffers had been increased to promote long-term landscape health. She noted that modifications, substitutions, transfers, reductions, and waivers provided additional flexibility. Ms. Propst reported that the Policy Committee reviewed the draft Landscaping Ordinance on June 11, 2026, recommended several changes, and forwarded it with a recommendation for approval to the Planning Commission, which subsequently recommended approval to the Board on July 1, 2026. Ms. Propst concluded her presentation and welcomed questions from the Board.

Ms. Wainwright commended Ms. Propst for her outstanding work on this task.

Dr. Haskins presented the Planning Commission's report to the Board, highlighting updates to the Landscaping Ordinance. She explained that the reorganization and amendments directly addressed the Board's request for clearer, more readable, and flexible standards. Specifically, the revised Ordinance consolidated scattered zoning requirements, refined definitions, and increased tree and shrub planting areas to promote healthier growth. Dr. Haskins noted that it also introduced native planting and water conservation rules, helpful illustrations, and increased regulatory flexibility. Dr. Haskins reported that the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval with a 6-0 vote.

Mr. McGlennon asked if the Board had questions.

The Board declined.

Mr. McGlennon opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. McGlennon closed the Public Hearing as there were no public speakers.

I. BOARD CONSIDERATION(S)

None.

J. BOARD REQUESTS AND DIRECTIVES

Ms. Wainwright reported that she had not reviewed her calendar from August, noting it was a pleasant break. She noted that while she attended some County-related meetings during the month, she could not recall specific details at the moment. Ms. Wainwright stated that looking ahead, she anticipated three to five upcoming items to report at the next Board meeting. She requested that the Planning Division notify the Board when large-scale proposals were initially submitted. She noted that many cases reach the Board only after applicants had spent significant time and money. Ms. Wainwright further noted that receiving early notice would allow the Board to evaluate if initial proposals aligned with the County's long-term plans and direction, though she acknowledged the exact process for this early review would need to be determined.

Mr. McGlennon asked Ms. Wainwright to expand further on her request.

Ms. Wainwright suggested that the Board be informed of large-scale development proposals during their initial phases.

Mr. McGlennon noted that the Board received a monthly report detailing cases submitted by the Planning Division.

Mr. Stevens agreed to review the Board's current information flow to see if materials could be provided earlier in the process, noting that he would discuss that matter with Mr. Holt.

Ms. Wainwright found the year-end summary to be very helpful.

Mr. McGlennon proposed including the PermitLink hyperlink within the year-end report to streamline user access and eliminate unnecessary searching.

Ms. Larson noted that navigating the Board's Agenda Packet required excessive scrolling to locate specific case information. To alleviate this, she recommended streamlining the process, which Mr. Holt agreed to look into for the Board.

Ms. Null agreed with the need for the Board to be informed much earlier in the proposal process.

Mr. McGlennon appreciated the intent of the request; however, he cautioned that the Board must maintain strict procedural boundaries. He noted that applicant proposals occasionally conflicted with land-use regulations. Mr. McGlennon stated that while the Board might receive preliminary information, official involvement was often inappropriate until the proposal had fully cleared the established administrative process.

Ms. Null stated that she attended the grand opening of Aloha Tiki Hawaiian Kitchen & Bar. She mentioned that Mr. Icenhour, Ms. Wainwright, and Mr. Stevens also attended the event. Ms. Null extended her best wishes for the company's future success. She noted that she was participating in several meetings next week and would provide a report on those items next Board meeting.

Mr. Icenhour reported that he attended the County Picnic on August 2 and expressed his appreciation to Mr. Stevens for his organizing efforts. He mentioned that he and Mr. McGlennon attended the 108th anniversary celebration of the Naval Weapons Station Yorktown on August 6. Mr. Icenhour stated that he attended the Real People Educating Others (RPEO) Back-to-School event at Lafayette High School on August 22. He reported that he attended the grand opening of Aloha Tiki Hawaiian Kitchen & Bar on September 4. Mr. Icenhour shared positive, informative updates regarding the Virginia Association of Counties (VACo) Summit.

Ms. Larson mentioned her attendance at the VACo Summit and commended its execution. She expressed appreciation for all participants, particularly the Governor's staff. She also highly praised the York County State of the County event, which she attended alongside Chair McGlennon at the Greater Williamsburg Sports and Events Center (GWSEC). Ms. Larson stated that she toured the site of the new Consolidated Government Center and encouraged fellow Board members to visit, noting that safety equipment was mandatory for the tour. Additionally, she reported that she and Supervisor Wainwright participated in a highly informative School Liaison meeting on July 31. Ms. Larson stated that on August 27, she and Supervisor Wainwright attended a community meeting regarding The Bluffs at Kiskiack. She announced an upcoming Berkeley District Town Hall Meeting at Legacy Hall, scheduled for October 1 at 6 p.m. Ms. Larson noted that while she appreciated the August meeting recess, it resulted in a heavily compressed workload immediately before and after the break. She suggested the Board consider scheduling at least one meeting in August to distribute the workload more evenly. Ms. Larson concluded by thanking County staff for their extensive preparation of the full Agenda, and extended her appreciation to the applicants and all entities seeking to do business in JCC.

Mr. McGlennon noted that while the Board did not meet in August, he recalled only one meeting being held in both November and December. He requested clarification from Mr. Stevens on that point.

Mr. Stevens clarified that both the Regular and Business Meetings for December would still take place, but the meetings had been combined onto a single date rather than held separately. He also confirmed that the Board would only hold a Regular Meeting in November.

Mr. McGlennon commended the 757 Giveback Committee and RPEO for hosting an exceptional back-to-school event. He noted that the annual initiative provided essential resources to the community, including school supplies, backpacks, complimentary haircuts, and free lunches courtesy of Corey's Kitchen. Additionally, the County's Police Department participated by issuing Child IDs. Mr. McGlennon reported an impressive turnout of approximately 600 to 700 attendees. He applauded the organizers' ongoing dedication, recognizing the event's consistent year-over-year growth. Mr. McGlennon noted that he attended the County's Picnic and the Large Staff meeting at the GWSEC. He reported that he attended the VACo Summit and made positive remarks about the event. Mr. McGlennon stated that he attended the Grove Community Park stakeholders meeting and acknowledged Supervisor Wainwright's attendance at the event. He mentioned he got to view the proposed design proposals and emphasized that the County's Parks & Recreation Department and design-build team was doing an excellent job obtaining community engagement on what the public would like to see at the Grove Community Park. Mr. McGlennon advised that there was a public input meeting scheduled for October 15 from 6-8 p.m. He mentioned that two weeks prior he attended a ReTree Program stakeholders meeting and noted that it was well-attended with many individuals representing different organizations which included State Forestry Department, Master Gardeners, Master Naturalists, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, a whole range of folks who were interested in getting involved in the ReTree Program. Mr. McGlennon noted that a part of that event was to sketch out some plans for a kickoff event which was scheduled for Saturday, October 10 at Veterans Park at 2 p.m.

K. REPORTS OF THE COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Stevens announced two upcoming design meetings for the Grove Community Park, both starting at 6 p.m. at James River Elementary School (JRES). The first meeting on September 17 would focus on gathering public input. He stated residents were strongly encouraged to attend both this session and the follow-up meeting on October 15, where a more formal park design would likely be proposed. Mr. Stevens reported that the County Treasurer's Office was facing staff shortages due to recent resignations, medical leave, and maternity absences. He explained that because these vacancies made it difficult to maintain standard service levels, a News Release was issued announcing the temporary closure of the DMV Select Office at the Government Center campus from September 14 through November 13. Mr. Stevens announced that an updated Citizens Guide was now available at most County facilities. He stated that the guide helped residents navigate County services by detailing which departments handled specific services and providing directions to their offices. Mr. Stevens noted for more information, residents could call 757-253-6826. He announced that the New Town Tunes Concert Series was set to return on September 9. He stated that the weekly event would take place in New Town at Sullivan Square, located behind Legacy Hall, and would run every Wednesday at 5 p.m. through October 14.

Mr. McGlennon asked Mr. Stevens to comment on the County's recent bond market activity. He explained that borrowing in early August for major projects, such as the new Consolidated Government Center, proved highly fortuitous. Thanks to efficient timing, the County secured an excellent rate just two weeks before interest rates spiked. Mr. McGlennon noted that this prompt action would yield significant, long-term savings for County citizens.

Mr. Stevens noted that the collective efforts of County staff, consultants, and the Board were instrumental in ensuring a successful outcome. He emphasized that the timing was critical, resulting in substantial cost savings.

Ms. Larson made a request to the County Attorney regarding the Public Comment segment. Drawing on her previous experience with the WJCC School Board, she suggested implementing brief, standard instructions to clarify that the Board did not engage in Q&A during public comments. Additionally, Ms. Larson inquired whether public commenters presenting physical documents could hand them directly to County staff for safety reasons.

L. CLOSED SESSION

None.

M. ADJOURNMENT

1. Adjourn until 1 pm on September 22, 2026 for the Business Meeting

A motion to Approve the Continuation of the Meeting until 12 p.m. on September 22, 2026, was made by Tracy Wainwright, the motion result was Passed.
AYES: 5 NAYS: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0
Ayes: Icenhour Jr., Larson, McGlennon, Null, Wainwright

At approximately 7:15 p.m., Mr. McGlennon adjourned the Board of Supervisors.

Teresa J. Saeed

Deputy Clerk