

**STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**January 25, 2017**

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, January 25, 2017, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Tom Coen in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the George L. Gordon, Jr., Government Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Coen, Crystal Vanuch, Steven Apicella, Sherry Bailey, Roy Boswell, Darrell English, Mike Rhodes,

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Harvey, Rysheda McClendon, Stacie Stinnette, Mike Zuraf, Brian Geouge, Susan Blackburn

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

Mr. Coen: Are there any declarations or disqualifications on any agenda item?

Mr. Boswell: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to be disqualifying myself from item number 2. This project borders some property that my family owns

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you Mr. Boswell, thank you very much. Are there any others? Alright, so now we move to the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing none. We go to public presentations for this part of the meeting. What we have is an opportunity for the public to speak on any matter except for tonight's two public hearings; the one with the townhomes up off Telegraph Road and the business on Garrisonville Road. These will... there will be a separate comment time during these public hearings for people to speak. Please, when you come forward, state your name and your address before you start your comments, and address the Commission as a whole. You have 3 minutes to speak when the green light comes on. When the yellow light comes on, that indicates you have 1 moment left... one minute left and then at the red light, please wrap up your comments. If anyone would like to speak, please come forward at this time. Seeing none, alright, we close the public comment portion of our meeting. So now we go to the regular part of the agenda. I believe, Mr. Harvey, we have a presentation this evening from Stafford County Public Schools?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it's on school enrollment and capacities, and if you'd please recognize Mr. Scott Horan for the presentation. And he is also accompanied by Ms. Holly Hazard, who's the Chairman of the School Board.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Horan and thank you Chairman Hazard.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Presentation on School Enrollment and Capacities

Mr. Horan: Certainly. Good evening Mr. Chairman, Board members, Mr. Harvey, tonight I'm going to give you a presentation on our enrollment projections. So, I'll walk you through where we identified growth. Obviously, many of you will be familiar with some of those developments. And then how are methodology, how we use our methodology to determine our student enrollment projections. I'll show you a little bit about some projections that we have. I passed out to Mr. Harvey, we had a change in our projections slide. The actual numbers did not change at all; it was the color coding. So, it just... we

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

used instead of 95% and less as green we changed it to 90% to kind of align more with what the Comprehensive Plan identifies as 90% utilization of schools as the optimum. And we agree with that and we've provided that information. So, I will begin and talk to you a little bit about the growth areas enrollment and forecast, and then open it up for questions. Okay, first slide is South Stafford. These are some of the subdivisions that are currently producing new homes that contribute to students at all of our levels. If you have any questions, just stop me; I'm going to breeze through these. I think you're probably familiar with many of these.

Mr. Coen: I'll stop you real quickly.

Mr. Horan: Alright.

Mr. Coen: Is there any distinction between the red (inaudible)?

Mr. Horan: Red are the ones that are really active that we're seeing growth. Some of the ones that aren't in red, such as Westlake, it's an approved subdivision and we have to account for that but obviously there's no activity currently with Westlake.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Mr. Horan: Yes, I'm sorry about that. Central Stafford is where we're really feeling most of the pressure across the division. As you well know, we have the developments around Colonial Forge High School called Colonial Forge; that's part of Augustine. Embrey Mill -- doing significant development in the last year. Liberty Knolls -- Liberty Knolls West which has been approved and it's next to Liberty Knolls, next to Winding Creek Elementary, will start to produce. And then we have Westgate, Shelton Woods, Courthouse Manor, Abberly -- all those are starting to get high on our radar and some of them are producing a lot of students. And then in the North Stafford area, we have really Aquia Towne Center is one that's producing the most, and the Hills of Aquia is finishing up. And these others still have units that they're being developed. Any questions?

Mr. Coen: Just one quick question. And that is, can you just sort of give us an overview of what you sort of depict as South Stafford, Central Stafford, and North Stafford, just so that the throngs that are watching on television understand. I mean, many people think of South Stafford as Hartwood and George Washington, but I just want to make sure people understand what areas you're referring.

Mr. Horan: Certainly. We look at kind of the three centric rings; we start at the north with 610 and kind of the arteries that go off 610 and the schools and divisions and all the development off of 610 about halfway in between 610 and Courthouse. Then there's the central part of Stafford, so we go from Courthouse, all the way from actually the river to the west part of the County, along Courthouse and Mountain View Road. And then the southern corridor is Route 17 and 218 as they connect, and those arteries off of those for South Stafford.

Mr. Coen: Thank you.

Mr. Horan: Certainly. Our enrollment forecast, and some of you are familiar with our methodology but I'll walk you through that. About 6 years ago we lost some of our in-house capability in urban planning. So, we leaned on contract support to help us develop our forecast. The methodology is not new; we used it in-house, but it's a cohort progression methodology where we utilize the birthrates of children at a certain year. When they arrive in kindergarten, we use birthrates to determine the number of kindergarteners. And then from kindergarten through 12, we use those students that are enrolled in our

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

school and we roll them up into the next year each year. We have some subtractions and additions based on mathematical formulas, based on you know just growth in a specific area. And then we take that methodology and we overlay a growth model on it and it identifies or interacts or injects the growth of new development into that model. And so the two models are merged together and it produces enrollment projections. So, you might ask, well on the growth part how do you do that? We identify at a certain date of each year, and this year it's usually July 30<sup>th</sup>, we identify any approved subdivisions that are on the books prior to that date. And then if it's active, we try and contact the developer, we work with Jeff Harvey and his staff to identify and coordinate and bounce off the number of units that we believe or we can plan for to be permitted and constructed in that particular year. And so that's how we determine. There's a prearranged student generation factor for the number of students that are generated from a single-family house, from an apartment, or townhouse. So, based on that, we develop what we feel are build-outs for each of these developments that are active, and then we, based on our assumptions... and these are assumptions that we use... we look at developments such as Westlake or Cabin Property or those and we say what's the likelihood that they may start development in 4, 5, 6 years. And so we make some assumptions based on that. And then we have a assumed build-out or assumed number of units per year. So that's how we look at the growth model; we overlay that on our cohort progression model, and then it spits out a forecast. On this particular chart, it shows our forecast relative to the number of students that showed up the next year. You can see in 14/15 we were about 292 off of roughly 27,000 students. In 2015/2016 it got a little better. And I need to apologize; the 2016/17 data -- that's incorrect. We found an error this morning and it is very closely to our 15/16 numbers. It's about 175 students off of 28,000. So, I apologize for that. So, any questions on the methodology?

Mr. Coen: Alright, and before I go to questions, just so again people understand the reason why we asked for this, is part of the new proffer legislation now entails looking at actual seats in buildings and capacities and whatnot. So, that's sort of why we asked you to come and you offered to come. So, thank you Ms. Hazard; you were kind enough to make the offer. Any questions for Mr. Horan? Mr. Apicella was moving first and then Mrs. Vanuch.

Mr. Apicella: Sorry Mrs. Vanuch. It strikes me that the projection for 2016/17 is, as you say, pretty spot on, and I'm curious what's changed because again I don't mean this in a pejorative way but you're about 300 off in just 2 years ago. So, what have you guys done that's different to get closer to...?

Mr. Horan: Well, the 16/17, you know, I told you it was wrong. And so it was about 175. This was incorrect on this chart.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Horan: Yeah, and I again apologize.

Mr. Apicella: So you're 175 off.

Mr. Horan: We are, and not the 13. I wish that was the case.

Mr. Apicella: Okay.

Mr. Horan: But, it's about very similar to last year. And I think what happened is in 2014, we began the contract support and so there was a bit, and I know Mr. Coen was involved with us looking at the data, and there was a little bit of a learning curve with our contract support folks to understand our developments and our neighborhoods and our communities. And so I attribute that maybe is a reason

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

we were a little higher, that number was a little different, again, projecting enrollment projections. But we do try to use science and methodology and math, but there is somewhat of a crystal balling to do this because we are making assumptions based on what we think are build-outs. And then in 15/16 and 16/17, both those years, some of the larger influences into the enrollment projections, these neighborhoods, we got a better feel and a better understanding for the number of units that were being produced. And so the ones that we assumed the next year were much closer to what our assumptions were. So, in fact, Embrey Mill actually they built more than what our assumptions were. They really took off this past year. So, I hope I answered that question for you.

Mr. Apicella: Yes.

Mr. Horan: And again, I apologize for the incorrect data.

Mr. Apicella: Just another follow-up question. What's the total growth between 2014 and 2016 that you've seen?

Mr. Horan: The total growth?

Mr. Apicella: Total growth of student population.

Mr. Horan: In students.

Mr. Apicella: Right.

Mr. Horan: I want to say, I guess you can come up with that on here, from 27,265 students to 28,119 students from September of 14 to September of 16. So, that's what almost 800, 900 students, I think?

Mr. Apicella: Right. And is that consistent with what you've seen in the past? Is it higher or lower (inaudible)?

Mr. Horan: It's absolutely higher, it's absolutely higher. And as you know, back in 2003-4-5-6, that timeframe, we were growing at 4 to 500 students on some years. And then we flat-lined in 2007 and 8. In fact, once year we actually had a decrease in the number of students, and I believe that might have been 2008. And then it slowly started creeping up in 2009 and 10, 11; now it's at a much healthier of 2 to 300 to 400 students per year, depending on the year.

Mr. Coen: Okay, one second Mr. Apicella. Do you have any other slides?

Mr. Horan: I do.

Mr. Coen: Okay, and then we'll go to you. I just figured it didn't make much sense to have the screen kind of on a slide if we were talking about other issues. Some people would actually like to see our wonderful faces.

Mr. Horan: This next slide, and you have this information, this is the elementary school enrollment projections. That first one-month column is the number of students at the end of September of this year. We call it the one-month count after drops are done by our school division for no-shows. And so that's an accurate number of students that begin the school year. Obviously, we have students that come and go during the school year. At the elementary and middle school level we see more adds and at the high school level we see more subtractions from that September number. And it's more in line of a lot of

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

high school students finish their requirements maybe after the... at Christmastime or some of them even drop out. But we see that trend that goes that way versus elementary and middle school goes up. The next slide is the middle school enrollment and the final slide is the high school enrollment. What I passed out to you, we changed the percentage, that block on the bottom, for all three from 95% and less to be green to 90% and less. So, you'll see a lot more yellow in the chart that I handed out to you than green. That's all I have.

Mr. Coen: Thank you. Alright, and we can go back to faces.

Mr. Horan: Yes sir.

Mr. Coen: Go ahead Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Well, it just goes back to the number. You said we're about 400 new students every year for the last couple years. I'm just curious what that... what you're seeing that glide scale being (inaudible).

Mr. Horan: It's increasing. We're projecting an increase of that from last year.

Mr. Apicella: And are we at the highest that we've been or going to get to the highest we've been?

Mr. Horan: No. I mean, when you say been, I think in the early... late 1990's and early 2000's we were looking at 8... before my time... but we were looking at some years 800 new students.

Mr. Apicella: I don't mean in terms of total new students; I mean in terms of total amount of students.

Mr. Horan: Oh, absolutely, correct, yes. We're steadily increasing in our total enrollment.

Mr. Apicella: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Coen: Mrs. Vanuch?

Mrs. Vanuch: This could just be me but, how do you define capacity? Like, what is your definition? And a subset to that is do you include, I think, at Colonial Forge and maybe South Stafford have these little nooks under the stairwells where kids kind of just hang out. Do you include that in the capacity to get your total number?

Mr. Horan: Okay. The capacity of a school, whether it be elementary, middle, or high school, is determined by the architect working with the school division on how... what size school they want. And so we look at a classroom and we use a standard that Virginia DOE provides to us to plan a classroom. So, typically, and a good number to use in a general classroom is 24, 24 students. For special ed classrooms that are designed for special ed, we use 8. For resource spaces at the elementary school we don't, because we have kids coming and going so they're not permanent stations. So based on kind of that, we develop the number of classrooms we want in a school and based on that is we develop a design capacity, and that's the architect's intent and the school division's intent on what the capacity of the school is. Now, we don't use collaborative areas, small teaching areas, as part of our capacity, our stated capacity.

Mrs. Vanuch: Okay, and the gym doesn't count either?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Mr. Horan: Not at the elementary school. But at the high school and nor at the middle school. We look at teaching spaces. So, if you go into a high school, all of our high schools have four blocks during the day. And at that first block at the beginning of school, do we have teaching spaces in our gyms, our aux gyms and other spaces? Then the answer is yes. The majority of those spaces are filled all day long with teaching spaces. So it was three years ago we did not count the gyms and the auxiliary gyms, nor did we count fine arts rooms, band, orchestra, chorus; we did not count those as part of the capacity. So our capacity of most of our high schools, for instance, Colonial Forge, was 1,800 students. When we decided to count those spaces as teaching, the capacity of the schools increased -- on paper. They were always there and we always taught in those spaces, but instead of 1,800 they now became 2,000 or 2,050. And then recently we added additions to Brooke Point, Colonial Forge, and Mountain View. And so that also increased the capacity. Does that answer your question?

Mrs. Vanuch: Yeah.

Mr. Horan: Okay.

Mr. Coen: Mr. English?

Mr. English: I've got a question. In reference to the elementary schools, Falmouth Elementary kind of sticks out; it's all green across there. And I'm assuming that the students that, as they get older, from Falmouth Elementary they're going to go to Drew. And then you've got here Drew, Drew starts at 90 to 100% in 2018, but the elementary school still stays green. Is that a reason for that? I mean, when you think those would kind of stay... if the elementary school was high, I mean, they're dumping into middle school, how come the elementary school is staying low? Is it... do you understand my question?

Mr. Horan: Yes sir, I'll try... I think I do. But not all of our students at Falmouth will go to Drew. Some of them will actually go to maybe Dixon Smith or even Gayle Middle School, depending on what neighborhoods. We don't have... in a perfect world we'd have feeder patterns that would streamline and everyone at a certain elementary school would go to that specific middle school or a specific middle school. But that doesn't happen. We try to align that. But, Falmouth, there are bubbles in the system. So, we might have 5<sup>th</sup> graders that have a really large class and a 3<sup>rd</sup> grade that might a very small class, and then 2<sup>nd</sup> graders that might be a very large class. So, there are bubbles to the system as students make their way through the different grade levels. So, for instance, not all the students at Falmouth will go to Drew. In fact, I know that many of... or not many, but there are a portion of them that will go to Gayle Middle School. And those middle schools are feeders for 2, 3, sometimes 4 elementary schools.

Mr. English: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Coen: Okay, anyone else? I just have a couple questions. Do we still use APU's?

Mr. Horan: We do. An APU is an Area Planning Unit and it includes, for instance, 4 or 5 different neighborhoods. And it's geographically identified usually by roads, but not necessarily roads.

Mr. Coen: Cool. And then, how often does the school system do a current count, an actual seat count? I know federal law and whatnot it's done at the beginning of the year. And the reason why I'm asking that is if part of this proffer law is to know capacity, and if I got it correctly you reassess in July based on what's on the books and whatnot, I'm just wondering if it's going to be practical or necessary for us to actually get more accurate data. And if that's the case... accurate as in, you know, total students actually sitting there... and if that's possible, how often do you do that?

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Mr. Horan: We have the capability to provide actual enrollment every day. So, we have the capability to look at our enrollments each day of the school year and to say, today we have 28,242 students. Tomorrow it could be 49 students and the following day it could be 53 students, you know. So we have that capability. When we do our projections, we use a static number or it would just be a mess trying to, you know, keep the projections updated. So we do them once a year. We start in the summer. We gather data on the growth and those items, and then at the end of September when we have our starting school year after all the no-shows have been dropped out, that number at 30 September is reported to Virginia DOE. We use that as the basis for starting our projections for that year.

Mr. Coen: And then these charts, are they available online for the public to see?

Mr. Horan: They are. We've shown them in different forms, but I believe they're part of our student accommodation report, which is online and available under our planning section.

Mr. Coen: Alright. And then lastly, I noticed, for example, the Colonial Forge capacity is 2,175 and they have basically two trailers. Are the trailers figured into that?

Mr. Horan: At one time they were, yes. And so the idea is, when they leave, that capacity will go away.

Mr. Coen: Okay, so that, in theory, if one of the trailers was to go away this summer to go to somewhere else, then this number would go down and then that would shift all their color coordinations that way.

Mr. Horan: Yes sir.

Mr. Coen: Alright, cool. Thank you sir. Any other questions?

Mr. Apicella: Any questions at all?

Mr. Coen: I'm open to any question, but go ahead.

Mr. Apicella: No, are we done with the presentation? Because I wasn't sure (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: I just didn't know if Mrs. Hazard would like to say a few words and then we can go...

Mrs. Hazard: Well, sure. Thanks for letting me come back. I just wanted to thank Mr. Horan for coming over. I think this is important information for you all to see, especially as Mr. Coen mentioned about the proffers, but also just going forward. If you all did, you got my maybe invitation; if you are bored tomorrow night, please come out, if you'd like to, to Colonial Forge. You'll get to see our redistricting new process in action. It's going to be very hands-on. Most of you who may remember the UDA thing, it's going to be very similar with maps, people getting to come up with solutions. One thing I wanted to just show you on this map, which was something I had to learn... or this one... the column called Pre-K, which is in 2016/17, the reason that is becoming very important, as you can see, under federal law we have a lot of requirements that requires us to have actually 2-, 3-, and 4-year olds involved in our Pre-K program which, by law, we have to provide. What's beginning to become an issue now is where do we put these programs. We don't have sort of a head-start type facility where we all come to one. So many of our schools, just so you know when you talked about design capacity and stuff, now we are using these 24, 25 generally regular classroom, now we're having 8 students in the morning, maybe 8 students in the afternoon, and it's being used not in the sense as when we first designed it to use that. Just so you see, these elementary numbers, even as time goes on, could go...

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

could change partly because taking one classroom, two classrooms, three classrooms here and there at each elementary school eventually over time adds up. Right now we have 20. In our budget for next year we are actually, for our Pre-K program, forecasting and this is just still forecast, 14 positions which, to me, that could be, you know, 6... 4 or 5 more classrooms, which takes one more out. So I just wanted... that's something new for me to learn about and how that's impacting our spaces as well. We look forward to partnering with you all too on providing information. And maybe we'll see you tomorrow night.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mrs. Hazard. Alright, and then I'll bring this to the... this was for information and/or discussion. Any member of the Commission wish to talk? Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, again I still have some questions. I'm curious how the Stafford County's forecasting methodology, I think it's in the Comp Plan, compares and contrasts with the school system's methodology. That's a question.

Mr. Horan: Well, I don't specifically know that because I'm not real familiar with the County's growth projection methodology. But I do know that we do take the growth portion of the data that we collect and the assumptions that we make and we do bounce those off of Jeff Harvey and his staff to make sure that not only one, are we making some sound and reasonable assumptions, but two, that we have accurate data and we have accurate data on the neighborhoods and the developments and those things. Of course, the students in our systems are fairly accurate. We have a good pulse on what students we have in our schools. The one kind of... the little bit of, not shaky, but we use birthrates for those kids coming into the kindergarten. We all are in agreement on the student generation factor. We use a student generation factor that we've worked together with the County staff to develop so that the number of students at elementary, middle, and high that are produced by a type of dwelling, I think we're all in locked step, so from that perspective. So, Jeff, I don't know if you can comment any at all on the County's methodology and how closely that's aligned with what we do at the schools.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, I would say the Comprehensive Plan has a much more coarse evaluation of what the student and school projections are. The intent of the Comprehensive Plan and the appendices is to give an idea what... the number of schools we might need in the future. What it looks at is our projected population growth and looks at it on an annual basis and then converts that to a dwelling unit number, and then also converts that to a student population number, and then produces... you need x number of additional schools based on this linear projection of number of increase in students. It doesn't account for the rates that a school division looks at as far as the birthrate and other factors.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, just kind of a related question, based on your experience, do you find that there's a difference in the number of students generated by existing housing stock versus new construction?

Mr. Horan: Yes, I do. I think... and I think we went through this discussion 4 years ago when we were tackling the student generation factor. We think that... at least I think the new construction generates a higher percentage of students from a new whether it be townhomes, single-family, or apartments than existing. Because there's a phenomenon that I you've all heard, a neighborhood ages out. As a neighborhood is developed, you know, it's usually... well, I won't say usually, but there is a demographic overlay of the age of types of people that are in there, young families, middle-aged families. And then as those families live there longer, those students grow up and they age out and they're out of our schools and then those families still stay in those houses for a period of time. So neighborhoods over a period of time go through an aging out where some of the older couples are retiring somewhere and their kids are out, and then new folks come in with younger kids. And so that process begins again. What that time period is, is up for... I'm sure there's some standards out there.



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

But we see that the existing neighborhoods don't produce quite as many students as newer neighborhoods.

Mr. Apicella: So, are we... I don't want to say harming ourselves, but are we underestimating when we use the countywide average versus look at a new construction average?

Mr. Horan: Right, we don't use the countywide average when we...

Mr. Apicella: I'm saying for us...

Mr. Horan: Okay, very good.

Mr. Apicella: ... because when we look at a project, we're trying to figure out how many students are going to potentially arrive as a result of, you know, 100, 200, 300 homes.

Mr. Horan: We (inaudible) Scott Mayauskey had developed or brought towards... to the County government a few years back that student generation factor. So we support that.

Mr. Apicella: And the last question, Mr. Chairman, and this is for both for Mrs. Hazard, and I appreciate your being here, and Mr. Horan, what can we do going forward to kind of be, I don't want to say in better alignment but to be more in alignment so that we're forecasting more closely what new growth is potentially going to... how it's going to impact Stafford County and how we better plan for it?

Mr. Horan: Well, all I can... I guess my comment would be, we don't know if a development, a rezoning, certainly know by-right but we don't have a good pulse on what gets developed until something is submitted, right. And then we track that. And so that's a good tool that we use, working with the County Planning staff that when a major site plan is submitted, then we have that idea. What is hard for us to graph is some of these developments that are on the books, that have been approved, but we don't know when they may start turning dirt or not, if in fact. And so a lot of them are... we start to address them in year 4, 5, 6, 7 of our 10 year forecast because we just don't know. And we have time to recover if all of a sudden one of those developments would come forward and, you know, it takes probably a year or so for that process, you know, for the site plan.

Mr. Apicella: Well, to that point, you mentioned that one of our risk areas, or greatest areas of growth is Central Stafford along, I believe, are all on the Courthouse Road corridor. There's a lot of approved projects, the sum total of which if they all started happening at the same time, I look at the number of students in Colonial Forge would really, you know, cause that to burst at the seams. So, is there anything that we could do to help them, the school system, know when the dirt is turning and when moving is actually starting to happen, so they can adjust...?

Mr. Horan: I think there's mechanisms in place right now that we are notified. Obviously, if we're neighbors, we get notification. We work closely with Jeff and his staff to know when these major site plans come in. We are part of the process to review these site plans to give our comments. So, from that perspective, I think it's really good connectivity with County government.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but even if a site plan is approved it doesn't necessarily mean that the dirt's going to start being... so...

Mr. Horan: That's correct, that's correct.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 25, 2017*

Mr. Apicella: ... again, there's a lot of stuff happening on that one roadway. If Embrey Mill is pushed forward and Colonial Forge is pushed forward and some of the other projects that we've approved push forward, they're not talking to each other, they're going to do what they need to do based on economics. But if they decide the economics are right in line, they might all start turning dirt at the same time.

Mr. Horan: That's right. And until we know that, we are trying to stay in connection with the developers and with Jeff's office. And we formally do that once a year. If there's a mechanism to do that quarterly or something, we certainly don't have the staff to follow-up all the time with these developers to find out.

Mrs. Hazard: I would sort of say in that line as Mr. Horan has stated, we look like we're in a growth model. I mean, what that percentage, how that's going to increase, we're going this way, this way, some way like that. I would like and would suggest that perhaps we do begin to create some kind of small working group of not just Planning Commissioners, you know, one or two from each board; I would think County Fire and Rescue... everybody is going to want to know how to react to this growth. And if we can be on this planning ahead of time before we're always reacting to it would be better. And I would suggest, you know, Board of Supervisor (inaudible), but some kind of working group like that. Yes, the relationships between, you know, Mr. Horan's office and Mr. Harvey's office, that is part of it. But we also have to make sure that some of that gets to the decision-makers in general for roads, police, sheriffs, all of those things. So that would be my personal suggestion is that we begin to think about some kind of working group. Maybe it is quarterly, but then we can make sure we stay on top of that. That would be my suggestion.

Mr. Coen: Ah, thank you Mrs. Hazard.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, is that something we can pulse the Board on? Either Mrs. Hazard and/or the Planning Commission?

Mr. Coen: Yep, we can certainly let people... I don't know if they want to think about it tonight, but sort of a some type of working group to get some feel for and have our bodies and our knowledge sort of work with the schools and any other entity, police and fire and etcetera. Is there sort of a feel that that's something that's worthwhile and meaningful for us to sort of look into?

Mr. Apicella: I guess what would be the downside of it? I can only see an upside; I'm not quite sure I see a downside.

Mr. Coen: Right. I mean, to a certain degree, even higher-ups have to sort of agree. Is there any other feedback from members? Okay. So there's sort of a couple nodding heads. So what I'll do is talk to members, see what we can do and see where we can go with this idea farther, and then perhaps we can talk to our higher-ups on the other Board and see what they think of it as well. Alright, anything else for Mrs. Hazard or Mr. Horan? Alright, thank you very much for coming out this evening.

Mr. Horan: Thank you.

Mr. Coen: I know you have a busy week.

Mrs. Hazard: Tomorrow night.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Mr. Coen: Yes, thank you. Alright, so the next item on our agenda are the public hearings. We start off with the public hearing for The Garrison at Stafford Financial Institution. Mr. Harvey, you have the floor.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. CUP16151554; Conditional Use Permit - The Garrison at Stafford Financial Institution - A request for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow a drive-through within the HC, Highway Corridor Overlay Zoning District, on a portion of Tax Map Parcel No. 20-130. The drive-through would be associated with a financial institution. The property is zoned P-TND, Planned – Traditional Neighborhood Development and consists of 0.84 acres, located on the south side of Garrisonville Road across from the intersection with Travis Lane, within the Garrisonville Election District. **(Time Limit: May 5, 2017)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. If you'd please recognize Mike Zuraf for the presentation.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, Mike Zuraf with the Planning and Zoning Department. If I could have the computer please. This item is a Conditional Use Permit for a project known as Garrison at Stafford Financial Institution. This is a request for a conditional use permit for a drive-through facility within the Highway Corridor Overlay District, specifically associated with a bank. The site is in the P-TND Zoning District; that's a Planned District, Traditional Neighborhood Development District, on a portion of a property that is .84 acres. The applicant is 606 Reston LLC; that's the developer of The Garrison at Stafford project, represented by Clark Leming and his staff. The location of the site is on the south side of Garrisonville Road, across from the intersection with Travis Lane in North Stafford. A portion of the site subject to the request and surrounding area on this aerial consists of open field area, it's generally level, the south are primarily forested areas including streams in those locations. There's also one single-family dwelling that previously existed on the property as a small farmstead; it may have actually been demolished from what we see here. Looking at the zoning history, the site was rezoned to the P-TND district back in October of 2015. The district requires a Regulating Plan and General Development Plan as part of that zone. This Regulating Plan identifies the area where this bank would locate in the T-6 Zone. This corresponds with specific development standards in the Zoning Ordinance. In the Regulating Plan, site details are not included on this type of plan. The associated original General Development Plan envisioned a development pattern that had buildings around the perimeter of the site and centralized parking. So you can see the area of the proposed bank originally as planned where a parking lot was shown at the time. And then there was an amendment in August of 2016, a proffer amendment added this optional General Development Plan which included the bank use in the location of this request. And you can see the location of this use is consistent with this latest approved General Development Plan from that time. So, this is the current General Development Plan submitted with this request. It shows a 6,000 square-foot bank with two drive-through lanes. The site has frontage directly on Garrisonville Road and the west side of the primary site entrance into the project. Access to the site would be limited to an internal travelway. So, if I can just show you, the access restrictions would be limited to this one location. There'd be no direct access off of Garrisonville Road or the primary entrance drive which is envisioned to really have a lot of traffic passing. So, somebody entering the site from Garrisonville Road, they would have to proceed down, turn at this access drive and then turn into the site at this location. The drive-through windows are located on the east side of the building, and their access would be a one-way counterclockwise traffic pattern around the building. And the building includes proposed landscaping that would serve to screen headlight glare from impacting vehicles on Garrisonville Road. To maintain consistency with the TND zoning standards, the plan identifies pedestrian circulation and access to the remainder of development that's required in that zone. So, there

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

are a few conditions being proposed. That the development occur in accordance with the GDP; access be limited to locations shown on the General Development Plan into the site; headlight glare be minimized with berms and evergreen plantings where needed; and loading areas and trash collection areas, if any, be screened from Garrisonville Road; and stacking lanes be designed to not impede traffic circulation, which is the primary reason for the use permit. Some of the other issues, the use itself would generate an estimated 889 vehicle trips per day. This would not require a traffic study. A traffic study was conducted as part of the original rezoning and this use fits into the anticipated traffic volumes for the overall project as originally studied. With architectural design, there are no specific architectural elevations of the proposed bank at this time. As part of the rezoning to the TND Zoning District, a Neighborhood Design Standards Manual is required, and that document itself will ensure that the buildings in the development kind of have a consistent design associated with them. And then with the Comp Plan, the drive-through use associated with the bank is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use recommendation for commercial corridors within Suburban areas. The proposal would allow neighborhoods serving commercial uses consistent with the recommendations in the Plan, and the use would fit in with the established development pattern along Garrisonville Road in this location. There are some positive aspects. The conditions would limit intensity and external impacts; it's consistent with the Comp Plan recommendations; and consistent with criteria to be considered for a conditional use permit. Staff doesn't see any negative aspects with this request and is supportive of the application, and recommends approval. And I will take any questions.

Mr. Coen: Alright, any questions for staff? Mr. English?

Mr. English: Mike, what bank is it going to be?

Mr. Zurf: That's not been... I'm not certain. The applicant may be able to answer that.

Mr. English: Okay.

Mr. Coen: Any other questions? Alright, seeing none, would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening Mr. Leming.

Mr. Leming: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission. In the overall context of this project, which you've seen in a couple other phases at this point, we're just dotting i's and crossing t's as users are lined up. We are under discussions with Navy Federal Credit Union which is why we're requesting the CUP; that would be an important part of those negotiations. So, I don't believe there really are any planning issues, because really we're into an implementation phase at this point. You've seen the overall plan and things are progressing. The Pencs are here this evening; if you do have any questions about this application, I'll be happy to address them. If there are any questions you have beyond that, I'll see if one of the Pencs can answer them.

Mr. Coen: Alright, thank you Mr. Leming. Any questions for Mr. Leming? Alright, I have one question only because that's the one question people keep asking me. It's when is the movie... is the movie theater on target and when are we sort of envisioning it?

Mr. Leming: Spring of 2018.

Mr. Coen: Alright. In time for the Memorial Day crush. Alright, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 25, 2017*

Mr. Coen: Go ahead.

Mr. Rhodes: Since you opened that door, Mr. Leming, any more information on other... any far enough along on any of your other negotiations you could talk about anything else that's going to be there?

Mr. Leming: Mr. Pence, do you wish to say anything else?

Mr. Rhodes: Too early or?

Mr. Leming: Mr. Pence will...

Mr. Coen: Good evening Mr. Pence.

Mr. Pence: Good evening Mr. Chairman. I'm Bob Pence, as opposed to Jeff Pence over here. Mr. Chairman, members of the Planning Commission, the answer to your question, we have two negotiations. We're hopeful we'll conclude a large health club facility on what we call Building 4 which would be above the retail section which is the plan 2. And, by the way, we are only pursuing the amended plan at the moment, not the original strip. And you'd probably like to know one thing we are not pursuing, and that is the gas station. And we have a letter of intent with, don't quote me... are we on TV?

Mr. Rhodes: Yeah.

Mr. Pence: Oh, okay, hello.

Mr. Rhodes: But we'll keep it a secret.

Mr. Pence: Oh good, thank you, thank you. But we have a letter of intent with Total Wine going on one of the pads in lieu of the gas station.

Mr. Rhodes: Keep rolling.

Mr. Coen: It's gas of another type I think.

Mr. Pence: Let's see, we have... on the pad next to...

Mr. Coen: Did you want the...

Mr. Rhodes: Computer please.

Mr. Coen: ... computer up?

Mr. Pence: Yes please, thank you. The pad to the west, we have... it's going to be a Longhorn Steakhouse. And I can't talk about the night property because we're not in for zoning yet; we have a lot over there. And in the phase, if you could put up the overall plan that goes with this please... okay... in the building right behind where the financial institution will be, we call it Building 4, the plan on that building is all retail on the first floor -- that's about 60,000 feet -- and somewhere between whether I win the argument of about 124 housing units above it or my son wins and it's a hundred, but you members of the Planning Commission may recall that somewhere along the line we have a provision to use our maximum housing. We need to put in at least a hundred above some other facility, and we've elected,

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

for a number of reasons, to do it going in on day 1. I suspect the full answer to your question, we have two big events coming up; one in February here in DC with an ICSC, International Council of Shopping Center meeting, and then we have our big annual convention in Las Vegas, which is always in Las Vegas, in May. So I suspect we'll come away from there with a pretty full roster. For those of you who have been by the site, we've been moving utility lines. You've seen the (inaudible) house come down recently. We're happy that ended up as well as it did for the church; it was an interesting resolution. Everybody I think was happy with that. But anyway, so I think I may have a good idea. Once we've started construction, and the construction you see out there now is we've moved back the Verizon... we're in the process of moving back the Verizon line. We've only moved the electric line, and I think the last big line that will be moved through our property is the County wishes to relocate and increase the size of a large sewer line that now runs through my property which will come through our property, and that was the subject of one of the proffers that we included at a previous rezoning. So, we're proceeding certainly in accordance with that. If there's another question, I'd be happy to try and answer it.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you very much.

Mr. Pence: Thank you, thank you all.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Pence and thank you Mr. Leming. So now we open up the public hearing on this matter. This is an opportunity for the public to comment on this item. It is the same ground rules as before that you have 3 minutes to speak. When the green light comes on, give us your name and address. And then when you start talking, that's when the time will start. When you see the yellow light, you have 1 moment... 1 minute -- I love saying moment -- 1 minute left, and then when the red light comes on we ask that you wrap up your comments. So, I open up the public hearing. Is there anyone who wishes to speak on this matter? Seeing absolutely no one I will close the public hearing. Since obviously there's nothing else to ask staff or the applicant about since nobody raised anything, Mr. Rhodes, this is in your district.

Mr. Rhodes: Yes, Mr. Chairman, thank you. Unless there's any issue from any other member, I would make a motion to recommend approval of CUP16151554, the Conditional Use Permit for the The Garrison at Stafford Financial Institution.

Mrs. Bailey: I'll second.

Mr. Boswell: Second.

Mr. Coen: Alright, we have a motion by Mr. Rhodes, seconded almost simultaneously by Mrs. Bailey and Mr. Boswell. Do you have a preference? Alright, Mrs. Bailey -- only because ladies first. Mr. Rhodes, any comment?

Mr. Rhodes: I would just submit I appreciate the update, what you're able to share. I know you're in negotiations on the many aspects of it. Certainly this proposal is consistent with what was presented before us when the ultimate plan came forward; it's just another evolution of moving that project forward. And looking forward to being able to hear more about what will be happening there. It'll be a good development. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Rhodes; Mrs. Bailey?

Mrs. Bailey: No further comment.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Mr. Coen: Alright, anyone else? Any other comments? Alright, seeing none, we'll take it to a vote. The motion is to approve this concept and this plan. And it passes unanimously (7-0). Thank you Mr. Pence, good luck. And thank you Mr. Leming.

Mr. Leming: Thank you all.

Mr. Coen: And so we move to our second public hearing of the evening. This is for Quantico Village. Mr. Harvey, you have the floor.

2. RC16151348; Reclassification - Quantico Village - A proposed zoning reclassification from the B-1, Convenience Commercial and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning Districts to the R-3, Urban Residential – High Density Zoning District, to allow for the development of 86 townhouse dwelling units on Tax Map Parcel Nos. 13-37 and 13-42A. The property consists of 12.58 acres, located on the south side of Telegraph Road, 1,200 feet east of Jefferson Davis Highway, within the Griffis-Widewater Election District. **(Time Limit: May 5, 2017)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Again, recognize Mike Zuraf for the presentation.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening again; if I could have the computer again please. Okay, this item is for a rezoning for a project known as Quantico Village. This is a request for a reclassification from the B-1, Convenience Commercial, and B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning Districts to the R-3, Urban Residential Zoning District, on two properties that cover an area of 12.58 acres. The applicant is Quantico Village, LLC. This would be for development of an 86-unit townhouse community. The site itself is on the south side of Telegraph Road, 1,200 feet east of Jefferson Davis Highway. The boundaries are highlighted with the blue line on the map that you see. The surrounding zoning and uses include a variety of residential uses on R-1, R-2, and R-4 Residential Zoning Districts. There's also a place of worship, some undeveloped land, and Quantico Marine Corps Base borders part of the site as well. With the history of this site, back in 2006 the site was rezoned from R-4, Manufactured Home zoning to B-2, Urban Commercial. The original development scheme envisioned a mixed use of commercial and residential apartment units, up to 180,000 square feet of building area. The residential fit under a commercial apartment use that was allowed at that time. In 2008, commercial apartment use, that use was deleted from the B-2 Zoning District. In 2009 a site plan was submitted for office warehouse uses but was never approved. Staff notes that given the development inactivity, the zoning district use changed deleting the commercial apartments as a by-right use and lack of specificity in the proffers, the apartments would likely not be vested. Staff notes that an official vesting determination on that has not been made though at this time. Also, no other development activity has occurred on the site since 2009, the last site plan request. Here's an aerial view of the site. The area is currently undeveloped and covered with forest land. There is no Resource Protection Areas. There are some wetlands that bisect the central area of the site. There is a high level... a level high plateau area on the eastern end of the property that'll serve as one of the development pad locations. There's a steep slope then down to a kind of another level area in the middle of the site, and then steep slopes upward to a tall hill on the eastern end of the site, which is on the left side of the screen. Here is an image of the General Development Plan that was submitted. And you have a single access point off of Telegraph Road, with dedicated turn lanes that the applicant would construct. Internal streets are to account for the varying topography on the site. Just to kind of highlight what I've been talking about, this area is basically one sitting at a higher level on the site. And then there's steep slopes that kind of go down then to this other development area in the middle part of the site. And the western part is in this location which, because of the extreme topography, would remain undeveloped. There likely would be retaining walls required between this upper and lower area as part of the development details of the site. And in lieu of providing secondary vehicle access, there are vehicle turnaround areas for emergency vehicles provided

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

in this area that's a greater distance from the entrance off of Telegraph Road. And that had been reviewed by Fire and Rescue staff and they deemed those turnarounds to be acceptable in this case. Open space accounts for approximately 63% of the property. The requirement in the zoning district would be 25%, so they far exceed that. And then a tot lot is proposed as a community amenity in this location of the site. Looking at this in relation to the Comprehensive Plan, the plan identifies the site as being within the Boswell's Corner Planning Area. This Planning Area includes this conceptual future land use plan; it recommends the site for Business and Industry and Highway Commercial Future Land Use. There are also other elements of the Comp Plan...

Mr. Coen: Mr. Zuraf? Just real quickly on that slide. The area in yellow, the residential, is it logical to believe that they were already there before the Boswell Planning Area was created?

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, the area to the left, that depicts the existing townhouse project. There are 136 townhouse units that were there since I'd say the early 2000s approximately. And the yellow area to the right, those are older large lot residential single-family detached homes in that location.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Zuraf.

Mr. Zuraf: So, there's another element of the Comprehensive Plan in this location. There is the Boswell's Corner Redevelopment Area Plan. It's a separate element that was adopted back in 2011 that applies to the area. This includes a little higher level of detail. The RDA Plan, as it was developed, envisioned a mixed use urban scale form of development, including a grid pattern network of streets and various types of residential and commercial uses at the time it was being developed. This image reflects one of the Master Concept Plans and a highlight of the location of this site in relation to that. So the plan identified residential uses at the time, but when the plan was adopted, due to the proximity to Quantico and potential impacts, the new residential uses was limited in the approval resolution specifying no more residential than already permitted. So, the use is not fully consistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan, although an argument could be made that the residential uses fit in the Concept Plan that was published and as part of the approval. Other than that, staff would note the residential use does fit in with the adjacent established residential uses. And commercial development of this site may not be realistic in this kind of location without consolidation with other adjacent parcels.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, before we go on, I'm a little confused here that we have a Redevelopment Plan that might say one thing and a Boswell's Corner Plan that might say something different. So, how do those two pieces fit together, and which of the two pieces, if either, take any precedence? One promotes commercial; the other has a mixed use, you know, feel to it although there's some caveat that says residential that's already there kind of fits that bill.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah, it does, you know, create some confusion and again, it's... those were the images that were created. The plan originally had a higher level of residential recommended; but when it was approved, there was no work to change these images and change the land use that was shown. But there was specific language in the resolution of the approval that limited the residential in this area. And the latest Comp Plan amendment with the latest Future Land Use Plan just adopted this year with recommendations for commercial development I would suggest take precedent over residential, in addition to the fact that the approval resolution discouraged the amount of residential on the plan. I'm just acknowledging that there's definitely confusion on our documents when somebody's looking at that and thinking one thing. Another element of the Comp Plan deals with the proximity of this site to Quantico. A new element adopted in the plan reflects the military influence areas and the Military Influence Area Zones. These zones are divided into subzones, and this whole effort was a result of the Joint Land Use Study that occurred... that started about two years ago and finished up last year between



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

the counties of Stafford, Prince William, and Fauquier and the Base. And through this these compatibility zones were developed with kind of a matrix chart, similar to the Airport Compatibility Overlay that identifies what uses are appropriate at different levels. And residential in this location is identified as having a moderate impact. There are mitigation recommendations which include sound attenuation, height limit considerations, lighting controls, and special reviews. This evening you received a modified proffer statement that includes mitigation measures... new mitigation measures under proffer 5.b. to address this concern, including sound attenuation measures and disclosure notification to new purchasers of the proximity to Quantico. The application was also provided to Marine Corps Base Quantico staff. In discussions with Base planning staff, they did not express concerns with this proposal. They did note that they looked at the nearby Midway Island facility that's to the south of this site. They have communication equipment and they had concerns with that regarding the height of structures and they determined that the height of the structures that would occur on this site would not be an impact. So they didn't have a problem with any potential conflicts with that federal facility. The latest proffer statement also includes an increased proffer amount from \$10,000 to \$14,500 per unit for the 86 new lots. The amount is below the recommended County proffer guideline of \$41,557 for townhomes. And in other cases there have been consideration of by-right credits made in cases, but that's not done in this case given the situation with the changes to the B-2 zone and commercial apartments. Staff notes that the application was submitted prior to the effective date of the new proffer legislation that applies to any zoning reclassification. So this request is subject to the old County proffer guidelines.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Zuraf?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: How does this compare, the monetary contributions proposed here to what we recently approved at the Courtyards at Colonial Forge?

Mr. Zuraf: That amount was I believe approximately \$24,000 per unit in that case.

Mr. Apicella: So this is \$10,000 or so below that per unit?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Zuraf: This slide illustrates the building elevations included and referenced in the proffers showing the general type of character and quality of the architectural design of the dwelling units. The design of these townhomes is in conformance with several of the recommendations in the County's Neighborhood Design Standards Plan which includes the varying style and materials, wall plane recesses and projections from one unit to the next, and breaking up of continuous roof lines with features such as gables. The proffers submitted require development of the site in conformance with the General Development Plan, limits the development to 86... no more than 86 townhouse units, requires construction of a tot lot prior to the 16<sup>th</sup> unit, the contributions I've already mentioned, transportation improvements at the entrance, also constructing the dwellings in conformance with the images we just saw, and then the new Military Influence Area mitigation efforts that were just provided to you this evening. With the evaluation of this request, there are several positives. The proposal is consistent with the established residential development pattern in some of the nearby properties. The residential use would reduce the potential impacts to the transportation network, compared to what the potential is under the current B-2 Zoning District should that build out. The proffered building design is consistent

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

with the Neighborhood Design Standards Plan recommendation. The proposed use fits with the RDA Master Plan concept drawings that we went over. And then also minimizes any potential land use conflicts with the Marine Corps Base Quantico. We previously had that identified as a negative, but we've moved that over to a positive aspect given the latest proffers that were being offered on that. With the negative findings, the proposed use is inconsistent with the latest Boswell's Corner Planning Area land use recommendation which envisions commercial development in this location. And monetary proffers are below the proffer guideline recommendations to offset potential development impacts. Given these issues and these factors, staff would recommend denial of the application despite the positive aspects that were cited. And at this point we will take any questions.

Mr. Coen: Any questions for Mr. Zuraf? And seeing none, okay, thank you Mr. Zuraf. So now we go and ask if the applicant would like to speak.

Mr. Webb: Good evening Chairman and Commission members. My name is Dan Webb and I'm going to be representing our group in this application. Just a few things I'd like to point out; I think Mike covered most everything great. You know, we feel like it really does fit well with what's constructed there. There are townhouses, a trailer park nearby, and other residential units. When we started this, we looked at the Comp Plan and when I looked at the Boswell Corner Redevelopment Plan, you know, it was very specific that residential should be here. And I know that there are some other sections in the Comp Plan that seem to contradict that but, when we started that, that was something that we really picked up on. We also met with Steve Hundley who is the Marine Corps Base Quantico Community Plan and Liaison Officer. We met with him early on and he looked at the project and he had no opposition. He said the Base, you know, certainly isn't going to come out in favor of it, but with them not coming out in opposition should say a whole lot. You know, Mike also mentioned one of the things that we just modified in our proffers is the construction materials, you know, to help mitigate the noise for the Military Land Use Compatibility. And one of the other major things is we're really reducing the potential traffic that our site would generate. With the way that it's zoned right now, it would generate close to 2,000 vehicle trips per day. What we are proposing now would limit that to right around 500 vehicle trips per day. You know, back in 2006 when the project was rezoned from R-4 to the B-2, the R-4 allowed a density of 7 dwelling units per acre, which would generate about 88 dwelling units. When the B-2 Commercial was zoned, there was an allowance for up to 75 apartments on that property, you know, with a \$10,000 a lot proffer. So, we feel as though, you know, going to the R-8 which would allow us to do 7 units to the acre -- you know, we are limiting ourselves to 86 -- we're right in the same number of units that has always been envisioned there. Part of the Boswell Corner Redevelopment Plan, to me what it states is that there shouldn't be any increase in the density that is allowed when that was approved in 2011. I understand in 2008 that the by-right commercial apartments were eliminated, but we still feel as though that the 75 units, there's a potential that they were vested and that they were always considered as part of the by-right use. The other item, if I could have the computer? One of the things that we're doing, we are constructing a turn lane here along Telegraph Road and we are constructing this access road, along with water and sewer that we'll be bringing up through this same area up to the project. What this is going to allow is the development of these two commercially zoned parcels right here which I think could have a real benefit. They were part of the entire project at one point, all owned by the Boswell family. And as we're bringing this road in it's going to provide the ability for those properties to develop, along with the clientele that we're going to be putting back behind the project. That's really all that I have. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you may have for me.

Mr. Coen: Okay, back to the camera. Any questions? I just have one question; how many bedrooms are we envisioning?

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 25, 2017*

Mr. Webb: Um, I mean, I would say you're going to be right around 3, 3 to 4.

Mr. Coen: Okay, thank you. Alright, thank you. Are there no more questions? Seeing none, thank you sir. Thank you Mr. Webb. I now will open up the public hearing. Remember, this is an opportunity to speak on this item. The same ground rules apply as before. When you come up, speak to the Planning Commission as a whole. You have 3 minutes to speak. Please state your name and address when the green light comes on. The yellow light indicates you have 1 minute left, and the red light indicates that you should quickly wrap up your comments. So, is there anyone here to speak on this item? Alright, seeing none I close the public hearing. Is there any motions or actions or activity by anyone on the Board?

Mr. English: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make a motion that we deny this application due to the fact that it doesn't... with staff recommendations of what I'm going as far as the impacts and the proffers.

Mr. Coen: Okay, we have a motion to deny by Mr. English. Is there a second?

Mrs. Vanuch: I'll second.

Mr. Coen: Seconded by Mrs. Vanuch. Anything else Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Coen: Alright, anything Mrs. Vanuch?

Mrs. Vanuch: I just echo Darryl's comments. Sorry, I'm losing my voice.

Mr. Coen: I'm surrounded by two people who are both ill. Alright, any other comments from anyone else? Mr. Apicella.

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, on the one hand I agree that the project could reduce the amount of potential traffic, and that's a positive. But I'm still stuck with the fact, and that's why I asked the question about what may be an inconsistency but, as staff indicated, the Boswell's Corner Plan as it exists now takes precedence and it does call for commercial. And there's at least a potential for an access point off of Route 1, if they can negotiate an entrance along that parcel. And the other thing that strongly struck out at me, and that's why I asked the question about the last townhouse rezoning, or R-3 rezoning that we had come in front of us just a couple months ago, was significantly greater the proffer amount that was offered in that case. So, in this particular case, I don't believe the proffers come close to the County's guidelines and they do not sufficiently mitigate the impact, especially in comparison of what we've gotten in the past. So, I apologize, but those are the reasons I'm not going to support it. We're one stop on this two stop journey, so we'll see how it goes from here. Thank you.

Mr. Coen: Alright.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Coen: Yes Mr. Rhodes.

Mr. Rhodes: I would... I actually understand what the new iteration with our Comp Plan (inaudible). I'm not sure that this is inconsistent given that it's got the commercial pieces that are abutting Telegraph Road. I think that that kind of complements. The dynamic that still drives me though is while our

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

proffer guidelines, when they were in place or whatever status they are now considered, I don't think we would have ever gotten to those levels. I think we've always wrestled with that reality. The fact is, I do echo Mr. Apicella's comments in that the level is significantly below the other similar levels we've been seeing on these types of projects, larger townhomes and other items, and I think that that's really... that and one other nitpicky point would be the problematic aspects I have on the application. If we were beyond that, then I would have just talked about a second tot lot or something else or more centrally located tot lot on the GDP. But, I mean, that would have been hugely on the margins of miniscule of the items. But I think the issue that might be considered to be confronted when this goes to the Board of Supervisors, at least as one person here, I really only sit on the level of proffers given the realities of school and other dynamics and how it has to offset and mitigate the implications it has on the County. That's really the only thing that holds me in a compromised position. So, that's it. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Rhodes. Anyone else? Alright, I will echo the sentiments of everybody who's spoken about the consistency with other proffers, and I've been consistent on that my entire time on this body of trying to be consistent about how we get and what we get in proffers, particularly if it's 3 to 4 bedrooms. That's a large number. And so there are many logical reasons, as staff pointed out in his report. I go along with what staff has said which was to go for rejection of it. Alright, so we have a motion before us to deny the Quantico Village application; if we will vote. Alright, and so the motion for denial has passed by 6 to 1 with 1 abstention, which was Mr. Boswell... 6 to 0 with 1 abstention (*Mr. Boswell abstained*). And so now we move onto our next item for the evening and that would be the Unfinished Business, which would be the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Harvey once again. Oh, we've got a different face than Mr. Zuraf.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

3. Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance - Proposed Ordinance O17-08 would amend Stafford County Code Sec. 28-33, "Districts Generally;" Sec. 28-34, "Purpose of Districts" Sec. 28-35, "Table of Uses and Standards;" and Sec. 28-125, "Types permitted in R-2, R-3, and R-4 districts," to create a new R-5 Age-Restricted Zoning District. The R-5 district would provide areas of high-intensity residential uses designed and intended to be multi-family dwellings for persons of 55 years in age or older, in accordance with all federal and state laws and regulations. Such districts are to be located within the designated Urban Services Area in the Comprehensive Plan, where public water and sewer are available and transportation systems are adequate.  
**(Time Limit: March 23, 2017)**  
**(Authorize for Public Hearing By: February 22, 2017)**  
**(Potential Public Hearing Date: March 22, 2017)**

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Susan Blackburn will lead the discussion on this matter,

Mrs. Blackburn: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Planning Commission members, this was unfinished business that you dealt with at your last meeting. And it is a proposed text amendment for age-restricted housing, and it is to create a new R-5 Age-Restricted Zoning District. And the R-5 district would provide areas of high-intensity residential uses designed and intended to be multi-family dwellings for persons of 55 years or older, in accordance with all federal and state and local regulations. And Mr. Doug Janney... is that correct?... a local developer had submitted this request to create this new zoning district and he has a piece of property that he would like to develop with this and that is attached in your packet showing the layout. And he currently owns a 6-acre tract of land and it is located in South Stafford, and he proposes to construct two age-restricted apartment buildings with a community center for use by future residents of this project. Now, the Zoning Ordinance currently allows retirement

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

housing by conditional use permit in the R-2, Urban Residential-Medium Density; R-3, Urban Residential-High Density; PD-1, Planned Development-1; PD-2, Planned Development-2; and as a by-right use in the RBC, Recreational Business Campus. The Life Care/Retirement District, by definition, provides housing for the elderly and that district must contain a minimum of 20 acres and a maximum density of 15 dwelling units. And that particular district is intended to provide a continuity of care from independent living through assisted living to actual nursing beds. The R-2 Zoning District allows a maximum density of 3.5 dwelling units. R-3, RBC, and PD-1 have 7 dwelling units per acre. The PD-2 is 3.25. Now the PD-1, PD-2, and RBC Zoning Districts have large minimum acreage requirements, and they're intended for multiple uses, and not really suitable for infill development as Mr. Janney would like this to be. Now the R-2 and R-3 Zoning Districts do not have minimum lot sizes. At the January 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Planning Commission... you all discussed this and there were concerns about density levels of the units that were too high and asked staff to research density levels permitted in the neighboring jurisdictions. You also asked that the language for the purpose of the district exclude the military impact area as shown in the Comprehensive Plan, and that attachment is Attachment 5 and that map is also in your packet. Staff did some research and found that Fairfax County and Prince William County both have zoning districts that allow for 16 to 30 dwelling units per acre. And that my initial review was that these densities are to complement mixed dwelling developments or mixed use developments. I have done a little more research and I may have found one in Prince William that actually deals with age restriction. But I will have to do some more research because going through the maze of their ordinance, I was not able to actually determine if it was an individual district or not. Spotsylvania County allows for densities up to 12 units per acre, and that has a minimum of 4 acres of land and they also have densities up to 16 units per acre, but that's in a mixed residential development. So, except for this new find of Prince William, I was not able to really find any jurisdiction that has an individual district for age restriction. I did have in your packet an amended language that does exclude the military impact area, and there was also a request that we remove the multi-family portion of the uses permitted because the retirement housing allows for multiple types of units allowed. And our definition states that retirement housing is a building or group of buildings comprised of more than one dwelling unit that is designed to accommodate physical and social needs of senior citizens in a community setting for retirement and pre-retirement households. And it goes on to say it can include adult daycare, congregate housing, duplex dwellings, multi-families, townhouse, patio dwellings, village dwellings, weak-link townhouse dwellings, single-family detached dwellings and ancillary commercial activities may be permitted. So, that was one of the requests that we do remove just the multi-family. And I do have a question for Ms. McClendon. If we... I know the request was for multi-family, and can we make those kinds of changes, or at least make recommendations for those changes?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman and Mrs. Blackburn, I believe the Board sent this down to the Planning Commission with the latitude to make changes. So if the Planning Commission would like to make that change to the ordinance prior to the public hearing, you can.

Mrs. Blackburn: Okay. And then I have another question. Is the purpose of the district strong enough to restrict it to 55 and older and not put any kind of language into uses, apartments for 55 and older or anything like that? Did that make sense?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Chairman and Mrs. Blackburn, I believe the language is sufficient. It restricts the housing to 55 and older in accordance with federal and state laws.

Mrs. Blackburn: Okay, good. Thank you. And, let's see... so we've done all of that. And if adopted, the proposed Zoning Ordinance would be applied in many areas of the County's Urban Service Areas, and staff notes that the Comprehensive Plan contemplates densities as high as 12 dwelling units per acre in the Targeted Growth Areas. It does not identify areas for densities as high as contemplated with the

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 25, 2017*

new zoning district. And should the Planning Commission find this proposed amendment to be desirable, it may consider recommending to the Board that it initiate a text amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to accommodate this style of development. At the Community and Economic Development Committee, the Board of Supervisors considered this zoning category at the November 1, 2016 meeting and voted 3-0 to send the matter to the full Board for its consideration. The Board referred this amendment to you, the Planning Commission, on November 22 and authorized the Planning Commission to make changes to the amendment as deemed necessary and appropriate. And the staff recommends the Planning Commission identify any desired or necessary changes in addition to what's been done, and authorize a public hearing for the proposed amendment. And the deadline for the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing is March 22<sup>nd</sup>. Do you have any questions?

Mr. Coen: Alright, any questions? Yes, Mr. English.

Mr. English: Mrs. Blackburn, where this is planned in the south end, what about consideration for the Shannon Airport? Is that noise... would that be in consideration of that? How close is that? I know it's close but in their flight path as far as like our general airport?

Mrs. Blackburn: I don't have a map of that but I can easily check that for you, yes.

Mr. English: Yeah, I think that would be my concern too because I think, if he's worried about noise, how much noise is that generating?

Mr. Coen: Okay. Mr. Apicella?

Mr. Apicella: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the great research staff's done on this topic, so I've got some questions. So, as I understand it, Stafford has several zoning categories that permit retirement housing, just not at the density that Mr. Janney is requesting.

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: And of the zoning categories that was identified in the staff report, given the 6-acre size of Mr. Janney's lot he could pursue an R-2 or R-3 rezoning request?

Mrs. Blackburn: He could but it would require a conditional use permit approval.

Mr. Apicella: Right, but he could.

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Because there's no size limitation...

Mrs. Blackburn: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: ... in those two zoning districts.

Mrs. Blackburn: Correct.

Mr. Apicella: So, as I see it, the R-3 zoning district would allow up to 7 units?

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes sir.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Mr. Apicella: And so that would provide about 42 units on that 42-acre... I'm sorry, 42 units on that 6-acre parcel?

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: Now what zoning categories in Stafford provide the highest intensities and what are their densities?

Mrs. Blackburn: Mr. Harvey, do you know that off the top of your head?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Apicella, as Mrs. Blackburn mentioned, the LC, Life Care allows up to 15 dwelling units per acre. The UD, Urban Development zoning category...

Mr. Apicella: But, can I stop you right there? I'm sorry. There's something very specific about that, right, the Life Care that may not fit in with what Mr. Janney is trying to do on this parcel. Is that correct?

Mr. Harvey: Correct. The Life Care District would not fit for this property for two specific reasons; the minimum tract size is 20 acres, which this site is less than that, and also the requirement is that that's intended to be a graduated care type of community where you have nursing home amenities as well as assisted living amenities and independent living. And all three are required. This proposal is for specifically independent living retirement housing. Also, the UD zone has a higher density that's allowed and I don't recall specifically what that density number is, but it's close to the LC if I recall correctly.

Mrs. Blackburn: And then we have the P-TND but that's also a mixed use.

Mr. Apicella: But nothing gets even close to 24 units.

Mrs. Blackburn: No.

Mr. Apicella: So, you indicated that, and you did a little bit more research, the information you were able to collect that there are few if any Virginia localities that have a retirement housing specific zoning category.

Mrs. Blackburn: In the neighboring areas that I looked, and I can expand that search.

Mr. Apicella: And I think that would be helpful to maybe cast the net a little bit wider and further, and even (inaudible) to go outside of Virginia. And I don't know if being a Dillon Rule state makes a difference but if we have to limit it to Dillon Rule states. I just want to see... part of what I'm concerned about, aside just from the what I think is a very high density amount, is making sure if we were to pull the trigger on something like this the language is pretty concrete. And I'd like to see what others have come up if they have this specific zoning category, because we don't. And again, as I said at the last meeting, I'm always concerned about being a trailblazer, and we've had to come back and fix things because we didn't necessarily see all the unanticipated issues that came up. And I think the other thing that might be helpful for some context, there are 55+ communities in this area, again, maybe not fitting within the vision of Mr. Janney. So, and I'm not asking for an exhaustive search but maybe some examples, if that's what it takes, of 55+ communities in the Fredericksburg area, the acreage of those developments, what they're zoning categories are, the densities, and the kind of housing, just so I can

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

understand what Mr. Janney is envisioning versus what others have done and whether what he's trying to do is realistic in, again, given the small size of his lot.

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes sir.

Mr. English: Mr. Apicella, wouldn't it maybe have him come to the next meeting and maybe answer some of these questions?

Mr. Apicella: Well, I think that would be fine, but I'm also trying to get a perspective of has this been done elsewhere and what does it look like.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Anything else?

Mr. Apicella: That's it Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Coen: Okay, any other questions for Mrs. Blackburn? And I just... Mr. Harvey and Ms. McClendon, I mean, if it's our desire to defer this, that has to be a motion and go through the whole... or we can just say that's what we want to do?

Ms. McClendon: Mr. Coen, this action is... this item is not up for action because it hasn't been through public hearing. So you can simply move past it and we'll bring it back at the next meeting.

Mr. Coen: Alright. So, I think it's pretty clear that there are several people that would like to get more information. You even indicated that. So, if I'm summarizing, you can make sure that I have all the things that were sort of raised so that we're all on the same page. You were going to look into the Prince William County item to get more information. Mr. English, Mr. Apicella, and I'll say myself would like to hear from the applicant to get their idea. Also, I think it would behoove us to get information on the impact of this type of development zoning on the County, as far as Fire and Rescue and whatnot, and how that also relates to the new proffer law. We have Mr. English's concepts or concerns about airports and flight paths for both Shannon and for ours, if I'm correct Mr. English.

Mr. English: Mainly Shannon.

Mr. Coen: Yep. Mr. Apicella asked for a 55 and older other residences in our area, how many acres, and what type of housing. Is that summary for what you were addressing?

Mr. Apicella: Sure.

Mr. Coen: You had another item in there too, I think.

Mr. Apicella: Well, what I said was the acreage, the zoning categories, densities, and what kind of housing they have.

Mr. Coen: Okay, you got the last two? Okay. I also would like... I'm just sort of curious if other areas have... we already have the LC. Are there other areas that sort of have the LC but they encompass what this is envisioning? I mean, I understand that this is looking at not being transitioned into a long term care.

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes sir.



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Mr. Coen: But we already have LC. So, in theory, would it be something that would be better served sliding under that as an entire concept? Maybe that's what other communities are doing. Or is it that these need to be two standalone concepts? And I just... I don't have the answer; I'm just curious if other communities are looking at it as we have senior living, period, and then under that umbrella we have what we call LC and then what they're envisioning. And I don't have the answer, but I'm just wondering if rather than coming up with a whole new category we just look at the existing category and see what we need to do. Mr. Apicella, did you have another item?

Mr. Apicella: Well, I just wanted... you mentioned looking at the impact on Fire and Rescue. I would just say let's look at the impacts, whatever those might be, beyond Fire and Rescue; Social Services, whatever.

Mr. Coen: Right.

Mr. Apicella: Obviously it's not going to impact schools but there are other (inaudible).

Mr. Coen: And that's sort of what I was inferring, but yes.

Mr. Apicella: Libraries.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Any other items that you wish for staff to have? And we would sort of... we're looking at February 8<sup>th</sup> to come back. Is that too soon for you to gather all that information? That's still... we have quite a window before we'd have to authorize a public hearing by our second meeting in February. So, I mean, theoretically you have a month if you needed it, but do you think the 8<sup>th</sup> is acceptable or would you say that's too close?

Mrs. Blackburn: Well, I would love to say I would be able to get it done. I'm just afraid that I will run into mazes of...

Mr. Coen: Prince William.

Mrs. Blackburn: Yes.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend that we continue to discuss at the next meeting to have the applicant come in and give us a more clear picture of their envisioned project.

Mr. Coen: What they're envisioning. Okay. Just as long as we articulate to him that we may... we're still gathering information and we may not actually call, go for a public hearing until the following one. Just so that they don't feel as though they're being invited in on one premise and then we do otherwise. Mr. Rhodes, did I hear you?

Mr. Rhodes: Oh, I just agree. I think even if it's iterative or we're not quite there, we can move it a little further rather than waiting right till our last opportunity to address. If there's anything in between we want to address, we've got the opportunity to do it.

Mrs. Blackburn: I will work to try and get everything together for the next meeting.

Mr. Coen: Well, and then quite honestly that gives you a window because it may well be that on the 8<sup>th</sup> he comes forward, offers something, and then that opens a new avenue for research. So, don't feel like you have to do everything by the 8<sup>th</sup>, but we can continue our deliberations. Thank you Mrs. Blackburn.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 25, 2017*

Mrs. Blackburn: Thank you.

CLOSED MEETING

Mr. Coen: Alright, we now have on the agenda to go to a closed session.

Mr. English: Do we need a motion to defer?

Mr. Coen: No, we don't... Ms. McClendon said we don't have to actually have a motion. Mr. Harvey, I understand that the conference room is locked.

Mr. Harvey: We will get that straightened out.

Mr. Coen: Okay. So, we can have Mrs. Vanuch call for the closed meeting, and then we can retire to some location.

Mrs. Vanuch: Yeah, we can huddle in the bathroom. Okay. Pursuant to Code 2.2-3711(A)(7), the Commission desires to hold a Closed Meeting for consultation with legal counsel regarding specific legal matters requiring the provision of legal advice by such counsel.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mrs. Vanuch. So, that is the motion to go into closed session. Is there a second?

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Coen: Alright, Mrs. Vanuch, do you have anything else to add?

Mrs. Vanuch: I do not.

Mr. Coen: Mr. English?

Mr. English: No sir.

Mr. Coen: Alright, so we will take a vote as to moving into closed session. Alright, and so the motion has passed (7-0), so we are in closed session.

Closed Session 8:08 p.m. to 8:32 p.m.

Mr. Coen: Alright, I call this meeting back in session, and Mrs. Vanuch, if you'll do your honors.

Mrs. Vanuch: The Stafford County Planning Commission, on this day the 25<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2017, that it be and hereby does certify that to the best of each member's knowledge: (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act were discussed in the Closed Meeting to which this certification applies; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the said Closed Meeting was convened were heard, discussed, or considered by the Commission.

Mr. Coen: Alright, and we don't need to vote back in, correct? We do. Alright, so we have a motion by Mrs. Vanuch; is there a second?

Mr. English: Second.

Mr. Coen: Mr. English will second. Any comment from anyone? Alright, we'll vote to come back officially. Alright, and so unanimously (7-0) we come back from our closed session. So, now we move on to New Business and the new business... and I'll give a little bit of preface if I may, Mr. Harvey. One of the things that we've done this evening is to look at other communities and see what our neighbors in other parts of the state are doing, and to get the best and the brightest of what we can. And with that in mind, I was made aware of some things that the City of Fredericksburg was looking in relationship to the proffer legislation. And so I just asked staff if they could look into that for us and bring that forward so that we would know basically different avenues that are there. And so now I'll turn it over to Mr. Harvey.

NEW BUSINESS

4. Discuss City of Fredericksburg Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. For this presentation, both Mike Zuraf and Brian Geouge will be giving the staff overall... overview.

Mr. Coen: Thank you Mr. Zuraf and welcome Mr. Geouge, nice to have you.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening again. So, again, we're before you to review the -- and if I could have the computer please -- to review and discuss the effort being considered by the City of Fredericksburg to amend their Comp Plan in response to the latest amendments to the State Legislation regarding proffers that could allow for more... that might be allowed for more flexibility and what could be considered acceptable proffers in certain situations. So, our presentation is going to look at the latest legislation; just a quick brief summary of that and provisions that allow for exemptions from the legislation; summary the City's proposed amendments; provide some visual examples to illustrate the affect the potential amendments would have on future development; and review potential locations and kind of procedural considerations should this be something that Stafford would consider as something they'd like. So, you're all familiar with Virginia Code Section 15.2-2303.4. This is the conditional rezoning proffer section of the State Code. And there are amendments effective July 1<sup>st</sup> of last year that impose new parameters that limit the extent to which proffers can be collected. There are certain criteria. The impacts from the... the proffer has to be attributable to impacts generated from the proposed development. The proffers have to relate to specific public facility types, those being schools, parks and recreation, fire and rescue, and transportation specifically. The amount of the contribution has to be associated with the excess capacity resulting from the new project on specific facilities that would be in the specific service area of the project. And the capacity has to be related to current conditions and cannot account for other planned development that might add to the impacts. And the use must receive a direct and material... the project must receive a direct and material benefit to the proffers that are being provided. So, that's just a quick summary. Now, in the same code section, there are some exemptions from that criteria. Subsection e provides the exemption from the provisions for new residential development if one of three alternative criteria are satisfied. The last two alternatives, alternatives 2 and 3, reference and refer to development that's in proximity to Metrorail, so those two options are out unless we plan on adding Metrorail. The first alternative, though, is criteria that may be possible here. It states that the exemption would occur if any locations were an approved small comprehensive plan in which the delineated area is designated as a revitalization area, encompasses mass transit as defined in Section 33.2 of the State Code, and includes mixed use development and allows a density of at least 3.0 FAR in a portion of the area. Staff looked at the definition; Fredericksburg Regional Transit does meet that mass transit definition. So this is a possibility that would allow for an exemption of the limitations in the new ordinance. So, looking at the City of Fredericksburg example, the Comprehensive Plan amendments are now being proposed that would

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

allow them to comply with the exemption criteria that I just went over. As background, the Comprehensive Plan in the City of Fredericksburg divides the city up into 10 planning areas. This map is out of the City's current Comprehensive Plan that identifies those subdivisions. So, the City's proposal would designate 9 of the 10 areas as small area comprehensive plans that, in line with the State Code, are designated for revitalization, served by mass transit, include mixed use development, and allows density of at least 3.0 FAR, Floor Area Ratio, in a portion of each area. Also, the proposal would establish policies that require adequate public facilities and services and would incorporate a specific definition for revitalization addressing... and in their definition they have a proposed revitalization definition. The general criteria in their definition would identify these areas as having large surface parking areas, significant structure age, and a low percentage of vacant parcels in the designated area. So, the proposal also would add recommendations supporting this higher floor area ratio up to 3.0 with a special use permit in commercial zones only. Currently I believe the County ordinances and plans only support up to 1.0 FAR, so this would be an increase with a special use permit which is equivalent to our conditional use permit process. They include a map that highlights where these locations would be and the zones that would support that currently in the City. No changes are proposed to any residential density recommendations as part of this amendment. And then there would be concurrent unified development ordinance amendments to increase the floor area ratio in commercial and mixed use zones. The unified development ordinance in the City is basically a combination of their zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinance, and some of the E&S criteria all in one document. So, at this point, I'll turn it over to Brian who's going to go over some visual examples of what this higher floor area ration might look like and how it affects site and parking considerations.

Mr. Geouge: Good evening Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I'm Brian Geouge with the Planning and Zoning Department. As Mike mentioned, a floor area ratio of at least 3.0 would be needed in order to be exempt from this legislation. So, I wanted to give you some examples of what these different floor area ratios look like in terms of scale of development. So, for that I've got a few examples here. You can see a birds-eye view of downtown Fredericksburg with four developments shown here; a couple shops on Caroline Street; City Hall; Courthouse; and Executive Plaza. And one thing to point out here is that there are some parking areas that serve these uses. Some public parking areas, we have some here and also a garage here that would serve a lot of these uses. So taking a little closer look at some of these, here's the shops on Caroline Street with a FAR of 3.5. You can see here on the upper right that the building occupies the entire parcel, so obviously we don't have open space here, we don't have loading spaces, we don't have any onsite parking, but parking space needs for this particular use is minimal so it can be expected that most of that will be accommodated from street parking. The next one is City Hall with a FAR of 1.1. And with this example, the building footprint occupies about half of the parcel and some parking is accommodated onsite; there's some on the south end of the site here, there's some along the streets fronting the building, and it's expected that those offsite parking lots and garages also accommodate the site. The next one up is the Courthouse with a FAR of 3.75. With this example, the building occupies most of the parcel and, again, those space needs are met mainly by those offsite public lots and garage. And the last one, last Fredericksburg example here is the Executive Plaza with a FAR of 3.32. Despite the fact that it's 7 stories tall, the FAR is still relatively low considering the building height; that's because it's only 60% of the parcel that it occupies. So, as a general rule of thumb, if your building occupies half the parcel then you'll need to build about 6 stores to achieve that 3.0. And again here, parking space needs are met through a combination of on-street and offsite shared parking and the garage. So, last but not least, we have a Stafford example here; the Aquia Fifteen Apartments. In this case, the buildings occupy about 26% of the site, and the site does utilize onsite parking. And here we have a FAR of about 1. Next slide here, this is meant to show a comparison between the ordinance requirements for parking proximity between Stafford County and the City of Fredericksburg. So obviously, based on these previous slides and just what we know, we know that FARs of this amount are going to require offsite parking, whether it be through a lot or garage or

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

on-street. So, you want to compare what the ordinance requirements were between Stafford and Fredericksburg to see how those requirements may facilitate some of these parking areas being located outside the development. So, you'll see here a couple white circles. Those represent the Stafford ordinance requirements that the parking lot must be within 300 feet of the lot that it serves, and any space cannot be more than 500 feet away from the entrance of the building that it serves. In comparison to that, we have Fredericksburg's requirements. Yellow rings C and D represent shared parking distance requirements and basically shared parking has to be within 1,000 feet of the use that it serves, unless it's in a parking structure or is served by shuttle, in which case it can be up to 2,000 feet away which here represents about 5 city blocks at that 2,000 feet. And the last one, that dashed ring E is for off-site parking dedicated to a particular use, and that has within 1,500 feet. So, I want to talk quickly about how this could be applicable to Stafford. We pointed out a few areas that could be considered for this potentially in the future. These areas are served by FRED bus routes; they have the potential for redevelopment or revitalization and, at some point down the road, maybe they'll be suitable for 3.0 FAR. And those areas are the Courthouse Planning Area, which includes actually a redevelopment plan existing which could be revised to encompass revitalization and incorporate that language. There is a current Small Area Plan for that area which again could be revised and expanded. The next one is Warrenton Road Planning Area which includes the Southern Gateway Redevelopment Area. There's no current Small Area Plan for that area. And the last one is Chatham Heights, which is not currently designated as a Planning Area nor does it have a Small Area Plan. So, a few steps that would be required to implement this in Stafford, the first one being Comprehensive Plan amendments; we'd have to define the meaning of revitalization. We'd have to establish metrics that would be used to identify revitalization areas. We'd have to modify existing and create new Small Area Plans in areas that are served by mass transit and wherever that 3.0 FAR and revitalization may be appropriate. And we'd have to modify existing and create new Redevelopment Area Plans and incorporate revitalization language and potentially sort of just consolidate all of that into a Small Area Revitalization Plan. As for the ordinance, we would need to modify existing zoning classifications or create new classifications that allow for 3.0 FAR by-right or through a conditional use permit. We'd have to reduce setback and open space requirements to make this type of development feasible. We should consider revising parking requirements to allow greater flexibility, i.e., proximity of parking requirements, shared parking credits, and what can be done as far as parking structures, and consider revisions to building height requirements which I believe the current maximum is at 65 feet. And, of course, keeping the public engaged throughout the process. Just a quick summary of considerations: is 3.0 FAR development appropriate now or in the future? What's the economic feasibility of it? Is it a desirable landform for the County? Is it something that we would want to see in the County? What locations would be appropriate? What elements of the Comp Plan or Ordinances would need to be amended? We would need a full re-evaluation of the Redevelopment Plans so we'd need to pull in consultant assistance for that. And we'd want to consider the level of public input that would be needed for this process, including community meetings and engaging special interest groups and other stakeholders. And we'll open it up for any questions and discussion.

Mr. Coen: Okay. Thank you Mr. Geouge and Mr. Zuraf. Any questions?

Mr. Apicella: Great information. I'm curious -- obviously Stafford is different than the City of Fredericksburg. Fredericksburg is a much more confined area. And I'm curious this ability's been on the books since July 1. Have any other county's gone down this path that you're aware of?

Mr. Geouge: Not that I'm aware of. Jeff, do you know of any?

Mr. Harvey: I don't know; we'd have to research that. I remember when the legislation was going through, Fairfax County was advocating for this type of exemption. Fairfax and Alexandria and

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Arlington probably would be localities where you could possibly see this apply, or maybe even Virginia Beach.

Mr. Apicella: Right, well they obviously allow for very, number one, tall buildings. Fairfax has Fairfax City which I think is incorporated within the boundaries of Fairfax.

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Apicella: I'm just kinda going to the reality, doing a reality check here of what might be applicable and doable here in Stafford. And you mentioned, one of the big trade-offs is open space, right, in order to get that 3.0 FAR. Can we get a copy of the slide? I thought it was pretty good.

Mr. Geouge: Sure.

Mr. Apicella: Thank you.

Mr. Coen: Okay, anyone else? I just want to say it was a very impressive presentation. Thank you Mr. Harvey, Mr. Geouge, Mr. Zuraf. Really, the thing is is that it just... as you said, it's been on the books and it may well be that now people are sort of looking at this thing that was initially on the books that was preferred by certain other communities. So it's really interesting just to get it. It's just for information sake. And so I appreciate all the effort staff went to go forward with this. If we can just get a copy of that, that would be awesome.

Mr. Geouge: Sure, thank you.

Mr. Coen: Thank you. And welcome again to our happy County.

Mr. Geouge: Thank you very much.

Mr. Coen: Alright, so we move along to the Planning Director's Report. Mr. Harvey?

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

5. Planning Commission Web Page Update

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. There's been discussion about possibly modifying the Planning Commission's web page, so I thought we would provide you with some images to refresh you on what the current web page looks like. And let me see if I can expand. There we go. And this is a current screenshot of the Planning Commission's web page. We're in the process of changing over our entire website so it'll look somewhat similar to this but a little bit different. This web page has a button for someone to click on for live stream video; it has quick buttons for popping up the most recent agenda, as well as a historic search of viewing all the agendas, and same with meeting minutes. And it has quick button shortcuts to each Commissioner's contact information. It gives a brief description about the responsibility as a Planning Commission and how you interact with the Board of Supervisors. This is an example of the Planning Department web page and one of the pages on it. It has my image so people can know who I am, be more personable, and also provides updated information and gives overall description of responsibilities. This is the Board of Supervisors web page. There has been some inquiry about modifying the Planning Commission web page to more closely look like the Board's web page, with possibly pictures of Commissioners. So, I'll turn that over to the Chairman for further discussion.

*Planning Commission Minutes  
January 25, 2017*

Mr. Coen: Okay. Regardless, we're redoing the page anyways, right?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, the whole website is getting redone. It should be operational in the next few days.

Mr. Coen: Okay. So, is there a feeling by the Commissioners of putting our faces with it and not just our names?

Mr. English: Is that what the Board of Supervisors is requesting to do, that they want us on there?

Mr. Harvey: No sir. That was a discussion item that was brought up by the Chairman at the end of the last meeting for overall discussion consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't necessarily have a... I would not necessarily be opposed. I'm not necessarily a proponent of it either. I think that fits better for the elected members of the County. I don't know that that's necessarily something we need or bio's or other things. If somebody wanted that, if citizens wanted to see that, you know, I certainly wouldn't oppose to it. But I don't know that I'm necessarily strongly in support of it.

Mr. Coen: Cool, okay. Anybody else?

Mr. Rhodes: I've got too much grey hair.

Mrs. Vanuch: She can do Photoshop.

Mr. Apicella: Yeah, can we use somebody else's picture?

Mr. Coen: Alright, so sort of the attitude is just to keep it basically as is, Mr. Harvey, and just do whatever changes that you were initially envisioning doing anyways as they upgraded the website.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir. Continuing on with my report, there are a number of things to report from yesterday's Board of Supervisors meeting. They were very busy yesterday. In the afternoon session, they approved the Patriot's Crossing Proffer Amendment application. They also approved the sign ordinance. However, there was a caveat they want to create a joint committee with two members of the Board of Supervisors and two members of the Planning Commission to further refine the sign ordinance to address some of the concerns and debate that had occurred during the public hearing process and the ordinance development process. So, Mr. Chairman, at some point in time I'd request you consider establishing who those two members would be so we can report back to the Board and start working towards a meeting schedule.

Mr. Coen: If you'd like, we've already had some communications, and Mr. Boswell and Mrs. Bailey are willing to serve on that. I'm just making sure. Alright, so those two members are willing to serve on that joint committee.

Mr. Harvey: Thank you sir. Also, during their public hearings last night, the Board of Supervisors approved the conditional use permit application for the new Moncure Elementary School that's being proposed. That would increase the building height from 35 feet to up to 40 feet for the new construction. And they also approved the conditional use permit for the Telegraph Road Vehicle Storage use. And that concludes my report.

*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

Mr. Coen: Okay. Yes. Alright, thank you Mr. Harvey. And so Ms. McClendon, do you have anything?

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

Ms. McClendon: I have no report at this time Mr. Chairman.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Coen: Alright. The only thing from the Chairman's Report, Mr. Harvey, when we had the one item before us today we saw that there was some confusion between... in the Boswell area between one map and the other map. And there was some discussion about trying to clear that up. And so if you could, at some point, just relate how's the best way to clear up things like that. And then if there are any other issues like that that we need to address so that we have some... we take care of the confusion that Mr. Apicella has mentioned that is sort of up there.

Mr. Harvey: Yes sir.

Mr. Apicella: But I'm always confused.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Zuraf mentioned in his staff report, our view of the Comprehensive Plan is that there are two documents out there; one is a little bit more refined than the other. But the overall Comprehensive Plan that was approved this past summary is the most recent document. That other document was adopted in 2011 and was initially started in 2008. So it may be time to revisit our Redevelopment Area Plans to bring them up to the current vision of the Comprehensive Plan and come in with another further refined study of how the land uses may play out in those areas.

Mr. Coen: Okay. How... what would be the best way to proceed on that if we wanted to try to do that?

Mr. Harvey: Well, the Planning Commission could proceed in its own direction and start that process, and form a committee to discuss it. In the case of the Redevelopment Area Plans, we actually had consulting firms working for us. Currently, we don't have the funding to accommodate that so it would have to be a staff... internal staff and Planning Commission endeavor. At some point in time also, it would be wise for the Commission to get some discussion and by-in from the Board as to how you want to proceed, before we get too far down the road.

Mr. Coen: Right. Okay, so perhaps we can just... you and I can discuss that and sort of look into how best to proceed on that avenue. If everyone's okay with that idea; just trying to get some clarity. Alright, thank you sir. And I have nothing else. We move... there are no committees -- there soon will be a committee report probably next meeting. Any other business from anyone? Alright, we have a TRC on February 8<sup>th</sup> that's in the Falmouth District. We have no meeting minutes to approve, so the only other thing is to adjourn.

OTHER BUSINESS

6. TRC Information - February 8, 2017
  - ✧ Taylor Bott Ind Pk Warehouse - Falmouth Election District



*Planning Commission Minutes*  
*January 25, 2017*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

NONE

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 8:59 p.m.