

MINUTES
YORK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting
York Hall, 301 Main Street
July 8, 2026

MEMBERS

Thomas W. Chamberlain
Glen D. Titus
Gregory "Skip" Brooks
John Butler
Nicholas Borelli
Jeffrey D. Wassmer
Joseph P. Smith

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Chamberlain stated that the Code of Virginia requires local governments to have a Planning Commission, the purpose of which is to advise the Board of Supervisors on land use and planning issues affecting the County. He explained that this responsibility is exercised through recommendations conveyed by resolutions or other official means, all of which are matters of public record. He stated that the Commission is comprised of seven citizen volunteers appointed by the Board, including one representative from each voting district and two at-large members.

ROLL CALL

The roll was called, all Commissioners were present. Staff members present were Earl W. Anderson, Director of Planning and Development Services; Sheree Konstantinou, Deputy County Attorney; Jeanne Carner, Senior Planner; Madison Scalf, Planner; Cathy Tartabini, Planning Assistant.

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

Chair Chamberlain led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Wassmer moved to adopt the minutes of the regular meeting on June 10, 2026. The motion was approved (6:0) with Mr. Borelli abstaining.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR FY 2027

With **Deputy County Attorney Sheree Konstantinou** presiding, Chair Chamberlain nominated Mr. Brooks to serve as Chair for FY 2027, and Mr. Brooks was elected (7:0). Mr. Titus nominated Mr. Smith to serve as Vice Chair for FY 2027, and Mr. Smith was elected (6:0) with Mr. Smith abstaining.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Application No. PD-60-26, EAH LLC: Request to amend the York County Zoning Map by reclassifying an approximately 22-acre portion of a 32-acre parcel (GPIN H13b-3278-4775) located at 200 Water Country Parkway (Route 640) from EO (Economic Opportunity) to PDMU (Planned Development Mixed Use), subject to voluntarily proffered conditions. According to the applicant's narrative, the proposed project – Marquis Crossing – is projected upon completion to have a maximum of 125 townhouse units, a 3.5-acre site for convenience, gas, and/or food use at the corner of Marquis Center Parkway (Route 199) and Water Country Parkway, and two commercial outparcels along Marquis Center Parkway. The subject parcels are designated Economic Opportunity in the Comprehensive Plan.

Jeanne Carner, Senior Planner, presented the staff report dated June 25, 2026, and recommended the Commission forward this application to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of denial. She noted that if the Commission instead chose to recommend approval, the recommendation should be subject to the conditions set forth in Resolution No. PC26-17.

Mr. Chamberlain asked which streets are owned by the applicant and VDOT.

Mrs. Carner stated that some streets would be private and some would be public. She identified the upper street as public, the streets around Land Bay B as private, and indicated the Route 199 connection was believed to be public, subject to the applicants' confirmation.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if the private streets are 26 feet wide and public streets are 50 feet wide.

Mrs. Carner replied yes.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if townhouse owners are responsible for maintaining the private streets.

Mrs. Carner replied yes.

Mr. Chamberlain asked how the setbacks are measured.

Mrs. Carner stated that the setback is generally measured from the building to the property line, and in the front-yard context from the building toward the street.

Mr. Anderson stated there are some ordinance allowances into the front setback for features such as eaves or stoops.

Mr. Chamberlain asked how the claimed parking totals were derived. He indicated that this question was likely best answered by the applicant rather than staff.

Mr. Borelli asked if VDOT approved the Traffic Impact Analysis.

Mrs. Carner stated yes, it had been approved the previous day.

Mr. Borelli asked why the proposal was classified as a minor PDMU, and why was the commercial square-footage guideline calculated using the commercial acreage rather than the entire 22-acre site.

Mrs. Carner explained that if the entire site had been used in the calculation, the applicant could have developed more houses in a smaller area, so the commercial-acreage calculation was used to limit development. Staff further stated that it was a minor PDMU because the site was under 50 acres.

Mr. Borelli asked if the Traffic Impact Analysis evaluates the interim scenario in which 80 townhomes were occupied before certain road improvements were completed.

Mrs. Carner stated that she did not see that interim analysis in the TIA, but that VDOT had approved the study, and the applicant's traffic engineer was present for questions.

Mr. Borelli asked if the final townhouse count was 125 or 123 units.

Mrs. Carner stated that staff had been told the number would be 123, but that the applicant could confirm.

Mr. Borelli asked if the Comprehensive Plan's "overall mixed-use strategy" required coordinated development beyond just the North Pod of Marquis and asked if staff was reading that language too broadly.

Mrs. Carner responded that they could only rely on the guidance as written and that, in staff's view, the application met part but not all the strategy, which is why denial was recommended.

Mr. Anderson added that the key phrase was that the site should not become purely residential, and that under the application as structured, up to 80 town homes could be built without any commercial component.

Mr. Borelli asked if York County historically had successful vertical mixed-use development with commercial on the first floor and residential above.

Mrs. Carner replied yes to the characterization that there had been little success with vertical mixed-use development.

Mr. Anderson elaborated that Commonwealth Green had a limited form of live-above development, Nelson's Grant was somewhat comparable in appearance, but the County had not had a true first-floor-commercial vertical mixed-use development succeed, and most local mixed-use projects had instead been horizontal in form.

Chair Brooks opened the public hearing.

Vernon Geddy, 1177 Jamestown Road, Williamsburg spoke as the applicant's representative and introduced representatives of ROKA Partners, Stanley Martin Homes, the civil engineer, and the traffic consultant. He stated that the applicant had revised the earlier apartment proposal in response to prior feedback and now proposed for-sale townhomes instead of apartments, while retaining the Sheetz parcel and other commercial sites. He argued that the proposal would provide moderately priced homeownership opportunities, support the Marquis area with additional

residential customers, add convenience and food uses, include proffered traffic improvements, and have a positive fiscal impact. He stated that ROKA had a signed lease with Sheetz and a signed letter of intent for another food use.

Hunter Taylor, 4701 Cox Road, Glen Allen spoke as a division president for Stanley Martin Homes and requested the Commission's support for the project. He is also a local resident of James City County for 20 years. He is deeply passionate about home building and wants to see good development brought to the area. He has a long history in trying to develop the Marquis North Pod. He worked for three and a half years to put his church in the JCPenney building and purchase properties within for development; however, the property ownership is too complex to be successful. He argued that the area needs an economic spark. Something to show that development is possible and that there can be an economic stimulus in this area. He did not see how that could be done in the North Pod of Marquis. He quoted the Comprehensive Plan and concluded that there is nothing that says this area cannot be developed in the way proposed. Currently, the Marquis North Pod is unsightly and not being maintained and he wants to see it be improved. He stated that there is a housing crisis in the Nation and on the Peninsula and there is a need for attainable housing, which is difficult to find locally and that the proposal would provide homes starting in the \$380,000 range, which he contended would help households build ownership and stability. He added the average rent for a 2,000 square foot home in York County is \$2,700 a month and stated the average age for a first-time home buyer has increased significantly over the last five years and is now 40 years old and he would like to change that.

Mr. Borelli asked since Sheetz had been part of the earlier proposal as well, had the applicant considered developing only the Sheetz site as a standalone use.

Mr. Geddy responded that a standalone Sheetz would be very difficult because the infrastructure costs could not be supported without the proposed residential development.

Mr. Borelli asked if ROKA was buying the entire property, subject to the rezoning being approved.

Mr. Geddy answered yes.

Mr. Borelli asked if ROKA Partners had any plan or concern about the future developability of the remaining 10 acres to the west after the requested rezoning area was carved out.

Mr. Geddy answered that they had no specific concern and that future access would align with the proposed internal site access and referenced the earlier concept layout.

Mr. Borelli asked if Sheetz was developed adjacent to the residential area, especially across from the pond, what mitigation would separate the commercial and residential uses.

Dan Hargett, 3540 Floyd Avenue, Richmond spoke as the CEO of ROKA Partners and answered that the applicant wanted the residential and commercial uses to coexist attractively and that buffer and landscaping details would be addressed during site plan review in accordance with County requirements.

Mr. Butler asked how we can have confidence that the phasing of the commercial portion, especially the food uses, would be developed alongside the residential portion.

Mr. Geddy answered that the strongest assurance was the signed 50-year lease with Sheetz and the signed letter of intent for another fast-food use.

Mr. Butler asked if there were any assurances that sit-down food uses would be established.

Mr. Hargett stated that food, gas, and convenience uses had been a recurring topic during community meetings and that the applicant was actively pursuing additional food uses for the site.

Mr. Butler discussed the Fiscal Impact Analysis and asked whether the school operating costs figure reflected a situation in which the schools could absorb the estimated 47 students without additional funding.

Mr. Geddy answered yes.

Mr. Butler then asked whether the increased school operating cost would therefore be offset within the increased tax revenue generated by the project.

Mr. Geddy responded affirmatively.

Mr. Chamberlain asked the applicant to explain the parking setup and where residents and visitors would park.

Steve Miller, 11820 Fountain Way, Newport News, of Stanley Martin Homes explained that all the townhome units are proposed to have garages. The County parking calculations credit garages and driveways differently depending on whether the garages are front-load or rear-load designed. He stated that rear-loaded units would have a two-car garage plus a two-car driveway, front-loaded units would have a garage plus single-width driveway, and about 60 additional spaces would be distributed around the community and green spaces. He added that the exact unit count would ultimately be determined during site-plan review to ensure the parking ratio was met.

Mr. Chamberlain asked if a 20-foot setback from the curb would be enough to keep vehicles from encroaching on sidewalks.

Mr. Miller clarified that the 20 feet would be measured from the property line to the front of the house and that the curb would typically be another five to ten feet beyond the property line, so vehicles generally would not encroach on the sidewalk.

Mr. Chamberlain asked where additional vehicles would park on a 26-foot-wide street if some units would only have single car garages.

Mr. Miller responded that the 26-foot streets would serve the rear-loaded garages, while the front-loaded garage units would be on public streets with a 50-foot right-of-way and on-street parking, supplemented by parking spaces distributed throughout the community.

Mr. Chamberlain commented that Whittaker's Mill already had a parking problem and that he did not see how enough parking was being provided.

Mr. Chamberlain asked why the applicant's fiscal analysis referred to Suffolk Public Schools.

Mr. Miller stated that the consultant likely used another study as a template and that the Suffolk reference appeared to be a typo, while the numbers used were intended to be consistent with York County data.

Mr. Chamberlain stated the projected school capacity expansions are being funded through roughly \$85 million in school construction paid for by York County taxpayers. He contended that many previous developments were not required to include school capital costs in the economic analysis and instead only considered operating costs. He further stated that the operating costs are estimated at two to four thousand dollars per residential unit per year and would be funded by the taxpayers of York County. Based on those factors, he asserted that the proposed development would be a bad investment.

Don Kline, 117 Clements Mill Trace, Williamsburg, stated that he opposed the application. He argued that Water Country Parkway traffic and sight-distance conditions are already problematic, that the Penniman Road intersection is dangerous, and that the archaeological and historical significance of the property warranted more respect and possibly additional archaeological review.

Martin Bank, 129 Clements Mill Trace, Williamsburg stated that he opposed the application. He argued that Water Country Parkway lacked lighting, traffic conditions were already dangerous, nearby intersections had flooding and bus-stop issues, and additional entrances would worsen conditions.

Mr. Titus asked Mr. Kline and Mr. Bank what they would like to see developed on the property.

Mr. Kline said he would like to see Water Country Parkway improved and, for the subject, property to remain undeveloped.

Mr. Bank said that townhomes were the lesser of two evils than apartments, but that the gas station did not belong there.

William Miller, 108 Davids Way, stated that he opposed the application. He characterized it as a scaled-down version of the previously rejected apartment proposal and expressed concerns that the PDMU rezoning request would allow a cookie-cutter townhouse development by a Northern Virginia builder on EO-designated land. The rationale of the applicant is to change the rules if you cannot meet the criteria. He questioned the adequacy of the traffic analysis and the proposed commercial commitments and argued that the property's historical significance was inadequately addressed. He noted the Sheetz facility won't commit to construction until 80% of the townhomes are committed with Certificates of Occupancy and the PDMU zoning is touted by the landowner to help the economic recovery of the failing Marquis shopping mall. He said 447 multifamily housing units have been constructed over the past several years for the purpose to spur recovery and questioned a mere 125 townhouses would spur the economy of the mall. He added the property was occupied by the Union army during the Civil War and has historical significance related to the establishment of the Emancipation Proclamation. The property must be preserved as the only place where the Emancipation initiative can be publicly interpreted.

Tonia Hinson, 204 Galts Mill Arch, stated that she supported the project and is here as a resident and not as the Whittakers Mill HOA President. She described existing conditions in the area as unsightly and is embarrassed to bring people back to the community because of how bad it looks. The landscape along Penniman Road has been changed, VDOT fails to cut the grass, and there is quite a bit of trash and debris along the road before you enter the back side of the subdivision. She added that access to gas and services had at times been inconvenient for Whittaker's Mill residents.

Darrell Hinson, 204 Galts Mill Arch, stated that he supported the project. He argued that the development would replace an overgrown and trash-strewn area with productive development, improve appearance, generate tax revenue and jobs, and include a bench and commemorative plaque to recognize the site's historic significance.

Ann Grigorian, 117 Baldric Place, expressed concerns regarding the school and fiscal analysis. She questioned whether the analysis accounted for tax exemptions, whether the student-cost assumptions were realistic, whether school-capacity data fully accounted for other new developments, whether increased Marquis revenue would instead flow to the Marquis Community Development Authority (CDA) through 2041, and whether school proffers should have been required. She also objected to the proposed townhouse form being allowed to have six units together in one block.

With no one else wishing to speak regarding the application, **Chair Brooks** closed the public hearing.

Mr. Chamberlain stated the application was hastily thrown together and the economic data is bad and he will not support the application.

Mr. Smith stated that he was torn, noting that the County and Commission had been working on the development for 10 years. He added that the Marquis has not been successful. He expressed concerns about traffic, agreed that the road needed improvement, and noted that VDOT is involved in addressing the issue. He acknowledged staff's position of adhering to the Comprehensive Plan but suggested that some flexibility should be considered to help sustain the County's investment in the Marquis and encourage residential development in the area identified for growth in the Comprehensive Plan. He said this is an unusual piece of property that it is not suitable for every type of use. He agreed that the application has shortcomings, including some natural and cultural resource considerations that had not been thoroughly evaluated. He shared concerns regarding proposed lighting along Water Country Parkway. However, he expressed confidence that those issues would be addressed during the site plan review process. He acknowledged that the projected school cost numbers may be understated but noted that the figures were based on County and School Division projections rather than estimates provided by the developer. He also highlighted the School Division's projection that student enrollment is expected to level off by 2030. Overall, he believed the proposal offered more benefits than drawbacks, citing its support of the existing Marquis development, the addition of needed fuel, convenience, and food services, expanded housing options near Camp Perry, and a projected net fiscal benefit to the County.

Mr. Wassmer agreed with Mr. Smith's comments. He noted the unique nature of the property and observed that the proposal had been scaled down from the original concept. He thanked the citizens for their comments, added that property owners have rights regarding the use of their property within applicable regulations and stated he would support this application.

Mr. Borelli acknowledged the long history of efforts to develop the property and the desire to support the Marquis area but expressed reservations about the proposal's alignment with the Comprehensive Plan's mixed-use strategy and natural and cultural resource considerations.

Mr. Butler thanked staff for the presentation and expressed his appreciation for comments from citizens regarding the proposal. He expressed his belief that there had not been enough information demonstrated in the proposal to recommend approval of it.

Mr. Titus stated his dislike for PDMU developments because they never turn out the way they were designed but stated his belief that the proposal was a reasonable approach for this piece of land.

Chair Brooks thanked everyone for their input. He stated he had some concerns and felt torn. He added that cultural and natural resources are especially important for the County and its history and expressed the need to safeguard them.

Mr. Anderson clarified that VDOT approved of the Traffic Impact Analysis on Tuesday prior to the meeting. He noted the applicant has proffered to put streetlights on Water Country Parkway and to reduce the speed limit on that road by changing signs and working with VDOT.

Mr. Chamberlain moved the adoption of Resolution No. PC26-17.

A RESOLUTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF AN APPLICATION TO REZONE AN APPROXIMATELY 22-ACRE PORTION OF A 32-ACRE PARCEL BOUNDED BY MARQUIS CENTER PARKWAY, WATER COUNTRY PARKWAY, AND PENNIMAN ROAD FROM EO (ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY) TO PDMU (PLANNED DEVELOPMENT MIXED USE) SUBJECT TO VOLUNTARILY PROFFERED CONDITIONS

WHEREAS, EAH LLC has submitted Application No. PD-060-26, which is a request to amend the York County Zoning Map by reclassifying an approximately 22-acre portion of a 32-acre parcel (GPIN H13b-3278-4775) located at 200 Water Country Parkway (Route 640) from EO (Economic Opportunity) to PDMU (Planned Development Mixed Use) 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 8th day of July, 2026, that Application No. PD-060-26 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 an approximately 22-acre portion of a 32.0-acre parcel (GPIN H13b-3278-4775) located at 200 Water Country Parkway (Route 640) from EO (Economic Opportunity) to PDMU (Planned Development Mixed Use) subject to the following conditions:

1. General Layout, Design, and Density

- a) The development shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the provisions set forth in Section 24.1-361.1 of the Zoning Ordinance, Planned Development Mixed Use district, and the documents referenced in Condition 1.b below, except as modified herein.

- b) A site plan, prepared in accordance with the provisions of Article V of the Zoning Ordinance, shall be submitted to and approved by the Division of Development Services prior to the commencement of any land clearing or construction activities on the site. Except as modified herein, said site plan shall be in substantial conformance with the overall development master plan titled "MARQUIS CROSSING DEVELOPMENT MASTERPLAN," prepared by Timmons Group, dated June 26, 2026, supplemented by the following documents, copies of which shall be kept on file in the office of the York County Planning Division:
 - i. "200 Water Country Parkway - Marquis Crossing Minor-PDMU Ordinance Narrative" dated June 26, 2026
 - ii. "200 Water Country Parkway - Marquis Crossing Phasing Plan" dated June 23, 2026
 - iii. "MARQUIS CROSSING – MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT" received by the Planning Division on June 26, 2026
 - iv. "Marquis Townhomes Residential Design Guidelines" dated June 25, 2026
 - v. "Generalized Architectural Design" (Townhomes Elevations) received by the Planning Division on June 26, 2026
 - vi. "200 Water Country Parkway – Marquis Crossing Design Guidelines: Commercial" dated June 26, 2026
 - vii. "200 Water Country Parkway Design Guidelines: Signage" dated June 23, 2026
 - viii. "Marquis Crossing at 200 Water Country Parkway Traffic Impact Analysis" dated June 23, 2026
- c) The maximum number of townhomes shall be 125, with no more than 80 final certificates of occupancy for townhome residential units being allowed on the property, before a site plan shall have been approved and a foundation poured for a commercial use located either on Land Bay A or C.
- d) The development shall include a minimum of 10,150 square feet of commercial/office/civic/institutional (i.e. non-residential) floor area in Landbay A and C.
- e) For the residential townhome development a minimum of two (2) parking spaces per unit plus one (1) space per two (2) units for visitor parking shall be required to serve the residential portion of the development subject to the requirements set forth in Section 24.1-604(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. A parking space located in a garage shall credited as one-half (1/2) of a required parking space. Commercial parking shall be governed by the particular use as required in the Zoning Ordinance.
- f) The minimum dimensional standards shall be per the proffered residential and commercial design guidelines and as follows:
 - i. Accessory storage sheds designed and constructed at the time of development as an architecturally compatible addition to the dwelling unit, may occupy up to sixty (60) square feet of the required rear yard area. Such sheds shall not exceed six feet (6') in width nor ten feet (10') in depth and shall be located along one of the side lot lines in order to serve as a privacy screen and to maximize the usefulness of the remaining yard/patio area. Required yard setback dimensions shall be measured to the unit rather than to any attached accessory structure.

- ii. Commercial buildings shall have a minimum front yard setback of forty-five feet (45'), and a minimum side and rear yard setback of ten feet (10').

2. Streets and Roads

All internal public streets shall be constructed in accordance with all applicable VDOT standards and all internal private streets or alleys shall be constructed per Section 20.5-102 – Private Streets.

3. Open Space and Recreation

- a) A minimum of 2.7 acres of common open space shall be provided as depicted on the Marquis Crossing Development Masterplan.
- b) Recreational amenities shall consist of the following, at a minimum, as depicted on the referenced Marquis Crossing Development Masterplan a copy of which shall be kept on file in the office of the York County Planning Division:
 - i. a 2.4-acre community green containing a gazebo;
 - ii. a 0.3-acre pocket park;
 - iii. 1,300 linear feet of recreational trail;
 - iv. Sidewalks on both sides of the public streets and in various locations on private streets;
 - v. Benches; and
 - vi. A historical interpretive display.

4. Fire and Life Safety

- a) All trees shall be planted such that when they mature, they will not grow into the drive lanes.
- b) Knox Boxes shall be installed on all commercial buildings and on any residential buildings equipped with fire sprinklers or fire alarms systems to allow emergency responders access to the building in the event of an emergency. The Fire Official shall determine the required model and locations of these Knox boxes during the site plan review process.

5. Signs

- a) Free-standing signs shall be of a ground-mounted monument type and shall not be larger than thirty-two (32) square feet nor erected to a height greater than ten feet (10'). The use of colors commonly referred to as "neon" or "fluorescent" and which are unnaturally bright shades of red, orange, yellow, green, or blue shall not be permitted on signs.
- b) Street signs shall adhere to the requirements of Section 20.5-80.
- c) Entrance signs or monuments to identify the residential component shall conform with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance and the following standards:
 - i. The maximum size and the maximum height of such signs shall be in accordance with the standards established in Chapter 24.1, Zoning. Signs have a minimum setback requirement of ten feet (10') and shall not encroach into sight triangles required by Section 20.5-101.

- ii. Only the subdivision name and logo and any symbols indicating compliance with or participation in a governmentally sponsored or mandated fair housing practices program or code may be placed on any such sign. The Subdivision Agent may authorize signs on both sides of a development entrance, and at multiple entrances to the development, provided that no individual sign shall exceed the allowable sign area specified by the Zoning Ordinance.
 - iii. Where such signs are to be illuminated, only external illumination shall be permitted and the size, placement, and number of luminaires shall be reviewed and approved by the Subdivision Agent.
 - iv. A landscaped planting area shall be provided surrounding the base of such sign. The minimum size of such planting area shall be four (4) square feet for each one (1) square foot of sign area. Appropriate groundcovers (other than grass) and shrubs shall be installed within the planting area, including a minimum of six (6) shrubs.
 - v. Walls, fences and other similar treatments which delineate or define the entrance to, or boundaries of a subdivision shall require the submission of architectural renderings for approval by the Subdivision Agent.
 - vi. The Subdivision Agent shall deny or require modification of plans for such features when he finds that the installation would be visually obtrusive upon adjacent properties or public streets, be incompatible with the character of existing or anticipated surrounding development, or conflict with other goals and policies of the county.
6. Landscaping, buffers, and screening for the residential component shall adhere to the requirements of Section 20.5-84 of the Zoning Ordinance.
7. Proffered Conditions

The reclassification shall be subject to the conditions listed in the proffer statement titled "PROFFERED CONDITIONS" received by the Planning Division on June, 26, 2026, and signed by Jason Hackmann, Owner/Managing Member of EAH LLC.

BE IT STILL FURTHER RESOLVED that in accordance with Section 24.1-114(e)(1) of the York County Zoning Ordinance, a certified copy of the ordinance accepting the proffered conditions, 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 application for site plan approval.

On a roll call the vote was:

Yea: (3)	Smith, Wassmer, Titus
Nay: (4)	Borelli, Chamberlain, Butler, Brooks

Therefore, the motion to approve the application was denied.

* * *

STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Anderson presented the Development Activity Report provided to the Planning Commission.

OLD BUSINESS

The Commission discussed a possible change in meeting start time from 7:00 p.m. to an earlier time and the implications for citizen participation. Commissioners expressed interest in forming a subcommittee to review the bylaws, including meeting time provisions, before making any change. By consensus, the Commission agreed to form a bylaws review subcommittee and appointed Mr. Smith and Mr. Borelli to serve, with staff support.

NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

There were no committee reports.

COMMISSION REPORTS AND REQUESTS

There were no Commission reports or requests.

ADJOURN

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:35 PM.

SUBMITTED:


Catherine G. Tartabini
Planning Commission Secretary

APPROVED:


Gregory "Skip" Brooks, Chair

DATE:

8-12-26