

MINUTES
JAMES CITY COUNTY DEVELOPMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
BUILDING A LARGE CONFERENCE ROOM
101 MOUNTS BAY ROAD, WILLIAMSBURG, VA 23185
December 17, 2025
4:00 P.M.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Polster called the meeting to order at approximately 4 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present:

Frank Polster, Chair
Steve Rodgers
Jack Haldeman
Scott Maye

Staff Present:

Barbara Null, Board of Supervisor, Stonehouse District
Allison Jackura, Senior Planner
Hannah Hunnicutt, Administrative Coordinator

C. MINUTES

1. Minutes of the November 19, 2025, Regular Meeting

Mr. Haldeman made a motion to Approve the Minutes.

On a voice vote, the Committee approved the Minutes of the November 19, 2025, Regular Meeting. (4-0)

D. OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. C-25-0045. 4451 and 4420 Cedar Point Lane - Rezoning and Special Use Permits

Ms. Allison Jackura, Senior Planner, stated that this conceptual plan was for two properties, and that 4451 Cedar Point Lane is the house address; the address for the parcel is 4305 Fenton Mill Road. Ms. Jackura noted that if this case was to move forward, the applicant would be using the parcel address rather than the street address for the house. Ms. Jackura stated that the goal for the two properties would be to do some subdivision changes and then secure the necessary Rezoning and Special Use Permit (SUP). Ms. Jackura noted that currently 4420 Cedar Point Lane was vacant but could construct a single-family dwelling without a subdivision. She noted that 4451 Cedar Point Lane had two existing single-family residences and a large area of undeveloped land.

Mr. Chase Grogg, Applicant, stated that both lots were purchased; however, 4420 Cedar Point Lane was a landlocked parcel. Mr. Grogg continued stating that the applicants could get an ingress/egress easement to give the property access, but as part of this proposal would subdivide a flag stem for that property so that it had its own parcel access.

Mr. Polster asked for clarification on the proposed use of Lot 1.

Mr. Grogg stated that the property would be used as a single residence.

Mr. Grogg stated that Lots 1 and 2 on the conceptual plan would be utilized for A-1, General Agricultural purposes as a single-family dwelling. Mr. Grogg noted that 4451 Cedar Point Lane was the parcel that had two existing homes on it. Mr. Grogg stated that the applicants wanted to make that parcel conform to the Zoning Ordinance by subdividing the existing homes onto their own lots. Mr. Grogg noted that proposed Lot 3 was the start of the reason that this meeting was requested. Mr. Grogg stated that Lot 3 had an existing house that would be proposed to be a short-term rental property, requiring a SUP. Mr. Grogg noted that staff had stated within the comment letter that short-term rentals should be located on a main road. Mr. Grogg stated that the 2045 Comprehensive Plan stated that the entire section of road along Fenton Mill was deemed to be Neighborhood Commercial. Mr. Grogg mentioned the possibility of plantings to screen the subdivision, an effort that would be part of additional planning underway along the street to the north.

Mr. Polster noted that the short-term rental guidelines within the Comprehensive Plan were guidelines and not mandatory requirements. He stated that one of the biggest hurdles had been that the owner resides on the property.

Mr. John Hill, Applicant, asked if the criteria had already been met since his home was on Lot 2.

Mr. Polster found that to be a helpful fact for consideration in the future of applying for this application, as the owner would be nearby to ensure any operational issues could be addressed quickly as intended by the guidelines.

Mr. Grogg stated that a portion of the proposed Lot 3 within the 2045 Comprehensive Plan was indicated as a Neighborhood Commercial use. Mr. Grogg noted that the campground planned would be more of an in-place structure, glamping type setup. Mr. Grogg stated that there would not be a lot of in and out traffic regarding campers for actual camping, with the big roundabout proposed for Fire apparatus; however, it was not a set in stone layout. Mr. Grogg continued stating that the boating and RV storage upfront seemed to be a good place for it since there are nearby county facilities for water recreation. Mr. Grogg noted that to meet zoning requirements it would have to have the M-1, Limited Business/Industrial District as staff pointed out; however, their plan would be to most likely proffer to not allow most of the other uses so that it did not become an issue down the road.

Mr. Rodgers asked if a parcel was rezoned, the parcel would not stay rezoned whether the business succeeded or failed; so if the applicants were to proffer to not allow the other uses, how would that proffer exist if the parcel was sold.

Ms. Jackura stated that rezonings were allowed to have conditions offered on them which affected the Ordinance for the property permanently. Ms. Jackura noted that if approved, the property would be rezoned to the district minus the specific uses in perpetuity regardless of what the actual use on the property was at any point. Additionally, rezoning would be required to allow for the other uses.

Mr. Maye asked regarding the boat and RV storage, could that potentially be used for camping spots for trailers to come in and start camping there in the future.

Mr. Grogg responded no, and that it would be strictly used for storage only.

Ms. Jackura stated that it was discussed internally regarding the glamping cabins as a use. Ms. Jackura noted that the Zoning Administrator determined that it was a campground use; however, there was some concern about if the business did not succeed or down the line, what would happen with the structures as they would not be permitted to be long-term residences. Ms. Jackura mentioned that staff would likely recommend a condition requiring the removal of the cabins if their use was discontinued, within a specified timeframe.

Mr. Rodgers asked for clarification regarding the two roundabouts and if they were for emergency vehicle use.

Mr. Grogg responded yes, and for other uses such as if someone who is transporting a boat could turn around.

Mr. Rodgers asked if the glamping cabins would have internal baths and showers or if they would be communal.

Mr. Hill responded yes, each cabin would have their own facilities.

Mr. Hill explained how he came across this idea and his intentions with the project and future of this property.

Mr. Haldeman asked how large the cabins would be.

Mr. Hill responded the bigger cabin would be just under 1,000 square feet and the smaller ones would be between 500 to 600 square feet. Mr. Hill indicated that the majority of the cabins would have a single bathroom and a single bedroom, while four of the cabins would likely feature two bedrooms and two bathrooms.

Mr. Haldeman asked if they would be able to limit the square footage.

Ms. Jackura stated yes.

Mr. Polster asked where the two Best Management Practices (BMPs) would drain.

Mr. Grogg stated that the property drained into the Skimino Creek watershed.

Mr. Polster stated that from the plan that was provided, it looked consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and that it was a good sign that Mr. Hill had already consulted the neighbors. Mr. Polster explained that a neighbor's concerns were important when he considered cases like this. Mr. Polster stated that on the other side of the Hankin's property there were two outfalls which required some stream restoration. Mr. Polster noted that the applicants might want to consider outfall protection on the property and the Special Stormwater Criteria (SSC) Nos. 12 or 13 to be able to help in mitigating that issue.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Rodgers asked if this property was located within the Primary Service Area (PSA).

Mr. Polster confirmed that it was located within the PSA.


Mr. Polster asked if there were any other questions for the applicants or staff.

Mr. Polster stated that there was no action required by the Development Review Committee.

F. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Haldeman made a motion to Adjourn the meeting.

On a voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:34 p.m.



Frank Polster, Chair



Susan Istenes, Secretary