

MINUTES
YORK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
York Hall, 301 Main Street
February 10, 2021

MEMBERS

Montgoussaint E. Jons
Glen D. Titus
Mary P. Leedom
Michael S. King
Robert T. Criner
Robert W. Peterman
Bruce R. Sturk

CALL TO ORDER

Chair King called the electronic meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The roll was called and all members were present or participating remotely via electronic means with the exception of Mary P. Leedom. Staff members participating remotely were Timothy C. Cross, Deputy Director of Planning and Development Services; Justin R. Atkins, Assistant County Attorney; Amy Parker, Senior Planner; Earl W. Anderson, Senior Planner; and Daria Linsinbigler, Planning Assistant.

REMARKS

Chair King called the meeting to order and stated that the meeting was being held by electronic means without a quorum being physically assembled in one place, pursuant to an emergency ordinance adopted by the York County Board of Supervisors on June 16. He stated that the meeting is being held remotely under the emergency “continuity of government” ordinance adopted under Code of Virginia Section 15.2-1413, allowing public meetings of County boards, commissions, and authorities to meet remotely. He said the action was taken because of the health emergency resulting from the coronavirus pandemic, making an assembly of the Commission and staff and members of the public in one place unsafe because of the highly contagious nature of the coronavirus pandemic. Chair King noted that as with all live Planning Commission meetings, this meeting is available to watch live on WYCG-TV, Cox Cable Channel 46, Verizon FiOS Channel 38, or live streaming at yorkcounty.gov/TV. He introduced himself, stating that he was physically present in the Board Room at York Hall, along with the other Commission members and County staff participating remotely.

Earl W. Anderson, Senior Planner; explained the procedures for the electronic meeting.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Chair King led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Criner moved to adopt the minutes of the regular meeting of January 13, 2021. The motion was approved (6:0)

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application No. ZM-190-21, Rhetson Companies, Inc.: Request to amend the York County Zoning Map by reclassifying four parcels of land totaling approximately 2.6 acres located at 2371 and 2601 Hampton Highway (Route 134) (GPINs U02b-3221-3367, U02b-3414-3198, U02b-3234-3193, and U02b-3359-3494) from R20 (Medium Density Single-family Residential) to GB (General Business) subject to voluntarily proffered conditions. The GB district is intended to provide opportunities for a broad range of commercial activities. Many of these uses are characterized by the need for large amounts of outdoor display and storage of goods or materials, significant parking and loading space requirements, a dependency on truck traffic, and, in general, an activity level and aesthetic character which set them apart from the types of uses permitted in the lower intensity commercial districts. The applicant has indicated “retail business” as the proposed use of the property and has voluntarily proffered to exclude various uses that would otherwise be permitted in the GB district. Proffers also address building materials, hours of operation, and fencing. The property is designated Medium Density Residential in the Comprehensive Plan. The Medium Density Residential designation is intended to provide opportunities primarily for single-family detached housing having a maximum density of 1.75 dwelling units per acre.

Amy M. Parker, Senior Planner, summarized the staff report dated February 2, 2021, stating that staff does not believe the application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and therefore recommends that the Commission forward the application to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of denial. She added that should the Commission choose to recommend approval, staff recommends that it be subject to the conditions set forth in proposed Resolution No. PC21-4.

Mr. Sturk asked if a wetlands delineation of the site has been conducted.

Ms. Parker responded that she was not aware of a wetlands delineation. She added there appear to be no wetlands in the vicinity, only man-made draining ditches.

Chair King opened the public hearing.

John Parker, project manager with Rhetson Companies, 2075 Juniper Lake Road, West End, North Carolina, spoke as the applicant. He introduced other project team members: Matt Meadows, attorney with Jones, Blechman, Woltz & Kelly; William Felts, civil engineer; and Rick Harris, property owner.

Mr. Harris stated that he is a wetlands scientist and that he has performed a wetlands delineation for the property and determined it to be uplands.

Mr. Meadows stated that he is a life-long resident of the County and that this property has always been vacant. He said that while the applicant understands the residential zoning designation, Mr. Meadows said he does not believe the property will ever be developed for residential use, noting that most of the recent development along the Hampton Highway corridor is commercial. He noted that commercially designated land is located less than a mile away.

Mr. Parker presented both aerial and street view photos of the site location. He noted that while taking photos, he noticed the amount of traffic on the road and could not imagine anyone wanting to build a home at the location. He showed a slide of the proposed layout, noting that the lot backs up to wet areas and a residential subdivision. He stated that the proposed building would have a brick façade to match the nearby Food Lion and that landscape buffering and fencing are planned to improve the view from the residential neighborhood. Mr. Parker noted that the Comprehensive Plan designates nearby property on Hampton Highway for Limited Business. He displayed an aerial map showing the variety of businesses in the vicinity and stated that based on the number of commercial buildings and traffic volume, he felt the request for commercial zoning was reasonable. He stated that although he appreciates the staff's opinion, he disagrees that this is a case of spot zoning.

Mr. Criner asked why the applicant is seeking to rezone the property to General Business (GB) instead of Limited Business (LB).

Mr. Parker replied that he is amenable to any suggestions staff may have and added that he is not sure if LB accommodates the proposed retail use.

John Rogers, 219 Bayberry Lane, stated that he sent a letter in opposition to the application.

Tom Ezell, 228 Bayberry Lane, clarified that the Churchill Estates subdivision behind the subject property was developed beginning in 2006. He said that as a homeowner and the homeowners' association president for the subdivision, he feels the application should be denied. He stated that the proposed commercial rezoning would infringe on the residents' quiet enjoyment of their neighborhood and that traffic would increase at the nearby intersection.

There being no one else wishing to address the Commission on this application, **Chair King** closed the public hearing.

Mr. Titus noted that social media comments showed about eight people against and one for the application. He said that he agreed with staff recommendation to recommend denial the application and added that he is opposed to spot rezonings of small parcels.

Mr. Peterman said he did not see a reason to go against the Comprehensive Plan to rezone these properties.

Mr. Jons agreed with staff's recommendation. He stated that the proposed rezoning would bring a more intensive use to the property that would affect the quality of life for neighboring residents.

Mr. Criner agreed with the applicant that the property is not likely to be developed for residential use. He said that if the adjacent parcels were rezoned with the subject property, it would make more sense to rezone. He said he agrees staff's comments and is not in favor of this application.

Chair King said there is not a compelling reason to go against the Comprehensive Plan and that he does not support the application.

Mr. Jons moved the adoption of Resolution No. PC21-4.

**A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION TO
REZONE 2.6 ACRES AT 2371 AND 2601 HAMPTON HIGHWAY FROM R20
TO GB SUBJECT TO VOLUNTARILY PROFFERED CONDITIONS**

WHEREAS, Rhetson Companies, Inc. has submitted Application No. ZM-190-21 to request to amend the York County Zoning Map by reclassifying four parcels of land totaling approximately 2.6 acres located at 2371 and 2601 Hampton Highway (Route 134) (GPINs U02b-3221-3367, U02b-3414-3198, U02b-3234-3193, and U02b-3359-3494) from R20 (Medium Density Single-family Residential) to GB (General Business) subject to voluntarily proffered conditions; and

WHEREAS, said application has been forwarded to the York County Planning Commission in accordance with applicable procedure; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on this application; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has carefully considered the public comments with respect to this application;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 10th day of February, 2021, that Application No. ZM-190-21 be, and it is hereby, transmitted to the York County Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval to amend the York County Zoning Map by reclassifying four parcels of land totaling approximately 2.6 acres located at 2371 and 2601 Hampton Highway (Route 134) (GPINs U02b-3221-3367, U02b-3414-3198, U02b-3234-3193, and U02b-3359-3494) from R20 (Medium Density Single-family Residential) to GB (General Business) subject to voluntarily proffered conditions set forth in the proffer statement titled "PROFFERS" dated January 28, 2021, and signed by Richard A. Harris, Jr., Chief Executive Officer and owner, COVA Development Group, LLC.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 24.1-114(e)(i) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, a certified copy of the ordinance authorizing this rezoning, together with a duly signed copy of the proffer statement, shall be recorded at the expense of the applicant in the name of the property owner as grantor in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court prior to the approval of a site plan or the issuance of any building permits for the subject property.

On a roll call the vote was:

Yea: (0)

Nay: (6) Titus, Criner, Sturk, Peterman, Jons, King

Application No. UP-962-21, Andrew Piske: Request for a Special Use Permit, pursuant to Section 24.1-283(b)(1) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, to authorize a firearms sales and gunsmithing business as a home occupation with on-site customer/client contact on a 0.4-acre parcel located at 211 Henry Lee Lane (Route 1570) (GPIN T06a-1372-3760). The property is zoned R20 (Medium density single-

family residential) and designated Medium Density Residential in the Comprehensive Plan.

Earl Anderson, Senior Planner, summarized the staff report dated January 26, 2021, stating that staff recommends that the Commission forward the application to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval subject to the conditions set forth in proposed Resolution No. PC21-5.

Mr. Criner asked about signage.

Mr. Anderson responded that signage is not allowed. He added that the applicant does not intend to have any signage.

Chair King opened the public hearing.

Andrew Piske, 211 Henry Lee Lane, spoke as the applicant. He stated that copies of the public hearing notice had been distributed to homes throughout the surrounding neighborhood, which generated a lot of questions and concerns about the application from nearby residents that he wanted to address. In response to concerns about an increase in crime, he noted that staff and the Sheriff's Office have indicated there is no data over the past five years to support such concerns. He stated that his business would be in strict compliance with all guidelines from the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) and the State Police. With regard to concerns that this would set a precedent for allowing businesses in residential areas, he said that is not his intent, adding that there are already quite a few home-based businesses in the neighborhood that have more impact than his business would. He explained that he would not be the actual seller of firearms but rather would serve as an ATF representative for online transactions that require verification of the purchaser's identity. With regard to the gunsmithing component of the business, he said the work is performed with common hand tools that he has used as a hobbyist in his garage for years with no noise complaints from neighbors. He said there would not be any signage, websites, business cards, or other public advertising. In response to traffic concerns, he said he expects to have only a few customers per week who would be by appointment only. He said he wants to minimize the impact on his home and neighborhood by using shipping as much as possible and ensuring that firearms are concealed when being brought into his home. He said there would not be an inventory of firearms onsite and he noted his security measures in place, including security cameras, a safe, digital keypads, and access locks. He added if the business should turn into a larger commercial endeavor, he would move to an appropriately zoned location.

Mr. Jons asked for clarification regarding the ATF licensing process.

Mr. Piske said that he would be held to strict record-keeping requirements and would be subject to surprise ATF audits and inspections and would have to comply with strict guidelines and policies to obtain and maintain his Federal Firearms License.

Mr. Jons asked if a customer could bring a loaded gun to his house.

Mr. Piske responded in the negative and that if there were a situation where a round is stuck in a gun chamber, he would advise the customer to leave it at home and he would figure out a safe way to resolve it or decline the job.

Mr. Jons said he feels every reasonable and responsible measure has been taken to conduct the

business safely.

Mr. Sturk asked for clarification as to whether or not any firearms sales would be taking place.

Mr. Piske explained that although no firearms are inventoried onsite, the transfer of firearms between a retailer and a customer would be transacted through him.

Mr. Sturk asked how much of the business would consist of transfers.

Mr. Piske responded that transfers would be a nominal part of his business and the bulk of his work would be gunsmithing, repair, and restoration.

Mr. Titus asked how a customer ensures the gun is functional after it has been worked on.

Mr. Piske stated that the gun could be tested at a nearby gun range or discharged on land that he owns in the western part of the state.

Mr. Jons asked if guns would be available to purchase onsite.

Mr. Piske said they would not.

Mr. Sturk asked if customers would be able to buy components and have them shipped to his business for the applicant to work on.

Mr. Piske said that is correct, stating that non-serialized components can be shipped to his business. He stated that he charges for the assembly but not for the shipped parts.

Mr. Titus asked what type of components Mr. Piske is capable of making.

Mr. Piske said he can manufacture smaller components and that most of his work is done with hand tools.

Chair King asked if this is a hobby or his occupation.

Mr. Piske responded that gunsmithing is a hobby that he is seeking to turn into a business but it will not be his primary source of income.

Mr. Anderson clarified his previous response to Mr. Criner's earlier question about signage, stating that home occupations are allowed a sign of up to three square feet. He added that phone calls and letters about the application were received and forwarded to the Commissioners. He stated that four of those who called were in support of the application and four were opposed, while the rest asked questions and did not express an opinion. Mr. Anderson said he received written comments from three citizens in support of the application and seven opposed. He added that there are 32 home occupations in the Brandywine subdivision, according to the Commissioner of the Revenue's office.

Bobby Clegg, 125 Duff Drive, stated that initially he was against the application but, having heard the details, most of his worst fears have been alleviated. As a thirty-year resident, he said he is concerned about the business's impact on property values. He agreed that signage would not be desirable. He said that he will stand by the decision made by the Commission.

Guy Werner, 214 Henry Lee Lane, spoke in opposition to the application. He said he does not want an increase in traffic, the possibility of signage, or people with concealed weapons permits in the neighborhood. He said this business does not belong in a residentially zoned area.

Sandy Werner, 214 Henry Lee Lane, said she moved to this area because it is safe and secure. She stated that she wants to protect the integrity of the residential neighborhood. She said this type of home occupation is not a common business and believes that because it deals with weapons, it should be located in an area zoned for business. She said traffic and potential crime are major concerns. Lastly, she stated that this type of business would decrease her property value.

Ann Baker, 404 Whispering Pine Drive, said she is a long-time resident and that there are a lot of younger families with children who ride bikes and play outside. She expressed concern about the additional traffic. She said she is apprehensive about a weapons business in the neighborhood and the possibility of setting a precedent for more businesses in this area.

Kenny Sterling, 103 Henry Lee Lane, said he is in full support of this application. He said both of his businesses were started out of his home and eventually grew into larger businesses. He stated that there would be no opposition to this application if it did not involve weapons. He said that he does not share the traffic concerns expressed by others.

Bradford Powell, 201 Gaines Way, stated that the only access problem in the neighborhood has nothing to do with the proposed home occupation but rather is caused by residents parking in the street instead of in their driveways, which is the real problem. He said the business would provide a valuable service to the community and he is in support of the application. He added that he would like to see the parking spaces in place prior to the business opening.

Kristi Chamberlain, 127 Duff Drive, said she understands the economic appeal of running a business out of the home. She stated that home businesses are diverse and some do not have customers or generate traffic. She said she is concerned about adding more cars to the neighborhood and a decline in property values. She said this type of business should be located in a commercially zoned area.

Robert McCallister, 102 Fox Hill Place, said he is concerned about weapons storage and asked about the scale of the business. He said the Special Use Permit would allow the applicant to sell guns, and although that is not the intent, there is nothing in the permit to prevent it. He noted that signage allowance is another issue and that the additional traffic will be non-residents.

Chet Szymecki, 103 Brigade Drive, stated that he strongly supports the application and noted that many large companies began in garages. He said that he is a federally-licensed firearms manufacturer and has been working out of his home in Brandywine since 2015. He said his business shares about 90% of the same characteristics as the applicant's. He stated that the ATF is very thorough and has a strict background investigation process and mandates accurate record-keeping. He said a gunsmith is a craftsman with specialized tools used to repair intricate parts. He noted that the ATF conducts regular safety inspections and has strict regulations.

Mr. Piske responded to a written question from a Mr. Pinkerton, stating that his business practices were included with his application, that he will not have any signs, and that he cannot limit the types of firearms that will be sold.

Brandon Scott, 300 Gaines Way, stated that he is in full support of the application. He said that

the applicant is doing an enormous service for the County and that he has no concerns.

There being no one else wishing to address the Commission on this application, **Chair King** closed the public hearing.

Mr. Titus said that he is very supportive of home occupations in general and that some types generate a lot more traffic and customer interface than this well-regulated business would. He said he supports this application.

Mr. Jons stated that he supports the application, noting that the hours of operation are more limited than the Zoning Ordinance allows, the applicant will have one customer at a time, parking is adequate, and the applicant has no intent to have a sign.

Mr. Peterman stated that the narrowness of the roads is concerning, but with one customer at a time, he does not think it will be a problem and he supports the application.

Mr. Criner stated that he supports the application. He asked if the parking area will be completed prior to opening the business.

Mr. Piske said he will open up the driveway for additional use and it will be able to accommodate four to six cars. He added that on-street parking will not be allowed.

Mr. Sturk said he supports the application.

Chair King stated that all of his questions and concerns have been addressed and he is in support. He noted the business is very well-regulated by various agencies. He added that stipulating that no signage will be allowed would please some of the citizens.

Mr. Titus moved the adoption of Resolution No. PC21-5(R) as revised to specify that no signage will be permitted.

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION TO AUTHORIZE FIREARMS SALES AND GUNSMITHING AS A HOME OCCUPATION WITH ON-PREMISES CUSTOMER/CLIENT CONTACT ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 211 HENRY LEE LANE (ROUTE 1570)

WHEREAS, Andrew Piske, has submitted Application No. UP-962-21 requesting a Special Use Permit, pursuant to Section 24.1-283(b)(1) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, to authorize firearms sales and gunsmithing as a home occupation with on-site customer/client contact on a 0.4-acre parcel of land located at 211 Henry Lee Lane (Route 1570) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 30-28-8 (GPIN T06a-1372-3760); and

WHEREAS, said application has been transmitted to the York County Planning Commission in accordance with applicable procedure; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has conducted a duly advertised public hearing on this application; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has carefully considered the public comments with respect to this application;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the York County Planning Commission this the 10th day of February, 2021, that Application No. UP-962-21 be, and it is hereby, transmitted to the York County Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval to authorize a Special Use Permit, pursuant to Section 24.1-283(b)(1) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, for the establishment of firearms sales and gunsmithing as a home occupation with on-site customer/client contact on a 0.4-acre parcel of land located at 211 Henry Lee Lane (Route 1570) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 30-28-8 (GPIN T06a-1372-3760), subject to the following conditions:

- 1) This use permit shall authorize the establishment of firearms sales and gunsmithing as a home occupation with on-site customer/client contact on a 0.4-acre parcel of land located at 211 Henry Lee Lane (Route 1570) and further identified as Assessor's Parcel No. 30-28-8 (GPIN T06a-1372-3760).
- 2) The home occupation shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the York County Zoning Ordinance, Sections 24.1-281 and 24.1-283(b), except as modified herein.
- 3) The floor area of the home occupation shall not exceed approximately 300 square feet of area within the detached garage area and the interior home floor area as depicted on the floor plan submitted by the applicant and received by the Planning Division on December 18, 2020, a copy of which shall remain on file in the office of the Planning Division.
- 4) No person other than individuals residing on the premises shall be engaged in the home occupation.
- 5) The days and hours of operation shall be limited to Monday through Friday, 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Customer/client contact on the premises shall be by appointment only and shall be limited to no more than one customer appointment at any one time. The applicant shall keep a log book indicating appointments scheduled by date and time with such log book to be made available for review by Zoning and Code Enforcement staff upon request. The log need not contain customer names or details concerning the type of firearm(s) or the amount of the business transaction.
- 6) A minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces shall be provided on the premises and no on-street parking shall be allowed for the residence or business uses.
- 7) There shall be no live firing of firearms on the premises.
- 8) No ammunition or gun powder shall be stored or manufactured on-site for the purposes of sale to customers.
- 9) All firearms not owned by the property owner shall be locked in the gun safe when not being worked on.
- 10) No signage shall be allowed for the home occupation.
- 11) Prior to commencement of operation of the home occupation, the portion of the home used for the home occupation, including the customer/client entrance and parking area shall conform to minimum standards of the Virginia Uniform Statewide Building Code, subject to the approval of the Building Code Official.

- 12) The home occupation shall be operated in conformance with all applicable codes and requirements of the York County Fire Prevention Code, the 2009 Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code, and the National Fire Protection Association and the following:
 - a) Installation of one 2A10BC fire extinguisher in the detached garage;
 - b) Submission of a Hazardous Materials Management Plan (to include ammunition, gunsmithing materials such as oils, and gun powder) to be reviewed and approved by the Department of Fire and Life Safety/Prevention and Community Safety Division;
 - c) An initial fire inspection prior to the commencement of the use, with annual fire inspection thereafter, to be conducted by the Department of Fire and Life Safety in accordance with the Virginia Statewide Fire Prevention Code and any local amendments to be conducted.
- 13) Proof of licensure from the Federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives for a Federal Firearms license shall be submitted to the Department of Fire and Life Safety prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the home occupation use.
- 14) In accordance with Section 24.1-115(b)(7) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, a certified copy of the resolution authorizing this Special Use Permit shall be recorded at the expense of the applicant in the name of the property owner as grantor in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court prior to issuance of a Certificate of Use and Occupancy for the home occupation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Special Use Permit is not severable, and invalidation of any word, phrase, clause, sentence, or paragraph shall invalidate the remainder.

On a roll call the vote was:

Yea: (6) Criner, Sturk, Peterman, Jons, Titus, King
Nay: (0)

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair King stated that in the aftermath of the Fenton Mill Planned Development public hearing, he felt it would be useful to have some sort of small area plan for that general area of the County to provide more detailed guidance with regard to future development proposals. He said he would like to ask staff to consider the idea and report back to the Commission on the feasibility of such an undertaking, and he asked the other Commission members for their opinions.

Mr. Sturk, Mr. Jons, and Mr. Titus expressed their support.

Mr. Peterman stated that he understood the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan to be to provide this kind of guidance and direction, and he asked why an additional document is needed when the Comprehensive Plan already addresses each area of the County and how it should be developed.

Chair King responded that he envisioned a plan for this specific area that would be more detailed than the Comprehensive Plan, which is general in nature. He said it would give citizens another opportunity to express their desires for the area.

Mr. Sturk commented that these types of plans are implemented in Hampton, and he stated the Comprehensive Plan provides a more strategic overview whereas an area plan would be more tactical and would seek to move toward a consensus among the citizens.

Mr. Peterman responded that he agrees that it is very important to have citizen involvement and that his question was intended to seek clarification as to the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan and a small area plan.

Chair King responded that he thought Mr. Sturk explained it very well in terms of strategic vs. tactical. By a show of hands, the Commissioners expressed their agreement with Chair King's suggestion, and he asked staff to bring the matter back to the Commission as a future agenda item.

STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Cross referred to the February Development Activity Report, stating that at its January 13 meeting, the Board of Supervisors approved the proposed machine shop at 451 Merrimac Trail and the esthetician's studio as a home occupation at 608 Clements Mill Trace. He stated that the agenda for the February 16 Board meeting will include the rezoning applications for the George Washington Inn property on Merrimac Trail and the former J.C. Penney store at the Marquis, which were both recommended for approval by the Commission at its January meeting. He stated that no new applications have been received and recommended cancelling the March 10 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Cross reported that the Fenton Mill Planned Development application is scheduled to go before the Board at its March 16 meeting, which is intended to be an "in-person" meeting. He said that normally he would be providing a briefing on the County Administrator's Capital Improvements Program (CIP) but that the proposed CIP is almost identical to last year's and that all the projects have already been found by the Commissioners to be consistent with the goals and the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the County Administrator made the decision to take a one year pause due to the pandemic in CIP spending.

Mr. Jons asked if there have been any negotiations on the Fenton Mill project between the developer and nearby residents since November when it was considered by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Cross responded that the developer has made no changes to the proposal.

Mr. Titus asked about the status of the proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendments pertaining to home occupations.

Mr. Cross said that the text minutes may go forward in April or May depending on the Boards' agendas.

Mr. Jons asked how many more meetings are remaining for the Comprehensive Plan Review Steering Committee.

Mr. Cross responded that he does not have a definitive answer, adding that the discussion of land use might require multiple meetings.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chair King stated that at its February 3 meeting, the York 2040 Steering Committee discussed the draft Transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan and that the document is available on the project website.

Mr. Jons commented that one idea from the meeting that he liked was to encourage builders and developers to install charging stations for electric vehicles in their development projects.

Chair King agreed that it is important to think about the transportation modes of the future, such as electric vehicles and autonomous vehicles.

COMMISSION REPORTS AND REQUESTS

There were no Commission reports or requests.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:17 PM.

SUBMITTED: _____
Daria Linsinbigler, Secretary

APPROVED: _____
Michael S. King, Chair

DATE: _____