

**MINUTES
STAUNTON PLANNING COMMISSION**

**April 16, 2026
5:30 p.m.
City Council Chambers**

PRESENT: **Jessica Robinson, Chair
Judith Wiegand, Vice Chair
Daniel Hansen
Kendrick Kier
Steve Tomaso**

ALSO PRESENT: **Rodney Rhodes, Director of Community Development
Tim Hartless, Planning Manager
Adam Campbell, Council Liaison
Linda Nesselrodt, Clerk of Planning Commission**

Ms. Robinson called the April 16, 2026 meeting of the Staunton Planning Commission to order.

Ms. Robinson welcomed new commissioner, Steve Tomaso.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Wiegand made a motion to approve the minutes of the March 19, 2026 Planning Commission meeting, as presented.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hansen and carried as follows:

Ms. Wiegand	aye	Mr. Hansen	aye
Ms. Robinson	aye	Mr. Kier	aye
Mr. Tomaso	abstained		

MOTION TO AMEND THE AGENDA

Ms. Wiegand made a motion to amend the meeting agenda and to add consideration for authorization of a zoning text amendment under new business as item 3-B.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hansen and carried as follows:

Ms. Wiegand	aye	Mr. Hansen	aye
Ms. Robinson	aye	Mr. Kier	aye
Mr. Tomaso	aye		

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

NEW BUSINESS

3-A) Public Hearing and Consideration of a Request by FAP Properties, XXIII, LLC, to Rezone 855 Statler Blvd. and a portion of 851 Statler Blvd. From I-1, Light Industrial District, to B-2, General Business District.

Mr. Kier and Mr. Hansen recused themselves due to working on the project. Mr. Hansen also recused himself from 3-B. They left the dais. Mr. Hartless presented the staff report for this item.

Background: FAP Properties, XXIII, LLC, is requesting a rezoning of 855 Statler Blvd from I-1, Light Industrial District, to B-2, General Business District. The property is located on the east side of Statler Blvd near the intersection with Greenville Ave. 855 Statler Blvd is portion of a larger parcel addressed as 851 Statler Blvd. Although it is one platted lot, the City Assessor has split it into two tax parcels for tax billing purposes.

The property was developed in the late 1980s as the Statler Crossing Shopping Center, and it was the location of Staunton's first Walmart and several other smaller retail stores. Walmart relocated to its current location on Richmond Avenue in 1994 and the applicant acquired the property in 2006 and began to use it for warehouse space. The smaller building remained used as retail operations. In 2011 the applicant requested to rezone the entire property from B-2, General Business to I-1, Light Industrial, which would allow the applicant more flexibility and possibly an expansion of the warehouse use. Now Fisher Auto Parts is requesting to rezone the smaller building, the strip center portion of the building, back to B-2 General Business. This would allow the applicant to once again lease these spaces out for business purposes; things like retail stores, restaurants, perhaps offices.

Staff has conducted a review of the proposed rezoning, during which it did not identify any issues. The smaller building is difficult to use for industrial purposes because of the lower ceiling height and the smaller footprint, and using the building for business purposes seems to be the highest and best use of the space. Access to the site is from Statler Boulevard by way of a traffic light. There is plenty of available parking for any businesses that might locate in this building. The property was developed and intended to be used for business purposes, and rezoning it back to B-2 would allow the reestablishment of that use. Surrounding zoning includes I-1, Light Industrial to the north, the south and the east and B-2, General Business to the west. Surrounding uses include the Fisher Auto Parts warehouse, Fisher Auto Parts retail store, the Augusta Health Outpatient Care Clinic, and the Statler Square Shopping Center, which is across Statler Boulevard.

Recommendation: The City's Comprehensive Plan future land use map designates this area as commercial and the requested rezoning is consistent with that designation, and staff is recommending that planning commission recommend approval of the rezoning.

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

Public Hearing: Ms. Robinson opened the public hearing. James Thompson, who is handling the surveying work for the rezoning, was available for questions on behalf of the applicant. Ross Hayes, General Counsel for Fisher Auto Parts stated the applicant is considering general retail, restaurant, and professional/office uses consistent with nearby Kroger-anchored shopping center.

After no further speakers, the public hearing was closed.

Motion: Ms. Wiegand motioned on the basis that the rezoning would serve the interests of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice, that Planning Commission recommend approval of the rezoning of 855 Statler Blvd. and a portion of 851 Statler Blvd. from I-1, Light Industrial District, to B-2, General Business District.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Tomaso and carried as follows:

Ms. Wiegand	aye	Ms. Robinson	aye
Mr. Tomaso	aye		

Mr. Kier returned to the dais.

3-B) Zoning Text Amendment Authorization To Amend – Chapters 18.20 (R-1) and 18.25 (R-2) – Allow Private Day Nurseries and Kindergartens

Ms. Robinson recused herself and left the dais due to conflict on this item. Ms. Wiegand chaired the request. Mr. Kier rejoined at the dais.

Mr. Hartless presented the staff report for this item.

Background: The Staunton Augusta YMCA has requested this zoning text amendment, which would allow private Day Nurseries and Kindergartens, which also are known as Child Day Cares, as a use permitted on review in our R-1 and R-2 zoning districts. That means that day cares could be permitted in the R-1 and R-2 districts with a Special Use Permit (SUP). These requests are handled similarly in our other residential districts. Currently day cares are not permitted at all in R-1 and R-2 districts, so we're asking to amend the code so that we handle day cares in R-1 and R-2 the same way that as in other residential zoning districts.

Recommendation: Staff supports the requested amendment and believes that Child Day Cares could be permitted in low density residential areas without negatively impacting the area. The Special Use Permit process allows us to review each request individually, based on its own merits, and it's in a specific location to ensure that compatibility with the surrounding area. Staff is asking that Planning Commission authorize this code amendment.

Discussion: Clarification confirmed the amendment applies to standalone day care facilities (6+ children), not in-home day cares, which are addressed separately through home occupation permits. This is for their facility to provide day care for over 100 children on New Hope Rd. If

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

this amendment is approved, which allows us to consider special use permits for this use, then they will follow that up with a Special Use application.

Motion: There was a motion made by Mr. Kier, on the basis that it would serve the interests of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice, to authorize staff to prepare amendments to Chapters 18.20 and 18.25 of Title 18 (Zoning) of the Staunton City Code to allow private day nurseries and kindergartens as a Use Permitted on Review.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Tomaso and carried as follows:

Ms. Wiegand	aye	Mr. Hansen	recused
Ms. Robinson	recused	Mr. Kier	aye
Mr. Tomaso	aye		

Ms. Robinson and Mr. Hansen returned to the dais.

OLD BUSINESS

4-B) Consideration of a Request by Staunton Augusta Properties, LLC, for a Special Use Permit for McIntosh village, a planned residential development requested under the provisions of Staunton city code section 18.25.030(10) at:

**1100 Middlebrook Ave - Parcel Identification Number 5937,
700 Grayson St - Parcel Identification Number 7348,
1106 Middlebrook Ave - Parcel Identification Number 7408,
100 Mayo St - Parcel Identification Number 10002,
824 Mineola St - Parcel Identification Number 10005,
910 Mineola St - Parcel Identification Number 10009,
914 Moore St - Parcel Identification Number 10092,
1320 Middlebrook Ave - Parcel Identification Number 10093,
1206 Middlebrook Ave - Parcel Identification Number 8404, and
200 Mayo St - Parcel Identification Number 11264,**

Under the Provisions of Staunton City Code 18.25.030(10) to Allow a Planned Residential Development (PRD) Consisting of 267 Single-Family Dwellings.

This was Previously 298 single-family homes. It has now been reduced to 267.

Mr. Hartless presented the staff report for this item.

Background: Staunton Augusta Properties, LLC, is requesting a Special Use Permit for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) to be known as McIntosh Village. The property is located in an area between Middlebrook Ave, the Shenandoah Heights neighborhood, and

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

the Green Spring Valley neighborhood. The applicant acquired the properties in September 2024, and is now proposing to construct 267 single family homes on 77.31 acres of land. The property is zoned R-2, Low Density Residential, and a PRD can only be permitted through the Special Use Permit process.

Analysis: Staunton City Code (SCC) 18.105, Development Standards for Uses Permitted on Review, establishes the requirements for a PRD. That section permits the developer to propose their own minimum lot size and setbacks which allows density to be clustered in the more easily developed areas. In exchange, the developer agrees to provide common area and amenities for recreation. Overall density for a PRD may not exceed the maximum density allowed in the underlying zoning. In this case, the underlying zoning is R-2, Low Density Residential, which allows a maximum density of 4.9 units per acre.

The developer has proposed the following area requirements:

Minimum lot size – 3,000 square feet (standard R-2 is 8,750 SF)

Minimum Setbacks:

Front – 18 feet (standard R-2 is 25 feet)
Side – 6 feet (standard R-2 is 7 feet)
Rear – 15 feet (standard R-2 is 30 feet)

Corner Side – 12 feet (standard R-2 is 12.5 feet)

Maximum Density – 3.5 units per acre (R-2 allows 4.9 units per acre)

Common Area Amenities:

Amenity A – patio with fire pit (Concrete pavers with paver blocks or comparable, 2000 SF minimum), and pavilion/gazebo (wooden structure under roof with 4 picnic tables and 4 benches, 800 SF minimum)

Amenity B – playground (commercial grade play equipment, 3 swings, 1 slide, and 1 climbing wall – 2000 SF minimum)

Amenity C – walking trail (asphalt or crushed rock, 5-foot width)

Amenity D – walking trail (asphalt or crushed rock, 5-foot width) Amenities E – walking trail (asphalt or crushed rock, 5-foot width)

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

Private Street – The Planned Residential Development process allows the City to consider allowing privately owned streets. A private street is generally a street owned and maintained by a Home Owners Association. The developer proposes one private street which will provide access to three lots, Lots 7, 8, and 9. A Home Owners Association must own this street and must bear the responsibility for maintenance. This will include snow removal and re-paving costs.

Access – Access to the property by way of an existing public street is available from either Green Spring Valley or Shenandoah Heights. The fire code requires two separate means of ingress and egress when a development exceeds 30 dwellings. The developer proposes 267 dwelling units; therefore, more than one access point will be required. The new access point from Middlebrook Ave. must be constructed in the first phase of the development before construction of any dwelling unit is completed. The developer proposes access from three possible locations:

- An existing access easement between 1138 and 1220 Middlebrook Avenue (next to Grace Christian Activity Center),
- Undeveloped Gilliam Street, and
- Undeveloped Grayson Street

If the developer chooses to use undeveloped Grayson Street, a portion of the street grade may exceed 12% slope which will necessitate a variance to the City's subdivision standards (Title 17.15.070, Grades of Streets). That subdivision variance must be granted by City Council prior to staff approval of any Infrastructure construction plans or subdivision plat. Even if the PRD is approved the project will not be feasible until the developer addresses the access requirement.

As shown on the map (Attachment 3), surrounding zoning is R-2, Low Density Residential District with some B-2, General Business District to the east along Middlebrook Ave. The B-2 area is minimal and does not appear to include any proposed development area so rezoning of the B-2 area is not necessary.

The *City of Staunton, Virginia, Comprehensive Plan 2018-2040*, Land Use Development Guide, Future Land Use Map, designates this area as Low Density Residential. This designation is characterized as single-family detached dwellings with a maximum density of 1 to 5 units per acre. The proposed development contains a density of approximately 3.5 units per acre (267 units / 77.3 acres = 3.45) The requested Special Use Permit is consistent with this designation.

A Special Use Permit is step one of the multi-step process to develop the property for the intended use. Likely, the development will occur in phases (or sections). For each phase, the

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

developer will submit an Infrastructure Construction Plan which details the construction of infrastructure including streets, curb, gutter, sidewalks, stormwater management facilities, common elements, and a grading plan for each lot. Construction Plans are reviewed and approved administratively. Once the Construction Plan is approved, the developer will submit a final plat to create the lots for that phase (section). Once the plat is recorded in the land book in the Circuit Court, building permits can be issued for each dwelling.

Recommendation: While staff is generally supportive of the proposed development, there are some concerns that should be addressed with conditions associated with approval of any Special Use Permit. Mr. Hartless read out the conditions, which are listed below in the minutes, after discussion.

Discussion: Mr. Tomaso asked for clarification on the definition of *principal structure*. Mr. Hartless confirmed a principal structure is the house itself, and would include any additions in the future. Mr. Tomaso also raised a question regarding the power easement. Mr. Hartless said Mr. Shimp stated that he has designed the neighborhood in such a way that the power easement does not interfere with the siting of any of the of the proposed homes, so the 30 ft. has nothing to do with that easement.

Ms. Robinson raised a question regarding how density is calculated for the development. Mr. Hartless noted it's based on the 77 acres that are part of this development. It's not based on the additional roughly 23 acres that are not part of this. Mr. Hartless clarified that the density calculation is based on the developable portion of the property, not the entire parcel.

Ms. Robinson noted that two public hearings on this matter have already been held. The group discussed the proposed minimum lot size for the development. Mr. Hansen noted that the typical lot in the development is approximately 6,000 square feet and expressed concern that a 3,000 square foot minimum would result in unreasonably small, potentially unbuildable lots. He proposed raising the minimum to 5,000–5,500 square feet. Ms. Robinson agreed that 5,500 square feet was reasonable. Mr. Tomaso asked whether a percentage-based standard could be used instead. Ms. Robinson and Mr. Hansen both preferred a fixed numerical standard, with Mr. Hansen noting it is easier for city staff to enforce. Mr. Hansen further clarified that lots smaller than 5,000 square feet become difficult to build on, and that smaller lots may be appropriate for downtown infill projects but not for this development. Ms. Wiegand referenced her 3,300 square foot lot in the downtown area as context. Mr. Kier indicated that 5,000 square feet sounded appropriate. The group reached consensus on a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size.

Mr. Hansen recommended that the language for walking trails and paths be updated to allow asphalt, concrete, or an alternative material approved by the Zoning Administrator, rather than specifying asphalt only. Mr. Hartless emphasized that the primary concern is surfaces that erode or are difficult for the HOA to maintain, noting that crushed stone is problematic because it shifts. He suggested concrete, asphalt, or pavers as acceptable options. Mr. Tomaso recommended

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

standardizing to concrete only. Mr. Campbell agreed that following city sidewalk standards would be a practical approach.

Mr. Hansen raised concerns about what qualifies as usable open space, specifically questioning whether stormwater retention ponds should count toward the open space requirement. Mr. Hartless stated that steep slopes, parking areas, sidewalks, and stormwater facilities should be excluded, as they do not serve recreational purposes. Ms. Robinson referenced a suggestion from Mr. Campbell at a prior meeting regarding an open space buffer in the Gloria Place area, and agreed that ponds should not count toward open space. Ms. Robinson asked the group how they felt about increasing the open space requirement to 20%. Mr. Tomaso supported the increase. Discussion followed on which approach would be easiest to enforce. Ms. Wiegand agreed that the 15% requirement should exclude retention ponds. Ms. Robinson asked for input on adding an additional buffer along Gloria Place and Geoffrey Street. Discussion followed regarding the relationship between the proposed buffer and existing nearby dwellings. Mr. Campbell provided photos to staff and recommended maintaining the standard 15-foot rear setback while adding a 30-foot buffer. Further discussion ensued regarding the proposed setback and open space language.

Mr. Hansen suggested a language change on Item #9. Mr. Hansen suggested adding language to specify requirements apply at the time of the preliminary plat on Item #10. Regarding Item #21, Mr. Hansen recommended that the master plan be updated prior to the matter going before City Council.

After further discussion the following SUP Conditions of Approval were decided upon.

SUP Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to the recordation of a final plat for section 1 of the proposed development, City staff must review a copy of the proposed covenants and restrictions. A responsible party must be identified for the maintenance, repair, replacement of the stormwater management facilities, common areas and amenities, as well as the proposed private street.
2. Construction of the connection to Middlebrook Ave must be completed as part of the first phase of the development and must be completed prior to issuance of any Certificates of Occupancy.
3. To avoid excessive construction traffic in Green Spring Valley, the road connecting to Ritchie Blvd shall not be opened to traffic until the Certificate of Occupancy is ready to be issued for the 31st dwelling unit.
4. An infrastructure construction plan must be submitted and reviewed to ensure that infrastructure construction meets City standards. The necessary streets, water, sewer, and stormwater infrastructure must be designed and constructed accordingly to extend to this

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

development. The infrastructure construction plan must be approved prior to beginning any construction activities.

5. The development will include more than 50 new lots; therefore, a preliminary plat will be required prior to submittal of the Infrastructure Construction Plan .
6. All lots to be platted will be for single-family development or uses that support single-family development as determined by the Zoning Administrator.
7. One private street is approved which will provide access to lots 7, 8, and 9 on the Master Plan. All other lots will be accessed from a dedicated public street.
8. All walking trails and paths for all amenities must be constructed with concrete surface to the same standard as public sidewalks and approved by the Zoning Administrator.
9. Section 17.15.070 of the Subdivision Ordinance limits the grade of streets in residential zones to no more than 12%. No street may exceed a 12% grade unless City Council chooses to grant a variance to the subdivision standard. Approval of this Planned Residential Development in no way implies approval of such a variance.
10. Because of the development's proximity to a Virginia Department of Transportation maintained roadway, Rt 262 and Rt 252 beyond the city limits, a 527 Traffic Impact Analysis, including turn lane analysis, will be required as part of the preliminary plat review.
11. In addition to the Staunton City Code, Title 17 requirement for sidewalks, sidewalks will also be required along the frontage of all residential lots as shown on the Master Plan.
12. The total number of units may not exceed 267 single-family dwellings.
13. On a corner lot, in cases where a garage faces a corner side yard, the corner side setback shall be a minimum of 18 feet.
14. Approval of the special use permit for a planned residential development will include staff review and approval of the restrictive covenants for the sole purpose of ensuring the association, or other entity, is responsible for ownership and maintenance of the common elements of the development such as common areas, open space, recreational area, common amenities, and storm water management facilities. Other provisions of the restrictive covenants are a private agreement between the association, individual property owners, and/or the developer and the City of Staunton is not a party to nor does it take any interest in those provisions, nor will the City of Staunton enforce or litigate any matter related to the restrictive covenants.

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

15. Approval of the Special Use Permit for the Planned Residential Development shall only include approval of entrance options #1 and #2 as shown on the Master Plan. Option #3, undeveloped Grayson Street, is not approved at this time. If the developer wishes to use undeveloped Grayson Street for access, they must return at a later date and amend the Special Use Permit and provide engineering details to show that Grayson Street can be developed with an acceptable grade.
16. A street connection must be made between Street H shown on the Master Plan and Gordon Street.
17. The City shall not approve any construction entrance from the Green Spring Valley or Shenandoah Heights neighborhoods.
18. A strip of open space, at least 45 feet in width, owned and maintained by the Home Owners Association, must be provided between this development and any existing lots fronting on Gloria Place or Geoffery Street. In all other areas, there shall be a minimum setback of 30 feet for any principal structure constructed on any lot that is located around the periphery of the planned residential development.
19. SCC 18.105.020(2)(c) requires a minimum of 15% of the land be set aside for permanent useable open space and recreation. The storm water management facilities shall not be counted as part of the useable open space when calculating this percentage as determined by the Zoning Administrator.
20. The minimum required lot size shall be 5,000 square feet.
21. Prior to this item being placed on a City Council agenda, the master plan shall be updated to reflect these conditions.

There were no additional questions or discussion from the group.

Motion: Being no further discussion, Ms. Wiegand made a motion, on the basis that it would serve the interests of public necessity, convenience, general welfare, and good zoning practice, to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit for the McIntosh Village Planned Residential Development with the 21 conditions stated above.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Tomaso and carried as follows:

Ms. Wiegand	aye	Mr. Hansen	aye
Ms. Robinson	aye	Mr. Kier	aye
Mr. Tomaso	aye		

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

MATTERS FROM THE PUBLIC

The following individuals addressed the Commission regarding the McIntosh Village development. The Commission listened without engaging in debate, consistent with its standard practice.

Mike Ansbach, 663 Gloria Place: Raised concerns about fire safety, water pressure, setback standards for two-story dwellings, and the precedent-setting nature of granting variances. Requested that the Fire Marshall review plans before any approvals proceed.

John Hart, 588 Hilltop Drive: Former Superintendent of Water and Wastewater for the City for 13 years. Raised concerns about water storage/pressure adequacy, VDOT STARS program potentially eliminating left turns from Richey Boulevard, environmental/wildlife habitat impact, and whether concrete paths may conflict with low-impact stormwater regulations.

Bennet Brown, corner of Ritchie and Carann: Expressed strong opposition; cited existing heavy truck traffic on Richey Boulevard from the Moore Street development and general distrust of the Commission's process.

Nancy Kalanta, 543 Hilltop Drive: Spoke on behalf of multiple residents. Raised concerns about traffic through Fisher Circle and Richey Boulevard, sinkhole/karst mapping, drainage and stormwater issues, power line routing, five-plus years of phased construction impact, blasting impacts from prior development (Meadowbrook Trace), HOA restrictions, and the characterization of the project as high-density in a low-density zone.

Zeke Stannard, 905 Ritchie Boulevard: Asked where the master plan and agenda packet are publicly available. Staff explained the documents are posted on the Planning and Zoning page of the City website under Planning Commission Agendas, typically the Friday before each meeting.

Tim Coley, 801 Ritchie Boulevard: Asked whether a traffic impact study has been conducted for Richey Boulevard. Staff explained the 527 TIA is required as part of the preliminary plat review and will include review by VDOT. Off-site improvements cannot be required of the developer under Virginia law.

Carlos Canales, 697 Alextine Drive: Raised concerns about quality of life, water availability and restrictions, traffic, speeding trucks, tree removal, environmental impact, and infrastructure costs ultimately borne by taxpayers.

Michael Smith, 910 Ritchie Boulevard: Concerned about the impact of additional families on Bessie Weller Elementary School enrollment.

Elizabeth Elliot, 905 Ritchie Boulevard: Asked whether the traffic analysis would address commute time and traffic signal feasibility at Ritchie Boulevard and Greenville Avenue. Staff explained that the City cannot require a developer to address off-site intersections, and that a 2019 study recommended removing the left-turn movement. City-funded signals cannot use state funds due to insufficient spacing from the Statler signal.

These minutes are intended to summarize the meetings of the Staunton Planning Commission. Full recordings of each meeting can be found on the [City's YouTube page](#).

Ending Comments: Commissioners noted for the record: (1) The property is already zoned R-2, and without the PRD/SUP process the developer could construct up to approximately 495 units by right with no conditions or guardrails; (2) the Commission imposed 21 conditions to mitigate impacts; (3) water adequacy and fire flow are reviewed by the City Engineer and Fire Marshall at each subsequent development stage; (4) closer building spacing triggers higher fire-resistance wall ratings; and (5) approximately 30 acres of the total site will remain undisturbed under the current plan. We listened, read and re-read all of your emails, and discussed on our field trip.

Next Step: The matter will be placed before City Council at its earliest available meeting (anticipated May 14, 2026, assuming the updated master plan is ready; otherwise, June 25, 2026). A full public hearing will be advertised in accordance with state code, with notice to all adjoining property owners. The public hearing will be noticed in the local newspaper (typically Thursdays), on the City's Facebook page, on the public notice bulletin board at City Hall, and by letter to immediately adjacent property owners.

OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business to discuss.

UPDATE ON ACTIONS OF CITY COUNCIL

Mr. Hartless had no updates on actions of City Council.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Robinson stated the next Planning Commission meeting would be held on May 21, 2026.

Upon a motion properly made, seconded, and unanimous, the meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.


Linda M. Nesselrodt,
Clerk of Planning Commission



DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST IN A TRANSACTION

(To be filed with the Clerk of Council of the City of Staunton/Administrative Head
and
made available for public inspection for a period of five years)

I, Jessica L. Robinson
am an officer or employee of the City of Staunton, Virginia, and I declare my
interest, of the Young Men's Christian Association of Staunton

My office or position: Treasurer

The transaction involved: Item 3B on April 16, 2026 agenda

Name of my personal interest affected by the transaction: Officer and
a Homey for applicant

Name and Address of Business and Address and Tax Map and Parcel No. of Real
Estate, If Any, Involved:

575 New Hope Road, Staunton, VA

Date: 04/16/2026

Signature: [Signature]



DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST IN A TRANSACTION

(To be filed with the Clerk of Council of the City of Staunton/Administrative Head
and
made available for public inspection for a period of five years)

I, Kendrick Kier
am an officer or employee of the City of Staunton, Virginia, and I declare my
interest.

My office or position: Fisher Auto Parts, Real Estate Dir.

The transaction involved: Reopening of 855 Statler Blvd.

Name of my personal interest affected by the transaction: FAP

Name and Address of Business and Address and Tax Map and Parcel No. of Real
Estate, If Any, Involved:

855 Statler Blvd.

Date: 8/16/26

Signature: Kendrick Kier



DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST IN A TRANSACTION

(To be filed with the Clerk of Council of the City of Staunton/Administrative Head
and
made available for public inspection for a period of five years)

I, DANIEL HANSEN
am an officer or employee of the City of Staunton, Virginia, and I declare my
interest.

My office or position: PLANNING COMMISSIONER

The transaction involved: FISHER AUTO REZONING / YMCA REZONING

Name of my personal interest affected by the transaction: _____
SURVEYOR ON BOTH

Name and Address of Business and Address and Tax Map and Parcel No. of Real
Estate, If Any, Involved:

Date: 04-16-2026

Signature: _____