



**BERRYVILLE AREA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
MEETING AGENDA
Wednesday, September 24, 2025, 1:00pm
Berryville – Clarke County Government Center A/B Meeting Room
101 Chalmers Court – Berryville, Virginia**

1. **Call to Order – Allen Kitselman, Chair**
2. **Approval of Agenda**
3. **Approval of Minutes – August 27, 2025 meeting**
4. **Resolution of Appreciation – Diane Harrison**
5. **Old Business**
 - A. **Berryville Area Plan Update**
 - (1) Discussion, Public water and sewer capacity for future growth
 - (2) Discussion, Scheduling additional meetings in November and December
6. **New Business – None scheduled**
7. **Other Business**
8. **Adjourn**

NEXT MEETING – Wednesday, October 22 (1:00PM)



Berryville Area Development Authority (BADA)
DRAFT MINUTES – Regular Meeting
 Wednesday, August 27, 2025 at 1:00PM
 Berryville-Clarke County Government Center
 A/B Meeting Room

ATTENDANCE:			
Allen Kitselman (Chair)	✓	John Hudson	✓
George L. Ohrstrom, II (Vice-Chair)	✓	Kathy Smart	✓
Diane Harrison	✓	David Weiss	✓

A meeting of the Berryville Area Development Authority (BADA) was held on Wednesday, August 27, 2025.

STAFF PRESENT: Terry Russell (Community Development Director – Berryville), Brandon Stidham (Director of Planning – County)

1. **Call to Order** – By Chair Kitselman at 1:01PM
2. **Approval of Agenda**

The Authority voted unanimously to approve the agenda as presented by Staff.

Motion to approve the agenda as presented by Staff			
Allen Kitselman	AYE	John Hudson	AYE (seconded)
George L. Ohrstrom, II	AYE	Kathy Smart	AYE
Diane Harrison	AYE (moved)	David Weiss	AYE

3. **Approval of Minutes**

- A. June 25, 2025 Meeting – Afternoon Session

The Authority voted unanimously to approve the minutes of the June 25, 2025 afternoon session as presented by Staff.

Motion to approve the June 25, 2025 afternoon session minutes as presented by Staff			
Allen Kitselman	AYE	John Hudson	AYE
George L. Ohrstrom, II	AYE (moved)	Kathy Smart	AYE
Diane Harrison	AYE (seconded)	David Weiss	AYE

- B. June 25, 2025 Meeting – Evening Session

The Authority voted 5-0-1 (Weiss abstained) to approve the minutes of the June 25, 2025 evening session as presented by Staff. Mr. Weiss abstained as he did not attend the evening session.

Motion to approve the June 25, 2025 evening session minutes as presented by Staff			
Allen Kitselman	AYE	John Hudson	AYE
George L. Ohrstrom, II	AYE (moved)	Kathy Smart	AYE (seconded)
Diane Harrison	AYE	David Weiss	ABSTAINED

Vice-Chair Ohrstrom asked when the developers of Hillson Grove are going to begin construction. Mr. Russell replied as soon as they can. He added that they need to build in the street first in order to construct the stormwater management facilities and were required to post bonds for that work. He also noted that the final plans are ready for the chair to sign on behalf of the Authority.

4. Old Business

A. Berryville Area Plan Update

Mr. Stidham said that today we will be reviewing the revised timeline for project completion that includes changes made by the Authority at the last meeting. He said the bulk of the work will be to continue discussion of the potential future growth areas.

Mr. Stidham reviewed the changes to the Work Plan and Draft Timeline for completion of the Berryville Area Plan update. Regarding the Work Plan, he noted that Keith Dalton is planning to attend to discuss utility capacity which is pertinent to discussion of the potential future growth areas. Regarding the timeline, he said the informal public workshop requested by the Authority at the last meeting has been added in which extends the timeline by a couple of months. He then reviewed the dates at the end of the Work Plan that are affected by this change. He said that the earliest possible date for plan adoption would be October 2026. Mr. Stidham asked if there were any questions or comments on the Work Plan or Draft Timeline. Mr. Hudson replied that it looks good, adding that we know something is likely to affect the timeline as we progress so we will just make further alterations and move on.

Mr. Stidham moved on to a discussion of the potential future growth areas and reviewed proposed changes to the text for the three areas. Regarding the Southern Potential Future Growth Area, he said that the substantive changes are based on the consensus that he believes the Authority reached at the last meeting on the southeastern collector road and development pattern. He noted the new reference to the collector road that would be included under the Southern Potential Future Growth Area description. He said that the County Transportation Plan description of the collector road project starting on page 26 of 27 would be incorporated into the Area Plan draft with the addition of points regarding the desired development approach on page 27 of 27. He said these include noting private sector construction of the road following Town and County agreement to create a new annexation area here, use of conditional zoning to encourage developers to proffer necessary right of way and improvements, development to begin with construction of the US 340 intersection and railroad crossing, and delaying final connection to Jack Enders Boulevard until required improvements and funding are identified to address traffic impacts on the existing Town street network.

Mr. Stidham asked if everyone is comfortable with inclusion of these points as they relate to the collector road project. Mr. Hudson said it is good that we are stating what needs to happen in order for the collector road to be connected to Jack Enders Boulevard. Chair Kitselman said that this negates any expansion of the business park unless these things come into play. Mr. Stidham replied that it depends on whether you want to ensure that the connection to US 340 is built. He said without these requirements, a developer can

develop all of their lots on the western side and never build the connection to US 340 and the railroad crossing. He added that this would be a big back-end expense. He also said that the only other way to complete the collector road would be to figure out how to get public money to do it. Mr. Russell asked why they would do this if the property was not already zoned. Mr. Stidham replied that we are presuming that someone will want to develop the balance of the area with the collector road as the centerpiece. He reiterated that you want to require development to come in from the US 340 side because they can refuse to construct this connection if you allow them to develop from the Jack Enders Boulevard side first. Mr. Russell said that you can get the road through a rezoning without requiring them to come in from Jack Enders Boulevard first but added that it would be better to have them start from the US 340 side. Chair Kitselman said that he agrees but is stating that he does not think the Business Park will be expanded at all. Mr. Stidham asked for clarification on Mr. Russell's point and asked if a developer has proffered to construct the collector road, why would we require them to build the US 340 intersection and railroad crossing first if they are proffering to complete the entire road. Mr. Russell replied that he may have misunderstood and thought Mr. Stidham was saying if they come in from Jack Enders Boulevard, they would not have to pay for the road. Mr. Russell also asked why the Business Park cannot be expanded if development is required to begin from US 340. Chair Kitselman replied that he does not see a scenario where the collector road does not eventually connect to Jack Enders Boulevard. Mr. Russell said that it could be a long time before the road is connected if it starts from the US 340 side. Mr. Stidham noted that the members agreed to include language to study the impacts of the collector road on the existing Town street network to identify necessary improvements, the cost to construct the improvements, and where the funding will come from. Chair Kitselman added that he is saying that we cannot expand the Business Park without finding a developer that will play along with these things. Mr. Stidham replied that you could change the philosophy by de-emphasizing the collector road and potentially build a dead-end street into the Smallwood property. He added that he did not know how you would get the collector road built in that scenario and Chair Kitselman replied unless it is built incrementally by a developer. Mr. Stidham said that the way to make that work is to give them a portion of land to develop first and require them to complete the collector road to get the rest of the property to develop.

Mr. Hudson said this is all coming from the problem of traffic on Jack Enders Boulevard that we have not been able to find a solution for. He said this is one solution that has its limitations. He asked about the Smallwood Lane rail crossing and Mr. Stidham replied that this may be the only crossing that we would be able to use. Mr. Hudson added that Norfolk Southern made it pretty clear that they would not allow any new crossings. Mr. Stidham said that we would probably have to offer closing other crossings to get a new crossing approved. Mr. Weiss noted that Norfolk Southern has never said that requiring us to close other crossings to upgrade the Smallwood Lane crossing would not be part of the deal. Mr. Stidham said that putting it in the hands of the development community gets them to solve the problem. Mr. Russell said that some localities put proposed streets in plans and they get built incrementally as development occurs. He added that the collector road study showed incremental development options. Mr. Stidham replied that the benefit to that approach is that you get lots developed more quickly with lower infrastructure costs but the drawback is the increased truck traffic on the Town street network and you may not get the collector road built. If you require the US 340 connection first, the benefit is that you get your road built but the drawback is that you need to find the right, well-equipped developer that is willing to put the funds in on the front end.

Mr. Hudson asked how much study we have done with East Main Street and what possibilities are there to eliminate truck and traffic issues. Mr. Stidham said that is a question for the Town and Mr. Weiss said that the Town has submitted various ideas to VDOT. Ms. Harrison said it has mostly been the sidewalk

improvements and added that any widening would have to be on Clermont Farm because the houses on the other side of the street are close to the road. Mr. Russell asked whether she is referring to widening East Main Street and Ms. Harrison replied that you would have to if you are expecting increased truck traffic. Mr. Weiss said there have been discussions over the years about impacts to existing properties at the intersection of Jack Enders Boulevard and East Main Street if you put a turn signal there. He added that even the sidewalks will take a significant amount of property from peoples' yards. He also said that this is a major project and if you do not solve all of the issues, you will just exacerbate the existing problems. Mr. Hudson said that he agrees. Ms. Harrison added that this is why she prefers requiring the US 340 entrance first and noted that truckers would enter and exit that way instead of going through town to get to Route 7. Mr. Hudson said that this prevents the additional traffic from going through town until the connection to Jack Enders Boulevard is made.

Mr. Stidham noted that expanding East Main Street onto the Clermont property is a challenge because it is owned by the State and in conservation easement. Ms. Harrison noted the stream at that location as well. Mr. Hudson asked if we have anything official regarding the limitations on the Clermont property. He added that if there are severe limitations, then we should take it off the table for discussion. Mr. Weiss said that there are easement documents and Vice-Chair Ohrstrom added that it is a Department of Historic Resources (DHR) easement. Mr. Stidham said that in the future you would be submitting proposed plans to DHR for their review and comment. He added that the County has had an East Main Street project in its Transportation Plan for a number of years and it consists of safety improvements and addition of center turn lanes. He said he did not know whether this design is sufficient to handle the additional traffic generated by the collector road so this would need to be evaluated. He also said that the impacts of the entire collector road through to Route 7 needs to be studied. Mr. Hudson noted that there are houses all along East Main Street with small yards. Vice-Chair Ohrstrom said that improving East Main Street may not be popular and members noted that the upcoming project to add sidewalks should be well received. Mr. Russell added that some people do not like sidewalks if they are coming across their own property and Mr. Weiss added that the same is true if they cannot park in their driveway anymore with addition of sidewalks.

Mr. Hudson said that focusing on developing the collector road beginning with the US 340 intersection would be a good starting point. Mr. Stidham said that if you had a developer that wanted to construct everything, you could use performance bonds to allow them to start from the Jack Enders Boulevard side and ensure that the collector road is constructed to US 340. Mr. Hudson added that it would have to be clear that it is a temporary arrangement.

Mr. Stidham reviewed the new recommendations for the Southern Potential Future Growth Area on page 21 of 27, noting that it attempts to capture the Authority's discussions and consensus reached at the last meeting. He said that the recommendations include encouraging developers to use conditional zoning as a way to get the collector road improvements built. He also noted that if the Town and County agree to create a new annexation area, the properties should be zoned Open Space Residential (OSR) to facilitate conditional zoning as the OSR District is the closest corresponding Town District to the County's Agricultural-Open Space-Conservation (AOC) District. This would ensure that conditional zoning would need to be used to up-zone these properties for development. Chair Kitselman asked for confirmation that the properties in the Southern area would be zoned OSR. Mr. Stidham said yes as this would facilitate conditional zoning. He added that if the properties were zoned Business Park (BP) by the Town and County, the opportunity to go through the conditional zoning process would be lost. Vice-Chair Ohrstrom said he totally agrees with this and Mr. Hudson said it is definitely a more flexible zoning. Mr. Stidham

said it should be very clear to the development community as to what we want them to do when they read this. Vice-Chair Ohrstrom noted that it would not be a more flexible option for the developer and Mr. Hudson replied that it would be more flexible for us. Mr. Weiss noted that previous attempts to encourage conditional zoning on residential properties did not work because the properties were zoned DR-1 and developers chose to develop at that by-right density. Members had no changes to this section or additional comments.

Mr. Stidham reviewed the changes to the Hermitage South Potential Future Growth Area. He noted that the biggest change would be to expand the area south all the way to Senseny Road and asked members if they were comfortable considering this change. Mr. Hudson said yes and that it allows for more connectivity and also noted that we can reach out to the property owners to see if they are interested in developing. Mr. Weiss said his only comment is to not go south of Senseny Road. Ms. Harrison noted that there are traffic issues there currently so major improvements would be necessary. Mr. Stidham referenced new language on page 23 of 27 regarding transportation improvements to address Ms. Harrison's concerns. Ms. Harrison noted that you could have a huge mess in the future with possible traffic signals at both Senseny Road and the future collector road intersection. Chair Kitselman said a traffic study is definitely in order. Mr. Russell said that you could design traffic improvements so they do not use Senseny Road. Mr. Hudson added that you could initially limit development in that area as opposed to allowing development all at once.

Mr. Stidham noted that this is the one potential future growth area that proposes a mix of residential and commercial uses. He then continued with a review of the proposed changes to this section including future commercial development and whether we continue to have concerns about impacts to the downtown businesses. Vice-Chair Ohrstrom asked if commercial buildings are limited to a maximum of 50,000 square feet. Mr. Stidham replied that he does not know what the Town's requirements are and Mr. Russell said that he would have to look it up. Mr. Stidham noted that if you want to plan for future development, this potential future growth area contains the most workable obstacles. He added that there is no rail crossing to deal with, the land is relatively flat, and it has frontage on two public roads. He also noted that it is not in the middle of a pedestrian area.

Mr. Stidham noted language regarding future residential development being limited to the unassigned residential units currently identified in the Future Land Use Table and Projected Development Yields until such time as additional public water and sewer capacity is developed in partnership with the Town and private sector development. He noted that this pool of residential units will not be enough to address current residential sub-areas and the vision for residential development in the potential future growth areas. He said that perhaps Town Manager Keith Dalton will be able to attend the next meeting to provide further information. Chair Kitselman said that we are at 50% utility capacity now which should provide enough water and sewer for the unbuilt units and headroom for new units. He added that we do not want to nail ourselves to the floor here. Mr. Stidham said that he does not know what capacity we want to reserve for commercial development. Chair Kitselman replied that we have never come up with a calculus for that. Mr. Stidham said maybe you set it aside in the event that a massive water user is proposed in the future. Mr. Weiss said he does not think that the proposed language would dissuade people from having the conversation about utility expansion. He also said the future growth areas would be limited by capacity and Chair Kitselman agreed. Mr. Stidham said if we can figure out with certainty if the additional 50% capacity translates into more residential units then we can add it into the Plan. Mr. Russell replied that it is more than is programmed into the Plan now and Chair Kitselman added that we need to quantify the amount.

Mr. Stidham noted language for this area and in the Western Potential Future Growth Area that these areas are currently being farmed and development may not occur until the property owners discontinue farming. Mr. Weiss said that he spoke with Mr. Byrd who owns most of the land in the Western Potential Future Growth Area. He said Mr. Byrd is content to continue farming the property but is not opposed to having it listed as a future growth area. He also noted that Mr. Byrd said that we could create "A, B, and C" areas for his property to allow it to be developed in phases over time. Mr. Russell asked if Mr. Byrd had an idea of which parts of his land could be so designated and Mr. Weiss replied that he did not go into detail. Mr. Stidham said we would want to start from the area that is currently designated and create B and C areas for the rest of the property. Mr. Weiss said he thought this would be a good concept to pursue. Mr. Stidham noted that the area would include properties in other ownership, in particular lots located behind Hermitage Subdivision. Mr. Stidham asked the Authority if they wanted to see a draft map with this concept and members agreed.

Mr. Stidham continued with review of the proposed changes for the Western Potential Future Growth Area. Regarding impacts to Rosemont, Vice-Chair Ohrstrom asked what type of buffering Mr. Stidham had in mind. Mr. Stidham replied likely an open space buffer with supplemental planting depending on what vegetation is currently there. Regarding whether property owners in these areas are interested in developing, Mr. Stidham noted that you can include the areas in the Plan but note that development is deferred until the property owners express interest in developing.

Mr. Stidham asked the members about their thoughts on all of the potential future growth areas including moving forward as described with the Southern area and continuing to work on conceptualizing the other two areas. Mr. Hudson said that continuing to refine the development concepts will save time in the future when these properties are ready for development. Mr. Stidham said we are working towards a framework for these potential future growth areas becoming annexation areas but the water and sewer capacity is the missing piece of information. He added that we will need to know this from Mr. Dalton next month. Mr. Weiss said you would be better off keeping the areas being actively farmed as potential future growth areas.

Mr. Stidham clarified that if the revised Plan is adopted as we are currently discussing, the Southern Potential Future Growth Area could become an annexation area before the next five-year plan review if all of the recommendations are met. He asked the members if they wanted to create something similar for one or both of the other two growth areas in the event that things change and development is proposed before the next five-year plan review. Mr. Hudson replied that there are some advantages to untying our hands a bit. Vice-Chair Ohrstrom replied that it might provoke a big public reaction. Mr. Weiss agreed and said it might lead to a more rapid development pattern than we are wanting to do. Mr. Stidham said that it is an option we can keep in the backs of our minds until after the public utilities discussion. He also noted that we can require phasing or only allow some areas to be developed after other areas reach build-out. Mr. Weiss noted that it will be important to identify income to offset the increased schools, EMS, and other costs with residential development. Mr. Stidham added that the Friant property could still come in for residential development. Mr. Hudson said that it is important to mention in the minutes that we are thinking ahead. Mr. Russell provided a brief update on the status of the Friant property.

Mr. Stidham asked if there are any other discussion items. Ms. Harrison noted that this will be her last meeting as her term on Town Council is ending and she is relocating from the area. Mr. Hudson asked if there can be an official recognition of her service. Vice-Chair Ohrstrom said we could adopt a resolution and Chair Kitselman replied that it is a great idea.

5. **New Business ~ None scheduled**

6. **Other Business ~ None scheduled**

Mr. Stidham noted that the next meeting is Wednesday, September 24 at 1:00PM.

7. **Adjourn**

The Authority voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 1:50PM.

Motion to adjourn the meeting			
Allen Kitselman	AYE	John Hudson	AYE (moved)
George L. Ohrstrom, II	AYE	Kathy Smart	AYE (seconded)
Diane Harrison	AYE	David Weiss	AYE

Allen Kitselman, Chair

Brandon Stidham, Clerk



Clarke County Department of Planning
Berryville-Clarke County Government Center
101 Chalmers Court, Suite B
Berryville, VA 22611

TO: Berryville Area Development Authority members

FROM: Brandon Stidham, Planning Director
Terry Russell, Community Development Director

RE: September 24, 2025 meeting

DATE: September 18, 2025

Below is an overview of the agenda items for the next BADA meeting to be held at 1:00PM on Wednesday, September 24 in the A/B meeting room:

Public water and sewer capacity for future growth

Keith Dalton will be attending the meeting to provide additional clarity on current available capacity of the public water and sewer systems to support additional growth as it relates to the potential future growth areas. This information should be used by the Authority to decide on wording and prioritization for possible residential growth in the Southern and Western potential future growth areas per discussion at the last meeting.

Scheduling additional meetings in November and December

Pursuant to the project timeline, we will need to plan for two additional meetings in November and December for continued work on the Area Plan update. Below are some possible meeting dates:

November (regular meeting date is Wednesday, November 19):

- Wednesday, November 12 (preferred)
- Thursday, November 6
- Thursday November 13

December (regular meeting date is Wednesday, December 17):

- Wednesday, December 10 (preferred)
- Thursday, December 4
- Tuesday, December 9
- Thursday, December 11

Please check your schedules in advance of the meeting so we can schedule these dates.

If you have questions in advance of the meetings, please do not hesitate to contact us.

(540) 955-5132
www.clarkecounty.gov