

STAFFORD COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

March 19, 2025

The regular meeting of the Stafford County Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) Tuesday, March 19, 2025, was called to order with the determination of a quorum at 7:00 PM by Vice Chairman Abraham Panjshiri in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Abraham Panjshiri, Everet Blaisdell, Tylor Underwood, Nathan Mowery (Alternate), Tracy Petty (Alternate)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Steven Apicella, Steven Gorski, Jeffrey Spinnanger

STAFF PRESENT: Juan Bernal, James Staranowicz, Stacie Stinnette

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Panjshiri: As it is now 7 PM, I hereby call today's Stafford BZA meeting to order. Please silence your phones and any other electronic devices. Will staff please call the roll and advise if we have a sufficient quorum for today's meeting.

Mr. Bernal: Good evening, Mr. Chairman. Yes, sir, the evening for roll call for tonight; Steve Apicella? Absent. Everet Blaisdell?

Mr. Blaisdell: Here.

Mr. Bernal: Steven Gorski? Absent. Abraham Panjshiri?

Mr. Panjshiri: Here.

Mr. Bernal: Jeffrey Spinnanger? Tylor Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: Here.

Mr. Bernal: Nathan Mowery?

Mr. Mowery: Here.

Mr. Bernal: Tracy Petty?

Ms. Petty: Here.

Mr. Bernal: Mr. Chairman, we have a quorum.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you. Are there any changes or additions to the advertised agenda?

Mr. Bernal: No, sir.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you. Before we proceed any further, does any board member wish to make any declarations or statements concerning any matter being heard by the board tonight? Alrighty, hearing none, I would like to now explain the roles and responsibilities of the BZA and its procedures. The BZA is a quasi-judicial body whose members are volunteers appointed by the Circuit Court of Stafford County. The purpose of the BZA, as authorized by the State Code and Stafford County Zoning Ordinance is to, (1) hear

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

and decide on special exception application requests; (2) hear and decide upon request for a variance from the Stafford Zoning Ordinance when a literal enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship to the owners of a property; (3) hear and decide appeals from any order, requirement, decision, or determination made by the Zoning Administrator; and (4) hear appeals on... hearing on appeals will be conducted in two parts. One, the first will be a review of jurisdiction and standing. And two, the review will be a hearing of its merits of the case as appropriate after review of jurisdiction and standing. The BZA consists of seven regular members and two alternative members. Alternative members may only participate when a regular member is unable to hear the case. The minimum quorum for the board to operate and to take votes is four members. Let the record reflect that we do have a quorum tonight, with a total of five voting members present. The regular members present and voting are Everet Blaisdell, Abraham Panjshiri, and Tylot Underwood. Alternative members standing in for a regular member and voting tonight are Nathan Mowery and Tracy Petty. County staff is represented tonight by James Staranowicz and Juan Bernal. Today's public hearing will be conducted in the following order. The Chair will ask Mr. Mowery to read the case. When there is an appeal to the BZA, the board will then discuss its jurisdiction and the applicant's standing of the case presented. BZA members can ask questions of county staff regarding the case. The Chair will then ask the applicant or their representative to come forward, state their name and address, and present their case to the board. The applicant's presentation shall not exceed 10 minutes, unless additional time is requested to and granted by the board. Members of the BZA may ask questions of the applicant regarding their case. The Chair will formally open the public hearing and invite members of the public who wish to speak about the case to come forward and address the Board for no more than three minutes. The applicant will have an additional opportunity to address the public's comments and any further questions by BZA members. After the applicant's final response, the Chair shall close the public hearing with no further public comment allowed, and bring the matter back to the board for further discussion and deliberation. The Board shall review the evidence presented, and the Chair shall seek a motion. After discussion of the motion, the Chair will call for a vote of the board. In order for any motion to be approved, at least four members of the board must vote in the affirmative. The procedure for addressing the BZA and submitting material to the board are as follows: after coming to the podium, members of the public shall provide their name and address that the board can maintain an accurate record of the proceeding. We also ask that you sign the meeting register at the back of the room. As this is a quasi-judicial body under the auspice of the County Circuit Court, we require all applicants, speakers, presenters, and audience members to act with a level of decorum and respect appropriate to a courtroom setting. If there are any disturbances, the Chair may call for a temporary recess. Please address your views to the board as a whole and not to the applicant or other members of the public. In order to allow the board time for appropriate review, the applicant or the applicant's representative is required to submit relevant material to the Department of Planning and Zoning at least 10 days prior to the hearing to be included in the staff report. The board may accept and consider additional relevant material from the applicant or the applicant's representative prior to or during the hearing. However, large amounts of additional material may require a deferral at the board's discretion on the behalf of the applicant to allow the board time to consider that additional material. Members of the public and/or staff may also submit relevant material before or during the hearing. I would like to provide some additional information for today's applicants. All applicants are hereby reminded that there are five voting members present, and any application requires a minimum of at least four affirmative votes for approval. If you decide that there are not enough members present tonight to enable you to receive a fair hearing, then you have a right to defer your public hearing until another meeting. However, you may defer the hearing for this reason only once in a 12-month period. To request a deferral, you need to do so at the beginning of your presentation. Deferral requests are granted at the sole discretion of the board. Applicants may also withdraw their application prior to the closing of the public hearing on the matter, provided that the applicant has not withdrawn a substantially similar application within the previous 12-month period. Also be aware that the BZA will not hear any denied application for a special exception or variance which is substantially the same request as determined by the board as is currently under consideration for last one

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

year from the date of its previous decision. Appeals, any person who does not agree with the decision of this board, Stafford County Board of Zoning Appeals, shall have 30 days to petition the Stafford County Circuit Court to review the BZA's decision. The Stafford BZA requires that any person who wishes to speak before the board shall be administer an oath. Therefore, anyone who wishes to speak tonight, please stand, if possible, raise your right hand and agree in the affirmative by saying I do after I read the following statement. Do you hereby swear or affirm that all of your testimony before this board shall be nothing but the truth?

Members of the Audience: I do.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you, and please be seated. So we have our first case. Have staff determined that the application and associated materials are complete?

Mr. Bernal: Yes, sir, they are complete.

Mr. Panjshiri: Alrighty. Since the matter before us is an appeal of a Zoning Administrator's determination, one of the first orders of business is to determine whether the Stafford County BZA has jurisdiction and that the applicant has standing in order for this body to proceed forward with this case, pursuant to the VA State Code and staff... and Stafford Zoning Ordinance. Before we entertain this motion, it was brought up by the Chairman, Steven Apicella, that this is not clear that the Stafford BZA has jurisdiction in this case based on the specifics in the applicant's appeal package. The applicant provided supplemental information as part of their submission. Please refer to Attachment 3 on page 8. In the first paragraph, last sentence, the applicant states that this document supplies additional information in support of our application to the Stafford Board of Zoning Appeals for approval of a non-listed use, specifically, explosives mixing and blasting on our property, as described below. On the same page in the second paragraph, last sentence, the applicant indicated that we are seeking a non-listed use authorization. Nowhere in the appeal package did the applicant indicate that they disagree with the Zoning Administrator's January 29, 2025, determination that explosive mixing and testing is not a permitted use under Stafford County's Zoning Ordinance. In fact, it appears that they do agree, in as much as they specifically seek authorization for a non-listed use, but they are going through the BZA for approval of an non-listed use which is not within the purview of the BZA. As the Zoning Administrator indicated, to get approval for a non-listed use under Stafford County Code Section 28-37, the applicant would need to seek a conditional use permit. Pursuant to Section 28-185, CUPs go through the Stafford Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, not the Board of Zoning Appeals. Based on the information, it appears that the BZA does not have jurisdiction on this matter as we do not approve land uses, whether listed or not listed in the Stafford County Zoning Ordinance. In this instance, the applicant would need to pursue a CUP if they would continue approval for the non-listed use. Is there a motion on whether the BZA has jurisdiction in this case?

Mr. Blaisdell: I'll make a motion for that.

Mr. Panjshiri: So I have a motion...

Mr. Mowery: May we have an opportunity to ask clarifying questions from staff?

Mr. Panjshiri: Yes. Can we get a second on it and then... Or do we want to do questions first? We can do questions first, yeah. Go ahead, Mr. Mowery.

Mr. Mowery: If a, if a use is not listed, either under permitted by-right or conditional use permit, is that saying that the only option for a resident to use it under that use would be to seek a CUP?

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes

March 19, 2025

Mr. Bernal: Correct, yes, sir. It's the only way to get something that's not listed within the ordinance.

Mr. Mowery: And if they're using a property for a use that's not either permitted by-right or listed as a CUP or special exception, how would a resident know that they were not permitted to be doing that?

Mr. Bernal: It would most likely would be a violation, because they don't have permission to do so.

Mr. Mowery: So if somebody complained about a use that's not listed as a, as expressly permitted, they could receive a violation, even though it's not expressly forbidden for them to be doing that?

Mr. Bernal: We would say that it's a use not permitted per the ordinance or not listed in this section of the ordinance...

Mr. Mowery: Okay.

Mr. Bernal: ... per Table 3.1.

Mr. Mowery: Okay, and so, from your, your opinion, the only way to get permission from the County for a non-listed use is the CUP process.

Mr. Bernal: Per the ordinance, yes, sir.

Mr. Mowery: Okay. No further questions.

Mr. Panjshiri: Any other board members with questions?

Mr. Mowery: Was this process explained to the applicant?

Mr. Bernal: Yes, sir.

Mr. Mowery: Okay.

Mr. Underwood: What was the motion?

Mr. Panjshiri: So I believe the motion, there's not a second though, was to approve that they do have jurisdiction, or that the BZA does have jurisdiction in this case.

Mr. Blaisdell: No, that wasn't the motion.

Mr. Panjshiri: That wasn't? All right. Can you clarify your motion?

Mr. Blaisdell: The motion was that we didn't have jurisdiction.

Mr. Panjshiri: Okay. So, the motion is that we don't have jurisdiction, and we're still waiting on a second if we were going to proceed with that.

Mr. Mowery: I would make an alternate motion that we move forward with the case to allow the applicant an opportunity to speak for the case before we decide outright to not hear it at all.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Mr. Blaisdell: We have to figure out if we can even rule on it first.

Mr. Underwood: It would appear in this case that we do have jurisdiction to rule on an appeal. I think the justification for the appeal would be the issue, is the way that I'm viewing this.

Mr. Mowery: Yeah, that makes sense to me. We may not have the, we may not have jurisdiction to grant them what they're seeking, but we can at least hear the case for an appeal on the administrator's decision in this case.

Mr. Blaisdell: Yeah, but they still have to have a CUP... *inaudible*.

Mr. Mowery: To get permission, yeah. But, but today, the packet that they're actually seeking is just simply for us to affirm or deny that the Zoning Administrator's decision that is a non-listed use is accurate. We could feasibly decide that it is a listed use and that, I think, is the question before us.

Mr. Blaisdell: Are we allowed... ? We can't add to this list or take away?

Mr. Bernal: No, sir, that would have to be done by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Mowery: And I don't mean to suggest that, you know, we can add a new one. I simply think that we do have jurisdiction to make a determination whether the Zoning Administrator was accurate when they said that this was a non-listed use. And that, I think, is the, is the narrow question that we have jurisdiction over in this matter. And so I would make a motion that we do have jurisdiction,

Mr. Underwood: And I would second that.

Mr. Panjshiri: Okay, so there's a motion and a second, and all those are ready to vote... any discussion, any further discussion? All right, all those in favor say aye.

Mr. Mowery: Aye.

Mr. Underwood: Aye.

Ms. Petty: Aye.

Mr. Panjshiri: Aye. All those opposed.

Mr. Blaisdell: Nay.

Mr. Panjshiri: Let the record reflect we have four affirmative, one against. So the motion passes for the case to be heard that the BZA has jurisdiction over hearing the appeal. All right. I'll now ask the... I'll now ask Mr. Mowery to read tonight's case.

APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS

1. A25-02/25156261; Sarah and Ian Vabnick – A request for an appeal pursuant to Stafford County Code Sec. 28-349, "Appeals to the board generally," of a Zoning Administrator's Determination related to Tax Map Parcel No. 26M-2-32 (Property). The Property is zoned A-1, Agricultural, and is located at 271 McPherson Drive, within the Hartwood Election District.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Mr. Mowery: Good evening. The Board of Zoning Appeals is to consider a request to appeal a Zoning Administrator's determination dated January 29, 2025, regarding a response to the applicant's request as to whether on-site explosive testing is a permitted use on Tax Map No. 26M-2-32 (Property), as outlined in the appeal. The applicant is requesting the Board of Zoning Appeals overturn a Zoning Administrator Determination, dated January 29, 2025 (Zoning Determination), issued in response to the applicant's request as to whether on-site explosive testing is a permitted use within an A-1, Agricultural zoned parcel. The determination stated that the proposed use is not specifically permitted in Table 3.1 of the Stafford County Zoning Ordinance and, therefore, would be considered a nonlisted use pursuant to Sec. 28-37 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Property, Tax Map Parcel No. 26M-2-32, consists of approximately 9.42 acres and is located within the A-1, Agricultural Zoning District. The property includes a single-family dwelling. The current owners purchased the property on March 5, 2012. The property is located on the south side of McPherson Drive, approximately 819 feet east of Tyson Court. The property is heavily wooded in the rear and along both sides of the property. There does not appear to be any wetlands or Critical Resource Protection Areas on the property.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you. Are there any questions for staff from the board?

Mr. Underwood: Yes. If the applicant were to withdraw the, their request at this point, is there any refund for the fees they have paid?

Mr. Bernal: Unfortunately, no, sir, I looked into it.

Mr. Underwood: Thank you.

Mr. Panjshiri: Anyone else? Mr. Mowery?

Mr. Mowery: I think you answered this already, but just to ensure that it is stated on the record, is it within this board's rights to make a determination that a non-listed use is permissible on the property?

Mr. Bernal: Yes, sir, per what we've written, per our staff report, and what the question was given to us, is it a use on the list.

Mr. Mowery: Let me say it again, just for clarity. So this board, it is within our right to make a determination that a non-listed use is permissible on the property.

Mr. Bernal: Oh, no, sir.

Mr. Mowery: Okay.

Mr. Bernal: I misunderstood.

Mr. Mowery: And that's fine. Yeah, I, it was strange language. So we, we do not have the authority to say a non-listed use is permissible.

Mr. Bernal: Only through a non... through the conditional use permit would that be permitted.

Mr. Mowery: Okay.

Mr. Bernal: But again, this board wouldn't have that authority.

***Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025***

Mr. Mowery: And what are the additional burdens that the, that the CUP process would, would put in place?

Mr. Bernal: They would have to go through the Planning Commission and through the Board of Supervisors to get approval.

Mr. Mowery: Okay, no further questions. Thank you.

Mr. Panjshiri: Anyone else? All right. Would the applicant or their... oh, sorry.

Mr. Blaisdell: So, so what are we gonna rule on if we don't have any jurisdiction to say yes or nay. I mean, what are we doing here?

Mr. Mowery: We're saying yes or no that it is a non-listed use, or is, or is, in fact, a listed use.

Mr. Blaisdell: Okay, gotcha.

Mr. Panjshiri: All right, would the applicant or their representative like to make a presentation to the board?

Mr. Vabnick: I have to let my computer warm up here. So I'm not sure if I should... I'm going to get started if you're ready. I'm not sure...

Mr. Panjshiri: If you could just, sorry, state your name and then address.

Mr. Vabnick: All right. My name is Dr. Ian Vabnick.

Mrs. Vabnick: And I'm Dr. Sarah Vabnick.

Mr. Vabnick: All right. Sarah is the owner of Disablement Technologies and Consulting LLC. We are seeking a non-listed use for approval to conduct explosive testing on A-1, Agricultural zoning property. I will have to tell you that I'm disappointed because we were not told that if it's not on the list, that it's prohibited. That's the first thing. The second thing is, we consulted with the Administrator and specifically asked what was the recourse for this, and we were given guidance that we can go to the BZA. So, that was the first thing. The second thing is, even though it's not listed on the County list, we meet all the requirements for the State of Virginia, which has ordinances that we'll read into the record that authorized the use on A-1, Agricultural land doing explosive testing and mixing for restricted explosives, which means that we can make and use those explosives that same day, okay. We work with the Fire Marshal who approved a test site plan and was ready to give us a permit based on an email received from the current Zoning Administrator, who's currently here, who did not see an issue with us doing the testing and blasting on our property. Due to his impending retirement, we didn't want to stick with just a presumptive. We actually then said, what should we do next? And we were advised that we should get it... we could get a determination, which we did. We were never told, even in the letter, that it was prohibited, okay. What we were told was that it was just not on the list, and therefore they could not give us a determination. That's not saying you cannot do it, it's just saying they cannot give us a determination, okay. Nowhere in the State of Virginia does it require a conditional use permit. What it says is it requires a blasting permit, and the Fire Marshal has already agreed and was going to give us a blasting permit and be currently present at every operation that we did on our property. So I would like to point that out. One of the things also I'd like to point out is the impact of this has on our small business, which is grave, okay. We are a licensed manufacturer of explosives by the federal government in the national defense industry, providing counter-

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

IED and counter defense such as exploded ordnance disposal and munitions disposal for the United States. That's what we do as our products. And we train bomb technicians, both military and civilian, okay. As part of what we do, we have to use explosives. I have 23 years of explosive handling and demolition experience with a PhD in physics. My wife, PhD in chemistry. I was an FBI Special Agent bomb technician and a certified bomb technician for 18 years. I also taught as an adjunct professor at the FBI Hazardous Devices School, which is the only recognized school for bomb technicians in the United States, for public safety bomb technicians. I'm the inventor of 15 patented technologies in this field. And you need to understand that bomb dis... in bomb disposal, that explosives are routinely used, as well as being used by agriculture. And you know, before they initially put the ATF regulations in place back in the early 1970s, you can go to a farm and feed store and buy explosives, like dynamite to use on your property or move stumps. The US Department of Agriculture currently still uses explosives for operations that they have, okay. So, from a safety perspective, we provided a blast site plan, where we're being very reasonable, a one pound max limit, okay. Quarries, just so you understand, on Garrisonville Road, like Vulcan, for example, has an open air blast limit of 150 times what we're proposing. I provided you with the K factor equations, given the maximum amount that we're going to use, you can be about 85 feet from there and be below 1.2 pounds per square inch, which is well below the four PSI level for human being safety. We've, part of the site plan, we implemented ways to, one, protect the environment using a sand pit, also to reduce any debris and blast, deflection and reflection. We've addressed all factors, and that's why the Fire Marshal was comfortable with issuing us a blasting permit. From a noise perspective. I just want to also point out that we hear firearms and ordnance on a routine basis, okay, in our neighborhood; including today, while we were eating lunch, we were listening to firearms from the Crucible, okay. Our neighbors are shooting firearms routinely on their properties, and from a noise level perspective, the sound that would be emanated from one blast that if we were doing explosive work is equivalent to that of a shotgun on an M-80 salute, right. So our neighbors are actually comfortable with this. That's why we had them sign a petition, and we thank our neighbors. Also one of our neighbors, immediate neighbors, has come here to speak on our behalf. So again, I just want to point out that the work that we're doing, one, is contributing to national security and the safety of our communities, including everyone on this board, okay. When the bomb squad rolls, I almost guarantee you that they've been trained in my tools and techniques, which are still taught at the bomb school, and are in the ADOPS, which is the EOD manual basically what's called the 60 series publication, right. People refer to that as with their reference for when they need to do a disposal. That's where they go, okay. So if small businesses like mine can't do the work that we're doing, we can't develop the technology to address the next threat that's out there. It's really just that simple. We're a small business. We cannot afford a \$10,000 conditional use permit. You'll drive us out of business as far as the explosive manufacturing is concerned. And what we've done recently is develop new technology to make it easier for bomb technicians and bomb squads to handle and store explosives, and it's very expensive for them. Most bomb squads are small, two person operations, okay, with very small budgets. Making these tools available and affordable and explosive available and affordable to bomb squads is a critical part of what we're doing. I don't have much else. Sarah, if you don't mind just read into record the statutes that we're referring to.

Mrs. Vabnick: According to the Virginia State Fire Prevention Code, 107.2, a permit from the Fire Marshal is required for the manufacturing, storage, handling, use, and sale of explosives. Section 5605.1.1 describes the details of such permitting, including that the manufacturers authorized by a federal license and conducted in accordance with recognized safety practices. These practices are outlined in Section 5605.8 and include safe distances site security notifications to the Fire Marshal's office so that a Deputy can be on site. We have met all the requirements to be eligible for a permit. So we have background clearance cards from the State Fire Marshal's Office, ATFE, manufacturing license, et cetera.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Mr. Vabnick: As well as the statute involving property and manufacture. Could you read that please, or at least summarize it? At least get in the record the statute number or ordinance number.

Mrs. Vabnick: Which one?

Mr. Vabnick: The one about five acres.

Mrs. Vabnick: Oh, okay, yes. The owner of real estate parcels of five or more acres conforming to the definition of real estate devoted to agricultural use, or real estate devoted to horticultural use in 58.1-3230 of the Code of Virginia is not required to obtain a permit for the restricted, for restricted explosives manufacturer when such manufacturer complies with all the following: 2.1, the manufacturer of the explosives and conducted by the owner of such real estate, the manufacturer of the explosive complies with the instructions provided by the producer of the components used in the manufacture, the explosive used does not include reactive targets. A permit to use explosives. I'm skipping a little bit, a permit to use explosive has been obtained in accordance with Section 107.2.

Mr. Vabnick: 107.2 is a list of all the different types of permits that you have to have, or what can be obtained by the State of Virginia. At this, at this point, I'm done pretty much with our case. I thank you for your time. I want to thank the Fire Marshals for their support and for their guidance and cooperation and participation in the development of the test site plan. And I also want to thank James, who took his time to also try to at least explain things to us, even though clearly it was not in the letter, okay. We were not told was prohibited. We would have not spent \$2,000 of our limited funds coming here if this was going to be the way that we were going to be treated. I turn over my time.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you. Are there any questions for the applicant from the board?

Mr. Mowery: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Panjshiri: All right, Mr. Mowery first.

Mr. Mowery: You mentioned that the size of the explosive was about the equivalent of a shotgun blast. Is that right?

Mr. Vabnick: From a noise perspective, that is correct.

Mr. Mowery: Okay, can you, can you elaborate on that a little bit more? So, how often is that occurring and, and does it ever exceed that?

Mr. Vabnick: Okay, the answer is, it will never exceed that, because we provided a limit of one pound net explosive weight. The majority of the materials is for quality assurance purposes. We're talking about tests with one ounce of explosive. Typically, if we were going to do higher than that, it would be up to eight ounces, and we would tamp it, typically, with water, which reduces the blast effect by 50%. What happens with blast waves is that they rapidly attenuate and go from a blast wave to a sound wave. So by the time it reached the top of a hill, of the hill, it's already a sound wave. It's not a blast wave anymore. And the other thing that by, we're taking steps is by using the sand or absorbing any shock or seismic effects as well as blast reflection, thus again, reducing the noise levels. And we're only doing this between 10 and three in the... 10am and three in the afternoon, with limited numbers of personnel and no more than 10 shots in a day, which means we're talking about less than two shots, assuming we're even going to do 10. Most cases

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes

March 19, 2025

we're not. You're talking about maybe two or three shots in a given day, but it could be up to 10, which is what, two an hour based on 10am to 3pm. So not a lot.

Mr. Mowery: And so with that amount of TNT, you mentioned somewhere between one to eight ounces. Now, the equation that you provided to us in your documentation, you gave us an example of 10 pounds of TNT having a safe distance of 86 feet, but the amount that you're actually using is significantly lower than that?

Mr. Vabnick: That's correct. I gave you a K factor calculation based on that, and that is the accepted equation used also by the military. They use a more conservative one of K-50. Public Safety uses the K-40.

Mr. Mowery: Okay, so that 86-foot safe distance radius is for much more explosive than what you would ever be using, and you're using this on a nine acre property.

Mr. Vabnick: That's correct, because blast waves attenuate exponentially.

Mr. Mowery: Okay. No further questions for me.

Mr. Panjshiri: Mr. Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: Thank you. I do have a few questions. To help me better understand, you're essentially operating a home business? Is that a reasonable statement?

Mr. Vabnick: That's a reasonable statement. It's a small business, an LLC in the State of Virginia.

Mr. Underwood: Okay. Do you have any employees that work out of the property?

Mr. Vabnick: Me. She's my boss.

Mr. Underwood: Do you have an increase in vehicular traffic associated with your business?

Mr. Vabnick: No.

Mr. Underwood: Do you have any customer visits?

Mr. Vabnick: Absolutely not. We only serve first responders and military.

Mr. Underwood: Do you have adequate off-street parking?

Mr. Vabnick: Yes, but we wouldn't need it. If we had someone come to assist us, like a high speed videographer, it'd be one car or two cars max.

Mr. Underwood: Do you have a vehicle associated with the business that weighs greater than 13,000 pounds?

Mr. Vabnick: No.

Mr. Underwood: Does your home business occupy greater than 25% of your finished floor area?

***Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025***

Mr. Vabnick: No.

Mr. Underwood: Do you store any goods, merchandise, or materials outside?

Mr. Vabnick: No.

Mr. Underwood: And are you engaged in the retail or wholesale sale of goods or merchandise to customers directly on the premises?

Mr. Vabnick: No.

Mr. Underwood: And you comply with all other federal, state and local laws and regulations?

Mr. Vabnick: Yes.

Mr. Underwood: Thank you.

Mr. Panjshiri: Ms. Petty.

Ms. Petty: You mentioned the sound was equivalent to approximately like a shotgun. Is there any vibration that would be felt like through the ground or shaking windows or anything like that?

Mr. Vabnick: Fair question. We addressed that matter with using a sand pit, and the answer is no.

Ms. Petty: Okay.

Mr. Vabnick: Not, not at, not at the quantities that we're talking about, not at the explosive quantities. Again, we gave you the K-factor calculation for way over that.

Ms. Petty: And you'd never do anything higher than that.

Mr. Vabnick: We already wrote in our test plan no more than one pound. So the answer is yes, correct. We will not do any higher than that.

Ms. Petty: Okay. And you mentioned that the Fire Marshal would be attending?

Mr. Vabnick: Yes. They have to be present at during all blasting.

Ms. Petty: Okay, so you schedule that in advance with them and, and...

Mr. Vabnick: That is correct. And they were willing to do it until we asked for a determination. If we just went on the email, we would have already been doing blasting.

Ms. Petty: Okay. And is it just one person from the Fire Marshal?

Mr. Vabnick: Yes, they send one officer.

Ms. Petty: Okay, so just a regular vehicle, not a fire...

***Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025***

Mr. Vabnick: Correct, correct.

Ms. Petty: Okay. All right, thank you.

Mr. Panjshiri: All right. I do have one question. You said you weren't given an exact determination. But then, after reviewing the letter that was sent to you, it does say that the proposed use, as described in the determination request, is a use that is not specifically permitted anywhere in Table 3.1 of the Stafford County Zoning Ordinance, therefore such use would be considered a non-listed use pursuant to Section 28-37 of the Zoning Ordinance. And then when you proceed to that section, it does say any non-listed use would require a conditional use permit. So, could you clarify what you meant by you didn't receive a determination in the sense of that you could not do that?

Mr. Vabnick: Again, we spoke with the Zoning Administrator after we got the letter to try to better understand it. And our understanding, based on the letter, was that it was... there was nothing that said it was prohibited, okay. And nowhere did we get any guidance saying that we had to get a conditional permit, okay. Show me any evidence of the, of the, that we were told that we had to get in writing or anywhere else. We didn't see that, okay. I don't think it's fair to have citizens go through the, you know, 10 different, you know, maze of statutes and subsections to try to... when you, when you call the, the Zoning Administrator, you expect to get straight answers from the expert, okay.

Mrs. Vabnick: And I'd like to say we sat down together, too, and went over sort of the application that we were going to put in, we sort of sat down to talk about it with Juan also.

Mr. Panjshiri: Any other questions? All right, so I'm going to now open the public hearing on this matter. If there are any members of the public who wish to speak in support of the application, please come forward now. And then, just as a reminder, please state your name and address. Thank you.

Mr. McKenzie: Good evening, I'm Robert McKenzie. We live directly across from the Vabnicks. We fully support the request for permission to operate as they requested. We've known them for 12 years. They're very responsible family. I'm a retired Marine Lieutenant Colonel. My MOS was combat engineer. I'm very familiar with large amounts of explosives. This should be a non-issue. The amounts they are using are so small, the distances are so great. There is no safety issue involved, unless you're standing right there. We live across the street. I'm not concerned about safety from a physical aspect. I'm not concerned about the noise. Now we live in the country. We've lived there for 12 years. It's not as quiet as I thought it would be. As Ian spoke earlier, we listened to the Crucible firing, pistol firing for about an hour and a half this morning. I noticed it when I was outside playing with the dog. We have military and commercial helicopters and jets flying directly over our house every day, day and night. We have lawn mowers. We have log splitters. We have kids across the street, not their family, another family nearby, that drive ATVs up and down the street. That noise is what bothers me. The noise they're going to create is minuscule. It should be a non-issue. Because it's not listed, it should not be prohibited. They're very responsible, they're very professional. They're a small business. They're what runs this country, small businesses. We fully support the request. Any questions for me? Thank you for your time.

Mrs. McKenzie: My name is Lori McKenzie, and that was my husband. I don't see any problem with what they're doing. The noise level and the effect on the homes in the area is minuscule. If you listen to where we live and hear the three day wars that go on at Quantico, I have to go through my house periodically and adjust everything in my house because it gets gone crazy from all the sound and the vibrations and everything else. This is not going to do it. It should not be a factor. This is just a small little thing that just

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

happens to not be listed on your list because nobody tried to do it before or ask permission. It shouldn't be that, you know, you therefore you turn it down because it's not on that list. I think it should be approved.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you. Are there any additional members that wanted to speak in support of the applicant? All right, if there are any members of the public who wish to speak in opposition to the applicant, please come forward. Seeing none. Does the applicant wish to respond and or add additional information?

Mr. Vabnick: Just that you have 500 pound bombs being dropped on the impact range at Quantico, and we had that earthquake several years ago. We all assumed, when I was in Home Depot, and I saw the glass and everything shaking, that it was Quantico, not an earthquake. So, I want to add that as well, as far as, you know, this area is concerned.

Mr. Panjshiri: Does any members of the board have any additional questions for the applicant or county staff? Ms. Petty?

Ms. Petty: I'm still not quite clear on what we need to decide. Can we decide that this is a permitted use on an A-1 zoning property?

Mr. Bernal: No, ma'am. The only thing what's here is that the determination letter is incorrect, that we made a determination that is not a permitted use, and therefore it would lead up to having to obtain a conditional use permit.

Ms. Petty: So we can decide that that letter is not correct.

Mr. Bernal: Correct.

Ms. Petty: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Mowery: And to follow up on Tracy's comment, we as the board can still make a determination that this use falls within one of the listed permitted by-right uses, reversing the Administrator's decision. That would be within our purview? I know you may not agree with that based on your decision. I'm just saying it would be within our purview to reverse the decision from the Zoning Administrator and say this falls within the permitted uses listed.

Mr. Bernal: If it fully falls in there.

Mr. Mowery: Okay. Is there a reason that you would assess it does not fall within a Home Business I?

Mr. Bernal: I'd have to look at the criteria for it. I know you asked about all the whole thing, but let me see what I've got, because I know I have, have that as well.

Mr. Mowery: I think, I think you went through it pretty much line by line. It was employees and timeframes, vehicle parking, customer visits, kind of, kind of went down the block there and checked every, every one, the 13,000 pound vehicle and such. Similarly, if somebody was firing a shotgun on their, on their property, they certainly wouldn't need a specific use listed for that, I assume.

Mr. Bernal: For me, the use is testing of explosives. That's a use that's not there. I mean, if it's a home business that's being run from within the home, that's a totally different thing. And this, I'm assuming the testing has to be outdoors, so therefore it's not fully within the dwelling.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Mr. Mowery: We've seen like landscaping businesses be certified as Home Business I previously, and most of their business is still conducted outdoors, but they're utilizing the home as a home business.

Mr. Bernal: I thought there was no outside storage. There shall be no outside storage of goods, merchandise, and materials. So a landscaping business, if he's running from within the house, that's fine. If he's got materials outside, that would not be fine, not in compliance with the Home Business I.

Mr. Mowery: Sorry to piggyback there. I hope that clarifies them.

Mr. Panjshiri: Any additional questions from the board to County staff or the applicant? Go ahead, Ms. Petty.

Ms. Petty: For the staff, what would be the proper zoning for this type of activity?

Mr. Bernal: You mentioned the Crucible. This is one of those things where there was, at least a thought I had, you know, I had a determination letter from 2014 that required the Crucible to obtain a conditional use permit, even though they were zoned – where did I have it – M-1, Light Industrial, as part of the definition of an industrial... in this case, it was an industrial school which requires the approval of a conditional use permit. And this was a use that was listed was detonation of explosive outdoors as a simulation of IEDs. So my assumption is basically so if we made them go through that process and as an M-1, going through the A-1, which is more residential/agricultural use, it would be more impacted.

Ms. Petty: And the reason that this wouldn't be considered simply a Home Business I is that things are stored outside?

Mr. Bernal: They're not storing their... they're exploding outside.

Ms. Petty: Okay.

Mr. Bernal: They're detonating those things outside.

Ms. Petty: Okay, does that take it out of Home Business I?

Mr. Mowery: James, do you have the Home Business I definition... *inaudible*?

Mr. Staranowicz: The definition for a Home Business I is: An occupation, profession, business, trade, e-commerce, or handicraft, carried on by the occupant of a single dwell... single-family dwelling as an accessory use, which meets the following standards:

- (1) There shall be no employees other than family members who reside in the principal residence.
- (2) There shall be no substantial increase in vehicular trip generation by the Home Business I beyond that normally associated with the principal residential use.
- (3) Customer visits may occur:
 - a. By appointment only and shall be scheduled in a manner which does not permit customers to wait for their appointments;
 - b. Up to six (6) days per week between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. EST Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. EST Saturday, and 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. EST Sunday; and
 - c. No more than five (5) total customer visits are permitted per day.

For the purposes of this definition, one customer visit is defined as the arrival at the Home Business I of a motor vehicle containing up to six (6) passengers.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

(4) The Home Business I must provide sufficient off-street parking for customers' vehicles in addition to the minimum requirements for the principle residential use.

(5) The Home Business I may permit the parking of one vehicle associated with the Home Business I, which is less than thirteen thousand (13,000) pounds and parked off-street. Fleet parking shall not be permitted.

(6) The Home Business I shall not occupy an area greater than twenty-five (25) percent of the finished floor area of the principal residence.

(7) There shall be no outdoor storage of goods, merchandise or materials associated with the Home Business I.

(8) The Home Business I shall not engage in retail or wholesale sale of goods or merchandise to customers directly on the premises. However, direct sales equal to the number of permitted customer visits per day shall not be considered retail sales.

(9) The Home Business I shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Ms. Petty: So I didn't hear anything that excludes this business from being a Home Business I.

Mr. Bernal: I understand. Again, we're just going with the explosive of self detonation on the outside, outdoors. And again, for our practice of what we do for home businesses, generally they are office work conducted within the dwelling.

Mr. Mowery: Is there a risk to us if we were to approve this as a Home Business I that we would be opening the flood gates for other people to do more extensive explosive testing? What is that risk that it would look like?

Mr. Bernal: That I couldn't tell you, but you said you'd set a precedence.

Mr. Mowery: Would, would our noise ordinance typically come into play for, for that type of thing?

Mr. Bernal: I would tend to think so, because there are limitations, you know, residential areas, agricultural areas, as opposed to decibels being different in the industrial areas.

Mr. Mowery: Okay.

Mr. Panjshiri: I do have a question. What was your determination... what was the request by the applicant for your determination? What use was their specific request?

Mr. Staranowicz: Their request was for a, was a request for use of explosive, explosives on the property.

Mr. Panjshiri: And that specific use is not listed for A-1, by-right, conditional use permit, and/or special exception?

Mr. Bernal: Per the ordinance, no sir. It's nowhere in the ordinance.

Mr. Panjshiri: Okay, thank you. Are there any other questions?

Ms. Petty: It's not in the ordinance at all, either allowed or disallowed.

Mr. Bernal: Correct.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Ms. Petty: Not addressed at all.

Mr. Bernal: But the way the ordinance is reading is that only those uses that are listed within that, in the table, are the ones that are permitted. If they're not permitted, they have the option of going to the, getting the conditional use permit, excuse me, from the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Petty: Okay.

Mr. Panjshiri: And then, just to clarify with that, can you read that Section 28-37, the nonlisted uses?

Mr. Bernal: 28-37. - Nonlisted uses. If a use is not specifically permitted anywhere in Table 3.1, an application may be made by a property owner to the administrator for such use as a conditional use pursuant to section 28-185.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you. I will now close the public hearing and bring this matter back to the board for discussion and deliberation. Are there... is there any discussion by the board? Mr. Mowery.

Mr. Mowery: Thank you. So I think that if the applicants had, had come to the Zoning Administrator and said, we'd like to sell dream catchers at our property, is this a permitted use, their response would not be that well, it's not listed on the form. I think that they would, they would result in finding that this is just a home business. And I think that that exact same thing applies to this case. I think that the fact that there are explosives involved can seem alarming, but the amount that they're actually using appears to be very minuscule and appears to have impacts far less than, than other things that we would typically see used on, on A-1 properties. So in my opinion, I don't see that this is anything other than a home business, and I, I would think that it should be considered a listed use as a Home Business I. And I think that we should all go ahead and make the motion that we reverse the Zoning Administrator's decision and grant this as a approved use under Home Business I.

Mr. Panjshiri: Is there a second?

Mr. Blaisdell: I'd like... I support this, this business, and I think that the work that they do is good. I think they're 100% safe, a lot safer than all your neighbors' shooting and having their own sort of fun. This is pretty serious business, and I think they take it seriously. I'd like for them to be able to move forward with this so they could go on and test, but I just have some hesitations about whether we're the vehicle to do that and whether we have the authority to move that ahead. It's like I said, I think it's great with everything that you do, but just on the legal side of things, from the kinds of things we can roll on and we can't, I just don't think it's in our scope of authority.

Mr. Mowery: So, so I think what, what I'm proposing is that what we're able to do as a board is that we can say whether the zoning determination was accurate when it said that what, what they are attempting to do on their property does not fall within the uses permitted by-right, this giant list here of different things that they could do.

Mr. Blaisdell: Right.

Mr. Mowery: The Zoning Administrator said nowhere on here does it say explosive testing, therefore it's not a listed use. What I'm proposing is that we reverse that decision and acknowledge that this is actually a listed use under Home Business I, because as we read through the criteria for Home Business I, it met all of those qualifications. It doesn't, it doesn't violate anything there and this, this should be something that is

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

allowed by-right on this property, as long as it's following the other County Ordinances that are in place, such as the Sound Ordinance.

Mr. Blaisdell: I understand, I see where you're coming from. But the Zoning Administrator, he kind of said that they are what they are, and we can't add to them and we can't take away from them. That's, that goes to the Board of Supervisors for determination for that. Is that correct?

Mr. Bernal: That's what our, our thinking is, yes sir.

Mr. Mowery: But Home Business I is already a listed use. We wouldn't need to modify anything.

Mr. Blaisdell: Under this?

Mr. Mowery: Under, yeah, under uses permitted by-right, Home Business I.

Mr. Blaisdell: Okay. I see where you're trying to stretch it, but...

Mr. Mowery: I don't think it's a stretch.

Mr. Blaisdell: I mean, I can go along with that to a point, but I'm just worried about where we stand with this. Like I said, I support it. I'd like for them to move ahead in any way possible. I just wanted to be on the right step and not something that we finangled to try and say, well, that kind of falls under this, or it kind of falls under that. You know what I mean? It should be set and clear.

Mr. Mowery: There absolutely should be safeguards in place from, you know, doing large scale explosive testing on a property. But...

Mr. Blaisdell: Yeah, I'm sure I've let off bigger bombs at my farm than they're going to test in their little sand. It doesn't bother me with that sort of aspect of it. I'm just trying to make sure it's legit, legal, we have the authority to say yes, no. And right now, from what he's been saying, I don't know if we have that. Like I said, I support it. I just wanted to go on the right... *inaudible*.

Mr. Mowery: Juan, are you able to articulate in any way that their business violates a Home Business I?

Mr. Bernal: No, I agree. I would say it runs with the Home Business I criteria, and it would be good to be, I mean, my interpretation, my thinking, is that you would uphold the determination letter to say it was correct that, per the request, it is not a use permitted. However, they can say, okay, it's not permitted. But as a home business, can we qualify as that? And they would have to apply for a home business.

Mr. Mowery: I see. So, so...

Mr. Blaisdell: Would you still have to have a CUP or a conditional use permit under a home business for that application?

Mr. Bernal: Not if we... the criteria, putting in the criteria that we've described.

Mr. Blaisdell: Okay.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Mr. Bernal: And everything's fitting in the confines of what a Home Business is, which was never presented to us that way, nor did we even think of it that way. First, first thought and only thought was detonation of explosives.

Mr. Mowery: So in your mind, the path forward here would be for us to actually affirm your decision that is a non-listed use and have them apply for a Home Business I, not under a CUP, but just under a by-right.

Mr. Bernal: I mean, if they meet the criteria for HOC, I mean, for home occupation, so, I mean, and you all bring up great points that it's hard to argue that point. The other part is that, yes, they would have to be in compliance with all state and federal requirements which they have the support of the Fire Marshal, which, I mean, they're good, that shows they're in compliance.

Mr. Mowery: And what additional financial burdens would that place on them to apply for the Home Business I?

Mr. Staranowicz: It would be the cost of a permit, which is approximately \$150 or so.

Mr. Panjshiri: And so that's where my deliberation was kind of going to go. In respect to the appeal, the appeal is, is on the basis of the use of explosives, use of explosives on the property, or detonation of explosives. That is not listed. And so my thinking was the same way; affirm it. But if they do meet those criteria for Home Business I, our, affirming of our Zoning Administrator's determination would not hinder them from conducting their business. They would just, as mentioned, need to have that by-right permit. So that was going to be my contribution, that regardless if we do as we've kind of gone through and we went through the list, they have met other things. So I think the, the premise behind what the application, or the appeal of the decision was, again, the request was for the, for use of explosives. It wasn't for a determination on if they met standards of a Home Business I or home occupation on A-1, Agriculture. I think that would have been a different conversation where we would have that, are we determining if their use is Home Business I or home occupation, where right now we're just dealing with is that specific use listed.

Mr. Mowery: Yeah, that, that actually makes sense. I think that's a valid argument, and we shouldn't supersede the Administrator's process in the Home Business I part. So I'll substitute my motion with a motion that we affirm the Zoning Administrator's decision that this is a non-listed use, with the understanding that the applicant would be eligible to apply for a Home Business I.

Mr. Blaisdell: Are you making that a motion?

Mr. Mowery: That is a motion.

Mr. Panjshiri: Motion. Is there a second?

Mr. Underwood: I have a question for staff, if possible.

Mr. Pamjshiri: Oh, sorry, go ahead, hit that question.

Mr. Underwood: What is the limitation on our ability to make a further determination that the, it would fall under a Home Business I? What's the appropriateness or limitation on our ability to bundle that in with our determination this evening?

***Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025***

Mr. Staranowicz: If I'm understanding the motion correctly, that's what you're doing. You're already doing that.

Mr. Underwood: I'm not sure that it was explicit. I think we were just... *inaudible*.

Mr. Mowery: Yeah, I intended to defer that decision back to you all in order to ensure that it met the criteria that we've discussed. But not, not for the board to supercede... *inaudible, being talked over*.

Mr. Staranowicz: Under this criteria, it does meet the criteria of a Home Business I. They definitely meet that criteria. They would have to apply for the application, submit an application for a Home Business I. That would include a copy of your plat showing the location of, if you're going to have any off-street parking at all; it's going to need a diagram of the house showing like your office area, so that we know where your office area is. The building department will come out and confirm some of, some of that on an inspection. And I may have misquoted the price; it may be a little bit more than the \$150 I said. It may be closer to two or \$300 but, you know, I just want to make sure that, because they're... I forgot that the building department's also going to look at it, and they're going to actually look at, come out and take a, do an inspection of the house for the office. And that's pretty much it. It's usually done within a few weeks. It's not a long process. So we can get those turned around really quickly for you, and I could even see if we can't get a little bit of a rush put on that for you in that case. In the meantime, we're... while your application is going through, you'll still be able to operate without any issues.

Mr. Underwood: Thank you. I think my intent would be to ensure that they wouldn't end up back before us with an additional \$2,000 fee.

Mr. Staranowicz: No, they wouldn't, not at this point, since the Home Business I is a by-right use in the A-1 zoning district.

Mr. Underwood: Excellent. Thank you.

Mr. Panjshiri: So, motion is to affirm the Zoning Administrator's determination in their January 29th letter to the applicant with the hopes of them applying for that Home Business I permit so that they can still conduct their business. Is there a second on that motion?

Mr. Underwood: I will second that.

Mr. Panjshiri: All right, we have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Speaker from the audience: *Inaudible, not at microphone*.

Mr. Staranowicz: Excuse me, sir, sir? Sir? Can you please come up to the podium and state your name and address?

Mr. Mansberger: Hey, good evening. And I'm sorry, I had a family emergency at the house that caused me to be late. And so I was a little hesitant coming earlier because I wasn't sure it was the same as the lady board member there, what the request was even being for, what was it being approved for. My question is, I wish the board would consider, also consider that based on their guidance, they've run down a process where they've applied for an application, appealed that application, and now you're telling them to go to another application. And there should be some money considerations associated and time considerations

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

associated with that process that should be reimbursed to them or not charged to them. That's my question. Sam Mansberger, I'm sorry.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you.

Mr. Mansberger: Thank you.

Mr. Panjshiri: So any discussion on the motion?

Mr. Mowery: Juan, I know, I know we can't circumvent the County's process. You mentioned the, the building department have to come out, but do we have any authority to grant a waiver for the fee?

Mr. Staranowicz: I'm unsure of that at this point. I'd have to check into that, see what we could do.

Mr. Bernal: One of the things... I mean, one of the things that I do know is that once the fees are thrown out there because of advertising, because that's one of the things we say, if it has been advertised, we cannot return the fees. If it hasn't been advertised, then we can work... we... well, I'm speaking from Prince William County, we refund partial of the fees. Once it gets to a certain degree, we don't, we can't refund.

Mr. Mowery: Okay. This, this particular case seems like a, maybe a special exception, considering the, it could have been, I think, rerouted through a, through a different, more practical way from the beginning, and now we're essentially telling them what you've, what you've asked for is not what you need to be asking for so go pay this other money to go ask for something different. Mr. Chair, is it, is it feasible for us to include in our motion a waiver for the fees, if, if possible, and allow staff to follow up on the practicality of that? And if it is capable of being done, have it done, otherwise it would be nulled out.

Mr. Panjshiri: So you would like to amend your motion.

Mr. Mowery: That's right.

Mr. Panjshiri: Okay.

Mr. Mowery: I'll amend the motion to affirm the Administrator's decision that is a non-listed use under the hopes that the applicant can submit a Home Business I application, and further, would seek to waive the application fee for that Home Business I application, if the Zoning Administrator's office is capable of doing so under the board's authority.

Ms. Petty: Just in this case.

Mr. Mowery: Just in this case.

Mr. Panjshiri: Do we still go with our second? Do you still support that?

Mr. Underwood: Unfortunately I wouldn't be able to. While I feel that that's the right thing to do, I don't think it's appropriate to include in our motion, considering that we are a semi-judicial body. And that I think it's appropriate to express the sentiment, but I wouldn't support it in a motion form.

Mr. Blaisdell: Yeah, I feel that way, too. We can't dictate fees and things like that. We're just here to interpret code to the best of our ability.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Mr. Panjshiri: So any second to this new motion, to the substitute motion?

Mr. Mowery: Okay, that fails. We'll revert back to the original motion.

Mr. Panjshiri: Back to the original motion of affirming the Zoning Administrator's determination with the hopes that the applicant will apply for the Home Business I permit to the Department of Zoning. And we have a second on that. I, again, just wanted to express that I don't have any issues with the proposed use or anything like that. Just specifically following with this, what we're doing here is that we are that judicial, just reviewing the facts of the case, and after reviewing the facts, I do think that the Zoning Administrator made the correct determination in response to the request by the applicant. Any more discussion, deliberation?

Mr. Underwood: Just to add on that we are limited in what we're able to do, and so we're limited to the request that's before us. So unfortunately, that is where we are left. But I do hope that you're able to work through the process, and I know we have excellent and qualified staff that will be able to help you get to the end goal.

Mr. Panjshiri: All those in favor say aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Panjshiri: All those against. All right. The motion carries 5-0. So thank you, and you will be receiving a follow-up letter from the Department of Planning and Zoning regarding the BZA's disposition of your case. All right, on to, we will move on to the next item, which is Unfinished Business, which it looks like we have no Unfinished Business, so we'll move on to the Report by the Zoning Administrator.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

NONE

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Mr. Bernal: At the moment, I have nothing. I know we don't have a case so far for April. We'll figure that one out Monday. I do have a request for a variance that's coming forward for a fence, but that applicant hasn't come forward yet to do the pre-application as of yet.

Mr. Panjshiri: Thank you. And we don't have any of the minutes from...? Okay. And then there's no Other Business. Anything else? We're good?

Mr. Mowery: Our meeting minutes from the last meeting, are we going to see those at the next meeting?

Mr. Panjshiri: Okay, cool.

Mr. Blaisdell: I've just got one extra thing. I was just wondering. I know we haven't had a Secretary for a little while, but I was wondering if we could get an email when the cases are submitted to the newspaper, like a copy of that. I know when I first started, we used to get an email that let us know that, hey, this is in the paper, an upcoming thing. Because I don't get the Free Lance-Star. It's gotten too expensive for me, so I just kind of, it's kind of hard to find out otherwise. The last couple cases I found out by somebody, just random citizen told me there's a case coming up. And I'm like, okay, great.

Board of Zoning Appeals Minutes
March 19, 2025

Mr. Panjshiri: Okay, anything else? Are we good? All right. Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

NONE

OTHER BUSINESS

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Mowery: So moved.

Mr. Panjshiri: All right.

Mr. Blaisdell: Second.

Mr. Panjshiri: All those in favor say aye.

All members: Aye.

Mr. Panjshiri: Motion carries 5-0. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attendance and input tonight.

Mr. Blaisdell: Good job, Mr. Chairman.

At 8:10 PM, Vice Chairman Pamjshiri adjourned the March 19, 2025, Stafford County Board of Zoning Appeals meeting.