



AT A REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION HELD IN THE VILLAGE BUILDING AUDITORIUM, AT 3910 OLD BUCKINGHAM ROAD IN POWHATAN COUNTY, VIRGINIA, ON JANUARY 6th, 2026 AT 6:00 PM

Planning Commissioners Present: Bobby Hall, District 1 (Vice Chair)
Darlene Bowlin, District 2
Jessica Winall, District 3
Kenneth Hatcher II, District 5

Planning Commissioners Absent: Craig Hughes, District 4 (Chair)

County Staff Present: Ligon Webb, Planning Director
Brian Haney, Deputy County Administrator
Kalli Jackson, County Attorney
Charity Gold, Principal Planner
Sean Clendening, Planner II

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Hall called the meeting to order and noted that Mr. Hughes would not be present.

2. Invocation

Vice Chair Hall led the invocation.

3. Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Hatcher motioned to approve the agenda as presented.

Mrs. Bowlin seconded the motion.

Mr. Hatcher, Mrs. Bowlin, Mrs. Winall, and Vice Chair Hall all vote AYE.

MOTION PASSED

4-0

4. Administrative Items

a. Minutes from November 19, 2025, workshop meeting

Mrs. Winall stated that on page four where it stated “Mr. Hall expressed concern for the design area” that it was actually Mr. Hatcher who made those comments; Mr. Hatcher agreed.

b. Minutes from December 2, 2025, regular meeting

No comments.



c. **Minutes from December 10, 2025, workshop meeting**

Mrs. Winall clarified that Charity Gold was not present at the December 10th, 2025 workshop meeting.

Mr. Hatcher motioned to approve the meeting minutes as amended.

Mrs. Bowlin seconded the motion.

Mr. Hatcher, Mrs. Bowlin, Mrs. Winall, and Vice Chair Hall all vote AYE.

MOTION PASSED

4-0

5. **Public Comment Period**

Vice-Chair Hall opened the public comment period. Seeing no one who wished to speak, he closed the public comment period.

6. **Public Hearings**

- a. **25-20-REZ-C: Berk and ALP LLC (District 2/Powhatan Station) request to conditionally rezone a 7.19-acre portion of a 9.97-acre property from Commerce Center (CC) and General Commercial (C) to Light Industrial (I-1), with proffered conditions, on Tax Map Parcels 43-34 and 43-34A located at 1375 and 1377 Anderson Highway. The 2021 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates the property as Industrial, and within the Route 60 Corridor East Special Area Plan.**

Mr. Webb presented 25-20-REZ-C displaying several aerial and other photos of the properties and existing entrance. He showed a color-coded zoning map of the parcels showing the front zoned as Commerce Center and the back zoned as General Commercial. He showed the comprehensive plan's future land use map that identifies the parcels as Gateway Business. He showed concept plans and surveys of the proposed zoning and layout plan for the parcels and explained the proposed lot and zoning reconfiguration for the approximately 9.9-acre site. He noted that the front portion of the property, currently zoned Commerce Center, would be adjusted to create Parcel One, consisting of about 2.79 acres. He stated that Parcel Two in the middle, about 3.3 acres, would be zoned Light Industrial and proposed for self-storage use. He said Parcel Three in the rear, about 3.8

POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 6, 2026



acres, was also proposed for Light Industrial zoning, with a potential warehouse use. He emphasized that the depicted building layouts were illustrative only and not representative of a final design. Overall, he stated that the proposal would reconfigure the existing parcels into three lots and adjust zoning boundaries accordingly.

Mr. Webb reviewed the concept plan with the proposed buffering. He noted that the development would share the existing entrance located on the adjacent property to the east, identified as the Classic Granite & Marble site.

Mr. Webb reviewed the applicant's seven proffers, stating that the property would be developed and reconfigured in accordance with the conceptual layout plan, with a boundary line adjustment completed prior to site plan approval. He noted that existing buildings would be demolished following approval of land disturbance permits. He explained that access to the site would be limited to the existing entrance from the adjacent Classic Granite & Marble property, and that the applicant would dedicate required right-of-way and a public access easement along Anderson Highway for future pedestrian and bicycle improvements. He added that loading and service areas would be screened from adjacent streets. Mr. Webb concluded by noting that Parcel Two would be restricted to self-storage use, while Parcel Three would allow a limited range of light industrial and warehouse-related uses.

Mr. Webb addressed traffic and transportation, explaining that the property fronts Anderson Highway, which is a principal arterial intended to handle higher traffic volumes. He noted that access would remain through the existing shared right-in/right-out entrance, which includes turn and acceleration lanes. He stated that self-storage and warehouse uses generate relatively few vehicle trips, with self-storage being among the lowest-impact commercial and industrial uses. He added that the Commercial Center parcel bordering Anderson Highway would likely account for most daily traffic, as shown in the applicant's traffic memo. He stated that any future site plan would be reviewed by VDOT, and access changes could be addressed if needed.



Mr. Webb stated the proposal is consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan and economic development goals. He noted that redeveloping the site and removing existing buildings would improve the property and that the proposed light industrial and commercial uses are compatible with nearby development, including the adjacent Classic Granite & Marble property. He acknowledged that traffic would increase but stated he did not identify any major negative impacts. He concluded by stating that staff recommends approval of the rezoning request, subject to the proposed conditions.

Mrs. Winall questioned whether rezoning cases require neighborhood meetings.

Mr. Webb responded that a neighborhood meeting was held around September or October.

William Felts of Landtech Resources, a Civil Engineer, stepped forward to speak.

Mr. Phelps stated that elevations had been submitted for the proposed self-storage building and that the architecture is intended to match the existing granite warehouse on the adjacent property.

Tony Kilic, President of Classic Granite and Marble and the site to be rezoned, added that the property serves as a gateway into the County and emphasized that the proposed development would reflect positively on Powhatan. Mr. Kilic described the existing structures on the site as an eyesore and stated that these would be demolished and replaced with higher-quality development. He expressed that the project would improve the appearance of the area for those entering the County.

Mr. Phelps noted that a community meeting was held, but no members of the public attended, aside from one individual who contacted him afterward because they were unable to be present.

Vice-Chair Hall opened the public hearing.

[Carl Schwendeman 1727 Teresa Lane](#) suggested that the County require construction of a sidewalk or paved multi-use trail along Route 60 as part of the project, rather than only dedicating land for future use. He stated that building the trail now, set back from traffic within the existing utility easements, would be

POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 6, 2026



more cost-effective for both taxpayers and the developer and would avoid the need for future reconstruction. He also asked whether the existing house on the property is historic, noting that if it dates to the 1700s it should be preserved and reused, potentially as an office, otherwise it can be demolished.

Billy Raynes, an adjoining property owner to the rear of the site, addressed the Commission with concerns related to buffering and enforcement. He referenced past development activity in the area, including construction associated with a previous project, during which utilities, fencing, and buffer areas were affected behind his property. He stated that, at the time, he was informed that little could be done after the fact and noted that he was not raising the issue to dispute past decisions. Mr. Raynes asked the Planning Commission to clarify the County's responsibility to neighboring landowners, specifically how required buffers and site conditions are monitored and enforced over time, and whom residents should contact if violations occur.

Mr. Webb responded that when a site plan is submitted, it must show the required buffers, which the County would review and verify in the field. He added that if there is a violation, it would be addressed through the County's code enforcement process.

Vice Chair Hall closed the public comment period

Mrs. Winall questioned whether the structure is historical, noting that it is recorded as being built in 1776 in the County's GIS, and if that can be verified.

Mr. Hatcher said that he believes the 1776 year is misinformation.

The applicant stated that the building appears to be about 100 years old or less based on the block foundation.

Mrs. Bowlin stated that this information can be verified using tax records.

Mrs. Winall questioned the nature of the lot reconfiguration, asking whether it was primarily a boundary line adjustment. She referenced the existing parcels and the changes that would result from the reconfiguration and expressed her understanding that the adjustment would alter parcel boundaries while leaving some zoning unchanged. Mrs. Winall clarified that one portion would change



from General Commercial to Light Industrial zoning while another portion would remain in Commerce Center, resulting in a split-zoned front parcel.

Ms. Jackson explained that the request is for a full rezoning of the rear parcel and a partial rezoning of the front parcel, covering roughly seven of the nine acres in the rezoning. It was noted that although GIS currently shows two parcels and two Tax Map numbers, past divisions and a current survey would indicate three, and that issue would be addressed later through resubdivision and/or boundary line adjustments as needed to create the three new parcels as shown on the concept plan. She noted the split zoning was permissible with the survey that had been provided. She acknowledged that the situation was somewhat complicated, but that there was a clear understanding of the current conditions, the intended outcome, and the steps needed in between to reach that outcome.

Mrs. Bowlin responded to the public speaker's concerns about the buffer, stating that policing would likely fall on residents. She explained that if encroachment into the buffer were observed, it could be reported, and the county would have the authority to require restoration.

Mrs. Bowlin motioned to approve the resolution.

Mrs. Winall seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Hall, Mrs. Bowlin, Mrs. Winall, and Mr. Hatcher all vote AYE

MOTION PASSED

4-0

b. 25-21-REZ: Lighthouse Learning Academy (District 1/Flat Rock) request to rezone 2.1 acres from Light Industrial (I-1) to Commerce Center (CC) on Tax Map Parcel 42E-1-8 located on the south side of Carter Gallier Boulevard approximately 540 feet west of its intersection with Southcreek One. The 2021 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates the property as Gateway Business, and within the Route 60 Corridor East Special Area Plan.

POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 6, 2026



Mr. Clendening provided a presentation on Case 25-21-REZ, explaining that the request involved rezoning a 2.1-acre parcel in the South Creek area from Light Industrial to Commerce Center. He displayed an aerial view photo and zoning map of the parcel and described the property as a mostly wooded lot surrounded by parcels with a mix of industrial, commercial, agricultural, and commerce center zoning, noting that nearby sites had recently been rezoned and were beginning to develop. He explained that the parcel was previously part of a larger rezoning in 2024 and that most prior proffer-related infrastructure requirements had already been satisfied. The current rezoning request was made by Lighthouse Learning Academy, which intends to use the site for a private school. Mr. Clendening outlined the proposed concept, which includes a 12,000-square-foot school building with potential future expansion, serving approximately 60 students initially and up to 90 students at full buildout, operating weekday school hours. He noted site constraints such as wetlands, intermittent streams, and required buffers. He stated that the future land use map designates the site as Gateway Business, which allows institutional uses such as schools, and concluded that the rezoning request is consistent with the comprehensive plan. Based on this analysis, staff recommended approval of the application.

Mr. Hatcher questioned whether the site could adequately accommodate parking and traffic associated with the proposed school. He noted that he had spoken with the planning director about parking concerns and pointed out that student drop-off and pick-up would create periods of increased traffic. He also expressed concern about future expansion and stated that, without a clear depiction of the building layout, it was difficult to visualize how all of the proposed elements would fit on the two-acre site.

Mrs. Winall asked whether a 200-foot building setback shown on a previous plat for the site was still applicable. She questioned if the setback remained in effect or if it had been associated with prior proffers referenced in the application.

Mr. Clendening responded that the requirement was not carried over.



Mr. Lane Hargroder, a civil engineer with MSA representing the applicant, addressed concerns about drop-off and the building setback. He explained that student drop-off would be staggered by grade in 15–20 minute increments, so all 60–90 students would not arrive or leave at the same time, helping to manage traffic flow. Regarding the 200-foot building setback, he clarified that it originated from previous proffers tied to an adjacent tract (the Shirley Brown property) and in his opinion this was not really relevant to the current site. He noted that the new plan supersedes the prior proffer, and even under the original conditions, the 200-foot setback would have extended only a short distance. He added that the site will maintain a minimum 50-foot buffer from the natural channel and wetlands at the rear. Mr. Hargroder offered to answer any further questions from the commission.

Mr. Webb stated that 30-40 onsite parking spots is a reasonable expectation for this development.

Mr. Hargroder concurred with Mr. Webb's estimate.

Vice Chair Hall opened the public comment period.

[Carl Shwendeman 1727 Teresa Lane](#) suggested that the developer be required to construct a five-foot sidewalk along Carter Gallier Road within the property's frontage set back from the curb. He noted that the area is becoming increasingly dense, and that sidewalks may be needed in the future as development and traffic increase. He expressed concern that parents might park at nearby businesses and walk children to the school, which could create safety issues without proper pedestrian infrastructure. He concluded that installing the sidewalk now would be more practical and cost-effective than adding it to the area in the future.

Vice Chair Hall closed the public comment period and asked if commissioners had any questions.

Mrs. Bowlin expressed concern about the size and layout of the proposed development. She noted that it was difficult to envision a 12,000-square-foot building, along with 30 to 40 parking spaces, fitting on a two-acre site, especially when compared to a similarly sized building at Powhatan Station that occupies a

POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 6, 2026



larger parcel. She also pointed out the potential future addition of another 6,000 square feet and stated that, while she could see the footprint on the plan, it remained challenging to picture how everything would fit on the site.

Vice Chair Hall stated that he shared similar concerns about parking and traffic flow, particularly how vehicles would be routed on and off the site. He noted that the development would largely fill the lot but said that the proposed staggered scheduling approach helped address and alleviate his concerns regarding those issues.

Ms. Jackson stated that the commission was only considering the zoning request at that time. She noted that the applicant would still need to meet all site plan requirements, including fire and rescue access, and emphasized that any layout issues would be addressed later in the site plan review process.

Mr. Webb stated that the parking requirements will later be determined as well, but noted that a good estimate of the total number of parking spaces is known.

Mr. Hatcher noted that typically comments from departments such as health and fire are included in the review packet and questioned why no such comments appeared to be provided in this case.

Mrs. Winall responded that comments had been received, noting that all buildings would be required to be accessible to fire department apparatus by an access roadway with an all-weather driving surface at least 20 feet wide from the edge of pavement. She added that since there isn't a proper site plan, the agencies and departments don't yet have anything to visually review.

Vice Chair Hall motioned to approve 25-21-REZ.

Mrs. Bowlin seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Hall, Mrs. Bowlin, Mrs. Winall, and Mr. Hatcher all voted AYE

MOTION PASSED

4-0



- b. **c. 25-22-CUP: Crown Castle Towers 06-2 LLC (District 1/Manakin) request for a conditional use permit (CUP) for a 295-foot telecommunications tower on 13.1 acres, Tax Map 32-38A, located at 2410 Hancroft Drive. The property is zoned Agricultural 10 (A-10) and the CUP is required by Zoning Ordinance Sec. 83-162. The application includes a request to modify the tower height and setback requirements from property lines and existing residential dwellings, as permitted under Zoning Ordinance Sec. 83-432 (d)(1)(a)(7)(iii). The 2021 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates the property as Rural Areas.**

Mr. Webb presented Case 25-22-CUP, explaining that the applicant was requesting a conditional use permit for a 295-foot telecommunications tower on 13.1 acres at 2410 Hancroft Drive. He noted that the property is zoned Agriculture A10 and that the request includes modifications to tower height and setback requirements. He reported that the applicant had submitted a deferral request to the March 3, 2026, Planning Commission meeting to allow for an independent third-party review of the fall zone analysis at the applicant's expense. Mr. Webb provided an overview of the current zoning and surrounding parcels, showing agriculture, residential, and other land uses, and explained the site's access via Hancroft Drive and Venita Road.

Mr. Webb reviewed the proposed tower location and compound plan, noting areas leased for carrier equipment and describing the lattice tower with a 4-foot lightning rod. He explained that the Planning Commission can approve modifications to height and setback requirements through the conditional use permit process based on site-specific conditions.

Mr. Webb outlined the required setbacks from property lines and existing dwellings, noting that the tower would meet some setbacks but not others. He referenced the engineer's documentation, which indicated that in the unlikely event of a total separation, the fall radius would be 208 feet at ground level. He displayed various images showing how the tower would look from various viewpoints on nearby roads, such as 288 and Huguenot Spring Road. The primary consideration for the Planning Commission was



whether to approve the applicant's request to defer the case until the March 3, 2026, regular meeting so a third-party engineering review of the fall zone could be completed. Vice-Chair Hall stated that, since the property is in his district, he personally felt that an additional engineering report was unnecessary. He noted that the existing ordinance already addresses the fall zone requirements, which are clearly defined in the code's specifications. Based on that, he expressed his opinion to deny the applicant's request for a deferral so a third-party review of the fall zone and he indicated that, if no one else had comments, he would proceed to make a motion.

Mr. Hatcher agreed, stating that the existing fall zone certification already provides more than the minimum required. He noted that, based on past experience reviewing tower approvals, he felt confident in the current fall zone study and did not see a need for an additional report.

Vice Chair Hall motioned to deny the request for a deferral.

Mr. Hatcher seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Hall, Mrs. Bowlin, Mrs. Winall, and Mr. Hatcher all voted AYE

MOTION DENIED

4-0

Vice Chair Hall opened the public hearing for comments.

Drew DiStanisloa, Virginia counsel for the applicant Crown Castle, addressed the commission, explaining that the proposed tower is a replacement for an existing tower at 655 Huguenot Trail, which will be decommissioned. He clarified that the new tower will be 299 feet tall, including the lightning rod, and is a self-support style wireless tower designed with enhanced structural integrity at the base to address the shorter setbacks being requested, reducing any risk of falling onto neighboring properties in a catastrophic event. He noted that the same carriers currently on the existing tower would be located on the new tower. The tower will be on a 13-acre parcel owned by Mr. and Mrs. Girone, identified as the only suitable location in the area to cover the same service area as the existing tower.



The proposed tower is 45 feet taller than the current tower to accommodate Powhatan County's communication equipment and maintain coverage when the existing tower is removed, providing a direct benefit to the county.

Mr. DiStanisloa acknowledged the commission had already voted on the deferral request but emphasized that the applicant had been willing to provide additional studies to confirm that the fall zones are safe and pose no public safety risk. He concluded by requesting a recommendation for approval of the conditional use permit so the county could maintain essential coverage and equipment placement, and offered to answer any questions from the commission.

Mr. Hatcher asked if it was necessary for the proposed tower to be taller to meet the coverage of the current tower.

Mr. DiStanisloa confirmed that additional equipment from Powhatan County would be installed on the new tower, which is not currently on the existing tower at 655 Huguenot Trail. He noted that the Crown Castle's engineer, who could explain the details more thoroughly, was unable to attend due to illness, but stated that this was his understanding of the planned equipment.

Mr. Hatcher asked whether the new tower has structural improvements that would make it less likely to fall or reduce the distance it could fall compared to previous Towers.

Mr. DiStanisloa confirmed that the tower has been designed with structural improvements to reduce the risk of falling. He explained that the tower is engineered to withstand wind speeds up to 124 mph, far exceeding typical requirements. The base of the tower is reinforced, similar to how a tree's wide base provides stability, so in an extreme catastrophic event, only the top portion might break and fall around the base. He noted that the certified fall zone report prepared by the professional engineer, Mr. Beacom, determined that only 208 feet would be at risk in such an event, and emphasized that the tower is designed to prevent further structural collapse.

Mr. Hatcher asked as a follow-up whether there have been tests or real-world instances showing that the tower's structural design performs as intended under

POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 6, 2026



extreme conditions, ensuring that any failure would remain within the certified fall zone.

Mr. DiStanisloa confirmed that, according to the engineering report, the tower's enhanced structural integrity has been tested and certified to limit any fall to a maximum of 208 feet. He explained that this extra reinforcement is not normally required because it is costly, but it has been included to reduce risk. Mr. DiStanisloa emphasized that the report notes this outcome as occurring in the "unlikely event" of a catastrophic failure, acknowledging that no absolute guarantee can be made. Nonetheless, he stated that the substantial investment in strengthening the base and foundation is intended to ensure public safety and meet the county's needs.

Mr. Thomas Nolan, the County's Emergency Communications Director, clarified that the equipment described by the previous speaker is indeed what is currently on the 655 Huguenot Trail tower, which is approximately 252 feet tall with elevation points around 220 feet. He emphasized that if the county needs to move from that tower, they would not be adding any additional equipment to the new proposed tower. He explained that discussions with Crown Castle about the new site were in good faith, and at the time, the ground elevation, which affects coverage requirements, was not fully known.

[Carl Shwendeman](#) asked about the typical lifespan of a cell

tower, specifically how long a lattice-style tower like the one proposed can last.

He also inquired about the age of the existing tower. He added that, aside from his curiosity, he viewed the project positively and appreciated the equipment upgrades.

[Larry Ojibway, 2715 Huguenot Springs Road](#), spoke in opposition to the proposed tower.

He noted that he owns property on two sides of the site and that the existing tower across 288 has recently had additional structural steel added to accommodate equipment. He expressed concern that six homes on Venita Drive would be affected by the new tower. He referenced reports suggesting that the primary concern is not the fall zone but electromagnetic fields, recommending a 500-foot distance from residences. He raised concerns about potential impacts on his cattle, including reproductive issues, as well as potential health risks to humans. He suggested relocating the tower across 288 into the



existing economic growth areas instead of this agricultural/residential area. He concluded by stating that he is completely opposed to the proposed tower.

[Floyd Green](#) then spoke about the importance of maintaining a tower in the area. He explained that he was involved with the county's communications system for over 30 years and was present when the original tower at 655 Huguenot Trail was built in the early 1980s. He noted that at that time, the Planning Commission required a proffer granting the county space on the tower, which allowed them to eventually add equipment when funds became available. Mr. Green emphasized that this location is critical for county communications, particularly for fire, EMS, and police coverage in the densest populated areas, including Artistry Apartments, Founders Bridge homes, and the future Data Center. He stressed that without a tower here, walkie-talkie coverage would be significantly reduced, which could impact public safety. He also raised concerns about the financial impact of relocating existing equipment to a new site. The current system, only six years old, represents a significant investment, and moving it would cost the county hundreds of thousands of dollars. While some costs could be offset by placing equipment on the new tower, coverage gaps would remain. Green's primary concern is ensuring health, safety, and welfare for both emergency personnel and residents. He expressed hope that the applicant and landowner could reach an arrangement to keep the current tower in place and noted that additional information from the county's communications team would have been helpful to assess the full impact of relocating the tower.

Mr. Nolan came forward, stating that he could provide coverage maps in the future to show the impact if the tower were removed. He emphasized, echoing Floyd Green, that the current tower and equipment are fully functional and necessary. He noted that even a temporary loss of the tower, even for 30 days, would create a significant public safety risk, and relocating the equipment would be costly. He concluded by thanking the commission.

Vice Chair Hall closed the public comment period.

Vice Chair Hall opened the floor for questions from the Commissioners.

POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Regular Meeting

January 6, 2026



Mr. Hatcher asked for clarification on whether the current tower's lease agreement is ending, and if that means the tower will be decommissioned because the land will no longer be leased.

Mr. Webb explained that the current lease for the tower is set to end in February. After that, it would move to a month-to-month arrangement, which could potentially be renegotiated between the landowner and the applicant. He clarified that the tower would not be decommissioned immediately when the lease ends.

Mrs. Winall noted that the land on the north side of Huguenot Trail, where Shalom Farms is located, is largely residential (zoned RR5). She asked whether a telecommunications tower could be allowed in RR5 through a conditional use permit if there were a larger parcel available. She suggested that placing the tower on that side of Huguenot Trail might have less impact on nearby residences in terms of fall zones and overall safety, given the larger parcels of land in that quadrant.

Mr. Webb noted that RR5 zoning allows telecommunications facilities if they are co-located. He added that, according to the applicant's representative, the proposed site was chosen after studying the area to determine the best location for coverage. The implication is that other locations in the general region were likely considered but deemed less suitable.

Mrs. Bowlin asked why the tower can't remain at its current location. She wanted clarification on whether the lease isn't being renewed because the landowners don't want it there anymore, or if the site simply doesn't have enough space for the larger proposed tower. She expressed that no clear reason had been given yet.

Mr. DiStanisloa explained that he could not speak to all the details, but confirmed that the issue is related to the lease. If the lease for the current tower falls through, the applicant would no longer be able to house equipment there. That is the main reason the new tower is being proposed.

Mr. Hatcher asked if the proposed tower meets the 500ft requirement from any nearby houses. Mr. DiStanisloa noted that the proposed tower would be 511 feet from the nearest residential dwelling of Joseph Gonzalez, which meets the 500-foot minimum presented in

POWHATAN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Regular Meeting
January 6, 2026



the application. However, Ms. Winall clarified that the required setback is actually 590 feet, since the ordinance requires the greater of 500 feet or 200% of the tower height. The proposed tower is only 500 feet 11 inches from the nearest residential dwelling, so it does not meet that requirement.

Mr. Hatcher questioned why, if the tower could potentially affect livestock as well as humans, that factor wouldn't be taken into consideration in determining its placement or safety.

Vice Chair Hall shared the concerns raised about the agricultural setting, livestock, electromagnetic fields, and the fall zone. While the probability of an incident may be low, there are no absolute guarantees, and if the tower were to fall, the consequences could be severe. He emphasized that the zoning requirements exist for a reason and should be followed, and this proposal does not meet those standards. He then made a motion to deny the planning commission resolution for case 25-22-CUP to allow a telecommunication tower and associated accessory uses in the A10 zoning district on tax map parcel 32-38A.

Mr. Hatcher seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Hall, Mrs. Bowlin, Mrs Winall, and Mr. Hatcher all voted AYE

MOTION DENIED

4-0

7. Adjourn

Vice Chair Hall concluded by announcing for those unfamiliar with the process, the cases discussed in this meeting will be presented to the Board of Supervisors for a final vote on Monday, January 26, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.


Ligon Webb, Planning Director

Date: 2/20/2026


Craig Hughes, Chair

Date: 20/FEB/2026