



# Accomack County Planning Commission

John Sparkman, District 1  
Angela Wingfield, Chair, District 2  
Harold White, District 3  
Kelvin Pettit, Vice-Chair, District 4  
Shelia Connor, District 5  
Glen "Adair" Tyler, District 6  
Lynn Gayle, District 7  
Myra Riley-Taylor, District 8  
Berran Rogers, District 9

1.

2 County Administration Building, Board Chambers, Room 104, 23296 Courthouse Avenue, Accomac, VA

## Minutes for Wednesday, April 9, 2025, at 7:00 PM

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

#### MEMBERS PRESENT AND ABSENT

##### Planning Commission Members Present:

Mrs. Angela Wingfield, Chairwoman

Mr. Kelvin Pettit, Vice Chairman

Ms. Myra Riley-Taylor

Mr. Adair Tyler

Mrs. Sheila Conner

Mr. John Sparkman

Mr. Harold White

Mr. Lynn Gayle

##### Planning Commission Members Absent:

Mr. Berran Rogers

##### Others Present:

Mr. Leander "Lee" Pambid, Deputy County Administrator

Chontese Ridley, County Planner I

Pamela Dix, Administrative Assistant II

### DETERMINATION OF A QUORUM

With a quorum present, Chairwoman Wingfield called the meeting of the Accomack County Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

### REMOTE PARTICIPATION

None

### 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA

*The Planning Commission unanimously adopted the agenda on a motion by Commissioner Tyler and seconded by Commissioner Sparkman.*

### 3. MINUTES

*On a motion made by Commissioner Tyler and seconded by Vice Chairman Pettit to adopt March 12, 2025, minutes as written.*

44 **4. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

45 **Chairman Wingfield**

46 Open public comment, has anybody signed up? We have no one who signed up, so we'll close  
47 the public comment period and move to old business.

48  
49 **5. OLD BUSINESS**

50 **Chairman Wingfield**

51 We have no business. We can move to the continued, I'm sorry, continue briefing of initiating  
52 resolution to Amendment Definitions of Height and clarity and The Method of Measuring  
53 Height.

54  
55 **6. NEW BUSINESS**

56 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

57 Hello everyone. Good evening. So again, these are the two ordinance amendments that I  
58 briefed you on last month. The information is the same, with a little more information to go  
59 with it focused on a couple of things. You saw these slides last month. These resolutions were  
60 handed down from the board of supervisors at their January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. Again, this is to  
61 clarify the definition of building height and to add a definition and method of calculating sign  
62 area in the industrial district. Both of these are coming from Chapter 106, titled Zoning for  
63 Clarifying of Building Height Of. Right now, we measure to a point, but we do not have a  
64 stopping point. And for the second one, we want to right-size the amount of sign area in the  
65 industrial district and provide a method of calculating sign area where none currently exist.  
66 We're starting with the definition of building height. Again, we only have a measure to point,  
67 so the staff has been measuring to the highest point of the roof. This has led to some  
68 inconsistent interpretations, confusion with not just staff, but also developers, or the applicant,  
69 and builders, not knowing where that stop point should be. If someone is building in Delaware  
70 or if they're building in Northampton County, and those places have a stop point, then they're  
71 going to do what they're used to doing. And we do have several who will turn in something,  
72 and we have to send it back for resubmittal because they're starting at grade, but not going to  
73 the highest point of the roof, which is current staff interpretation. We need something in the  
74 code that says where the stopping point is. We have to turn applicants down or send things  
75 back for resubmittal, depending on how that plan was drawn up, if it was done by an engineer,  
76 architect, or what have you, that's more money out of the applicant's pocket. There is more  
77 time being added in the process to get those drawings redone, resubmitted, and then put back  
78 in for staff review. This is a table showing what we have currently and what we are proposing  
79 as additions. So right now, the starting point is average grade along the front of the building,  
80 and we don't plan to change that. The endpoint is not specified, and these are our proposals.  
81 For a flat roof, the highest point of the roof, the mansard roof, would be at the deck line and  
82 the main level between the eaves and the ridge for a gable hip, cone gambrel, or a shed. Again,  
83 right now interpretation is inconsistent, which leads to some delays. So with these proposed  
84 additions, it will reduce the variance request and have more consistent reviews being done.  
85 This is the image I showed at last month's meeting. And just in case this is a little confusing,  
86 Lee did do some new ones for us that I think kind of speak more to Accomack County and  
87 what we're trying to do here. For example, what we're trying to do is we're proposing between  
88 the eve and the ridge. With this one, that point would be 30 feet and a half. This one would be  
89 fine according to the proposal. I'm sorry. I'm going to start over, because I just explained that  
90 wrong after looking at it again. So, what we are proposing our max overall height will be 45,  
91 so nothing can go over 45. We're not trying to increase any height limits for our residential  
92 districts, so 45 is still going to be the maximum overall height. So, for all of these, none of

93 them are over 45 feet. We are proposing to do between the eve and the rooftop. So that would  
94 be the middle here, so it's 37 and being that it's 37 feet, they would have to have the necessary  
95 setbacks to go over that amount. This one here, they're at 32, which is under the 35 feet, and  
96 their overall is 35, so they would still be in compliance. You want to ask a question. You want  
97 to ask your question now, are you sure?  
98

99 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

100 So, the overall is 35 unless you want to get a setback to 45?  
101

102 **Chontese Ridley**

103 The overall height that no one can go over is 45 feet. But if at the midpoint they're over 35,  
104 then they would have to have the necessary setbacks. For example, this one at 32 would be  
105 fine. They don't need any setbacks because they're under 35. This first one would have to have  
106 the necessary setbacks because they're over 35 at the midpoint.  
107

108 **Commissioner Pettit**

109 So, any building that has all three of those heights in one building, which one would we use?  
110

111 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

112 These are just different examples of what we could get into review. This first one, I feel like,  
113 is the best example. The midpoint, which is what we are proposing, instead of going to the  
114 highest point. With 37, these folks would have to have the necessary setbacks, because they're  
115 over 35, but overall, they are not going over the maximum allowance of 45 feet.  
116

117 **Commissioner Pettit**

118 Okay, so my question is, on a building that has different roof levels, roof lines, which one are  
119 we going to?  
120

121 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

122 The highest, so it would be the midpoint of the highest roof.  
123

124 **Commissioner Pettit**

125 Thank you.  
126

127 **Commissioner Sparkman**

128 If I may ask, why did you pull the midpoint rather than the height?  
129

130 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

131 The homes in Captains Cove, some of those homes are on pilings, so they meet the code, other  
132 than the height, and that difference could be one foot. We're telling them to resubmit or change  
133 their design for one foot. For example, well, I don't think these match that example, but it's to  
134 give some flexibility to residents and some builders so their submittals aren't being denied for  
135 a one-foot difference.  
136

137 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

138 Lee Pambid, Deputy County Administrator for Community & Economic Development. So  
139 basically, what we're finding, especially in places like Captain Cove and certain HOAs, is that  
140 their HOAs or their environmental control committees will, for whatever reason, they'll write  
141 variance on their plan reviews. We would like the HOAs to review the plans first, but we see

142 a lot of those come in at a height between 35 and 40 feet. Some of them we see coming in  
143 excess of 40 feet. But what we don't want to do, as Chontese was explaining, was turn  
144 somebody away because their height may end up measuring up to 37 feet or 38 feet. We have  
145 seen several of those in the past. Since I got here, we have been measuring to the overall height.  
146 It's not specified in the Zoning Ordinance where we measure to, but of course, we have to  
147 interpret that. If there's no place to measure to, we will say to the overall height, but that would  
148 preclude approval of anything over 35 feet. You know, if the overall height is 36, 37, and 40  
149 feet, then we would have to just outright deny that. But if we're talking about a difference of  
150 anywhere from a few inches to five feet, they're not going to get any extra floor area out of  
151 that. So what we're doing is we're trying to provide a little bit of flexibility where it really  
152 would not negatively impact.

153

154 **Commissioner Sparkman**

155 You're trying to allow for pilings and those sorts of things.

156

157 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

158 That would be just one of several instances. You know, maybe somebody wants to have a  
159 three-story house, and it would end up being 37, 38 feet. Our building inspectors are saying,  
160 on average, the height of one single floor is about nine to 10 feet. These blocks that you see  
161 here are 10-foot blocks. So that's where you're getting the essentially the 30-foot height up to  
162 the eve. And of course, we're interested in what extra height that roof is going to put on. So  
163 we're trying to provide a little bit of flexibility there

164

165 **Commissioner Gayle**

166 Those numbers are regardless of the pitch.

167

168 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

169 Those numbers are regardless of the pitch. Yes, sir. Chontese, if we could go back to the last  
170 slide. You know, there are several different kinds of roofs. This is only four of the you know,  
171 25 to 30 different kinds of roofs. But these are the most common ones. But to answer your  
172 question, Commissioner Gayle, it would be regardless of the roof pitch. So, if we go back to  
173 the next slide. You can see these have different roof pitches. But what we try to explain here  
174 in the far right example is that it's an overall height of 35 feet. In the middle example, the  
175 overall height is 40 feet. We wouldn't be able to approve that one, but you can see that they're  
176 all still three-story buildings. In the far left example, the overall height is 45 feet. But you can  
177 see the midpoint. Well, maybe you can't see it because it's kind of small, but if we could zoom  
178 in on that left one, you would see that the overall height is 37 feet. In that example, anything  
179 over 35 feet would require an additional two feet of setback. For every additional height that  
180 you are above the maximum, you have to have an additional foot of setback.

181

182 **Commissioner Conner**

183 So, with that, they could get the approval with the setback.

184

185 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

186 Yes.

187

188 **Commissioner Sparkman**

189 Why would you go is such a steep roof? Usually those are snow load right? Based on snow  
190 load.

191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239

**Commissioner Tyler**

Because they're pretty. 12, 12 pitches are just pretty.

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

This is just an example. Yeah, we get all kinds of roof pitches.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

Did you say number two, you could not approve?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

We could not approve today because the overall height is 40 feet.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

But you could approve the overall height of 45 feet on the first one?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

Yes. For these two, we could, if they had, for instance, in the middle example, an additional five feet. They would need five feet of additional setback on both sides to get that extra five feet of height that's above 35. For the 45-foot example, they need an extra 10 feet for example.

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

And that's what we have currently.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

As long as you guys understand.

**Commissioner Tyler**

They're trying to avoid McMansions, like got down in Florida on some of those very nice lots. They've got buildings that are 45 to 50 feet tall and they're right jammed up next to the property line. That's what we're trying to avoid.

**Commissioner Sparkman**

Most of the ones in Florida I see have the lower roof, you know, because they don't have snow load obviously down there.

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

Some other issues that we have related to height in the residential district. For accessory structures right now, it says maximum height of 12 feet or one story. So we are proposing to remove the one story and just do 12 feet, because one story could be anything. Also in the industrial district, the maximum height is 35 square feet, and someone could go to the Zoning Administrator, which in this case would be Lee, to gain additional height. So we have proposed to do is just have that maximum height, and eliminate someone being able to go to the Zoning Administrator to get additional height. The increased height must not have an adverse impact on abutting properties, so we're trying to keep them from going to the Zoning Administrator. So these are our end goals. Again, the staff is not trying to increase the overall height. That is not our intent. The max overall height will remain at 45 feet. We're not trying to go over that. We want to improve consistency, reduce the need for variances, simplify the review process,

240 and promote fairness and consistency overall in all our zoning districts. Okay, if no one wants  
241 to ask any other questions, I'll move on to the definition and method of calculating the sign  
242 area.

243  
244 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

245 I have a question, let me find the page here. On the bottom, it says Page 13, Agricultural District  
246 height regulations. It was in the package under the Agricultural District. Yeah, of the packet.  
247 On number four, I have read all accessory buildings and structures shall be less than the main  
248 structure in height. I'm not sure if that would work for Ag District.

249  
250 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

251 And that was page 13? And we're going to number four.

252  
253 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

254 Number 13, number four.

255  
256 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

257 No accessory building, which is within 10 feet of any lot line shall be more than 12 feet high.

258  
259 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

260 Yes, and then it says all accessory buildings and structures shall be less than the main structure  
261 in height. If your main structure is your ranch style home on a farm, and you build a barn out  
262 back, it's going to be above a ranch style.

263  
264 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

265 I don't see it there.

266  
267 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

268 It wasn't on the handout from today. It was on the handout that I got in my pamphlet.

269  
270 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

271 Okay, number four under Section 10684 is that the one?

272  
273 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

274 Maybe it's changed. The packet has a red line.

275  
276 **Commissioner Sparkman**

277 Yeah, I see what she's talking about, right there. All accessory building and structures shall be  
278 less than the main structure.

279  
280 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

281 Right, if the farmers has a ranch style home.

282  
283 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

284 Okay, that looks like something we could discuss with Jan, but especially for the Ag District,  
285 I know in a residential district, that's how it is.

286  
287 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

288 There's a red line in residential also that you guys added, and that is on page.

289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

With regards to the Ag example that you just inquired about, that is a reasonable thing and we can make some exceptions. There are other places in the Zoning Ordinance where we would make exceptions for things like chimneys, flues, belfries, antennas, that kind of stuff. And we do acknowledge that in an agricultural setting, you would have things like grain silos or conveyor belts or something that might exceed, so that is something that we don't want to run afoul of. So if we find in the ordinance elsewhere that it's not called for, or that is not allowed for, we can include some exceptions for customary agricultural structures, if you will.

**Commissioner Sparkman**

Or review on a case-by-case basis, right?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

Well, we try not to get into a review on a case-by-case basis, because then that would actually increase our workload. We know that there are some instances in an agricultural setting where there may be accessory, like farm-related accessory structures. The intent behind number four here is with regard to any residential-type accessory structures, like sheds. But if someone is zoned Ag, and all they have on their house is a ranch style house or a house. The reason why we are asking for a 12-foot maximum is for those kinds of structures. So we will throw in the hopper the situation that you brought up, Madam Chair. In terms of the agricultural setting the things like the grain silos or the tall barns, which one might think is an accessory building. But we definitely don't want to run afoul and create any additional regulations when it comes to the Ag structures.

**Commissioner Conner**

So, in a residential area, let's say I'm a truck driver, and I want to pitch a large building to accommodate my truck. I couldn't do that?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

Not unless your truck is under 12 feet tall, and that number of clearance.

**Commissioner Conner**

I'm speaking about the buildings they build for trucks to work on. So if you lived in a residential area.

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

This regulation would preclude that.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

How would you get around that?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

They'd have to come and get a variance.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

Are you guys taking out this red line that all accessory buildings and structures shall be less than the main structure on Ag?

338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

We can look at removing that. If we can make sense of the other situation. Again, number four was written to address residential accessory structures, not agricultural accessory structures.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

I understand that. I have a ranch-style house, and I have a 12-foot or more carport for my camper that would not be allowed because I'm not a farmer.

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

Correct. Then we can always change that 12 feet, too. We carry that 12 feet over from the existing code, and we just wanted to insert that number in all of the zoning districts, so that it's actually clear, because in some instances it says one story or 12 feet, as Chontese said. A one-story house could exceed 12 feet. We're accustomed to seeing an actual dimension there, as opposed to something that could be interpreted as variable.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

If I wanted to build a barn, I couldn't be with this.

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

You would need to fill out an application for variance. What I will also do is make sure that we have the correct version, just in case your issue has already been handled or taken care of. But again, the 12 feet is more for residential accessories.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

We can keep that. It seems like you're making somebody who may be a farmer go through a lot of hoops when it's Ag. All right, we'll get back to that one.

**Commissioner Taylor**

Do we need to specify that if the variance is required for any exceptions in the documentation?

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

No.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

And to get a variance, you would have to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

Yes, Board of Zoning Appeals.

**Commissioner Sparkman**

What do you think about Gayle? You're a farmer.

**Commissioner Gayle**

Well, I built a grain handling facility with 100-foot elevator. And when I checked back then, Rich Morrison was in, and there was no issue regarding that. We filed a building permit, and that was it.

387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

So that could have been under some type of Ag exemption. I'll say that neither Lee nor I were here then, so we would not be able to say why the staff may have gone that route, but I'm going to assume it was an Ag exemption. We can get with Jan, and we can look into some other options and come back with something for you next month on that. Was there anything else in here?

**Commissioner Gayle**

In the past, I've built large buildings, and there has never been an issue for Ag. Just an agricultural building.

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

I'm going to assume it was an Ag exemption.

**Commissioner Tyler**

For you to get your carport put in now, when we change this, you would have to go before the BZA.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

It would me cost me another \$500.

**Commissioner Tyler**

I'm all about the revenue to the county.

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

With regards to the agricultural setting, they would also have to demonstrate that it's a working farm for those silos and those other things. If it's residential, and there's no working farm. In that case, that's what we're trying to control, what we're trying to clarify. Removing the variable nature of what one story could be, versus putting in an actual dimension that says it cannot exceed this height. If we amend the ordinance to use the midpoint of whatever structure, then you could gain a couple of feet, depending on the roof pitch and the size of the building and that kind of thing. There are some symbiotic, if you will, effects between these two aspects.

**Commissioner Gayle**

The other year, there was a case before the BZA. It was a building in Temperanceville, and they were considering building or assembling rockets. They needed to go up to 50 feet, and were going to elevate the building. We granted the variance at that time, but I don't think it ever happened.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

Should we reconsider the height in Ag to a different height other than 12 foot?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

I've written that note down, and we're consider the ramifications of increasing that to something higher than 12 feet. The reason, again, why 12 feet is in there is because it's already in there, so we're just carrying that through.

436 **Commissioner Tyler**  
437 What we want is 13 feet six inches, right?

438  
439 **Chairwoman Wingfield**  
440 I don't know, yeah.

441  
442 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**  
443 The 12 feet is already in there. What we're trying to eliminate is the one story.

444  
445 **Commissioner Gayle**  
446 The building would have to be taller

447  
448 **Commissioner Tyler**  
449 Excellent point.

450  
451 **Commissioner Sparkman**  
452 Campers with air conditioning units on it and so forth could get into it.

453  
454 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**  
455 Was there anything else on this one that you wanted to mention or wanted us to come back?  
456 Anyone else before we move on? All right, so we are moving on to the definition and method  
457 of calculating sign area. Again, this resolution came down from the Board of Supervisors at  
458 their January 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. The current ordinance does not adequately address the larger  
459 industrial buildings and properties that have more than one industrial building. Some of these  
460 sites have multiple buildings, and if the max limit is four signs for one building, then what does  
461 the other building do? What we want to do is make some adjustments to the sign limitation.  
462 We believe they should be based on building size, lot size, and the number of structures on  
463 site. And we are proposing to adopt a standardized approach to calculating the sign area. What  
464 we currently have in our ordinance and the challenges it's creating for us. So right now, the  
465 maximum number of signs is four. But again, this does not account for multi-structure  
466 properties. The total area of right now is 160 square feet, but that is inadequate for the larger  
467 buildings. If they can only have 160 square feet of signage, and that has to span over four signs,  
468 for most of these structures, that would only be one sign for them. Right now, the calculation  
469 method is length times width, and it includes voided areas, which would be windows, doors,  
470 that type. But including that increases the sign area, which means it would decrease how large  
471 their sign could be. And right now, there is no method for calculating sign area per the structure.  
472 There is also no flexibility in our current ordinance for these larger industrial buildings to get  
473 larger signage, so the staff is unable to accommodate. This is something that you've seen at last  
474 month's meeting. These are our proposed sign area calculation methods. We believe that the  
475 maximum sign area should be determined as 10% of the wall elevation, but the signs cannot  
476 exceed the roof line of the building. Voided areas, which I mentioned from the last slide, that  
477 includes windows, doors and bays, that will not be subtracted from the total wall elevation.  
478 The sign area must be calculated by using basic geometric shapes, which will exclude  
479 supporting structures, including bracing in the decorative walls. I do have some visuals for you  
480 to explain what some of those are. We want to change the max from being four signs for one  
481 building on a parcel to being four signs per building on a parcel. So if the parcel is big enough  
482 to accommodate three or four buildings, each of those buildings should be able to have the four  
483 signs. So to describe the shapes and their formulas for rectilinear: the length times width, circle:  
484  $A = \pi r^2$  square, or triangular:  $A$  equals one half times the base height, and for irregularly

485 shaped signs that we may get coming in, they could use a combination of those geometric  
486 shapes. The same would be done for multiple-component signs. To give some visuals of those,  
487 these are the shapes they will be able to use. And for the irregular shaped and for the multi  
488 component, it would still be one of these shapes going around each element, the whole sign  
489 together. And I did show you this last month, but I'll go over it again. The shape options we  
490 have, the rectangle, square, circle or triangle. We are currently doing now would be one shape  
491 around the whole sign, what we have here are some voided and dead space which increases  
492 the sign area? What we are proposing is to do one of those basic shapes to fit as tightly around  
493 those signs as possible, to get rid of that voided and dead space and to allow flexibility. And  
494 this is just the image of both of those together. So, the yellow portion is what this applicant is  
495 now saving on space. And just a visual. Currently, no matter what size the industrial building  
496 is, it can only go to a maximum of 160 square feet. In proportion, this smaller building, 160  
497 square feet, may be fine, but for the larger building, the proportion is not adequate. And here  
498 is an example of two industrial buildings where the signage is in proportion to the building  
499 size. As I mentioned a couple of slides ago, decorative walls, so this is a live example that we  
500 already have now in Captains Cove. I do believe there are a couple of newer subdivisions in  
501 the County that have decorative walls as well. I believe the one in Gargatha on the highway  
502 has one of these two, or something similar to it. So, for signs like this, the only portion that  
503 would be calculated as sign area is the actual Captains Cove. We would not calculate this whole  
504 structure as being signage. Some benefits of making these changes will be scalable and  
505 proportional signage, consistency, reduced exceptions, fair application processes, and ending  
506 of the one size fits all. Which goes back to the image of the larger building having the same  
507 160 square feet of sign area as a smaller building, which isn't proportionate. Some other Zoning  
508 Ordinance considerations, Section 106-135 Sign Regulations. Sign Regulations and Industrial  
509 District I shall conform to Article Eight of this Chapter. If you were to go to code right now,  
510 you would go to section 106-135 it's going to refer you to another section in the code. There  
511 is no guidance there, so what we want to do is, when someone is going into the ordinance,  
512 they're going to the Industrial District, we want to have language there if someone would be  
513 able to see what they are and are not allowed to do, versus now click here and it takes you to  
514 another section and it still doesn't give you the necessary guidance. The sign area is currently  
515 interpreted as length times width by our Zoning Administrator and the Zoning Administrator  
516 before him as well. We need to do something to allow more flexibility, which, using the four  
517 basic geometric shapes, will allow that flexibility. The staff has recommended a method that  
518 includes only the functional portion of the sign, not including the dead voided space. And I  
519 will take any questions that you have.

520

**Commissioner Sparkman**

521 Is there any room for public input on these signs? Reason, what comes to mind is a giant Ronald  
522 McDonald. And if you lived down the street or a few houses away, do you really want to look  
523 at it?  
524

525

**Ms. Chontese Ridley**

526 Eventually, we will have a public hearing on this, and at that time, if there's anyone from the  
527 public who wants to come in and voice their concerns would be able to do it at that time.  
528

529

**Commissioner Sparkman**

530 I was just wondering if there was any room for individuals.  
531

532

533

534 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**  
535 You mean for individual applications.

536  
537

538 **Commissioner Sparkman**  
539 I mean, there is a possibility of some tasteless signs. You do that not in my neighborhood,  
540 kind of thing. So, I'm just wondering if there was anything for public input on that, without  
541 getting into what's good taste for you may not be for me.

542  
543 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
544 We cannot legislate aesthetics, unfortunately.

545  
546 **Commissioner Sparkman**  
547 I'm just thinking if we have public input on noise, for example. Which, we did, remember, on  
548 the arguments with that battery plant on 175. The noise in the neighborhood around there.

549  
550 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
551 If an application requires public hearings, then that type of case would enable public input. If  
552 someone comes in and they comply with the ordinance, they comply with the ordinance, what  
553 we can regulate, size, location and timing. We could try to regulate aesthetics. I would not  
554 recommend it.

555  
556 **Commissioner Sparkman**  
557 I was wondering about public input.

558  
559 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
560 We cannot regulate the content. So, we're talking about the First Amendment constitutional  
561 issues at that point. But what we're trying to do is we're just trying to clarify certain regulations  
562 with regards to timing, place and size.

563  
564 **Commissioner Sparkman**  
565 It's just popped into my head. You know, I could see a giant problem.

566  
567 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
568 There are certain signs. If we're trying to accommodate larger signs, just to be clear. We are  
569 trying to accommodate larger signs. We have received sign applications that we cannot  
570 process, we cannot, we can't approve, because they exceed by a great deal what our maximum  
571 sign area is, for example. Getting back to you know, we don't want to get into a situation where  
572 we're reviewing and adjudicating on aesthetics.

573  
574 **Commissioner Sparkman**  
575 You know what comes to mind. Those of you who have written down I-95 South of the Border,  
576 the giant Pedro with the Mexican hat.

577  
578 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
579 I don't know what the rules and regulations are in North Carolina or South Carolina or Georgia,  
580 but here in Accomack, if somebody wants to do a billboard, they still would have to go through  
581 the Board of Zoning Appeals. An off-premises sign would still have to go through the Board  
582 of Zoning Appeals. And what I will say on that is recommending denial of any, the staff is

583 recommending denial of any special use permit for billboards. Okay, it is our contention that  
584 there are plenty enough billboards in Accomack and that the billboards that we do have are not  
585 being properly maintained. So why would we want additional signage? However, it's the Board  
586 of Zoning Appeals' ultimate decision as to whether or not that's approved.

587

588 **Commissioner Gayle**

589 Excuse me. These signs that we've seen here are only signs secured flat to the surface, not signs  
590 that are perpendicular to the surface.

591

592 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

593 Yes, sir. These are building-mounted signs that the wall they're attached to would have to be  
594 able to structurally support that sign. A projecting sign, which is what you're talking about, in  
595 the perpendicular example, that's called a projecting sign. You would normally find those in a  
596 downtown setting or maybe even a shopping center setting, but in an industrial setting, you  
597 don't see those at all. But the difference in a projecting sign certainly can be a building-mounted  
598 sign, but you made a good observation that signs can either be mounted flat on the wall or they  
599 can project out on a stem or a pole or some sort of support structure, and they hang down. They  
600 could be fabric, they could be any other material that the structure could support. But we don't  
601 have too many places where a projecting sign would be appropriate, as in a downtown area,  
602 you see projecting signs in downtown Onancock, Cape Charles, and Chincoteague all the time.

603

604 **Commissioner Pettit**

605 Just comment on the off-premises sign. Do we not have some unfinished business with off-  
606 site sign? Or have we concluded the review process?

607

608 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

609 That was during Rich Morrison's time. We started a sign review, and I don't know if we finished  
610 it.

611

612 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

613 That might have gotten lost in the transition.

614

615 **Commissioner Gayle**

616 But the question was, when people were applying for square footage, the wording was unclear  
617 if you had a four-by-eight sign. Did it include both sides? Was the square footage calculation  
618 of both sides?

619

620 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

621 Typically, you just calculate that off of one side. That's how I've always seen it. I think that it  
622 would be kind of tough to double that. So, if you've got a four-by-eight sign, and one side is  
623 32 square feet, to call that a 64 square foot sign, I don't see that. Where I have usually seen that  
624 is in several definitions throughout the state and several Zoning Ordinances. That's usually just  
625 one side.

626

627 **Commissioner Gayle**

628 But correction would have been that for a sign, it would be, shall we say, 64 square feet per  
629 side, not to exceed that per side.

630

631

632 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
633 I have also seen where, if there is a two-sided sign, and you're doing this with your hands, and  
634 that brought a point if the two sign faces are past a certain angle, one side, the other side, just  
635 like a piece of paper or cardboard or whatever. But if you have those two signs that are starting  
636 to angle out, then we could reasonably put in a provision that says, if it's past a certain angle,  
637 then that will be counted as 32 and 32 a total of 64. We can certainly do some research on what  
638 other localities say that angle is, unless you have some ideas as to what that angle should be.

639  
640 **Commissioner Gayle**  
641 But we had some issues with some sign applications regarding that in question, and they  
642 initiated a review that I think did come to fruition.

643  
644 **Commissioner Tyler**  
645 Well, there was a move afoot to reduce, eliminate, or remove billboards from the Eastern  
646 Shore. There's a contingent there that wants that to happen. There is a portion of the citizenry  
647 who would like to see all billboards removed and certainly no more billboards built at all.  
648 There's a certain contingency

649  
650 **Commissioner Gayle**  
651 Billboards can only go up in zoned for business.

652  
653 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
654 Correct, correct.

655  
656 **Commissioner Tyler**  
657 There's a whole contingent of people who have talked to me about it.

658  
659 **Commissioner Gayle**  
660 That came up for all those billboards South of Mappsville. That's zoned business.

661  
662 **Commissioner Tyler**  
663 Well, I've got, what, 210 feet or three. I can't remember how many feet right on Chincoteague  
664 Road where I could put billboards. There's a whole contingent of people that have talked to me  
665 that would like to (A) remove all billboards, and (B), have no more billboards built because a  
666 lot of them are junky, which is, I would say that the County certainly is within their rights to  
667 tell the billboard owner to fix it, which they have not done.

668  
669 **Commissioner Sparkman**  
670 Especially on the causeway.

671  
672 **Commissioner Tyler**  
673 Well, the County has the ability to force a person to fix their stuff, and they choose not to.

674  
675 **Mr. Lee Pambid**  
676 What I will say about the sign ordinance in general is that it needs a lot of work. It's outdated.  
677 A lot of what we're bringing to you on an individual basis is to try to clarify some things. Try  
678 to include some flexibility where the staff sees flexibility would be a pro or a desirable thing.  
679 But with regards to the signage, the County Administrator, Mike Mason and I have talked on  
680 several occasions about the Sign Ordinance, and we both recognize that the Sign Ordinance is

681 deficient as an entire section of the Zoning Ordinance. It needs to be revised, and that's the  
682 plan when we do a diagnostic of the Zoning Ordinance overall.

683

684 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

685 Any other questions?

686

687 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

688 Another comment on the question that Mr. Sparkman had being that we're talking about the  
689 industrial district with these larger signs, most of these would not be in residential  
690 neighborhoods where they would obstruct anyone's view. No other questions. Nothing you  
691 want me to look into for you.

692

693 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

694 No, not on the signs. Nothing.

695

696 **Commissioner White**

697 If they are revised, everyone that currently has signs that may not be at code or they're falling  
698 down, would they be informed that they need.

699

700 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

701 So, you're talking about whether a sign conforms or is non-conforming to the Zoning  
702 Ordinance. There's a section in the Zoning Ordinance that addresses non-conformities, whether  
703 a non-conforming lot, non-conforming, whatever. If it was legally approved in the past, but we  
704 change the regulation, and make it non-conforming, that sign, or that house or whatever is  
705 allowed to continue. We wouldn't go back and say, okay, you've got to change the sign or to  
706 change the size of your sign. We wouldn't do that. There is a process, and there is a code section  
707 or a chapter that pertains to the situation you're talking about. Non conformities happen every  
708 day. They're allowed to continue if they were legally established in the past.

709

710 **Commissioner Sparkman**

711 Maintenance is one of the things.

712

713 **Commissioner White**

714 Right, there was one in New Church that fell, a huge one, and maybe rain or something and it  
715 actually fell.

716

717 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

718 In that instance, if there is a certain amount of damage that we would accept to allow them to  
719 repair that sign as it was before, if the value of the damage exceeds 50% they've got to take the  
720 sign down.

721

722 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

723 So, would you like to have a public hearing?

724

725 **Ms. Chontese Ridley**

726 Not at this time.

727

728 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

729 Thank you. We'll move to the public hearing.

730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

I have to apologize for pulling the trigger quickly on the public hearings, because after I did that, I was informed by legal counsel that some things were coming down from the State Legislature, that were not expected to pass, that did. At the Chair's request. I will not be providing any briefings tonight, because we did advertise the public hearings. It's necessary to open the public hearing at least, close the public hearing, and then do the same thing for both items. Again, I sincerely apologize for the false start here. We will come back to you next month. I'm not requesting another public hearing in May, but we're going to slow down just a tick and just get it right. We're going to bring that language to you next month.

**7. PUBLIC HEARING**

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

We do have to open it to cancel it?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

You would just open it and close it. Hold the public hearing, there's nobody here. No one has signed up. But if you would, ma'am, just officially open the public hearing as normal, close the public hearing and we'll do that for the next item as well.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

So, when it comes back up, we'll have another public hearing.

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

Yes, ma'am.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

So we'll open the public hearing on Chapter 78 Subdivision in Chapter 106 Zoning Regarding the Definition of Subdivisions.

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

Nobody has signed up to speak.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

We have nobody signed up and no presentation. Close the public hearing. Move on to open the public hearing on Chapter 106 Zoning Regarding the Periods of Validity certain approvals,

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

I will say that we did put an exhibit in your packets to try to visually explain the whole timing of the public hearings and the notices. But with that being said, that's a new piece of information. But again, we're not going to provide any other briefing besides what you've just heard, so that concludes staff remarks on this, and I'll turn it back over to you for the public hearing.

**Chairwoman Wingfield**

All right. We have nobody signed up, so we'll close the public hearing. Do you have any other matters?

779 **8. OTHER MATTERS**

780 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

781 We do not have any other matters.

782

783 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

784 Does any of the commissioners have any other matters or questions they want to ask?

785

786 **Commissioner Tyler**

787 How's the hiring going?

788

789 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

790 We're having to get a little creative in terms of our approach. The hiring is touch and go, as it's  
791 always been for us here on the Eastern Shore for this particular department. We currently have  
792 five vacancies. We have two Building Inspector positions open. We have a Planner position  
793 open. We have an Environmental Planner position open and a Deputy Director of  
794 Environmental Programs position open. So we are fine for now. We're making it work with  
795 chewing gum and baling wire. But what I will say is the HR department will be bringing on an  
796 Assistant or Deputy Director of HR. So we hope that that will increase HR's bandwidth to put  
797 some additional ads out there, and that kind of thing. One of the creative approaches that we  
798 want to try to take is to recruit directly, maybe identify some individuals and ask them if they  
799 would be interested, whether they're here on the shore or across the bay. But that approach has  
800 worked in certain instances for us, just organization-wide, not for this particular department,  
801 but organization-wide.

802

803 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

804 Any other questions? Can we move to the Subdivision Agent Report?

805

806 **9. STAFF REPORTS**

807 **Subdivision Agent**

808 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

809 We have no other major subdivisions in process right now. The Coastal Square and Residences  
810 application. They have submitted their engineer drawings, and we are currently reviewing  
811 those, and there's nothing to report. Last month was the last public action that would have been  
812 required for that case. The rest of the review is going to be administrative in nature, but besides  
813 that, we don't have any other major subdivision applications requiring the Planning  
814 Commission's review.

815

816 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

817 Do Coastal Squares, do they come back with other phases that they didn't have buildings and  
818 plots for? Or is that through you?

819

820 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

821 That would still be through us. So the preliminary plat, as I like to say, kind of sets the table  
822 for the staff to do the rest of the review. And of course, it is our responsibility to make sure  
823 that the individual sections that they submit so if they're approved for let's take for example,  
824 the 130 lots that were that was proposed last month, and they come in and they say, hey, we  
825 just want to do 25 of those lots. Then they're going to submit to us a plat just for those 25 lots.  
826 We make sure that everything is the way that it's supposed to be, per the conditions of the  
827 Conditional Use Permit, the proffers of the rezoning case, as well as the Zoning Ordinance.

828 We don't want to get caught in a situation where they are not complying with any of that. So  
829 that is the that would be the basic process there. And then they would come in for future  
830 sections. And we would do the same thing for those future sections.

831

832 **Commissioner Pettit**

833 Information for me, what's the process of rezoning? Is it only allowed from an applicant, or  
834 does the County have a means of rezoning property?

835

836 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

837 I'm trying to understand the situation here, but if we're talking about a County wide rezoning  
838 to maybe change the zoning of certain properties, or to make it agree with the future land use  
839 map, then that's something that we would do County wide. But we can't select an individual  
840 piece of property and rezone that ourselves, unless it is our property, but applicants would have  
841 to come in individually on their own to rezone their property. Does that answer your question?

842

843 **Commissioner Pettit**

844 Just wanted to clarify how that process worked.

845

846 **Chairwoman Wingfield**

847 Back few years ago, we were looking at different places on the ground and looking at the  
848 zoning. We were reaching out to the landowners and rezoning. We were rezoning like  
849 Mappsville, before Stuckey's, and we were rezoning their property as a whole, like different  
850 places along Nelsonia.

851

852 **Commissioner Gayle**

853 It was tidying up a little bit.

854

855 **Mr. Lee Pambid**

856 In that instance, we could rezone the property. But again, that's more of an area-wide or  
857 vicinity-wide effort. We wouldn't go in and do it for one piece of property. It would have to be  
858 done in a comprehensive or larger context.

859

860 **Commissioner Gayle**

861 The Comprehensive Plan, I think, has the language on conformity, I believe is the best way to  
862 describe it. There was an exception where there was a proposal to build a cell tower near  
863 Pungoteague. At that time the you could only build a cell tower in a location zoned for  
864 business. We had to go adverse to the Comprehensive Plan to zone a small area of business to  
865 get a cell tower done. And I think the supervisors revisited and reverse that in the ordinance.

866

867 **Commissioner Tyler**

868 They never built that tower in Pungoteague.

869

870 **Commissioner Gayle**

871 They never did; that was Verizon. There were several proposals for towers that haven't been  
872 done. But anyhow, that was contrary to the Comprehensive Plan to do because it was five or  
873 10 acres zone business in the middle. But we did it to facilitate the cell tower construction.

874

875

876

877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

What we generally want to do, and in the Deputy County Administrators report, I'm going to get into the Comprehensive Plan and the status of that RFP. What we would try to do, generally is we want the zoning to match what's on the ground, but we also want the zoning to match what's on the future land use plan. The future land use plan is something that we would put side by side with the zoning map. And we would essentially do that as a group. When we do the Comprehensive Plan revision or the review. But there are several instances that we've just noticed throughout where the zoning and the Future Land Use Plan don't quite agree. It's not a deal breaker by any stretch of the imagination. But there are certain instances where that might be problematic.

**Commissioner Taylor**

It sounds like it's done individually by property versus being done by an area. If it needs to be rezoned. Who would submit the request if it were done by an area? If you wanted that done by an area who would submit the request?

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

It could be a private property owner that owns several contiguous pieces of property, or it could be the County. I'm sure there are other instances that I'm not imagining right now, but those are the two that really come to mind at the forefront, if we're talking about a vicinity or several pieces of property, and yes, they would have to be contiguous.

**Commissioner Taylor**

Can we get more information on that? I know you said you were looking at it from what's in the Comp Plan, but can we get more information as you're working through that?

**Deputy County Administrator**

**Mr. Lee Pambid**

There's going to be plenty of time for that. If I could just go into the Deputy County Administrator Report. With regards to the Comp Plan, we have finalized the draft RFP for Comp Plan consulting services that has not been distributed to the public. We still have to run it through Legal, Finance, and the County Administrator one more time. I was working on this last night. As a matter of fact, I want to try to finalize that with them by the end of the week, certainly by the end of next week. But what's going to happen is we will probably start the work on the Comp Plan in the next fiscal year. We're already here in the second week of April, and the amount of time that it takes to put the RFP out, get the responses back, review the responses, decide who are the top five, let's say that we get 10 who are the top five consultants that we want to interview. Interview those, do some negotiating, and then finalize, which would probably take us pretty close to the end of the fiscal year. So again, almost mid-April, we want to try to get this finalized by the end of the fiscal year. We have \$90,000 in the current budget and then we've got \$90,000 in the next fiscal year's budget. What we're going to have to do is we're going to have to carry over that 90,000 to the next fiscal year for a total of 180, and hopefully that'll be enough to get it done. Commissioner Tyler has asked occasionally what's going on with the Comp Plan review and that's the latest and greatest.

**Commissioner Tyler**

Thank you.

