



Nelson County Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
October 22, 2025



Present: Commissioners Mike Harman, William Smith, and Phil Proulx; Board of Supervisors Representative Jessica Ligon.

Absent: Richard Averitt and Gary Scott.

Staff Present: Dylan Bishop, Planning Director.

Call to Order: Chair Harman called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in the General District Courtroom, County Courthouse, Lovingston.

Public Hearings

- SUP #250278 – Request for Extension of SUP #240239 (Dwelling Units in B-1 Business at 622 Front Street)

Ms. Bishop reported that there were three special use permit (SUP) public hearings scheduled for the evening. She noted that the second hearing concerned a Campground and A1 Agriculture application, and the applicant was unable to attend because he was on a job six hours away, but the public hearing should proceed since it was advertised, and she expected the Planning Commission to defer the vote to their November meeting. She stated that the Conference Center at the Monroe Institute was also on the agenda, but the Central and South District Planning Commission representatives were not present, so she expected them to defer vote on that application as well. Ms. Bishop said the public hearing would still be held to gather feedback, after which the Commission could discuss or defer the matter.

Ms. Bishop stated that the first hearing was a request for an extension of an existing approved SUP for dwelling units on properties in B1 Business at 622 Front Street in Lovingston. Ms. Bishop said that Jesse and Alexandra Lopez-Lowe completed the renovation of the structure to be used for mixed use, including two long-term residential rental units and commercial space on the lower level. She stated that the property previously held a SUP for a dwelling, which expired after more than two years of vacancy, and the Board approved SUP 240-239 on November 14, 2024, with the condition that the dwelling units could not be used as short-term rentals. Ms. Bishop said the owners were requesting an extension of their approved SUP for an additional year because the units were not yet occupied. She noted that with a SUP, the use had to be established within 12 months of approval or it would become void.

Ms. Bishop stated that the zoning was mixed use in nature, and B1 Business and R2 Residential were exempt from off-street parking requirements. She said Lovingston was designated as a community hub by the 2042 future land use map, with a focus on regional scale development, redevelopment, and infill to protect the rural landscape, ensure more efficient and effective provision of community services, bolster economic development, and improve quality of life. She stated that the primary land use types included all types of housing, mixed use units, commercial, professional, and offices.

Ms. Bishop stated that with a new zoning ordinance forthcoming that would allow for mixed use in Lovingston, staff recommends approval of the extension request. Ms. Bishop said the Planning Commission should recommend approval with a one-year extension for dwelling units in B1 Business with the existing condition to the Board of Supervisors. She offered to answer questions and said the applicant was also present.

Mr. Harman opened the public hearing, and Ms. Bishop read the speaker guidelines.

There being no speakers, he closed the public hearing.

Ms. Proulx made a motion to recommend SUP #250278 to the Board of Supervisors with the existing condition. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Yes:

Phil Proulx

Mike Harman

William Smith

- SUP #250263 – Campground in A-1 Agriculture (Morse Lane, Arrington)

Ms. Bishop reported that this request is for a campground use on properties zoned A1 Agriculture on Morse Lane in Arrington in the South District. She said there are two parcels—one about 36 acres and the other 77.5 acres, owned by Tim Masters, and is currently vacant. Ms. Bishop said the owner is proposing to develop a large campground with a mixture of RV slips and tent sites. She stated that the site plan submitted shows a minimum of 60 sites on one parcel and an additional 25 on the other, and an engineering site plan would be required if this is approved.

Ms. Bishop stated that the area is residential and rural in nature, and the zoning is A1 Agriculture. She said there is some floodplain on the property but no development is proposed there, and the property adjoins the Nelson County Transfer Station. She said the site is accessed by an existing entrance on Morse Lane, and existing road scars access the remainder of the properties; she has not received comments from VDOT. She noted that there are no utilities proposed at the individual sites.

Ms. Bishop stated that the request currently proposes a dumping station located at the entrance of the property. She said the applicant would be required to comply with Health Department regulations, and she had not yet received comments back from them. She noted that EMS wants to see the dimensions on the turnaround circle so they can ensure fire apparatus can navigate it. Ms. Bishop said if land disturbance exceeds certain thresholds, it would require an erosion plan or storm water plan.

Ms. Bishop stated that there are some recommended conditions listed in the staff report. She said the applicant had also provided expanded information about his proposal, and when she spoke to him earlier that afternoon, he landed on a number of 110 sites between the two properties. Ms. Bishop said she told him she would come to him with any concerns or questions that arose from the public hearing or the Planning Commission, and they would clarify some of this information when they came back next month.

Mr. Harman asked if the 110 number was slips or campsites.

Ms. Bishop responded that it is a mix of RV slips and tent sites, but the applicant did not provide specific numbers on each; since it was advertised, they would like for the Commission to hold the public hearing.

Mr. Harman opened the public hearing.

Mr. David Morse stated that he lives on the parcel that adjoins this property, and he would like to see a map of it so he can make more informed comments. Mr. Morse stated that they already have trash disposal on his road and there's too much noise already with that. He said there is a lot of activity on the road, and he is concerned about resident safety.

There being no further comment, Mr. Harman closed the public hearing.

Ms. Proulx asked what deferral did to their timeframe and whether an applicant deferral was possible.

Ms. Bishop responded that it's acceptable to go ahead and defer, and the Planning Commission has a timeframe in which they need to act on it, so they are still well within that timeframe. She said that can be discussed with the applicant at the next meeting, or prior to the next meeting, if there's going to be another deferral. She added that staff would have the applicant put in the request and work with them on an mutually agreeable timeline.

Mr. Smith asked if they can also extend the public hearing to get more input from the neighborhood.

Ms. Bishop responded that they could schedule another public hearing if that's the pleasure of the Planning Commission, and she would just make a motion to defer with another scheduled public hearing. She clarified that if the applicant cannot be present, he can request further deferral.

Mr. Smith made a motion to defer SUP #250263, with another public hearing, to the November 19, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Proulx seconded the motion.

Yes:

Phil Proulx

Mike Harman

William Smith

- SUP #250260 – Conference Center in A-1 Agriculture (The Monroe Institute, Faber)

Ms. Bishop stated that the application is for a conference center at the Monroe Institute, 365 Roberts Mountain Road, Faber, in the South District. She said the project covers six parcels totaling 44.44 acres, and the applicant is Shimp Engineering. Ms. Bishop stated that the property is home to the Monroe Institute, founded in 1971, and because it was established before the adoption of the zoning ordinance, it is considered a legal non-conforming use. She noted that any expansion of a non-conforming use requires compliance with the current zoning ordinance, which is the reason for the SUP request.

She said the Monroe Institute is proposing to expand its operations and develop a conference center that will include residential quarters, offices, a cafeteria, a common services area, a gift shop, meeting rooms, a studio, and storage space. Ms. Bishop stated that a project narrative and photo renderings of the proposed facility are included in the packet. She said that the applicant held a community meeting with neighbors, and the applicant will summarize those discussions. Ms. Bishop noted that a conference center is defined as a facility for hosting public or private events, including but not limited to weddings, receptions, social events, parties, workshops, and conferences, and is used as a venue for social, cultural, recreational, or educational activities that may include lodging accommodations.

Ms. Bishop reported that the area is rural, residential, and institutional in nature, and all zoning in the vicinity is A1 agriculture. She said there is some floodplain on the parcels containing the existing water

system, although no development is proposed in those areas. Ms. Bishop stated that the property is accessed by an existing entrance on Roberts Mountain Road, and some paving improvements and at least 41 additional parking spaces are proposed. She said the property is served by existing utilities, and the two parcels containing the water system are included as part of this application should any improvements be required; no structures or other development are proposed on those lots. She said land disturbance is anticipated at about 5.5 acres, which requires approval of an erosion and sediment control plan and a stormwater management plan by DEQ. She added that EMS wants to see the dimensions of the turnaround circle to ensure fire apparatus can navigate.

Ms. Bishop reported that in the comprehensive plan, this property is located in a rural area on the 2042 future land use map. She said the core concept is to ensure the protection of the county's rural landscape and economy by maintaining open space, scenic views, and agricultural uses with compatible low-density residential uses. Ms. Bishop stated that primary land use types include institutional uses, farms, agriculture, forestry, agritourism, parks, recreation, and trails. She said alterations and retrofits to existing low-density single-family areas are appropriate and encouraged.

Ms. Bishop stated that with the packet that did not go out originally and was received today, there is a letter from the applicant regarding the water supply. She said there are some recommended conditions submitted by the applicant as well as all the public comments received by email. Ms. Bishop stated that Commissioners received some emails, and all the ones sent just to her are also included in the packet.

Ms. Bishop stated that for SUPs, the review criteria shall not change the character and established pattern of development of the area or the community, shall be in harmony with uses permitted by right in the zoning district, and not adversely affect the use of neighboring property. She said the property must be adequately served by essential public or private services and shall not result in the destruction, loss, or damage of any feature of significant ecological, scenic, or historic importance. Ms. Bishop referenced a map showing the six parcels outlined in green and the development area proposed for the conference center, as well as the location of the three existing buildings and the water system.

Mr. Justin Shimp of Shimp Engineering addressed the Commission and said he was pleased to represent the Monroe Institute, a staple of Nelson County for over 50 years. He said Allyn Evans is the director of the Institute and is present at this meeting.

Mr. Shimp said that a community meeting with the neighbors was held at the Rockfish Valley Community Center on October 4th to inform them of the ongoing developments. He stated that some individuals present at the current meeting had also attended the previous one, where they learned many of these same details. Mr. Shimp explained that the site location was clearly indicated, with the colored parcels representing those subject to the SUP. He said that three buildings directly below the Roberts Mountain Road label represented the current Monroe Institute facilities, which had existed before the zoning ordinance and were therefore permitted to continue, though expansion required a SUP.

Mr. Shimp stated that the proposal involved constructing a 33,000-square-foot multi-use center containing residential quarters, offices, and gift shops. He said that access to the site would remain off Rocky Road or Roberts Mountain Road. Mr. Shimp clarified that the request was for an expansion to a total of 90 guests, up from the current operation of around 28, emphasizing that the expansion was not for 90 new guests but for a total capacity of 90.

Mr. Shimp reported that the Monroe Institute was founded in 1971 by Bob Monroe, who acquired the current property in 1976, including adjacent land in a new subdivision totaling approximately 726 acres. He stated that Monroe was a pioneer in the community, leading to the establishment of similar

institutions and contributing to the character of Nelson County. Mr. Shimp said these institutions attracted visitors, allowing them to engage with nature in ways fundamental to the community and providing space for operational expansion.

Mr. Shimp stated that all current program slots were booked about a year in advance, resulting in limited access for interested attendees. He described the rendered site plan, noting that three buildings on the right were existing structures and a new three-wing building was proposed for expansion. Mr. Shimp said the existing parking lot would be extended to a new access circle serving the new facility. He presented an additional rendered view from the neighborhood, showing the three existing buildings to the left and offering a face-on perspective of the proposed expansion.

Mr. Shimp explained that the building was designed to fit into the topography, appearing as a one-story structure from the road to minimize its roadside impact, while the rear would be two stories to provide the necessary square footage for operations. He said this approach avoided a tall roadside building and reduced the development's scale from the street. Mr. Shimp stated that landscaping and site planning would be integrated into the project's design. He said views from Roberts Mountain Road showed the one-level frontage, while rear views depicted the two-story elevation created by the sloping terrain, which also allowed for integration of trails to connect guests to lakes without requiring road use.

Mr. Shimp stated that questions regarding groundwater and traffic were common and would be addressed. He said that Dr. Nick Evans, a highly experienced geologist with a long career in central Virginia, was engaged to evaluate the water impact. Mr. Shimp relayed Dr. Evans's opinion that increased water usage was very unlikely to affect the water body, explaining that the property's well was adjacent to the Rockfish River and primarily drew water from the river, which provided ample supply. He stated that neighboring wells with lesser supply were up gradient and not hydrologically connected, according to Dr. Evans's report, which was available for review.

Mr. Shimp said that in 23 years of operation, there were no reports of the Monroe Institute's well experiencing supply problems or affecting other wells. He explained that the facility's water usage was non-consumptive, as water drawn from the well was returned to the ground through a drain field, unlike agricultural or industrial uses which consume water. Mr. Shimp cited a USGS statistic indicating that agriculture accounted for 90% of consumed water in the United States, while public water supplies used 70% of the total. He stated that the current permit allowed 10,000 gallons per day, with projected expansion usage estimated below 15,000 gallons per day, requiring only slight adjustment through the health department as a site plan matter.

Mr. Shimp clarified that the property had a 10,000-gallon domestic water tank and that the new building would require a 120,000-gallon fire suppression tank. He emphasized that the fire tank would be filled once and used only in emergencies, serving as a community resource for fire response. Mr. Shimp stated that screening, such as planting trees, would be applied to the tank, ensuring it was not prominently visible, and fire access would be maintained.

Mr. Shimp said that the Monroe Institute was responsible for maintaining a specific section of road, currently 15 to 16 feet wide, and proposed widening it to at least 18 feet and repaving it as part of the project, benefiting the entire neighborhood. He stated that entrance improvements would also be made to enhance visibility when entering from Roberts Mountain Road onto Rocky Road, in compliance with VDOT standards. Mr. Shimp acknowledged a modest increase in traffic due to the expansion, justifying the road improvements.

Mr. Shimp compared anticipated traffic, estimating 523 trips per day for a hypothetical 49-lot subdivision, while current Monroe Institute traffic was lower due to shuttle use and structured programs. He stated that with expansion, traffic would rise to 72 trips per day, representing about 12% of overall traffic, up from 4.2%, but only on arrival and departure days. He reiterated the intent to improve the road and sight lines to accommodate this increase.

Mr. Shimp listed proposed conditions based on neighborhood feedback, including road improvements subject to neighborhood approval, implementation of full cutoff, dark sky light fixtures, required screening for the fire tank, rainwater capture for groundwater recharge, and limiting the structure to one story facing Roberts Mountain Road. He thanked the Commission and offered to answer questions.

Ms. Proulx asked whether they would be drilling another well or making the current one deeper since this would increase water consumption.

Mr. Shimp responded that the current well will probably have capacity, but they would likely drill a second well next to the current one or in the same vicinity as a redundancy.

Dr. Ligon asked if the applicant would be willing to do a 48-hour drawdown test and measuring other people's wells during that, if water is a concern.

Mr. Shimp said that Dr. Evans is coming to the next meeting, so he could speak to that but would likely say that a second well is unnecessary.

Mr. Harman opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ronald Blake, 86 Rainbow Ridge Road, Faber, addressed the Commission and said he was speaking on behalf of multiple property owners, a list that he would furnish upon conclusion of his comments. He said this application is severely lacking in certain areas.

Mr. Blake stated that this is a major commercial development of 59,000 square feet in total, which will adversely impact adjacent property values and irretrievably change the character of this small residential community forever. He said the proposal equates to an almost 400% increase in the subdivision's population—effectively doubling the population of the subdivision.

He said with up to 90 course attendees, half the population of the area is not vested in the community.

Mr. Blake stated that an additional 90 people, including the 22 already there and the additional attendees, comes to 90, which equates to building 30 to 40 new homes in the subdivision with this increase in the number of people. He said the permit request is assigned minor status, but in just looking at these drawings and plans, this is major.

Mr. Blake stated that the application seems to fail to meet Nelson County's five planning and zoning strategic goals, which include protecting and strengthening the County's special sense of place and high quality of life. Mr. Blake said a corporate building such as this is better suited to a business park in Fairfax or Manassas, and it is not the sense of place expected here. Mr. Blake emphasized that the proposal has limited or no benefit to the local economy, and the attendees are catered for and housed in the planned hotel and conference facilities; they do not spend money at the local wineries, breweries, or restaurants while attending the course at Monroe.

Mr. Blake stated that the third strategic planning goal is to protect and enhance property land. He said people do not choose to pay a lot of money to buy a house next to a hotel or car park. He stated that the fourth goal is to improve the public health, safety, convenience, and welfare of the citizens and facilitate the creation of a convenient, attractive, and harmonious community. Mr. Blake said this facility is

specifically not for local citizens. He stated that the users fly in or drive in, stay a week, and leave before the next cohort arrives. Mr. Blake said the fifth goal is to help Nelson County community successfully pursue a more prosperous and sustainable future. He stated that the proposed facility does not help Nelson County residents pursue those goals unless they pay over \$2,000 for a course there.

Mr. Blake stated that this is an experiment in expansion never before attempted by the Institute, and it consequently contains more inherent risk than a conventional business with a track record successfully managing expansion. He said if this is approved and proceeds to be built and ultimately fails due to over-optimism and financial overreach on the part of the Monroe Board, they can walk away from it—but the families who live here cannot.

Mr. Blake said the information presented so far has been inadequate and incomplete, though a thorough job has been done insofar as it can be and in some cases misleading, particularly regarding road development and changes. He noted that the Monroe Institute does not own the roads that are highlighted as potentially being changed. Mr. Blake said by deed of government in 2008, the Monroe Institute gave ownership of the roads to all the residents and at that time the homeowners association was created. He stated that only by a vote of 75% majority of homeowners can any road improvement, change, or otherwise be made—but that vote has not taken place.

Mr. Stephen Bickers, 122 Gasp Lane, Faber, said he has lived there 27 years and moved in with his father, who has owned the house for 35 years. Mr. Bickers said that when the Monroe Institute started, most of the people who lived there were part of the Monroe Institute; it is now very much the New Land subdivision, explaining that most of the current residents are new, with previous occupants having moved out and new houses established. He said that the area has not grown exponentially.

Mr. Bickers stated that he was the president of the New Land Property Owners Association for a period and strongly disagreed with the traffic estimates Mr. Shimp provided, explaining that part of the lots being counted are on Creekside Lane, which is not part of New Land proper and does not share the same entrance. He said those residents would never be affected by the traffic counts and Mr. Shimp did not know what Creekside was, resulting in an overestimation of the number of houses.

Mr. Bickers stated that many people either work from home or have children and do not frequently drive in and out, so he questioned whether anyone would ever observe 523 trips passing through the gate in either direction. He said that the Institute's impact is further misrepresented because the conversion of Lori and Bob Monroe's house at the top into part of the Institute requires transporting people all the way through the area. He stated that the roads are not up to quality and are barely wide enough in places for vehicles to pass, and they are already being overused—with improvements not planned for all the roads.

Mr. Bickers said that the Monroe Institute has not maintained its part of the property, and when he was on the board, he would bring up the issue of road maintenance with Angie, who was also on the board at the time and works for the Institute. He stated that every building is receiving new decks and guardrails, but the road maintenance is being neglected. He concluded by saying that, because of this, he is very hesitant to believe any of the Monroe Institute's claims, asserting that if one part is not true, the rest may not be true in terms of its impact on the community.

Mr. Heath Matysek-Snyder, 1124 Roberts Mountain Road, Faber, stated that he wanted to voice concerns and reservations about the Monroe Institute's SUP application #250260 and a subsequent expansion proposal. He stated that the first concern is the overall size, scale, and commercial aspect of the project. He said that at approximately 59,000 square feet, including the first level and walkout basement, the

building proposed is a large-scale commercial building that would be out of character with the other Monroe Institute buildings and with the houses of the New Land subdivision.

Mr. Matysek-Snyder stated that this large commercial structure will be built in a quiet rural subdivision on A1 agricultural zone property and will stand out in the landscape far more than the current Monroe Institute buildings, which are tucked away. He said this proposed expansion will negatively impact the visual character of the rural bucolic community by day and increase light pollution by night, although there were steps taken to address that. He stated that a primary concern is the potentially detrimental impact this large-scale commercial expansion will have on the New Land community's water supply.

Mr. Matysek-Snyder said the Monroe Institute's groundwater assessment for their proposal provided inadequate detailed information and evidence that this large commercial expansion will not have negative effects on residential wells in the New Land subdivision. He stated that in the past few years, several wells in the community have periodically run dry and the Monroe Institute's proposal fails to adequately assess the immediate and extended impact on the community's water supply. He said a more extensive groundwater assessment study by an independent entity is necessary.

Mr. Matysek-Snyder expressed concern regarding the lack of transparency related to the SUP application and the subsequent expansion proposal. He said that many New Land residents, himself included, were blindsided by this expansion proposal, the size and scale of the project, and the last-minute nature of how they were told about it. He said the informational meeting called by the Monroe Institute for New Land residents on October 5th was beneficial, but calling it just one week prior to the October 22nd Planning Commission meeting did not give residents of the New Land subdivision adequate time to gather relevant information and ask meaningful questions regarding this community-altering expansion proposal. He asked Commission members to consider postponing a vote on this SUP application.

Mr. Paul Devoursney, 105 Forest Lane, Faber, thanked the Commission and said he was here to address the water situation in this area. He said there are a lot of wells that are running dry, and there are properties that have four or five wells dug on them currently. He said they are talking about how this is not going to impact water usage or the water supply in the area—yet there have been no water studies done showing how much water is going into their well and how much water is coming out of their well. He suggested that an independent commission or person study and demonstrating waterflow. He emphasized that the applicant should answer a lot of questions about how much water they are actually using and how much water is available. He said they talk about returning water to the groundwater, but that is not really true; they are going to be returning water to the immediate area around the open roads.

Mr. Devoursney said they also talk about making it a one-story visible from the road. He stated that if you look at the picture, the first story is brown, followed by a roof that makes it technically a second-story building. He said if you are looking at it from the road, you will see brown and then above it, gray—two stories, not one. He stated they are talking about minimizing visual impact, but he does not see that.

Mr. Devoursney said the Monroe Institute is a fundamental part of the community. He stated he moved here four years ago with the understanding that the Monroe Institute was part of the community. He said he has had friends who attended the Monroe Institute, and at least one friend whose life was changed by the Monroe Institute for the positive. He said he has had no trouble with the traffic, and the people on the roads have been polite. He said the traffic study does not make sense to him, and there is no way that there are 500 people coming and going from there every day, or even every week.

Mr. Drew Perkins, 122 Gasp Lane and 116 Gasp Lane, said he has lived in the County for 35 years and did not know anything about the Institute when he moved here but was simply looking for a house he could afford in an area he liked.

Mr. Perkins stated that the New Land Property Owners Association (NLPOA) road maintenance agreement is divided up among all landowners, which the Monroe Institute is considered. He said that with owning two homes there and having two lots, he has two votes; Monroe has nine votes. He stated that what they're proposing in terms of the roads specifically cannot be done by their agreement—which was put in place in 2008 when they took ownership of the roads from the Monroe Family Trust.

Mr. Perkins said he was a Monroe lawyer who was in part responsible for drafting the document that we all adopted in 2008, and that document is very specific in terms of what the Monroe Institute's responsibility is in terms of maintaining the paved portion of the road. He emphasized that they haven't maintained that in at least 15 years, and it may have been longer than 15 years since they paved it—but they can't expand their paved footprint without 75% of the landowners approval based on the NLPOA document. He added that he doesn't think they have the votes to successfully be able to do what they want to do, and that would be to expand the roads and expand their paved footprint.

Mr. Perkins echoed his neighbors' concerns about water and traffic, and it was not uncommon for them to find four or five program participants walking on the road, which he did not mind. He emphasized that he respects what they're doing, but to bring that many more people into the community, they're not limited to just that section. He said he lives a mile past the institute off Roberts Mountain Road and has found people roaming in his yard and just looking through the neighborhood. He said while it was okay now, he did not personally want that many more people in the community on a weekly basis.

Ms. Shakti Pierce, 599 Remo Ridge Road, Faber, stated that she shared the concerns that she has heard and also understands the Monroe Institute's need to expand. She commented that Monroe has been central to the community and what founded it in the first place. Ms. Pierce said her family agrees that a lot of the concerns could be remedied if the proposal were scaled down—as this is a really big change, which means bigger impacts and bigger variables.

There being no further speakers, Mr. Harman closed the public hearing. He asked Mr. Shimp to readdress the Commission.

Dr. Ligon said Monroe Institute owns both sides of the road and asked if they had discussed a land grab from Barbara Bledsoe.

Mr. Shimp explained that the road itself is in its own parcel and is not owned by the adjacent landowners, but rather the property association. He said if the property owners vote against that, then they can't move forward with it—but he hoped they would accept that. It would be a condition that if the building could not open until those things (widening the road, repaving it) were completed.

Mr. Harman asked if it wouldn't impact the project if the road remained the size that it is now, or if there is a requirement that it must be 18 feet wide.

Mr. Shimp responded that there is no requirement that it be widened to that standard, as it is a private road and not a VDOT road.

Mr. Harman asked if he agreed that they have the legal right to not do that change.

Mr. Shimp responded that some things are maintenance and others are improvements, and their responsibility is to maintain—which is a tricky area to define. He said if they repave the road and widen it one foot, for example, the question is whether that's an improvement requiring a vote. He said in principle, they will put this forward and say they are willing to do it if the NLPOA is willing to accept it.

Mr. Smith asked about maintenance contributions.

Mr. Shimp responded that they already have responsibility to maintain that whole section Monroe is on, and there are many other maintenance contributions also; the agreement sort of already works that out. He said it is a matter in this case whether they want the improvements, which is where it gets into an area that has to be discussed in this agreement.

Ms. Proulx pointed out that they're asking for an SUP, and the County can put conditions on an SUP.

Mr. Smith said it's great they have offered to improve the road, but maintaining those improvements gets expensive over a period of time, so that's a consideration they need to look at.

Dr. Ligon asked if the intention with this expansion is to not be shuttling people to different buildings—that they are all going to be there.

Mr. Shimp explained that Robert's Mountain Retreat is another part of the facility that's at the very end of Robert's Mountain Road, which is similar to a non-conforming use and cannot be expanded without an SUP also. He said they are not asking for that and there's no expansion of that, so no further attendees will be going to Robert's Mountain Road; any added attendees are only at the site under consideration here.

Dr. Ligon said her inquiry was whether there would be less people going to the retreat because they're being housed down in the other area.

Mr. Shimp clarified that this is separate, and people can choose different programs, different spaces; hypothetically, if they weren't at full capacity all the time with one facility, people might choose to go there, but this SUP doesn't really affect that. He said the same number of people will have the right to go there as before.

Mr. Smith asked how many more employees they were anticipating.

Mr. Shimp responded that it would be five or six more.

Ms. Proulx commented that Monroe has facilities all over the world.

Monroe Institute Director Allyn Evans responded that they have an international presence but do not own any structures internationally.

Ms. Proulx commented that this is a huge increase.

Dr. Ligon said she still had questions on the water drawdown but realized the professional hydrologist was coming to the next meeting.

Ms. Proulx said she has not had the information for very long and would like to visit the site. She commented that they cannot address the business model, but there is also no control if they sell the business as to what type of convention center can go in.

Mr. Harman stated that it would also be helpful to have the full Commission present for this discussion and decision, as two were absent tonight.

Ms. Proulx commented that one of the issues is that the other two people won't have heard the public comment, but they could get the recording.

Ms. Bishop said she could also summarize the meeting for them, and her recommendation was not to have another public hearing on this item.

Ms. Proulx made a motion to defer action on SUP #250260 to the Commission's November 19, 2025 meeting. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Yes:

Phil Proulx

Mike Harman

William Smith

Board of Supervisors Report

Dr. Ligon stated that at the Board's last meeting, they received a report from the engineer for water exploration on the Larkin property, and he discussed pulling water from the creek and explained the process for a 48-hour drawdown test. She said they would have another session and discuss the report, then decide on direction.

Upcoming Scheduled Meetings

- November 19, 2025 (third Wednesday to accommodate Thanksgiving Holiday).

Ms. Proulx made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Smith seconded the motion.

Yes:

Phil Proulx

Mike Harman

William Smith

Respectfully submitted,



Dylan M. Bishop, CZA, CFM

Director of Planning & Zoning