

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 24, 2008

The special meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, September 24, 2008, was called to order at 7:06 p.m. by Chairman Peter Fields in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the Stafford County Administration Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Fields, Di Peppe, Mitchell, Rhodes, Carlone and Kirkman

MEMBERS ABSENT: Howard

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Roberts, Stinnette, Zuraf, Hess, Woolfenden and deLamorton

Mr. Fields stated Mr. Howard was not present due to a scheduling conflict. He thanked the Commission members and staff for taking on an extra meeting for the month and apologized for being absent September 17, 2008. He stated he was serving as President of the Virginians for the Arts and the Governor's Arts awards were being presented in Richmond. He stated he needed to be present for that event, which was wonderful for the arts and the Commonwealth. He stated the Commission was working on the Comprehensive Plan and other issues and contemplating some of the tasks that the Commission and the Board of Supervisions were trying to accomplish by the end of the year. He stated the Commission would start with the Comprehensive Plan Update.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Comprehensive Plan Update

Mr. Di Peppe state the Comp Plan Committee just had their thirty month anniversary and stated he would like to recognize Mr. Zuraf for the update.

Mike Zuraf stated he had provided handouts to the Commission and stated hopefully the final change to the fiscal financial impact model, Section 4.5 and the appendix. He stated some data was incorrect and had been corrected. He stated staff had provided the Commission a document titled Public Input based on the last meeting, Commissioner Howard requested more detailed public input that was provided earlier in the process. He stated this was a section of the first draft of the Comp Plan which included more detailed line by line provided by the people, from the various group meetings, surveys which were conducted and the first public input meeting. He stated the full size of the future Land Use Map was provided in early May, should be added to your Comprehensive Plan. He stated at the last meeting Mr. Howard requested information concerning commercial acreage and how much of a change there would be and Mr. Rhodes had requested information concerning the location of where the changed would occur. He gave a PowerPoint presentation and explained in detail information which addressed the concerns of both Commission members. He stated there was a decrease in commercial land use, urban commercial and light industrial but heavy industrial actually increased. He stated the other category which included new land uses such as urban development areas and business, which did not exist in the 2003 plan and were designated in the 2008 plan which added an additional. 1,126 acres of commercial for urban development areas and business was 3,680 acres. He explained business designation includes areas which were previously designated as light industrial. He stated overall there were a net decrease in commercial land us of approximately 4,300 acres. He explained in detail and showed an overall map which identified some of the areas where three major changes, reductions and additions, of commercial land use. He stated area one was along Kings Highway, he stated the area previously had light industrial and the new plan designates it as Agricultural, which was a reduction of 869 acres. He stated area two was Celebrate Virginia towards the end of Celebrate Virginia Parkway.

Ms. Kirkman asked Mr. Zuraf if he was talking about future land uses not actual zoning.

Mr. Zuraf stated correct.

Ms. Kirkman stated future land uses was like a wish list of what would like to be seen, with no guarantees that would happen.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mr. Zuraf stated correct.

Ms. Kirkman stated this was all hypothetical.

Mr. Zuraf stated yes, this was designated what the County would like in these locations. He stated area two comprised of 468 acres which was currently designated business campus and would change to agricultural. He stated area three was out on Route 17 and the current plan designates light industrial around and within the area known as Westlake, the proposed plan would remove future land use designation of industrial and go to agricultural and that area encompassed 882 acres.

Ms. Kirkman asked what the current zoning was for those properties.

Mr. Zuraf stated M-1, Light Industrial, A-2 Rural Residential, and B-2 Urban Commercial and show the locations on the map for the Commission.

Ms. Kirkman stated although the future designation shows it at agricultural, the majority of that acreage was currently zoned as commercial and could only be changed through rezoning.

Mr. Zuraf stated correct. He stated the fourth area was bounded by Truslow Road and US Route 1, the Centreport Interchange and Enon Road. This area would be changing from several different uses including light industrial, rural residential, suburban residential and some A-1 properties over to business designation, which would increase 607 acres from residential use to business use. He stated the fifth area was land to the east of US Route 1, north of Potomac creek to north of Accokeek Creek and would be changing from light industrial to agricultural with a reduction of 712 acres of industrial land. He stated area six was a single parcel located along Centreport Parkway and south of the Stafford Regional Airport which was currently designated as light industrial and would be changing to agricultural which encompassed 103 acres. He stated area seven was within an area on the current Land Use Plan was designated light industrial, which was located to the west of Interstate 95 and to the south of Courthouse Road. He stated the proposed land use plan would place this area and some areas around it in the Phase 2019 expansion of the Urban Service Area (USA) and the new designation would be agricultural. He stated in this scenario you would have a reduction of 384 acres from light industrial to agricultural. He stated area eight was a smaller parcel just south of the Courthouse area, south of the Hospital was designated urban commercial and would change to agricultural which was an additional 67 acres reduction.

Mr. Rhodes asked Mr. Zuraf in area eight, what was located around the agricultural designated in the dark red on the map.

Mr. Zuraf stated office designation, which was rezoned earlier this year by the County to promote office development around the Courthouse and the area in the bright green was designated park land with the red being urban development area.

Mr. Rhodes asked if eight would be agricultural.

Mr. Zuraf stated yes. He stated that was a summary of the commercial changes that were proposed with this plan as related to commercial land use.

Ms. Kirkman stated the best predictor of future land use was the current zoning and asked how many of the acres removed from commercial use were currently zoned commercial industrial or manufacturing.

Mr. Zuraf stated he did not do an analysis of how much was already zoned; he was strictly looking at the land use. He stated those were the only request for information from the last meeting and suggests at this point the Commission go through chapter by chapter and see if anyone has comments. He stated he would refer to the Chairman to see if that was appropriate starting with Chapter 1, which was the introduction of the document.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mr. Fields asked the Commission if anyone had any comments on Chapter 1, Chapter 2.

Mr. Rhodes stated in Chapter 2, goals and objectives, on goal 1, objective 1.2 and policy 1.23, he noticed with this goal verses most of the other goals there was a much heavier propensity to identify shall instead of encouraging and maximizing minimizing, but there was shall in many places. He stated it was very directive in the framework which caused him some concern while he was not necessarily uncomfortable with the concepts, just the strength and the absoluteness of the language caused him some concern. He stated for example on page 16, the second bullet down “demonstration of no availability of suitable alternative locations with the Urban Service Area” and asked how you would determine suitable. He stated further down there were multiple others, such as “shall not lead to the extension of water and sewer” and “demonstration that the boundary changes and associated land use to have minimal impact on the land or land uses outside the new boundary”, and asked how you would determine minimal impact. He stated further down and as well on pages 18 and 19 there was the same type of language. On page 19, Policy 1.4.5, “spot safety improvements shall be the priority for road improvements outside the Urban Service Areas. Road projects to increase volume or capacity shall not be funded until all other transportation needs within the Urban Service Area are met”. He stated he thought there may be a logic to have things that preclude traffic from coming into the core, which may be outside the USA, yet the policy drives it with some very distinct language. He stated Chapters 2, 3 and 4 does not use the same type of language. He stated he had concerns with the general tenor throughout Chapter 2. He stated he did not know if that was going one by one through, or general discussion, but this section caused him some concern.

Mr. Fields asked the members of the Committee that worked on the project if they had and comments on how the language originated or evolved.

Ms. Kirkman stated the use of the work shall was very deliberate, two of the three Committee members made a decision that they were not going to use weasel words in the Comprehensive Plan. She stated weasel words were things like may, to the extent possible, as feasible and maybe. She stated if there was going to be an USA boundary that meant something, the Committee felt it should be said that was how it shall be done.

Mr. Rhodes stated, in his opinion, the Committee tended to weasel word out starting with objective 3 and on, which was not a consistency necessarily applied, and in his opinion, felt the document got very hard to look at alternatives. He stated he did not believe in 1.4.5, and in his opinion, was incorrect. He stated when you get to shall, it makes it harder to figure out how to apply when you have the not necessarily bounded or defined things, “they shall be updated to incorporate 1.4.6” and “they shall be updated to incorporated the highest standards allowable under Virginia Statute” or “demonstration of no availability of suitable alternative locations within the Urban Service Area”. He asked how you would decide absolutely there was no available, when do you get to that point and who would determine that point. He stated when you get to the absolute language, those things matter more significantly.

Mrs. Carlone stated she was one hundred percent for the word shall, because looking further it states “where practical and feasible”. She stated the purpose was to be definitive, in the past the document did not give directives such as “you will do this or this will be done or shall be done”.

Mr. Rhodes stated we tend to not be all knowing and seeing and we tend to have many third order effects when the language was hard. He stated the same language was not used throughout and there was an inconsistency recognized in that regard.

Ms. Kirkman stated although there seems to be an inconsistency, there were places where the Committee deliberately used “to the extent possible verses shall” because of legal limitations on the Commission based on the authorization from the General Assembly. She stated there was some deliberation of the choice of words and when the words were used.

*Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008*

Mr. Rhodes stated in 1.6.3 “new development proposals for projects within the expansion area of the Urban Service Area boundary and for the Urban Development Areas that are dependent upon future changes, shall be rejected until the proposed changes”, he stated he did not know there would not be a time period prior to 2019 that something may be in the best interest of the County support.

Mr. Field asked Mr. Rhodes if he had a concept of how to look at the document and be somewhere between being too lenient and too hard.

Mr. Rhodes stated he thought there was terminology that could be used which was strong, but not absolute that there was no flexibility. He stated he thought strong words could be used that were not shall.

Ms. Kirkman stated perhaps everyone should keep in mind the Comprehensive Plan was only a guiding policy document and nothing would be locked in until the legislation that implements the Comprehensive Plan was passed. She stated, in her opinion, the focus was misplaced and she thought the importance of where the word shall was located should remain.

Mr. Di Peppe stated this was a directive document and as we move forward over the next twenty years and anticipate growth, direct action had to be taken in order to accommodate the growth. He stated as they were looking forward, moving forward and making recommendations, it should be pointed in a particular direction, and in his opinion it shall move in that direction. He stated he understood Mr. Rhodes’ concern and would listen to what he had to say about wording, but the Committee did have discussions about the word shall.

Mr. Rhodes stated he would also like to highlight policy 1.4.5, was very wrong to preclude any roadwork other than spot safety improvement outside the USA, because you would never have all needed road improvements within the USA.

Ms. Kirkman stated she would like to add, the Committee was encouraged by the General Assembly to do with the plan was to encourage development and direct development into the USA and Urban Development Area. She stated the tools were limited and there were two way to meet that goal, one was through infrastructure and the other was through impact fees. She stated since the question was open concerning impact fees the best way was through infrastructure.

Mr. Rhodes stated that was only goal one, he had two other points. He stated on page 21, Fiscal responsibility, he did not agree with the number of 92,000, “that each new by-right single family dwelling creates capital infrastructure costs of at least \$92,002”. He asked if it could be summarized how that amount was calculated.

Mr. Di Peppe stated, in his opinion, one of the terrific things about this document, which was never done in the past, was the financial impact model. He stated there was a way to calculate the cost of growth because the County has a certain Level of Services (LOS) which was provided to the County. He stated the libraries, park land, schools, infrastructure, the administration, the buildings; all those services were provided now and know the cost because of the budget. He stated he would let Mr. Hess explain further.

Joey Hess stated at a highlight, the methodology that was use, was to look at the established LOS, which were available for some facilities, such as parks and recreation and schools and multiply by the cost today and use the housing unit sizes.

Mr. Rhodes asked how the LOS was determined for transportation.

Mr. Hess stated transportation was based on the proffer methodology and explained that proffers were voluntary contributions that a developer made when rezoning a piece of property to a higher density than the current by-right use allowed. He stated the objective of the proffers was to mitigate the impact on the facilities. He explained to obtain the transportation comprehensive impact fee, you

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

would take the number of secondary road miles and divide by the total number of housing units to establish the service level and multiply by the cost.

Mr. Rhodes asked if every existing road lane mile in the County was used

Mr. Hess stated every secondary road lane mile.

Mr. Rhodes stated then you divide by the number of units.

Mr. Hess stated yes, and then multiplies by the average cost of one lane mile. He stated you would be taking the numbers based on the cost today which would give a ratio of lane miles to units. He explained in detail the cost would go down for housing unit type, such as townhomes, multi-family and mobile home because there would be less vehicle trips per day.

Mr. Rhodes suggested the number be rounded to \$92,000 even. He stated to state that each by-right single family dwelling creates that capital infrastructure cost, was a strong statement and suggested it be carefully caveated. He stated, in his opinion, to say that each dwelling unit was costing \$46,000 of road infrastructure and costing \$92,000 of capital costs was in reality a bit of an overstatement.

Mr. Fields stated the challenges with per unit assessment of impact, whether a proffer or a comprehensive impact fee, the only rational way to assess this was across all types in that category. He stated there were single family houses that cost the county very little and others that cost more than \$92,000. He gave an example of a house on a three acre lot way out in the county, with five children in school, you would have to add more to calculate the cost for the county transportation as opposed to a house in the walking zones in more developed areas with one child or can ride a bike to the Virginia Railway Express (VRE). He stated he did not know a methodology which would allow a scale, so the average was set. He stated in the past there have been debates about active adult communities, the residents do not have children and the developers feel they do not have to pay the full proffer amount. He stated Virginia was not inventing the wheel on creating systems which make growth pay for itself. He stated it was his belief this methodology was used across the country.

Mr. Hess stated he had only studied localities in Virginia.

Mr. Rhodes stated his last comment was on goal two on page 22. He stated he had some problem with the philosophical approach behind policies 2.11 and 2.12, where they basically state “the future land use maps shall limit potential residential growth to the amount of dwelling units needed to accommodate the forecasted population growth”. He stated the way he interprets that statement was there would be no more lots available than number of houses needed and by having no excess capacity, that would limit any options in choice and would drive up the cost of the land. He stated he felt there need some type of flexibility or buffer built in, and maybe not the best approach to take when you start limiting the future.

Ms. Kirkman stated based on the existing zoning, there was already excess capacity, and that was why the policies were written the way they were. She stated the majority of the Committee felt that was more than enough buffer.

Mr. Rhodes stated this would take out that buffer, it does not state you would keep a thirty percent buffer, it states “ in the future, the land use map shall limit potential residential growth to the amount of dwelling units needed to accommodate the forecasted population growth”, which was zero buffer not thirty percent.

Mr. Di Peppe stated Committee looked at the existing zoning and the projected growth; there was already room for thirty thousand homes in the existing zoning.

Mr. Rhodes stated in reading policy 2.1.1 it might say the future land use map, should be constrained by thirty percent to limit it to the future growth.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mr. Di Peppe stated this would be tied to the map. He stated there were actually in the zoning ten thousand more homes.

Mr. Rhodes stated ten thousand potentially developable lots not homes.

Ms. Kirkman stated that was dwelling units not single family homes.

Mr. Rhodes stated if you were using this as the guide for future actions and shape future policies, it does not state you leave any flexibility. He stated it states “limit your future land use map shall limit potential residential growth to the amount of dwelling units needed to accommodate the forecasted population growth”. He stated if you were trying to implement this consistently, you would constrain because it says “only to accommodate the forecasted population growth”.

Discussion ensued between me Di Peppe and Mr. Rhodes concerning the cost of \$92,000 per home and the potential of twenty thousand new homes.

Mr. Di Peppe asked Mr. Hess to explain how the number was derived for park land.

Mr. Hess stated the methodology for calculating capital cost by dwelling unit by type was appendix A on page 180. He stated from the top it showed the ideal LOS for parks was twenty acres of usable park land per one thousand citizens.

Mr. Di Peppe asked Mr. Hess where he found those numbers.

Mr. Hess stated that was a LOS pulled from the Parks and Recreation Master Plan.

Mr. Di Peppe stated again the Committee went back to what our own people were saying.

Mr. Hess stated there was a source that stated Stafford County Parks and Recreational Department. He stated with the cost of \$192,000 which was the cost per acre to acquire and develop one acre of county park land. He explained in detail the formula for determining the cost for each single family detached house. He stated the developer could always donate land to offset costs.

Ms. Kirkman stated typically when a developed would give the land to the county, they developer would subtract the value from the cash proffers. She stated based on what Mr. Rhodes said, on page 21 where it states “as of calendar year 2008”; insert the words “on average each new by-right”. She suggested that might assist and she would be happy make that change.

Mr. Rhodes stated he was not trying to get into the averages and the types, he was stating depending on what that was used for, it was significant to show residential costs based on order of magnitude. He stated he felt everyone would agree there was a significant cost for residential housing, but he felt the methodology used for transportation would submit that was not the cost.

Ms. Kirkman stated she felt it did need to be clear that was an average cost and not a fixed cost, so she would like to make that language change.

Mr. Fields stated he had no objection to the change and stated he thought it was important to understand that was proposed as an average.

Ms. Kirkman state the other item she would like to point out was in Chapter 4, the public costs of growth and development. She stated the figures were used differently based on the application.

Mr. Fields asked if anyone had comments on Chapter 3. He stated the new map was the current most recent version.

*Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008*

Mr. Zuraf stated the revised map includes the three adjustments to the USA boundary that were recommended by the Commission this past summer to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Fields stated the Board of Supervisors had a work session on the USA.

Mr. Zuraf stated this map did not reflect what the Board was considering. He stated that was still being discussed.

Ms. Kirkman stated the Board was considering was actually an amendment to the current Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Fields asked if there were any comments on the land use section or the map.

Ms. Kirkman stated based on the presentation by Mr. Zuraf regarding commercial property, she would like to suggest that for commercial, industrial, recreational business campus and office parcels outside the USA the Commission change the designations on the future Land Use Map from Agricultural to the current zoning.

Mr. Rhodes asked were any of those not served by water and sewer.

Ms. Kirkman stated if the property was outside the USA, by definition they would not be served by water and sewer.

Mr. Rhodes asked if they were inside the current USA and not the proposed, were any of those currently not served. He stated if the property currently did not have service and after modified could not get service, it did not matter how it was listed.

Ms. Kirkman stated the Committee has prioritized and made very clear the criteria for extension for water and sewer outside of the USA would be for commercially zoned properties. She state there was nothing in the Comprehensive Plan that would prohibit those currently commercially zoned properties outside the USA from getting water and sewer.

Mr. Fields stated from a policy standpoint.

Mr. Rhodes asked from a policy standpoint did it say they “will or could”.

Ms. Kirkman stated the policy said “it shall be criteria for evaluating applications for extension of water and sewer outside the Urban Service Area. She stated that was her suggestion and stated she did not know if she would need to make a formal motion or ask if there were any objections.

Mr. Fields state Ms. Kirkman was asking to designate commercial, industrial, RBC and office that would be outside of the new USA to be designated on the Land Use Map by the underlying zoning, not by the planning designation.

Ms. Kirkman stated correct.

Mr. Di Peppe stated they were still by-right.

Mr. Fields stated it was important to understand what way by-right.

Mr. Rhodes stated he would like to know how much did have water and sewer, so when people do apply, while that would be a criteria for evaluation, the Commission would tend to hold fairly strongly to the USA.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Ms. Kirkman stated Mr. Harvey could provide that statistics, and stated in the four or five years she had been following Planning Commission, she believed the Commission had approved every request for extension of water and sewer.

Mr. Rhodes asked outside of the USA.

Ms. Kirkman stated yes.

Mr. Di Peppe stated commercial, not residential. He stated there were several times water and sewer was extended for residential, which he fought, but he could not remember a time the Commission did not approve the extension for commercial.

Mr. Harvey stated the residential projects that had been extended, were the projects near the reservoirs for water quality issues. He stated in general terms, properties outside the USA, zoned for commercial or industrial were primarily on Route 17 corridor, associated with the Westlake property and several industrial pieces of land in the White Oak area on the Route 3 and Route 218 corridor.

Mr. Fields stated those properties were relics of thinking two or three decades ago. He stated those properties were thousands of feet if not miles from the nearest sewer lines and would never logically have sewer extended that far.

Mr. Rhodes stated if the change was made, he would like to know how many properties were outside.

Mr. Fields asked if he meant by zoning or land use designation. He stated for example the Sherwood Forest property, on the land use map shows light industrial and the suggested trajectory was residential.

Mr. Rhodes stated yes sir.

Mr. Fields stated one of the reasons for being strict about the USA and commercial designations on land that was not currently zoned commercial was so that if someone wanted to zone commercial and had a compelling business proposition, the felt the County would be willing to consider. He stated, in his opinion, the Commission was trying to make it possible to accommodate business development in the County, but were trying to draw a much tighter line on capricious and unnecessary residential development.

Mr. Di Peppe stated the Comprehensive Plan actually states that.

Ms. Kirkman asked if there were any objections to making the wording change.

Mr. Fields stated he had no objections. He stated back to Chapter 4, he had a Financial Impact Model.

Mr. Zuraf stated that was only a part of chapter. He stated Chapter was titled The Cost of Growth.

Mr. Fields asked if anyone had any questions on Chapter 4.

Mr. Zuraf stated Chapter 4 begins on page 61.

Ms. Kirkman stated the Committee added a section about implementing the language to recover fifty percent of the cost of dam safety improvements was needed to be added in the outtake box.

Mr. Zuraf stated payments for upgrading a structure.

Ms. Kirkman stated yes.

Mr. Zuraf stated that was page 82, within section 4.3, Capital cost per residential unit.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Ms. Kirkman stated ok, thank you.

Mr. Rhodes asked how the \$90,557 was applied on page 79, the comprehensive impact fee amounts.

Mr. Zuraf stated that was a specific section that went with the new State Code provision that would tie in with Urban Transportation Service Districts (UTSD), which references certain public facilities the county could potentially impose impact fees. He explained why the number was less than the initial number in Chapter 2, because general government could not be included in the cost.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the statute sited as to how the calculation would be done.

Mr. Zuraf stated no, it was very general, but did require the Comprehensive Plan include the methodology for how that information was calculated. He stated it did not get in specifics about the calculations, but it did get into specifics as to where the fee could be imposed, which was on single family homes outside the designated UTSD.

Mr. Rhodes stated not any home built outside the UTSD.

Mr. Zuraf stated on land that was zoned A-1, Agricultural.

Mr. Harvey added, that was subdivided after the County would adopt the ordinance.

Mr. Rhodes stated any home that was built outside UTSD that was zoned A-1 that was subdivided after the adoption of the ordinance, there would be a \$91,000 comprehensive impact fee associated with that home.

Mr. Harvey stated yes, there would be an impact fee imposed and could change on an annual basis, based upon the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) and the actual costs.

Mr. Rhodes asked how the CIP would influence the costs.

Ms. Kirkman stated she thought that question had been reviewed a number of times with the County Attorney and the comprehensive impact fees were not, by legislation, tied to the CIP.

Mr. Harvey stated he was referring to the construction costs identified in the CIP change/went up that would be something to cause you to change the impact fee because of the cost of actually providing those capital facilities.

Ms. Kirkman stated she wanted to clarify.

Mr. Rhodes stated ten years the cost of a new fire and rescue station or library would be higher that could drive the cost in the future.

Ms. Kirkman stated the \$90,000 figure was just the calculation for calendar year 2008, the methodology was the formula used. She asked Mr. Harvey if he was saying based on the actual cost, the Commission may have to adjust the value inputs that were put into the formula, but the comprehensive impacts fees themselves were not limited to the projects on the CIP.

Mr. Harvey stated correct.

Mr. Fields asked who was actually eligible for the impact fee.

Mrs. Roberts stated final plat.

*Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008*

Ms. Kirkman stated for clarification, these impact fees would only apply to agricultural zoned land, which was A-1 and A-2, outside the UTSD boundaries, which the Board would designate, for newly recorded lots.

Mr. Harvey stated correct.

Mr. Rhodes stated any single home built out in the agricultural zoned area would now cost \$91,000 more.

Ms. Kirkman stated only if it was on a newly recorded lot, so people with existing parcels of land would not be paying the impact fee. She stated it was only for new subdivisions.

Mr. Fields stated to say the cost to the consumer would go up \$91,000 more was not exactly accurate.

Mr. Rhodes stated someone who was subdividing for a child would pay \$91,000.

Mr. Rhodes stated the person building the home whether for themselves or someone else would pay the fee.

Mr. Rhodes stated he was not looking at the consumer, but at the person who owns that would be building.

Ms. Kirkman asked the Chairman to dispel the myth about family subdivisions. She stated Mr. Harvey looked into the matter for the Committee, and found since the county changed the regulations which require the landowner to hold the land for fifteen years instead of the previous five years, applications for family subdivisions had dropped eighty nine percent, and the county was only receiving two or three a year.

Mr. Harvey stated that was what the county was on track for now, yes.

Mr. Rhodes stated he was not sure what myth Ms. Kirkman was addressing, he was trying to understand if some were to build and subdivide there was a cost incurred. He stated you would always want to look at the second and third order effects and unintended consequences.

Mr. Fields stated Ms. Kirkman was correct in pointing out family subdivision, because that item had been brought up at every talk about rural land use. He stated he felt it was important to understand there was not a vast number of people subdividing land for their children. He gave a brief example of people that abused the system regarding family subdivisions.

Mr. Di Peppe stated when he goes to the grocery store and the bill comes to \$67.50, he does not turn to the person behind him in line and ask for \$20.00 to pay for his groceries. He stated since he created the demand, he would have to pay the freight. He stated, in his opinion, in Stafford County we have just the opposite because the Committee has illustrated the cost of a new home, and if people want to know why their taxes go up every year it was because the county subsidizes growth. He stated the county does not charge the people which create the demand to pay the freight, we divide it up among everyone in the county. He stated new homes do cost money and in his opinion, the people who create the demand should pay the money.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the impact fee funds were limited to use for those purposes, such as parks and recreations, public schools, fire and rescue etc.

Mr. Harvey stated correct, those funds were limited to capital facilities under that category.

Mr. Fields asked if there were any more questions.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Ms. Kirkman asked staff what the changes to section 4.5 were. She asked if there were minor technical changes or substantial changes.

Mr. Zuraf stated the changes were the numbers in the tables. He stated Table 4.4, the table had to be updated and the appendix had minor changes on the input under Table 1 on page 208 and all changes have been tracked.

Ms. Kirkman stated there were not changes to methodology or conceptual approach, just technical changes.

Mr. Zuraf stated staff realized some of the date did not get carried over correctly.

Mr. Fields asked on Table 4.4, how was the tax rate calculated.

Mr. Zuraf stated that was the rate that would be needed to balance the budget.

Mr. Fields asked if there were pressing concerns about the remainder of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Harvey stated he had a staff question. He stated it was requested to have the information on the public input information and asked was that something the Commission would desire to have in the appendix or to leave it out.

Mr. Di Peppe stated, he thought the Committee voted to put it in the appendix.

Mr. Zuraf stated it was suggested in the summary.

Ms. Kirkman stated it was the summary. She stated if all the details and comments were put in, the Committee should do the same thing for all the input gathering, which could make the document very long.

Mr. Fields stated he thought a lot of the material could be electronic and available through the county website.

Ms. Kirkman stated a lot of the information was already on the website.

Mr. Zuraf stated not this piece.

Ms. Kirkman asked Mr. Zuraf to put the information on the website.

Mr. Fields stated he would suggest the website rather than loading down the document. He stated he thought the document should be clear.

Ms. Kirkman stated one of the goals the new sub-committee undertook was to make the document as streamlined and user friendly as possible.

Mr. Fields asked if there were any further questions or comments on the comp plan. He asked the next piece of action on the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Di Peppe stated in his opinion, it was important to get Mr. Rhodes the information he requested. He stated he was not thinking the Commission would move forward tonight, he would suggest it be held in Committee.

Mr. Harvey stated the Commission was under a request by the Board to consider dealing with the impact fee issue by October 15, 2008, which was necessary to keep the Board on track with the UTSD. He stated if the Commission did not want to move forward with the full document, he stated Chapter 4 would need to be advertised as an amendment to the existing Comprehensive Plan.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mr. Fields asked if the Commission would have to vote tonight regarding advertisement.

Mr. Harvey stated yes.

Ms. Kirkman stated she was not willing to separate Chapter 4 from the remainder of the Comprehensive Plan since, in her opinion, it all works together. She stated the Committee would be voting to move it forward on October 15, 2008, which would give staff a month to come back with answers. She stated she would oppose separating out the fiscal piece from the policy piece, because the two only work in conjunction with one another.

Mr. Di Peppe stated that would allow Mr. Rhodes an opportunity to have his questions answered before he would have to vote on it.

Mr. Fields stated Ms. Kirkman's comments strongly resembled a motion.

Ms. Kirkman stated yes, she would make it a motion to move it to public hearing on October 15, 2008.

Mr. Di Peppe seconded.

Mrs. Carlone asked if the section was changed that Ms. Kirkman mentioned about having on average

Ms. Kirkman stated she would amend her primary motion to include the two amendments discussed, the first amendment was to add on average and the second was on the Land Use Map, for the properties that were outside of the proposed Urban Service Area that were currently zoned in any of the commercial, industrial, recreational business campus or office uses that those be designated in the Land Use Map as their existing zoning. She asked Mr. Di Peppe if he would accept that amendment.

Mr. Di Peppe stated yes.

The motion to schedule public hearing for October 15, 2008 passed 5-1 (Mr. Rhodes voted no) (Mr. Howard absent).

Mr. Rhodes stated he was not fast enough during discussion, so he would like to make a comment. He stated he had the questions concerning the designation of the Land Use Plan those properties that did not have water and sewer and the other comment he would like to make was as we gets to public hearing, in his opinion, if the Commission had a couple sets of before and after pictures on easels of the Urban Services Area and maybe the Land Use, it might help during the public hearing.

Mr. Harvey stated as a follow up, staff has two additional questions. He asked if the Commission would be willing to make a motion to consider holding a public hearing to repeal the Land Use Plan and the Land Use Plan Map in its current form so there would be no conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Kirkman stated she did not understand the request, there would not be any conflicts.

Mr. Harvey stated currently the way the Comprehensive Plan was set up, there were a series of elements to make the whole. He stated now the Commission was going to have a main document in which the elements would feed into it, which would leave a Land Use Plan element sitting out there that would have a map and text that would not match the vision in the new document.

Mr. Fields asked if that would be on October 15, 2008, at the same public hearing, to approve the new and repeal the old one.

Mr. Harvey stated correct.

Mr. Di Peppe made a motion to advertise the repeal of the current Land Use plan for public hearing

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mrs. Carlone seconded.

The motion to schedule public hearing passed 5-1 (Mr. Mitchell voted no) (Mr. Howard absent).

Mr. Harvey stated the second staff request was for consideration of how the Commission would want the agenda to be scheduled for October 15, 2008. He stated he knew the Comprehensive Plan was a significant document which could potentially have a significant amount of public input at the public hearing. He asked if the Commission would want to limit the number of public hearing cases to the Comprehensive Plan and any other item the Commission would refer to public hearing tonight or would the Commission want to take on other business that night.

Mr. Fields stated in his opinion, the Comprehensive Plan would take up the bulk of the nights work.

Ms. Kirkman stated she would like to know what would be delayed.

Mr. Zuraf stated there would be several other rezoning and conditional use cases waiting to go to the October 15, 2008 meeting.

Ms. Kirkman asked if there were any ordinances that would be delayed.

Mr. Harvey stated no, because anything the Commission authorized for hearing next week, would be sent to November because of advertising times, unless there was something authorized at the last meeting.

Ms. Kirkman stated there were two from the last meeting and she wanted to make sure those did not get bumped.

Mr. Fields asked what those ordinances were.

Ms. Kirkman stated she would have to look.

Mr. Fields asked if those ordinances were scheduled for October 15, 2008.

Mr. Harvey stated they could have been scheduled for October 15, 2008. He stated they were electronic billboards and flood hazard overlay.

Ms. Kirkman stated the flood hazard overlay was tied to citizens insurance.

Mr. Harvey stated correct.

Ms. Kirkman asked for staff's assessment if those were bumped for two weeks.

Mr. Zuraf stated the draft ad was upstairs, and staff could actually go upstairs to see what items were actually scheduled for the next meeting.

Mr. Fields stated if something was time sensitive and was not complex, then he thought it could be added. He stated he would not want to bog down the comp plan public hearing with two or three large topics.

Ms. Kirkman stated for public information purposed, could staff hand out a single page with goals and policies.

Mr. Fields stated we would move on to impact fees.

2. Impact Fees

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mr. Harvey stated it was briefly discussed at the last Planning Commission meeting concerning proposed Ordinance O08-74, which would implement the proposed comprehensive impact fees as discussed in Chapter 4 of the plan. He stated the cost in the Ordinance were reflective of the costs identified of Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Kirkman stated this did need to move forward in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Rhodes asked it needs to move forward because.

Mr. Harvey stated if the Board was to consider the UTSD and the Comprehensive Impact Fees, they would need to do that before the end of the year, which places time line on advertising public hearings. He stated if the Commission held their public hearing on this issue October 15, 2008, that would allow the Board to hold their public hearing the second meeting in November and still give the Board time to react to citizen comments and take any necessary due diligence the would feel was required.

Ms. Kirkman stated she had some suggested changes based on conversations with the County Attorney and some of the information in Chapter 4. She stated the first change would be on page 3, so it would read "Be it further ordained as amended, impact fees for public facilities be and hereby imposed on newly recorded lots of Agriculturally Zoned land located outside the County Urban Transportation Service District" and strike the words saying "which land is being subdivided for by-right residential development". She stated the second change would be after "Be it still further ordained" to add another paragraph about updating the annual costs. She stated she would add there "these fees shall be updated annually on January 15, using the Marshall Swift Construction Index". She asked Mr. Harvey or Mr. Fields if that would make it consistent with the proffer guidelines.

Mr. Fields stated the Marshall Swift index was put in to make sure the proffers would inflate reflecting the true cost of construction or close to the cost of construction.

Mrs. Roberts stated she would have to check to make sure that was not just specific enabling legislation just for proffers. She stated she was not sure if the Commission had the authority to do that.

Ms. Kirkman stated it all ties back to what was the methodology in the comprehensive plan. She stated in the methodology it was written in it would be updated annually using the Marshall Swift Construction Index. She stated the last item was when the Ordinance would be enacted, and suggested instead of leaving the blank where it states "this ordinance shall take effect on" she would like to suggest it read " Be it finally ordained that this ordinance shall take effect upon passage". She asked if there was a legal reason that could not be done. She stated with those amendments she would move that the Commission send this item to public hearing on October 15, 2008.

Mr. Fields asked if everyone was clear on the amendments.

Mr. Rhodes asked the consequence if there was no legal authority for one of the lines in the amendment regarding the Marshall Swift Index.

Ms. Kirkman stated she thought that language could be struck at the public hearing if there was a problem.

Mr. Di Peppe seconded.

Mr. Rhodes stated he was uncomfortable with the number of \$92,000. He stated he understood the logic but did not feel confident it was the correct methodology for the cost with this element, and he would not be supporting.

Mr. Mitchell stated he was going to reiterate Mr. Rhodes comments.

Planning Commission Minutes

Special Meeting

September 24, 2008

Mr. Fields stated he would like to ask was it a question of general fiscal level that stormwater was excluded.

Mr. Harvey stated currently the County did not have any capital stormwater projects. He stated there were a couple regional ponds that were maintained, but were not dealing with new construction.

Ms. Kirkman stated it would be a placeholder if the county should decide to do something in the future. She stated there was also a category for shoreline protection and improvement.

Mr. Fields stated he was not trying to run up the costs, but thought the stormwater factor was progressively becoming a problem. He stated a number of older neighborhoods have no stormwater facilities whatsoever and a number of the modern neighborhoods have stormwater facilities.

Mr. Rhodes asked was the amount of time these funds have to be used was ten years, like some of the other impact fees.

Mr. Harvey stated he did not recall a time limit. He stated the Transportation Impact Fees had a time limit.

Ms. Kirkman stated what drives the calculations on the capital costs was the work staff did on LOS. She stated those LOS were used to determine the capital cost, and those capital costs were used as inputs for any number of calculations including comprehensive impact fees as well as the Financial Impact Model (FIM).

Mr. Rhodes stated he did not know that he necessarily said that, but he has not negative feeling, thought or comment associated with the FIM and has always strongly supported Patricia's work with it. He stated his concern was the Commission was costing out LOS that were not obtained for anything, so significant additional burden was being added to the new homes. He stated if you look at it in transportation, every single road mile has been capitalized and built out at the standard of new construction and applied that cost. He stated there was a degree of significant overburdening associated and therefore he was not comfortable.

The motion passed 4-2 (Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Rhodes voted no) (Mr. Howard absent).

3. Transportation Plan

Sara Woolfenden presented the staff report. She stated she would review the highlights, looking at the goals and objectives in each of the sections and major road changes. She stated the plan was written in 1992 and updated in 2005, with significant changes. She stated the first goal was to emphasize and incorporate the proposed Comprehensive Plan Land Use and on efficient and safe road operation; it also incorporated into the objectives were concepts of smart development and coordination with future road way needs, including preserving right of way and the eight interstate crossing for development in those areas. She stated goals two, three and six stated the same. She stated the Transportation plan should consider economic development, environmental, cultural, and historic and feasibility considerations. She stated they included ideas of alternative roads and alternative financing, also, an emphasis on environmental considerations, preserving neighborhoods and considering the roadway network. She stated the idea was not to cut up existing neighborhoods but to improve connectivity. She stated goal four was strongly about multi-module transportation and was heavily emphasized throughout the plan. She stated the airport was changed when it was first put into the plan and was new and developing. She stated the goals changed to promote the proper maturation of the airport; also High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) lanes, the current idea was hot lanes and staff wanted to leave them as HOV lanes because it was not a final deal and the preference was to leave it open to any form of HOV in the future. She stated goal five was new and discussed multi-module transportation and movement but the emphasis was on connectivity. She stated this plan seeks to broaden the perspective and create all types of access; almost every trip begins and ends with walking and this plan seeks to meet the pedestrian experience and the bicycle access and integral part of the plan. She stated the existing and future conditions discussed Stafford County's Transportation rule in the region and introduces new

*Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008*

corridors in the region and discussed the redevelopment areas as well as conditions on the ground and introduces the Transportation demand model. She stated in transportation coordination, it seeks to improve the regional network through cooperation. She stated the Office of Transportation coordinates with FAMPO, VDOT and Quantico as well as other jurisdictions; through the coordination with the MPO the Office of Transportation also participate in federal programs such as CMAC and the federal bonus obligations which help to funds roads in the county. She stated the Office of Transportation worked with FAMPO this year on a bike and pedestrian plan, which had not yet been adopted. She stated part of the plan called for minimum bike facilities to be provided along Virginia Route 1 bicycle path, which was designated through Stafford County. She stated VDOT required that all road projects provide for bicycle and pedestrian access as possible and staff supported that for all development in the county. She stated the plan promoted creating access where roads do not connect and the plan suggests connecting the road a pedestrian level. She stated in south Stafford there was the Belmont Ferry Farm trail and there was coordination to become the heritage loop or the heritage trail in connection with the City of Fredericksburg plan. She stated the plan updated functional classification and Level of Service (LOS) and considered the VDOT functional classifications. She stated whether to change the LOS of service was discussed in committee; VDOT and neighboring county maintain a LOS D as acceptable but in Stafford County the LOS C was decided to be kept. She stated in the plan there was a promotion of better planning for right of way reservation and emphasis on inter-parcel connectors and access management. She stated the non-degradation policy and offsetting impact policies were policies in effect that were not documented. She stated if development comes in they need to offset their development to the level impacted in the roadway network. She stated these policies were also in effect in other localities in Virginia. She stated since the plan was developed, VDOT instituted new guidelines, which include Chapter 527, which requires Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for rezonings, preliminary plans, site plans and other. She stated this would bring the county TIA in alignment with Chapter 527 and all TIA's that come into the county would come in under the Chapter 527 guidelines. She stated the primary road were now subject to stricter regulations as well as access directly off the interstate. She stated access management regulated the spacing of driveways, which promotes safety and the preservation of road capacity because there were fewer conflicts with through traffic and less stop and go traffic; this was one of the critical item that would help the road capacity to last longer and have fewer accidents. She stated these programs were updated or renewed since the last update of the Transportation Plan: the Highway Corridor Overlay District (HCOD), the redevelopment areas, Guidelines on Zoning Designations and Residential Traffic Management Program and this Transportation Plan updated them and would included the information and put them into context of Transportation. She stated staff wanted to create one source list for funding, which was included in the plan. She stated the service district, impact fees and two percent gas tax were among the some of the few on the funding list. She stated the Economic Development Office mentioned that CDA's may need to be added to the list, as it was used to fund roads. She discussed the maps of the Transportation Improvement network as approved by the Transportation Committee and went through changes to the roads. She stated Warrenton Road was designated as a four lane road. She stated Plantation Drive was a part of the Centerport Parkway, Enon Road and Mine Road extended pathway and was designated as a four lane. She stated Lions Boulevard was upgraded and needed to be added to the map showing a two lane upgrade. She stated Tomorrow Street should be completed by the time the plan gets approved. She stated McClain extended was a private road and staff did not feel that needed to be put on the Transportation Plan.

Ms. Kirkman asked if the plan called for Route 17 to be an eight (8) lane road.

Ms. Woolfenden stated yes.

Mrs. Carlone asked what the proposal was on Poplar Road.

Ms. Woolfenden stated it was designated as an impact fee road and hasn't been designed or funded. She stated it would have to be brought before the Board of Supervisors before anything can start but the idea was that there would be a connector to Truslow as designated. She stated it was designated four lane was to keep it consistent with the rest of Truslow Road. She stated in southwestern Stafford there were changes due to the reservoir and no longer needed to connect Rocky Pen Run, it was taken

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

out. She stated the Warrenton Road widening had been extended out further. She stated in Central Stafford the idea was in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan and with the capacity improvements where growth was; it identified the need for north and south connector roads and staff emphasized the Mine Road, Center Port Parkway connection. She stated the idea would be road improvements on either side of Interstate 95 and US Route 1. She stated there was also a corridor Leeland and Potomac Run to Eskimo Hill.

Ms. Kirkman asked why Eskimo Hill Road would be realigned. She asked if it was a realignment or a new road.

Ms. Woolfenden stated Eskimo Hill Road was to be realigned to remove the sharp curve from the road.

Ms. Kirkman asked if the realignment would change the Levels of Service (LOS).

Ms. Woolfenden stated she did not recall.

Ms. Kirkman asked why the extension shown on the map in green was there and if that would change the LOS.

Ms. Woolfenden stated that was in the old plan and was not chosen to be taken out; LOS had not been run without that segment because it was in the existing plan.

Mrs. Carlone stated Stafford Town Station was in that area originally and were going to pay for realignment of the road and the plan was not approved and asked if that was the impetus for that portion of the road.

Ms. Woolfenden stated staff did not think about development in that area and understood that if the area were to be developed it would be part of the road. She stated it was suggested for uniformity in the Leeland Road, Potomac Run Corridor. She stated when staff ran the model it back up to two lanes and staff had thought with Morton Road it would be better, but it needed to be uniform in order for the piece to work.

Ms. Kirkman asked staff to clarify what this was.

Ms. Woolfenden referenced a small green portion on the map. She stated in the Courthouse area there were connecting roads for the interchange. She stated Hospital Boulevard was already in place and designated for four lanes. She stated there was an alignment that was dependent on what VDOT came up with and could tie into Hospital Boulevard; there was not designation where the Interstate 95 interchange was going to be. She stated staff was told there was a concern with the road.

Ms. Kirkman asked what the concern was.

Ms. Woolfenden stated staff was told the hospital did not want the interchange to connect to Hospital Boulevard and that was why there was a southern connection designated. She stated the area was dependent on what would happen with the I95 interchange; if it did not connect, there would be no reason to designate the road. She stated there needed to be a receiving road for the interchange road.

Ms. Kirkman asked how an individual organization would make a request and change a plan before the plan would be brought before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Woolfenden stated staff met with various internal organizations Economic Development, Administration and various others; staff had been asked to designate some other route.

Mr. Harvey stated some of the conceptual thought process was in the redevelopment effort was to have a Downtown Stafford; there would be a road, likely sections of Route 1 that may eventually have median and be more pedestrian friendly. He stated if the interstate was dumped out, there would be

Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008

limited access right away, which would make it impossible to have the downtown feel. He stated where ever the interstate landed it needed to have an outlet greater than Route 1 to feed the traffic off. He stated whether Hospital Boulevard was it or not, that would be an issue with VDOT. He stated there was one proposed rezoning that may potentially make right of way available to allow that eventual connection if VDOT says they want the interchange south of Hospital Boulevard.

Mr. Rhodes asked if the hospital or a private sector organization asked staff not to show a map that tied the road into Hospital Boulevard.

Ms. Woolfenden stated no.

Mr. Rhodes stated staff showed several variations and recognized that some roads were coming off the highway or alternate routes.

Ms. Woolfenden stated some roads were coming in just as one road or as two road concept and was discussed internally.

Ms. Kirkman stated there was a four lane connector called Hospital Road and asked why the county was building a second road right next to Hospital Road. She asked if there really was a traffic demand for two connector roads from US Route 1 to Courthouse Road going east of US Route 1.

Mr. Fields stated it was his understanding that this was a contingency and if VDOT brought the outflow of I-95 to US Route 1 then the idea was not that Route 1 should have to absorb the capacity and would not align with Hospital Boulevard. He stated it was not envisioned that both were going to be built.

Ms. Kirkman stated the county knew the Hospital Road would be built.

Mr. Fields stated that in addition to Hospital Road it would depend on VDOT on where it would connect to US Route 1.

Mr. Harvey stated another concept discussed was if there was an interchange put on US Route 1; if there was no outlet for it, there would be a similar situation as the Centerport interchange where there would be a clover leaf environment. He stated that may or may not be the best route for Courthouse Road and US Route 1. He stated it was conceptual until the county knows the decision of VDOT.

Ms. Kirkman stated her concern was having two connector roads from US Route 1 to Courthouse Road and she had not seen the Transportation Modeling that shows anywhere in the next ten years the demand for that kind of road access east of US Route 1. She stated he was trying to understand the demand that would necessitate connecting all the way to Courthouse Road to go east of US Route 1.

Ms. Woolfenden stated for the next twenty years it would not be required to be four lanes across; staff did see that an outlet would be needed and the designation was an outlet across a receiving road. She stated whether the interchange connected to Hospital Boulevard, north or south, the idea was that would be some connector across and would not impact US Route 1. She stated US Route 1 was problematic through that area.

Mr. Fields stated it would reduce capacity at the current Courthouse Road and US Route 1 interchange, rather than increase capacity.

Ms. Kirkman stated her concern was that there was already a four lane Hospital Road and asked why that was not being used for the connector since it was originally designed to be. She asked why an additional connector was needed.

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mr. Rhodes stated as Ms. Woolfenden said it could be that the connector may come in at many different places and the expectation would be that a relief would be tied across from where ever it crossed US Route 1.

Ms. Kirkman stated there was nothing in the model that had to have it now; it could be taken out of the plan and added at a later date once VDOT finalized there plan.

Ms. Woolfenden stated that would be a policy choice.

Ms. Kirkman asked from a modeling point of view, if it was taken out would it turn a road black.

Ms. Woolfenden stated unless the connection was made to a road across then it would impact US Route 1 significantly.

Ms. Kirkman stated if the connection was made to Hospital Road, which was already built.

Ms. Woolfenden stated that would work.

Mrs. Carlone stated when the road was reviewed the connection from US Route 1 to Courthouse Road, it was based on a certain traffic volume; she was concerned that if it did connect, it was not originally programmed for the volume that may come off the interchange.

Ms. Woolfenden stated interchanges were designed for a minimum of fifty years and the county only plans for twenty years. She stated the county should consider whether the Hospital Boulevard could be expanded to six lanes at a future point fifty years out. She stated that would be a consideration of where the landing point would be.

Mrs. Carlone stated US Route 1 was a supplemental route in the event of accidents, traffic or holiday; the idea that the Courthouse Area could be a walkable-across-the-streets-type area really needed to be reviewed.

Mr. Mitchell stated the hospital going around and not connecting to the Hospital Boulevard was good because if you were at the hospital for any reason you would not want to be involved with any of the 195 traffic. He stated it made more sense to have the connector away from the hospital, otherwise, there may be more accidents there.

Ms. Woolfenden stated there were some thoughts of making Jason Mooney Drive four lanes; the Board of Supervisors designated Courthouse Road East to be built as a four lane road on a six lane right-of-way. She stated staff ultimately believed that it would be six lanes.

Ms. Kirkman asked if the Commission did not designate it as six lanes on the Transportation Plan then the Commission could not require right-of-way dedication for six lanes.

Ms. Woolfenden stated the right-of-way was for the full six lanes.

Ms. Kirkman stated, in her opinion, she was talking about the plan as presented to the Commission could not require six lane right-of-way.

Mr. Harvey stated yes.

Ms. Woolfenden stated it would need to be designated as six on the Transportation Plan. She stated there was a connector in Falmouth and southeast Stafford and the concern was that it would run through a conservation easement. While there still needed to be a connector it was moved so it would connect further south to avoid any issues. She stated in running the model there were significant impacts to a portion of Brooke Road, rather than upgrade the road, staff put into the plan an alternate

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

route to avoid four lanes. She stated on Brooke Road the homes were close to the road and would be impacted by a widening project.

Ms. Kirkman asked if the topography was reviewed for the section discussed; it would go through wetlands and very sensitive environmental features with the connection between Hope Road and Brooke Road. She stated it was the failure to pay attention to environmental features that led to the Juggins Road connector escalating from a \$300,000 project to a multi-million dollar project.

Ms. Woolfenden stated staff looked at the environmental impact in that area and found that there was not a great impact to that area. She stated the greater impact was near the Brooke Road area. She stated language could be added to avoid wetlands and environmentally sensitive areas.

Mr. Fields asked if Ms. Kirkman issue was primarily environmental and asked if it was logical to widen the road.

Ms. Kirkman stated her concerns were environmental and the environmental then turned into costs that could potentially be very significant. She stated those were the two primary concerns and the Commission asked and was told in June that they would get modeling for 2018 based on existing zoning. She stated she had trouble with a twenty year plan on a future land use map that may or may not happen. She stated the current zoning was the best predictor of what was going to happen and the Commission had not seen that. She stated she could not answer from a transportation perspective because she had not seen any modeling, but from an environmental perspective, she had concerns about that particular connector.

Ms. Woolfenden stated some portions of road were removed from the Transportation Plan because they had been completed. She stated Cool Springs Road, portions of Deacon Road, Butler Road and White Road were all removed because those roads had been upgraded. She stated in the Hartwood and North Stafford area, staff was proposing an S road connection between Hartwood and North Stafford. She stated the idea was to preserve the neighborhoods and avoid potential wetlands or any other environmental concerns. She stated Stephaniga, Shelton Shop, Stoney Hill and Stork Roads were currently being used as a cross-county access and this would increase the connection between them so people would not have to turn on all four roads while cutting through the county. She stated it would preserve the rural roads and the neighborhoods. She stated staff did not believe that this would be a through traffic truck route because of the nature of the roads, instead it would promote inter county connectivity in connecting Hartwood and North Stafford for the residents in the area. she stated there quit a few changes to the Garrisonville Road area, Mine Road extended again and there was a portion of Mine Road removed from the plan because it had been upgraded. She stated Onville Road had been widened to four lanes due to the BRAC expansion after working to get it modeled right.

Ms. Kirkman asked if the upgrade to Barrett Heights Road was necessary.

Ms. Woolfenden stated portions of the road were already upgraded and this was a cut through that people used to get to Onville Road; the idea was because of the volume of people it was sufficient to require four lanes, but there were some needed. She stated it could be designated not to be upgraded but would be reluctant.

Ms. Kirkman stated she was not suggesting that and just gathering information.

Ms. Woolfenden stated Shelton Shop Road was designated for four lanes and some neighborhoods in Augustine were removed. She stated these were areas designated for the expansion of the USA and were neighborhood roads and did not feel they were needed to be included in the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Harvey asked if she was referring to North Hampton Boulevard and the other connector road in Park Ridge. He stated there were a couple of connector roads in between subdivisions that stop at the creek and were never connected through.

*Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008*

Ms. Woolfenden stated those were removed from the plan because staff understood that there were existing neighborhoods that were not anticipated to connect. She stated there was significant traffic from these roads and the access was showing failing roads coming out the subdivision. They were not designated as connectors because there were quite a few connectors in the county that should be built but were unlikely to be built, which was why they were not included.

Ms. Kirkman asked if a green dot on the map represented the Juggins Road Connector.

Ms. Woolfenden stated yes.

Ms. Kirkman asked if there was anything in the modeling that supported the connector, given that it dead ended into a private road, which was Worth Avenue.

Ms. Woolfenden stated staff ran the model to see what would happen and it picked up approximately 3,000 vehicles per day, which was not insignificant for that little piece. The private road was not included into that modeling run because it was a private road. She stated the reason it was included into the six year plan was the Board of Supervisors voted on that and it needed to be included into the Transportation Plan to make it consistent.

Ms. Kirkman asked if adding that road improvement would change the LOS.

Ms. Woolfenden stated not on Garrisonville Road. She stated the most recent Garrisonville Plans were included and if sections were upgraded for the plan. She stated all of the roads incorporated in the six year plan had been added and with the designation in the six year plan, staff suggested this would not likely be improved and suggested removing the upgrade to Andrew Chapel.

Ms. Kirkman stated after going over some of the early models in the spring, Andrew Chapel Road was one of the roads that if there was just a change to the shoulders it would improve the LOS. She asked if there was anything in the modeling that supported any new four lane construction in terms of improving the LOS versus just improving the shoulders. She stated there was a big cost difference between the two.

Ms. Woolfenden stated the plan showed that it would be impacted if it was left open and staff understood that if it was built, the new Andrew Chapel Road would be a cul-de-sac or emergency access only.

Ms. Kirkman asked what would happen on the modeling if the county did not build the new Andrew Chapel Road and simply improve the shoulders on the existing Andrew Chapel Road.

Ms. Woolfenden stated from a capacity stand point there was no difference. She stated it was a capacity improvement in that the overpass could not support the type of traffic that would come through if the new road was built and there would be an increased amount of the possible types of traffic that would come through there.

Ms. Kirkman asked if the county built a road would there be more traffic on it.

Ms. Woolfenden stated there would always be more traffic; it was induced traffic. She stated the Board of Supervisors change the Widewater Plan by removing the Widewater Parkway and removed it from the USA. She stated as a result the Parkway was removed from the plan; there was a state park that was designated and left Widewater Parkway as a local road or a minor collector along the existing right of way. She stated there were donations of right of way, which would provide a state park access road that would be a collector road but would also provide emergency access for the area. She stated currently there was limited emergency access to this area and the road would provide an alternative.

Ms. Kirkman asked if there was a demand for two roads of that size. She understood the access issue but the county should not go around building roads for emergency access but to meet the basic LOS

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

needs. She asked if there was the traffic demand under the agricultural bailout in that area to warrant two four lane roads in that close proximity and the same question for running a four lane connector through the new Patowomack Park and creating the four lane connector between Telegraph and US Route 1. She stated she would want to know if the demand was there for those road improvements.

Mr. Rhodes asked if green was two lanes or four lanes.

Ms. Woolfenden stated it was two lanes. She stated all of the road Ms. Kirkman discussed were two lanes and most of them were two lane upgrades. She referenced the Transportation Traffic Demand Model, which was the old plan LOS; there was a separate model excluding that road and staff did not see that road overburdened. She stated the answer was no. She stated in the old Transportation Plan there were a lot of green and mostly D and E and most of the plan was C and above except where there was D and E where it was failing with a few exceptions. She stated even with the outer connector in place, Truslow Road was significantly impacted at a two lane road. She stated there was also an impact fee road. Most of the traffic was along the major corridor, US Route 1, Garrisonville Road, US Route 3, Warrenton Road and the outer connector was picking up significant traffic. She stated with the new Courthouse and Mine Road had significant traffic. She stated with the new Transportation model as proposed, it was compared to a couple different runs, which included the base year 2006 and was carrying almost three times the vehicle miles traveled under the new plan, but reduced the number of failing lane miles. She stated the new plan reduced the failing number of lanes miles in comparison to the old plan; we reduce expressway, parkway and major arterial roads under this plan by approximately 100 lane miles. She stated those were significant capacity reductions because major arterials contain significantly more cars than under the old plan; the new plan improved connectivity and capacity in key corridors. She stated as a result it reduced the number of failing lane miles and the percentage of failing, with a great deal more area that was C and above in the plan. She stated Garrisonville Road, US Route 1, Warrenton Road, White Oak and a portion of Route 3 were carrying significant traffic; a lot of US Route 1 through this area had less traffic and picked by some alternate routes. She stated the Truslow Road connector picked up a lot of traffic that was otherwise being carried. She stated there was a drop in the center of Mine Road because it was designated outside of the USA.

Ms. Kirkman asked when the Commission would get the 2018 model build-out based on current zoning.

Ms. Woolfenden stated there have been discussions with the consultants and within the next two meetings the Commission should receive the model.

Mr. Fields asked Mr. Harvey if the Board of Supervisors wanted the Transportation Plan updated by the end of the year.

Mr. Harvey stated yes.

Mr. Fields asked if there was action needed at this meeting.

Mr. Harvey stated this was the Commissions introduction to the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Fields stated that he and Mr. Rhodes had looked at the plan in committee. He stated it was a collective between staff and the Commission committee members. He stated there were a lot of great comments and would anxiously await the 2018 results. He stated it would be significant in finalizing the Transportation Plan.

Ms. Kirkman stated she had concerns on the timing of the plan and it was good to work on the plan because it was very detailed information. She stated it would be premature to move forward with moving a Transportation Plan until after the Board of Supervisors approved the Comprehensive Plan because depending on what the Board does, it could radically change what the Transportation Plan would need to look like. She stated an example would be early on in the Comprehensive Plan there

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

was discussion about making the entire USA an Urban Development Area, while the Commission may recommend something different, it was a recommendation only and the Board could still decide to do that. She stated that would radically impact what the Transportation Plan needs to look like; she mentioned that the plan should not be finalized until after the Commission knows what the Comprehensive Plan looks like.

Mr. Fields stated that was a logical point and could not see, unless requested by the Board, why the Commission would want to move ahead. He stated he agreed that in the in the new era of trying to link land use and transportation, until the Commission knew for sure what the land use was for the short was, it would be a guess for the transportation plan. He stated he felt it would resemble something close to what the county has, something as radical as the USA being a Urban Development Area would be huge.

Ms. Kirkman stated the Transportation Plan had real financial consequences, not in terms of road construction, but in terms of development review and acceptance process. Two examples were if it was not designated on the plan then the Commission could not require right-of-way for it; the second example was that if there was a road on the Transportation Plan and right-of-way was dedicated as part of a rezoning, the value of that dedicated was subtracted from the cash proffers, so if a developer proffered right-of-way for a new and the road does not get built then the county has lost out on substantial cash proffers.

MINUTES

None

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey stated there were approximately five (5) land use cases in queue and some could be taken to the October 15, 2008 meeting or they could be deferred to the next meeting.

Mr. Fields asked if they were Reclassifications or Conditional Use Permits (CUP).

Mr. Harvey stated there was the CUP for Aquia Harbour Substation and a Comprehensive Plan Review, Bank and Highway Corridor Overlay District rezoning to industrial on US Route 17 and rezoning to commercial on US Route 1.

Mr. Fields asked if there were any thoughts from the commission.

Mr. Di Peppe stated unless there was a time constraint the October 15, 2008 would be as full as possible and would recommend deferral.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

No Report

SECRETARY'S REPORT

No Report

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

***Planning Commission Minutes
Special Meeting
September 24, 2008***

Mr. Di Peppe reminded the commission that Saturday was Stafford Day.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

No Report

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

No Report

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss the meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

Peter Fields, Chairman
Planning Commission